Everett
Fallin
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Clarke
Costa
Davis, Jo Ann
Feeney
Johnson, Sam
LaHood
Pomeroy
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised they have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1522

Mr. DOOLITTLE changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. HOLT changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

Mr. GOHMERT changed his vote from ''present'' to ''nay.''

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WEINER. On rollcall 765, H.R. 2347, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act, during the period of consideration of that bill Congressman WEXLER and I were away from the floor, organizing efforts to stop the wrong-headed arms sale to Saudi Arabia.

Had I been present, I would have voted in favor, and believe we need to keep on sanctioning Iran.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WEXLER. Madam Speaker, I, too, would like to be recognized as just expressing my support for H.R. 2347.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2272, 21ST CENTURY COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Science and Technology, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. Gordon, Lipinski, Baird, Wu, Lampson, Udall of Colorado, Ms. Giffords, Messrs. McNerney, Hall of Texas, Sensenbrenner, Ehlers, Mrs. Biggert, Messrs. Feeney, and Gingrey.

From the Committee on Education and Labor, for consideration of Division C of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. George Miller of California, Holt, and McKeon.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. DELAURO. Madam 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. 3161, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 581 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. 3161.

□ 1524

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. 3161) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. BECERRA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

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

I am pleased to present to the House for fiscal year 2008 the appropriations bill For Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies. I want to say ''thank you'' to Chairman DAVID OBEY for his dedication and leadership. It has been a very busy 7 months, and we have been fortunate to have Chairman OBEY at the helm. A special ''thank you'' to my colleague, Congressman KINGSTON. It has been a pleasure to partner with him on this subcommittee, and I believe that we have accomplished a lot together. We are working to accomplish quite a lot today, with quite a wide-ranging portfolio.

This appropriation covers many subjects. Our top priority has always been to move with a clear purpose and direction towards several key goals: strengthening rural America, protecting public health, improving nutrition for more Americans, transforming our energy future, supporting conservation, investing in research, and, finally, enhancing oversight.

It begins with our fiscal year 2008 mark providing total discretionary resources of $18.8 billion, $1 billion, or 5.7 percent, above 2007, and $987.4 million, or 5.5 percent, above the budget request. A full 95 percent of the increase above the budget request, or $940 million, is used to restore funding that was either eliminated or cut in the President's budget.

Our first goal is strengthening rural America. Community development is a key link to rebuilding rural America, preserving infrastructure, building new opportunities, and confronting a tremendous gap when it comes to educational and medical resources. To help close that gap, the bill provides $52.8 million. That would double the broadband grant program which the President's budget request had eliminated. It provides $10 million more than the President requested for distance learning and telemedicine grants and includes $728.8 million to support community facilities, water and waste disposal systems, and business grants; $31.2 million for community facilities; $56.8 million for business and industry; and $70.3 million for waste and waste disposal programs.

Clean water. Rural communities face tens of billions of dollars in costs for safe drinking water and wastewater treatment systems. To begin addressing these needs, the bill provides $500 million for rural water and waste disposal grants and $1 billion for water and waste direct loans.

In housing, the community held a special hearing to discuss economic conditions in rural America with the USDA's Economic Research Service. A recent ERS report found that 302 of America's non-metro counties are ''housing stressed.'' That is why we are making significant investments in rural housing, including $212.2 million to fund $5.1 billion in affordable loans to providing housing to low-income and moderate-income families in rural areas, providing approximately 38,000 single family home ownership opportunities.

The President's budget eliminated direct loans and shifted funding to guaranteed loans with a 1 percent increase

in fees, making these loans more expensive and less accessible for low-income families.

Protecting public health was another of our priorities. The bill provides $1.7 billion for the Food and Drug Administration. That is $128.5 million over 2007 and $62 million over the budget request; in addition, $7 million in the manager's amendment in order for us to be able to inspect produce coming in from foreign countries.

This is what the committee hopes will be the first step in the fundamental transformation and the regulation of food safety at FDA.

□ 1530

The committee directs the FDA to submit a plan to begin changing its approach to food safety when it submits the fiscal year 2009 budget, giving the committee time to review the plan before the funds to implement it become available on July 1, 2008.

We can help with additional resources at FDA, but there also needs to be a corresponding commitment from management to perform its duties.

When our pets began to die from contaminated pet food that originated in China, the news forced us to take a hard look at entire food safety systems abroad. Our renewed attention revealed inadequate protection and an increasingly global food supply system. The budget includes an additional $7 million, as I said, for FDA inspection of FDA imports. In addition, we address vacancies in Federal meat inspector positions. The bill fully funds the requested amount for the food safety and inspection service at $930 million.

The bill also includes key language preventing the FDA from granting waivers of conflict of interest rules to voting members of the FDA advisory committee, and preventing USDA from establishing or implementing a rule allowing poultry products from China into the United States. The Chinese and others must be aware that trade cannot trump public health and that their regulations need to be strengthened to be considered an adequate trading partner.

Another of our top priorities is improving nutrition. For many long years we have failed to meet our obligations, failed to act, while too many Americans have gone without adequate healthy food. One in eight families with a toddler, an infant, in the United States is ''food insecure''; that means that they are hungry. One in eight families with an infant.

Forty percent of children in rural America are dependent upon food stamps. The progress we made on this issue with the farm bill last week represents real change, and this bill includes $39.8 billion for the Food Stamp program to meet increased participation and ensuring rising food prices do not diminish families' purchasing power.

The bill also provides record funding for two fundamental food security programs which serve our country's most vulnerable population, the supplemental nutrition program for Women, Infants and Children, WIC, and the Commodities Supplemental Food Program, CSFP. These efforts go hand in hand with ongoing initiatives, including $957.7 million for nutrition programs to confront our Nation's obesity crisis, instilling better eating habits in our children, giving them the tools and the choices to avoid diabetes and other dangerous health conditions. That includes $68.5 million for the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program, $26 million to expand the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable and Simplified Summer Food Programs to all States, and $10 million for specialty crops. What are specialty crops? They are related to healthy diets in this Nation; fruits and vegetables that are farmed in my part of the country, in the mid-Atlantic States, in California, crops that are so crucial nationwide from New England to the west coast.

Our work continues with other chief goals. Energy independence. This bill makes investments across the spectrum to grow our economy, create new jobs, lower energy prices and address global warming. It promotes renewable energy and moves us down the path to energy independence, strengthening bioenergy and renewable energy research funded at $1.2 billion, including loans and grants in rural areas. The conservation and stewardship of our lands will affect our children for years to come.

This bill restores many of the programs slated for elimination in the President's request, including the Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative, the Wildlife Habitat Program, and watershed rehabilitation, and provides $979.4 million to continue assistance to landowners for conservation efforts on private lands.

We also have an obligation to maintain agriculture's critical place at the forefront of groundbreaking research, maintaining our edge in crop development, competitiveness, trade, nutrition, food safety and even homeland security.

The bill increases funds for research and education through USDA's Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service and the Agricultural Research Service.

Finally, enhanced oversight. The committee is concerned about waste, fraud and abuse in key programs and has included language requested by the administration to allow the Risk Management Agency to use up $11.2 million in mandatory crop insurance funds to strengthen its ability to oversee the program by maintaining and upgrading IT systems and other methods of detecting dubious claims.

In closing, I think we should be excited about this bill, the goals that we set out to accomplish: strengthening rural America, protecting our public health, improving nutrition for more Americans, transforming our energy future, supporting conservation, investing in research, and finally, enhancing oversight.

Most importantly, I believe it brings us back to our Nation's most fundamental principles; the strength of our communities. We have an obligation to get these things right. Let us assume that responsibility today, Mr. Chairman, and I'm pleased to submit this bill and I urge favorable consideration.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to, first of all, start off by complimenting the Chair of the committee. We have had a number of hearings this year. We've had a lot of great oversight opportunities. I look forward to more. We've thoroughly reviewed this bill, and there's many things that we found agreement on. There are some things that we're going to have debate on today and things that we'll continue to debate as the bill goes through the process, but I want to commend Ms. DELAURO for a bill well put together. Also, I want to thank her staff, Martha Foley, Leslie Barrack, Diem-Lihn Jones, Adrienne Simmonson, Kelly Wade and Brian Ronholm, and thank them for everything that they've done. And on our side, Martin Delgado, Dave Gibbons. You'll note, on the Democrat side, I pronounced the Republican side with equal ineptitude as I do the Democrats. Jamie Swafford, Meg Gilley, Merritt Myers, Emily Watson, Heather McNatt, Elizabeth Davis and Jason Lawrence and Scott Stevens. We have a lot of folks who've helped. One of my friends on the floor said, Well, how many people does this take? And I said, Well, you know this is almost a $100 billion bill, so we all have to get involved in it.

I also wanted to say something about RAY LAHOOD. Mr. LAHOOD is a great committee member. He's going to be leaving Congress at the end of this term and made that announcement this week, and I thought I'd be remiss if we didn't say something about Mr. LAHOOD. He is a great appropriator. He's a guy who had early on worked with the Hershey Retreat to bring more bipartisan civility to the floor. He was instrumental when I was Chair of the Leg branch subcommittee of getting the staff gym started. Indeed, I don't know if we would have it without him and all of his hard work.

And also, when we were in majority, he stood and sat where you are, Mr. Chairman, many times guiding this House through hot debates and emotional issues, and we're all going to miss Mr. LAHOOD.

I want to start off on the bill a little bit because so many people think of agriculture as just farming. And yet, if we look at the breakdown of this bill and we see this large blue part, the actual money in this bill, the majority of it goes to domestic food assistance programs. And it's appropriate that it is in the ag bill because so much of what

we're talking about is national security, as seen through our food policy, but direct farming programs are in this more purplish area, and it's about 35 percent of the bill. We also have money for conservation, rural development for the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration, and foreign food assistance. But I think it's important for people to realize that this is not just a bill that affects the rural areas.

I also want to point out that much of this bill our committee doesn't have the control over that we would like to. In fact, if you look at this bill, we have an expression here in Washington called ''mandatory and discretionary spending.'' Discretionary spending is spending that Congress itself can effect on an appropriate bill. Mandatory spending is what authorizing committees do. This would have been done through the farm bill, for example.

Now, I don't like the term ''mandatory.'' I think it should be called automatic spending, maybe even lazy spending, maybe even unchallenged spending, since we debate it once every 5 years and then lock it up in a farm bill. I think that the mandatory portion of this budget, since it is almost 80 percent of the budget, should be opened up and debated. I think there's a lot of things in there that need more scrutiny. Indeed, of the $18 billion in the discretionary spending area, we have been scrutinized and we've had a good look at it.

I want to make a couple of points. Number one, the bill at its current level will be vetoed. We do not have a veto-proof majority. This bill will pass today, but not by a veto-proof. The President has made it clear that at a 5.9 percent increase over last year, he will veto it. I think it's important for us to realize this since this is a bipartisan body. This is not a veiled threat. The President has the votes to sustain the veto, and so that's what's going to happen. I think we would be better served getting together and bringing down the numbers on this bill.

The second thing that I wanted to point out is there are a lot of issues that we're faced with in this House this week. One of them is the government health care program that's being pushed on the States and taking away a lot of their discretion. Another one is the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. These bills are being pushed aside for this bill, and while I have a lot of passion for this bill, being an aggie myself, the reality is, this bill will leave the Chamber and it will sit over with the Senate. The Senate Appropriations Committee, for all intents and purposes, is defunct. We've been working hard. We've been working long in the House to pass our appropriation bills on time, and I commend Mr. OBEY and the Democrat leadership to make sure that we get the bills over there.

And yet, the reality is the Senate is going to sit on this bill, cram it into another bill, stuff it into a shoe box called an omnibus bill, and I think that's the wrong way to approach things. And at the same time, we're going to have other things that slide.

Another thing I wanted to do is set the record straight on some of the nutrition programs, because we've had and heard from a number of people on the Rules Committee earlier today that this restores funding for important and critical child nutrition programs. And you would think that under Republican control, that the bill did not give any money for food and nutrition programs. And yet, if you look at this chart, Mr. Chairman, going back from 2001 on up to 2008, you can see there's simply a linear progression in nutrition funding that has taken place under Republicans mostly, and now under Democrats. But there's no huge dip. There's no great spike now that the Democrats are in charge. And it's important to set the record straight on that.

In fact, I'm one, call me old fashioned, who doesn't think it's great to have lots and lots of people dependent on government programs. I think we should work to get people more independent, and I don't think that increasing these programs blindly makes sense. For example, the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, I don't follow the math on that. Last year the casework estimate was 490,000 people. The actual number to participate was 463,000. And yet this year, even though the projection's 464,000, the budget increase is $42 million for it, and I don't follow that logic at all. If the number of participants is going down, why is the spending going up? And the President actually had zeroed that out. Why did he do that? Does the President not care about hungry people? No, it's because they are eligible for food stamps. There's another program for them. Why have two bureaucracies doing basically the same thing, especially since you have electronic benefit transfer cards which are very simple to do, and those were some that this committee led in.

The other thing that I wanted to point out on the subject of nutrition and hunger is it's interesting that we debated obesity a lot more than we have debated hunger. I think that's probably a good thing, but I think, on the other hand, it shows that there hasn't been this horrible hunger crisis under Republican rule.

Another point I want to say about this bill, the farm service agencies, right now farm service agencies, there are 58 of them that have no staff. The Chair and I have agreed that these should be closed down. I think that's a step in the right direction; 139 of them have one employee and 338 have two employees and 515 have three employees.

Now, I've heard it said about the VA that you can close down any veterans clinic you want in America as long as it's not located in a congressional district. Well, I guess the same is true with military bases, and it's true with FSA offices and other offices. We talk about wanting to balance the budget, but when it comes home to our own district, we all backpedal and say, no, we don't want anything closed.

These decisions aren't easy, but we have to be leaders on this and not shirk our responsibility. I think this committee kind of worked through it, and I'm hoping that we're going to continue to work through it as the bill moves through the process.

Renewable energy. There's so much right now in the rural areas from the subject of ethanol, biodiesel, cellulosic ethanol and other economies that we can go out and capitalize in and help bring alternative fuel to America.

□ 1545

In my home State of Georgia, there are about five or six ethanol plants. There are 121 of them nationally, but Georgia has on the drawing table right now to build another 80 ethanol plants just in our one State. That would put Georgia on the national leaders level. I am excited about that. Because if Georgia can do that, then certainly other States should be doing that; and I am glad that this bill puts a lot of investment into renewable energy.

On broadband and distance learning, I think we all have a commitment to that. Two things that the Chair and I have agreed on that are very important is, one, we don't want the government programs to be competing with the private sector. If the private sector is already there, why put a government program out there? And, number two, for the retired stockbroker who has bought his mountain house on the top of the beautiful mountains in Colorado, why should we care if his laptop is hooked up or not? I don't think we have to waste taxpayer money so that he can check his stock quotes while he is in retirement.

I also want to talk a little bit about a horse amendment that we have, some language in the bill that prohibits people who own horses from taking these horses across international lines. If you own a horse in America and this bill passes with the language that is in it, you will not be allowed to take that horse to Mexico or Canada for any purpose.

Now, I understand that there are those who don't want horses to be slaughtered. Most of them are people who have never owned horses, who don't understand horse owners or who are intimidated by special interest groups in Washington. But the reality is sometimes you have to put a horse down, and since we have a problem with that in America, as outlawed by this Congress or the previous Congress, then this bill does give some flexibility to those people. But, in trying to close that loophole, what the committee did is they said now you can't take your horse out of the country and you can't bring one in. It is a ridiculous part of the language, and I am going to move to strike it.

Another issue that I have some concerns about is drug reimportation. I think drug reimportation is a major policy shift, and I believe that we should have a vote on that.

I commend the Chair in reducing the number of earmarks. The earmarks last year in the bill were about 4½ percent. We are starting out at about a 2 percent level. I think that is a great reduction not just in the dollar amount but in the number of earmarks.

And one other area that I was disappointed in that I want to point out is risk-based inspection. This is where USDA inspectors go to food-processing plants and, rather than dwell on all of them equally over time, they focus on the ones who are the bad actors, the ones who have the older equipment and the shoddy practices. They put more time there. It is a common business decision, and yet we are interfering with the USDA's right to do that. It is called ''risk-based inspection.'' I think it is very important to a good, clean, healthy food supply, and we have stopped RBI. I think that is a mistake.

But, overall, there is a lot that's good in the bill. I look forward to the debate.

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

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman for yielding to me.

I am the only Californian that sits on the Agriculture Appropriations Committee, and I am very proud that this bill is in partnership with the progressive new provisions that were adopted last week in the farm bill. This spends the money to implement those provisions. As the Chair just said, this bill takes us in a new direction, a direction that rural America can be really proud of.

Many people know California as the most populous State and think of our large metropolitan areas. But few know that California is the number one ag-producing State in the United States. Every one of the 58 counties in California produces agriculture, from the smallest county in San Francisco, which has nursery and flower stock, to the most populous county in California, Los Angeles County, with row crops and cattle ranches.

The new leadership in Congress has taken us in a new direction. That direction is good news for rural America. That is good news for fresh foods, for fresh vegetables and fresh fruits to get into the diet. This bill takes us in a new direction for consumers. A new direction so that people have choices. A new direction for green technology to be used in the energy field. A new direction for conservation to be a part of good management practices.

I applaud the committee's new Chair for taking us in a new direction and the opportunity for farming in America to be economically viable. This is good because it preserves open space and preserves the rural character, which is such a strength of this country.

For California, this is good news. Our agriculture is like our technology. It's changing, always changing. It needs to be state-of-the-art of technology, of research, of university work. We are the leaders in organic growing, from wines to artichokes. I am proud to represent the part of California that is called the ''Salad Bowl Capital of the World.'' The farmers who implement the best management practices in caring not only for their farm workers, and there is a big discussion on that in issues with immigration, but we have the largest farm worker force in the United States and they are now getting paid good wages. In fact, a lot of them have their own health care plans, which most Americans don't have, and they have 401(k)s for their families and scholarships for their children to go to school. This is a new attitude about farm workers.

I want to thank Congresswoman DELAURO, the Chair of this committee, for taking America into a new direction, a more healthy direction.

Let's reject the reckless amendments to this bill that undermine the positive gains made for America. This is a good appropriations bill. I applaud the Chair, Mr. OBEY, for bringing it to the floor and to the members of the committee, and I urge all my colleagues to adopt this bill.

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

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

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let me first begin by congratulating the hardest-working Member of the Congress, Chairwoman ROSA DELAURO, for this outstanding bill.

Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Appropriations Agriculture Subcommittee, I rise to voice my strong support for H.R. 3161, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies appropriations bill. Again, I want to congratulate Chairwoman DELAURO and the subcommittee staff for the product here before us today. I also want to thank Ranking Member KINGSTON of the minority subcommittee staff for working with us to produce this product.

Over the past 8 months, I have learned a lot about agriculture policy. When asked why I serve on this subcommittee, considering my largely urban and suburban district, I quickly respond by saying this bill touches the lives of 647,000 residents of the Second District of Illinois. We all eat, we all want safe food, and we all want safe medicines.

With the recent passage of the Farm, Nutrition, and Bioenergy Act of 2007, our Nation's agriculture policy and spending reflects our growing investments not only in rural development and commodity programs but in nutrition, conservation, and renewable energy. We want to continue to support our farmers as well as feed the hungry, protect our Nation's food supply, and invest in research.

One out of five Americans at some point in time in their lives will participate in at least one domestic food assistance program. Our nutrition programs serve as the first line of defense against combating hunger by helping low-income families purchase food. This bill illustrates Congress's commitment to protecting our country's most vulnerable populations. It accomplishes the following:

It increases the Food Stamp Program by $1.7 billion and creates a $3 billion contingency reserve, which helps feed over 26 million people annually. It restores the President's proposed cuts to the Commodity Supplemental Food Program and expands the program that serves over 485,000 people monthly by adding five new States. It appropriates $5.6 billion to the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children and restores State grants to help administer the program. It supports the expansion of the simplified summer school food program that provides up to two meals a day to children under the age of 18 during the summer.

This bill also addresses a wide variety of needs, ranging from increased grants and loans for rural communities to fully funding the USDA's Food Safety and Inspection Service.

The increases in this bill are sensible, they are prudent, they reflect our priorities, reinforcing our commitment to feed the hungry, to house the needy, and to protect us all.

I recommend that my colleagues vote against any amendments cutting these vital programs, and I strongly urge them to vote for this bill.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that I think we kind of know where we are heading on various amendments. I look forward to that amendment.

And, again, I have enjoyed working with you and the staff. You have a semi-good bill.

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

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

I, too, want to say thank you to my colleague, Mr. KINGSTON, in working with him; and it is not the first time we have had an opportunity to work together. We have been working together over the years.

As I said, I am very proud of the bill and the goals that we set out and the direction that we set out to strengthen rural America and deal with our public health and nutrition, energy, conservation and looking at how we invest in our research.

I look forward to the balance of our time and the amendment process, but I do, too, want to associate myself with

my colleague from Georgia's remarks about our colleague on the committee, Mr. LAHOOD, who has been an outstanding member of this committee but has been an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives, someone you could always count on to speak his mind but to be fair and to do his best for his constituents and for this Nation.

I also want to say thank you to the many staffers who have worked hour after hour on this bill to make today possible. As a former staff member, I know that these efforts don't come together by some alchemy, but it is because of the incredible hard work that people put into it over many, many hours.

And let me thank Martha Foley, subcommittee Clerk; as well as Leslie Barrack; Diem-Lihn Jones; Adrienne Simmonson; Kelly Wade; Brian Ronholm, my staff. Also, Ashley Turton, my Chief of Staff; and Leticia Mederos, Legislative Director. I also want to say thank you to Martin Delgado, Dave Gibbons, and Jamie Swafford on the minority staff. I thank everyone for their time and their patience in putting this effort together.

I believe nothing could be more important for us to move forward on this bill and get it passed. I think it is in the best interest of this Nation.

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary	5,097	18,355	5,505	+408	-12,850
Executive Operations:					
Chief Economist	10,487	11,347	10,847	+360	-500
National Appeals Division	14,466	15,056	15,056	+590	---
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	8,270	9,035	8,622	+352	-413
Homeland Security staff	931	2,412	2,252	+1,321	-160
Office of the Chief Information Officer	16,361	17,024	16,723	+362	-301
Common computing environment	107,971	---	---	-107,971	---
(Provided in other accounts) (NA)	---	(90,900)	(90,900)	(+90,900)	---
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	5,850	30,863	6,076	+226	-24,787
Working capital fund	1,891	---	---	-1,891	---
Total, Executive Operations	166,227	85,737	59,576	-106,651	-26,161
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights	818	897	897	+79	---
Office of Civil Rights	20,020	23,147	23,147	+3,127	---
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	673	739	709	+36	-30
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments	(185,919)	(216,837)	(196,616)	(+10,697)	(-20,221)
Payments to GSA	146,257	156,590	156,590	+10,333	---
Building operations and maintenance	39,662	60,247	40,026	+364	-20,221
Hazardous materials management	11,887	12,200	12,200	+313	---
Departmental administration	23,144	24,608	23,913	+769	-695
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	3,795	4,099	3,936	+141	-163
Office of Communications	9,338	9,720	9,720	+382	---
Office of the Inspector General	80,052	83,998	85,998	+5,946	+2,000
Office of the General Counsel	39,227	41,721	40,964	+1,737	-757
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics	596	654	626	+30	-28
Economic Research Service	75,193	82,544	79,282	+4,089	-3,262
National Agricultural Statistics Service	147,253	167,699	166,099	+18,846	-1,600
Census of Agriculture	(36,249)	(54,325)	(52,725)	(+16,476)	(-1,600)
Agricultural Research Service:					
Salaries and expenses	1,128,944	1,021,517	1,076,340	-52,604	+54,823
Buildings and facilities	---	16,000	64,000	+64,000	+48,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service	1,128,944	1,037,517	1,140,340	+11,396	+102,823
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:					
Research and education activities	671,419	562,518	671,419	---	+108,901
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund	(12,000)	(11,880)	(11,880)	(-120)	---
Extension activities	450,346	431,125	463,886	+13,540	+32,761
Integrated activities	55,234	20,120	57,244	+2,010	+37,124
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers	5,940	6,930	6,930	+990	---
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service	1,182,939	1,020,693	1,199,479	+16,540	+178,786
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs	721	792	759	+38	-33
'Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses	846,230	945,550	874,643	+28,413	-70,907
Animal welfare (user fees) (leg. proposal) NA.	---	(9,000)	---	---	(-9,000)
Buildings and facilities	4,946	8,931	4,946	---	-3,985
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	851,176	954,481	879,589	+28,413	-74,892

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services	74,937	74,988	79,945	+5,008	+4,957
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(62,211)	(61,233)	(61,233)	(-978)	---
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32)	16,425	16,798	16,798	+373	---
Discretionary appropriations	20,000	20,000	20,000	---	---
Payments to states and possessions	1,334	1,334	1,334	---	---
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	112,696	113,120	118,077	+5,381	+4,957
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:					
Salaries and expenses	37,785	44,385	41,115	+3,330	-3,270
Grain inspection, packers and stockyards administration (user fees) (leg. proposal)NA	---	(21,200)	---	---	(-21,200)
Limitation on inspection and weighing services	(42,463)	(42,463)	(42,463)	---	---
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety	600	659	632	+32	-27
Food Safety and Inspection Service	892,136	930,120	930,120	+37,984	---
Food safety inspection (user fees) (leg. prop) NA.	---	(96,000)	---	---	(-96,000)
Lab accreditation fees	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	---	---
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing	4,976,236	4,874,722	5,019,299	+43,063	+144,577
Farm Assistance Programs					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services	632	695	666	+34	-29
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses	1,030,193	1,228,662	1,127,409	+97,216	-101,253
(Common computing environment) (NA)	---	(64,200)	(64,200)	(+64,200)	---
(Transfer from export loans)	(343)	(359)	(353)	(+10)	(-6)
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(3,207)	(2,761)	(2,749)	(-458)	(-12)
(Transfer from ACIF)	(303,309)	(311,737)	(310,230)	(+6,921)	(-1,507)
(Transfer from farm storage loan program account)	---	(4,660)	---	---	(-4,660)
Subtotal, transfers from program accounts	(306,859)	(319,517)	(313,332)	(+6,473)	(-6,185)
Total, Salaries and expenses	(1,337,052)	(1,548,179)	(1,440,741)	(+103,689)	(-107,438)
State mediation grants	4,208	4,000	4,000	-208	---
Grassroot source water protection program	3,713	---	3,713	---	+3,713
Dairy indemnity program	100	100	100	---	---
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency	1,038,214	1,232,762	1,135,222	+97,008	-97,540
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	(207,642)	(223,857)	(223,857)	(+16,215)	---
Guaranteed	(1,386,000)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	(-186,000)	---
Subtotal	(1,593,642)	(1,423,857)	(1,423,857)	(-169,785)	---
Farm operating loans:					
Direct	(643,500)	(629,595)	(629,595)	(-13,905)	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(1,138,500)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(-138,500)	---
Subsidized guaranteed	(271,886)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(-21,886)	---
Subtotal	(2,053,886)	(1,879,595)	(1,879,595)	(-174,291)	---
Indian tribe land acquisition loans	(2,000)	(3,960)	(3,960)	(+1,960)	---
Boll weevil eradication loans	(100,000)	(59,400)	(100,000)	---	(+40,600)
Total, Loan authorizations	(3,749,528)	(3,366,812)	(3,407,412)	(-342,116)	(+40,600)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	8,700	9,962	9,962	+1,262	---
Guaranteed	8,039	4,800	4,800	-3,239	---
Subtotal	16,739	14,762	14,762	-1,977	---
Farm operating loans:					
Direct	75,225	79,896	79,896	+4,671	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed	28,121	24,200	24,200	-3,921	---
Subsidized guaranteed	27,379	33,350	33,350	+5,971	---
Subtotal	130,725	137,446	137,446	+6,721	---
Indian tribe land acquisition	423	125	125	-298	---
Boll weevil eradication	1,900	---	---	-1,900	---
Total, Loan subsidies	149,787	152,333	152,333	+2,546	---
ACIF expenses:					
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)	303,309	311,737	310,230	+6,921	-1,507
Administrative expenses	7,920	7,920	7,920	---	---
Total, ACIF expenses	311,229	319,657	318,150	+6,921	-1,507
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	461,016	471,990	470,483	+9,467	-1,507
(Loan authorization)	(3,749,528)	(3,366,812)	(3,407,412)	(-342,116)	(+40,600)
Total, Farm Service Agency	1,499,230	1,704,752	1,605,705	+106,475	-99,047
Risk Management Agency, Administrative and operating expenses	76,658	79,062	78,833	+2,175	-229
Total, Farm Assistance Programs	1,576,520	1,784,509	1,685,204	+108,684	-99,305
Corporations					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund	4,379,256	4,818,099	4,818,099	+438,843	---
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses	23,098,328	12,983,053	12,983,053	-10,115,275	---
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)	---	4,660	---	---	-4,660
Total, Corporations	27,477,584	17,805,812	17,801,152	-9,676,432	-4,660
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs	34,030,340	24,465,043	24,505,655	-9,524,685	+40,612
(By transfer)	(306,859)	(319,517)	(313,332)	(+6,473)	(-6,185)
(Loan authorization)	(3,749,528)	(3,366,812)	(3,407,412)	(-342,116)	(+40,600)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(109,674)	(108,696)	(108,696)	(-978)	---
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment	742	822	781	+39	-41
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations	763,360	801,825	851,910	+88,550	+50,085
(Common computing environment) (NA)	---	(20,000)	(20,000)	(+20,000)	---

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Watershed surveys and planning	6,056	---	6,556	+500	+6,556
Watershed and flood prevention operations	---	---	37,000	+37,000	+37,000
Watershed rehabilitation program	31,309	5,807	31,586	+277	+25,779
Resource conservation and development	51,088	14,653	52,370	+1,282	+37,717
Healthy forests reserve program	---	2,476	---	---	-2,476
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service	851,813	824,761	979,422	+127,609	+154,661
Total, title II, Conservation Programs	852,555	825,583	980,203	+127,648	+154,620
TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development	632	695	666	+34	-29
Rural Development:					
Rural community advancement program:					
Rural community program account 1/:					
Loan authorizations:					
Community facility:					
Direct	(297,000)	(302,414)	(350,000)	(+53,000)	(+47,586)
Guaranteed	(207,900)	(210,000)	(250,000)	(+42,100)	(+40,000)
Subtotal, Loan authorizations	(504,900)	(512,414)	(600,000)	(+95,100)	(+87,586)
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Commmunity facility:					
Direct	19,038	16,784	19,425	+387	+2,641
Guaranteed	7,609	7,728	9,200	+1,591	+1,472
Grants	16,830	---	23,117	+6,287	+23,117
Rural community development initiative	6,287	---	---	-6,287	---
Economic impact initiative grants	17,820	---	---	-17,820	---
High energy cost grants	25,740	---	---	-25,740	---
Tribal college grants	4,419	---	4,000	-419	+4,000
Subtotal, RCP subsidies and grants	97,743	24,512	55,742	-42,001	+31,230
Rural Business Program Account 2/:					
(Guaranteed business and industry loans)	(913,962)	(1,000,000)	(1,250,000)	(+336,038)	(+250,000)
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Guaranteed business and industry subsidy	39,849	43,200	54,000	+14,151	+10,800
Grants:					
Rural business enterprise	39,600	---	40,000	+400	+40,000
Rural business opportunity	2,970	---	3,000	+30	+3,000
Delta regional authority	1,980	---	3,000	+1,020	+3,000
Subtotal, RBP subsidies and grants	84,399	43,200	100,000	+15,601	+56,800
Rural water & waste disposal program account 3/:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct	(990,000)	(1,080,239)	(1,000,000)	(+10,000)	(-80,239)
Guaranteed	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	---	---
Subtotal, Loan authorizations	1,065,000	1,155,239	1,075,000	+10,000	-80,239
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Direct subsidy	98,604	153,394	68,100	-30,504	-85,294
Water and waste grants	437,748	344,920	500,000	+62,252	+155,080
Solid waste management grants	3,465	3,465	3,465	---	---
Emerg. community water assistance grants	13,692	---	---	-13,692	---
Water and waste financing revolving fund	495	---	500	+5	+500
Water well system grants	990	1,000	1,000	+10	---
Subtotal, Water subsidies and grants	554,994	502,779	573,065	+18,071	+70,286

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Less adjustment (rounding)	-1	---	---	+1	---
Total, Rural community advancement program	737,135	570,491	728,807	-8,328	+158,316
(Transfer to High energy costs grants)	(-25,740)	---	---	(+25,740)	---
RD expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	161,298	208,194	175,382	+14,084	-32,812
(Common computing environment)	---	(6,700)	(6,700)	(+6,700)	---
(Transfer from RHIF)	(452,927)	(434,890)	(462,521)	(+9,594)	(+27,631)
(Transfer from RDLFP)	(4,774)	(4,576)	(4,861)	(+87)	(+285)
(Transfer from RETLP)	(38,623)	(37,009)	(39,405)	(+782)	(+2,396)
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts	(496,324)	(476,475)	(506,787)	(+10,463)	(+30,312)
Total, RD expenses	(657,622)	(684,669)	(682,169)	(+24,547)	(-2,500)
Total, Rural Development	898,433	778,685	904,189	+5,756	+125,504
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family direct (sec. 502)	(1,129,391)	---	(1,129,391)	---	(+1,129,391)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(3,644,224)	(4,848,611)	(3,716,425)	(+72,201)	(-1,132,186)
Subtotal, Single family	(4,773,615)	(4,848,611)	(4,845,816)	(+72,201)	(-2,795)
Housing repair (sec. 504)	(34,652)	(22,855)	(34,652)	---	(+11,797)
Rental housing (sec. 515)	(99,000)	---	(99,000)	---	(+99,000)
Site loans (sec. 524)	(5,000)	(5,045)	(5,046)	(+46)	(+1)
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	(99,000)	(200,000)	(99,000)	---	(-101,000)
Multi-family housing credit sales	(1,485)	(1,408)	(1,486)	(+1)	(+78)
Single family housing credit sales	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	---	---
Self-help housing land develop. (sec. 523)	(4,998)	---	(5,000)	(+2)	(+5,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(5,027,750)	(5,087,919)	(5,100,000)	(+72,250)	(+12,081)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family direct (sec. 502)	113,278	---	105,824	-7,454	+105,824
Unsubsidized guaranteed	42,641	10,070	44,359	+1,718	+34,289
Subtotal, Single family	155,919	10,070	150,183	-5,736	+140,113
Housing repair (sec. 504)	10,240	6,461	9,796	-444	+3,335
Rental housing (sec. 515)	45,213	---	42,184	-3,029	+42,184
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	7,663	18,800	9,306	+1,643	-9,494
Multi-family housing credit sales	673	523	552	-121	+29
Single family housing credit sales	48	---	---	-48	---
Self-help housing land develop. (sec. 523)	123	---	142	+19	+142
Multi-family housing preservation	8,910	---	---	-8,910	---
Total, Loan subsidies	228,789	35,854	212,163	-16,626	+176,309
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	452,927	434,890	462,521	+9,594	+27,631
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund program	681,716	470,744	674,684	-7,032	+203,940
(Loan authorization)	(5,027,750)	(5,087,919)	(5,100,000)	(+72,250)	(+12,081)
Rental assistance program:					
(Sec. 521)	608,100	567,000	525,100	-83,000	-41,900
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D))	7,920	---	7,920	---	+7,920
Total, Rental assistance program	616,020	567,000	533,020	-83,000	-33,980

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rural housing voucher program	15,840	---	---	-15,840	---
Multifamily housing revitalization program account	---	27,800	27,800	+27,800	---
Total, Multifamily housing revitalization	---	27,800	27,800	+27,800	---
Mutual and self-help housing grants	33,660	9,500	40,000	+6,340	+30,500
Rural housing assistance grants	43,603	39,000	39,000	-4,603	---
Farm labor housing program account:					
(Loan authorization)	(38,117)	(13,520)	(50,000)	(+11,883)	(+36,480)
Loan subsidy	18,277	5,849	21,630	+3,353	+15,781
Grants	13,860	4,000	25,000	+11,140	+21,000
Total, Farm Labor Housing Program Account	32,137	9,849	46,630	+14,493	+36,781
Total, Rural Housing Service	1,422,976	1,123,893	1,361,134	-61,842	+237,241
(Loan authorization)	(5,065,867)	(5,101,439)	(5,150,000)	(+84,133)	(+48,561)
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:					
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(33,870)	(33,772)	(33,772)	(-98)	---
Loan subsidy	14,927	14,485	14,485	-442	---
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	4,774	4,576	4,861	+87	+285
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund	19,701	19,061	19,346	-355	+285
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(24,752)	(33,077)	(33,077)	(+8,325)	---
Direct subsidy	5,406	---	---	-5,406	---
Mandatory subsidy (NA)	---	(7,472)	(7,472)	(+7,472)	---
Rural economic development grants (NA)	---	(10,000)	(10,000)	(+10,000)	---
Rural cooperative development grants:					
Cooperative development	3,753	4,455	4,455	+702	---
Appropriate technology transfer for rural areas	936	---	2,475	+1,539	+2,475
Cooperative research agreement	495	---	495	---	+495
Value-added agricultural product market development	20,295	15,000	20,295	---	+5,295
Grants to assist minority producers	1,239	1,473	1,473	+234	---
Total, Rural Cooperative development grants	26,718	20,928	29,193	+2,475	+8,265
Rural empowerment zones and enterprise communities grants	11,088	---	11,088	---	+11,088
Renewable energy program:					
(Loan authorization)	(176,512)	(195,470)	(250,000)	(+73,488)	(+54,530)
Loan subsidy	11,456	18,941	24,225	+12,769	+5,284
Grants	11,385	15,000	21,775	+10,390	+6,775
Total, Renewable energy program	22,841	33,941	46,000	+23,159	+12,059
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service	85,754	73,930	105,627	+19,873	+31,697
(Loan authorization)	(235,134)	(262,319)	(316,849)	(+81,715)	(+54,530)
Rural Utilities Service:					
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5%	(99,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+1,000)	---
Direct, Municipal rate	(100,764)	---	---	(-100,764)	---
Direct, FFB	(2,700,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,500,000)	(+1,800,000)	(+500,000)
Direct, Treasury rate	(990,000)	---	---	(-990,000)	---
Guaranteed underwriting	(1,500,000)	---	---	(-1,500,000)	---
Subtotal, Electric	(5,389,764)	(4,100,000)	(4,600,000)	(-789,764)	(+500,000)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Telecommunications:					
Direct, 5%	(145,000)	(145,000)	(145,000)	---	---
Direct, Treasury rate	(419,760)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(-169,760)	---
Direct, FFB	(125,000)	(295,000)	(295,000)	(+170,000)	---
Subtotal, Telecommunications	(689,760)	(690,000)	(690,000)	(+240)	---
Total, Loan authorizations	(6,079,524)	(4,790,000)	(5,290,000)	(-789,524)	(+500,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5%	2,119	120	120	-1,999	---
Direct, Municipal rate	1,522	---	---	-1,522	---
Subtotal, Electric	3,641	120	120	-3,521	---
Telecommunications:					
Direct, 5%	537	116	116	-421	---
Direct, Treasury rate	126	1,675	1,675	+1,549	---
Direct, FFB	---	1,829	1,829	+1,829	---
Subtotal, Telecommunications	663	3,620	3,620	+2,957	---
Total, Loan subsidies	4,304	3,740	3,740	-564	---
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	38,623	37,009	39,405	+782	+2,396
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account	42,927	40,749	43,145	+218	+2,396
(Loan authorization)	(6,079,524)	(4,790,000)	(5,290,000)	(-789,524)	(+500,000)
High energy costs grants (by transfer)	(25,740)	---	---	(-25,740)	---
Distance learning, telemedicine, and broadband program:					
Loan authorizations:					
Broadband telecommunications	(495,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(-195,000)	---
Total, Loan authorizations	(495,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(-195,000)	---
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Distance learning and telemedicine:					
Grants	29,700	24,750	35,000	+5,300	+10,250
Broadband telecommunications:					
Direct	10,643	6,450	6,450	-4,193	---
Grants	8,910	---	17,820	+8,910	+17,820
Total, Loan subsidies and grants	49,253	31,200	59,270	+10,017	+28,070
Total, Rural Utilities Service	92,180	71,949	102,415	+10,235	+30,466
(Loan authorization)	(6,574,524)	(5,090,000)	(5,590,000)	(-984,524)	(+500,000)
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs	2,499,975	2,049,152	2,474,031	-25,944	+424,879
(By transfer)	(522,064)	(476,475)	(506,787)	(-15,277)	(+30,312)
(Loan authorization)	(14,359,387)	(13,121,411)	(13,981,849)	(-377,538)	(+860,438)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services	597	655	628	+31	-27
Food and Nutrition Service:					
Child nutrition programs	7,614,523	7,592,797	7,668,156	+53,633	+75,359
Transfer from section 32	5,731,073	6,304,475	6,235,057	+503,984	-69,418
Total, Child nutrition programs	13,345,596	13,897,272	13,903,213	+557,617	+5,941

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	5,204,430	5,386,597	5,620,000	+415,570	+233,403
Food stamp program:					
Expenses	33,463,137	35,053,973	35,053,973	+1,590,836	---
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	1,557,397	1,621,250	1,621,250	+63,853	---
The emergency food assistance program	140,000	140,000	140,000	---	---
CSFP transitional benefit	---	21,000	---	---	-21,000
CSFP outreach grant	---	2,000	---	---	-2,000
Total, Food stamp program	38,161,534	39,838,223	39,816,223	+1,654,689	-22,000
Commodity assistance program:					
Commodity supplemental food program	107,202	---	150,000	+42,798	+150,000
Farmers market nutrition program	19,800	19,800	20,000	+200	+200
Emergency food assistance program	49,500	49,500	50,000	+500	+500
Pacific island and disaster assistance	1,070	1,070	1,070	---	---
Total, Commodity assistance program	177,572	70,370	221,070	+43,498	+150,700
Nutrition programs administration	140,252	148,926	146,926	+6,674	-2,000
Total, Food and Nutrition Service	57,029,384	59,341,388	59,707,432	+2,678,048	+366,044
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs	57,029,981	59,342,043	59,708,060	+2,678,079	+366,017
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	156,220	168,209	159,136	+2,916	-9,073
(Transfer from export loans)	(4,918)	(4,985)	(4,985)	(+67)	---
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(166)	---	---	(-166)	---
Total, Salaries and expenses program level	(161,304)	(173,194)	(164,121)	(+2,817)	(-9,073)
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:					
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:					
Program level	(1,214,711)	(1,219,400)	(1,219,400)	(+4,689)	---
Appropriation	1,214,711	1,219,400	1,219,400	+4,689	---
Salaries and expenses:					
Foreign Agricultural Service (transfer to FAS)	166	---	---	-166	---
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	3,207	2,761	2,749	-458	-12
Subtotal	3,373	2,761	2,749	-624	-12
Total, Public Law 480:					
Program level	(1,214,711)	(1,219,400)	(1,219,400)	(+4,689)	---
Appropriation	1,218,084	1,222,161	1,222,149	+4,065	-12
CCC Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):					
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS)	4,918	4,985	4,985	+67	---
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	343	359	353	+10	-6
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account	5,261	5,344	5,338	+77	-6

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
McGovern-Dole international food for education and child nutrition program grants	99,000	100,000	100,000	+1,000	---
Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs	1,478,565	1,495,714	1,486,623	+8,058	-9,091
(By transfer)	(5,084)	(4,985)	(4,985)	(-99)	---
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	1,569,244	1,635,709	1,697,709	+128,465	+62,000
Prescription drug user fee act	(352,200)	(339,195)	---	(-352,200)	(-339,195)
Medical device user fee act	(43,726)	(47,500)	---	(-43,726)	(-47,500)
Animal drug user fee act	(11,604)	(13,696)	(13,696)	(+2,092)	---
Generic drug user fee	---	(15,701)	---	---	(-15,701)
Reinspection fees (user fees) (leg. prop) NA	---	(23,276)	---	---	(-23,276)
Food export fees (user fees) (leg. prop) NA	---	(3,741)	---	---	(-3,741)
Subtotal	(1,976,774)	(2,051,801)	(1,711,405)	(-265,369)	(-340,396)
Mammography clinics user fee (outlay savings)	(17,522)	(18,398)	(18,398)	(+876)	---
Export and color certification	(8,481)	(9,500)	(9,500)	(+1,019)	---
Payments to GSA	(126,871)	(131,533)	(131,533)	(+4,662)	---
Buildings and facilities	4,950	4,950	4,950	---	---
Total, Food and Drug Administration	1,574,194	1,640,659	1,702,659	+128,465	+62,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	97,981	116,000	102,550	+4,569	-13,450
Transaction fees (user fees) (leg. prop) NA	---	(86,000)	---	---	(-86,000)
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(44,250)	(46,000)	(46,000)	(+1,750)	---
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration	1,672,175	1,756,659	1,805,209	+133,034	+48,550
TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Denali Commission	743	---	---	-743	---
Hunger Fellowships	---	---	2,475	+2,475	+2,475
Section 32 (rescission)	-37,601	-65,452	-210,361	-172,760	-144,909
Specialty crop grants (sec. 736)	6,930	---	10,000	+3,070	+10,000
Healthy Forest Reserve	2,476	---	---	-2,476	---
Simplified Summer Food Program	---	---	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Food stamp program employment & training (rescission)	-11,200	---	---	+11,200	---
ARS buildings and facilities (rescission)	---	-16,000	---	---	+16,000
Fruit and vegetable program	---	---	21,000	+21,000	+21,000
WIC (rescission)	---	---	-16,069	-16,069	-16,069
High energy cost grant (rescission)	---	---	-25,740	-25,740	-25,740
Department of Homeland Security (rescission)	---	---	-8,000	-8,000	-8,000
Total, title VII, General provisions	-38,652	-81,452	-221,695	-183,043	-140,243

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3161)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
OTHER APPROPRIATIONS					
U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' CARE, KATRINA RECOVERY AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007					
Foreign Agricultural Service					
Public Law 480 Title II Grants (Titles I/III) (emerg).	450,000	---	---	-450,000	---
General Provisions					
Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust (Title III) (emerg)...	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Emergency Forestry Conservation Reserve program (Title IV) (emergency).....	115,000	---	---	-115,000	---
Stafford Act Disaster Relief (Title V) (emergency)....	40,000	---	---	-40,000	---
Farm Service Agency					
Salaries and expenses (Title VI).....	37,500	---	---	-37,500	---
Agricultural Assistance (Title IX)	---	---	---	---	---
Crop disaster assistance (Sec. 9001) (emergency).....	1,552,000	---	---	-1,552,000	---
Livestock compensation program (Sec.9002a) (emergency)	1,203,000	---	---	-1,203,000	---
Livestock indemnity payments (Sec. 9002b) (emergency).	29,000	---	---	-29,000	---
Emergency conservation program (Sec. 9003) (emergency)	16,000	---	---	-16,000	---
National Diary Market Loss Payment Program (Sec. 9006) (emergency).....	31,000	---	---	-31,000	---
Dairy assistance (Sec. 9007) (emergency).....	16,000	---	---	-16,000	---
Low-income migrant and seasonal farmworkers (Sec. 9009) (emergency).....	16,000	---	---	-16,000	---
Conservation security program (Sec. 9010) (emergency).	115,000	---	---	-115,000	---
Farm Service Agency, salaries and expenses (Sec. 9011) (emergency).....	22,000	---	---	-22,000	---
Subtotal, Title IX.....	3,000,000	---	---	-3,000,000	---
Total, Public Law 110-28	3,652,500	---	---	-3,652,500	---
(emergency appropriations)	(3,615,000)	---	---	(-3,615,000)	---
Grand total.....	101,177,439	89,852,742	90,738,086	-10,439,353	+885,344
Appropriations.....	(97,611,240)	(89,934,194)	(90,998,256)	(-6,612,984)	(+1,064,062)
Emergency Appropriations.....	3,615,000	---	---	-3,615,000	---
Rescissions.....	(-48,801)	(-81,452)	(-260,170)	(-211,369)	(-178,718)
(By transfer).....	(834,007)	(800,977)	(825,104)	(-8,903)	(+24,127)
(Loan authorization).....	(18,108,915)	(16,488,223)	(17,389,261)	(-719,654)	(+901,038)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(153,924)	(154,696)	(154,696)	(+772)	---

FOOTNOTES:
1/ Budget request includes program account under Rural Housing.
2/ Budget request includes program account under Rural Business-Cooperative Service.
3/ Budget request includes program account under Rural Utilities Service.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to thank Chairman PETERSON Chairman BACA, and members of the House Agriculture Committee for their continued commitment and interest in supporting our agriculture industry, producers—and specifically supporting modernization of the food stamp program, increasing access to fresh produce, particularly for low-income neighborhoods and working with the Congressional Black Caucus and urban Members to accommodate the needs of diverse communities.

Throughout our Nation, we have a host of communities that are disconnected from accessing fresh fruits and vegetables. An increasing number of families are facing hunger and food insecurity: according to USDA's most recent data, more than 35 million Americans are unable to purchase food on a regular basis. Both sets of problems stem in part from the same cause: in urban as well as rural areas, too many low-income families live in ''food deserts'' where access to fresh, healthy foods is lacking.

I have worked with my fellow urban Members on a package of urban needs—ranging from making mandatory funds for the Community Food Project grant, increasing access to fresh fruits and produce, defining the term food desert, and creating a new Urban Health Enterprise grant program to strengthen links between producers to actual providers in urban communities.

All but one of these amendments are included in the Manager's Amendment, and I thank the Chairman for working with us to ensure urban members have a stake in the farm bill.

Mr. Chairman, although we still must find funding for the Community Food Projects grant; overall, the 2007 Farm Bill contains significant gains to promote access, expansion and education on nutrition.

As you may know, with regard to nutrition, the bill modernizes the food stamp program by: 1. Requiring all states go to an electronic system; 2. Increasing the minimum food benefit of participants; 3. Indexing asset limits and excludes retirement and education accounts, and combat pay.

The nutrition title extends and funds the Emergency Food Assistance Program to provide needed commodities to food banks and homeless shelters.

And it expands the authority of the Senior Farmer's Market Nutrition Program and creates a demonstration project to evaluate strategies to address obesity among low-income communities.

In conclusion Mr. Chairman, for far too many urban dwellers, the choice comes down to traveling long distances to buy groceries or shopping at expensive corner stores that often sell high-fat, high-sugar convenience food and little or no fresh produce. The consequences are byproducts of poverty: diabetes, obesity, and heart disease.

In the interests of public health, cost-efficiency, and social justice, we should consider policies to increase the availability of and access to fresh fruits and vegetables in underserved neighborhoods and communities.

I call on my colleagues to support the Farm Bill, because of the gains in nutrition the committee has included in this bill.

In addition to supporting farmers and our agriculture industry; this bill increases healthy food options in our poorest communities, creates incentives for producers and retailers to provide foods that provide healthy food options, and increasing consumer education about healthy alternatives at school and home.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the Agriculture Sub-committee Chairwoman, Ms. DELAURO, and the ranking Republican, Mr. KINGSTON. They have done a commendable job in putting this measure together in this first year in their respective positions.

All along the way, Ms. DELAURO reached across the aisle to sound out the concern of the members on this side of the aisle—and the work product shows her bi-partisan efforts.

While I do not agree with everything in the bill, I think it is a good product, all things considered. I especially want to thank the Chairwoman for her efforts to increase funding in the bill for the cooperative State research, education and extension service. The CSREES funding level was below the level where it should have been coming out of the subcommittee.

After hearing the concerns of many members, Ms. DELAURO and Mr. KINGSTON closed ranks and fixed the problem. That funding gap was a particular issue to many members, especially those from rural, farming areas.

I am pleased to note that the bill contains much in the way of agriculture research funding in a number of areas. This is important to many areas, particularly renewable fuels and food production science, to name two areas. The more we can make substantive progress in both of these areas, the better for the consumer and the farm community.

I do want to point out a couple of areas where I think we can and should improve on the bill. First, there is a provision, section 746, which currently reads, ''no funds in this act may be used to authorize qualified health claims for conventional foods''.

I understand that there will be an amendment later on that stipulates no funds for FDA will be used for this purpose. However, this amendment does not address the problem.

If this provision, or a similar one, is intended to help FDA avoid wasted time and resources on frivolous petitions, it misses the mark. Nothing in the language removes FDA's responsibility to review these petitions, as required by law. The provision only denies final approval, or ''authorization'' of the use of valid claims.

This is bad health policy, and it is bad fiscal policy, and I urge the chairwoman to relook at the provision in conference, lest its impact come back to haunt us.

On another issue, the horse slaughter language, the provision, as written, is opposed by animal experts across the country—real experts, including veterinarians and others. The way the language is written, it precludes health inspections and certifications for the legal transport of horses, for example.

Finally, I think, like some others on both sides of the aisle, that we have short-changed some necessary program areas, on occasion, in the past.

But I also think that, as with some other bills, we are going a little far in adding extra spending. Too much spending can do as much damage as too little spending.

It is important to remember that when we give agencies too much money, they spend more than they need to spend simply to hold their annual baseline intact. this is not a heal thy way to manage the Nation's resources.

We have some discretion here, and we should use that discretion since, apparently, we have turned a blind eye to the serious and growing problem of out-of-control entitlements.

In summary, let me, again, commend the gentlewoman from Connecticut. I think you have done a fine job, and I look forward to continuing to work with you to improve this bill as we go forward.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to rise in strong support of the H.R. 3161, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 2008.

As a member of this Subcommittee, I am extremely proud of the work of the Subcommittee and our members on both sides of the aisle, in crafting a bill which truly impacts and touches the lives of everyone who lives in this great Nation of ours, as well as millions of individuals around the world.

Our bill invests in Rural America, providing funding to accommodate some $5.1 billion in affordable loans for low income families in rural areas, which will support approximately 38,000 single family homeownership opportunities.

We invest in rural communities, by expanding resources devoted to economic development programs and access to broadband telecommunication services to bridge the digital divide in rural, underserved areas.

We address the health care and emergency needs of rural areas, as well as providing support for the rebuilding of our Nation's rural infrastructure.

We invest in the protection of the Nation's Public Health, by providing nearly $930 million for the Food Safety and Inspection Service as well as $1.7 billion for the Food and Drug Administration—including increases to begin a transformation of food safety regulation, improving drug safety, monitor prescription drug advertisements and expanding the review of new generic drug applications.

To fight hunger in America, our bill makes investments which will expand nutrition, providing $958 million for nutrition programs, including the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program, Fresh Fruit and Vegetable program and the Simplified Summer Food program.

We provide $5.6 billion for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), which is expected to benefit over 8.4 million Americans over the next year.

Not only does this bill provide the resources necessary to keep nearly 26 million of the nation's poorest from going hungry, we also expand Emergency Food Assistance Program, so that food banks, soup kitchens, and other emergency feeding sites have needed resources. The bill also expands the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Snack Program to all 50 states.

We invest in the transformation of our Energy Future, providing $1.2 billion for renewable energy, which was $955.3 million above 2007 and $810.4 million above the President's request—and includes funding for bio-energy and renewable energy research and development, including loans and grants in rural areas. The resources provided will be key building blocks in the expansion of renewable fuel production needed to encourage American energy independence and protect our environment.

We invest in Conservation, providing over $979 million for conservation efforts and community development. This bill restores many of the programs slated for major reductions in the president's request, including the Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative, Resource Conservation and Development, and the watershed programs which are funded $75 million—more than double last year's levels.

This investment will continue our efforts to improve both funding and access to conservation programs that take environmentally sensitive land out of farming and encourage environmentally friendly practices on working farmland.

Finally, I would like to congratulate my Chairwoman, ROSA DELAURO, for the outstanding job she's done in stewarding and leading the important work of our Subcommitee.

And I would be remiss if I did not recognize and thank the staff of Subcommittee—Martha Foley, Leslie Barrack, Adrienne Simonson, Diem-Linh Joan and Kelly Wade of the Majority staff; and Martin Delgado, Jamie Swafford and Dave Gibbons on the Minority staff, and of course, Michael Reed, and Niki Newberry of my staff.

This is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the FY08 Agriculture Appropriations bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with House earmark reforms, 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 the FY08 Agriculture, Rural Development and FDA Appropriations 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.

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? He can do it by achieving 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.

Four of the projects below are funded through the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS). The first program, Potato Cyst Nematode (PCN) Detection and Eradication, provides funding that is critical to saving the potato industry, both in Idaho and across the nation. In August 2006, PCN was discovered in our country for the first time on approximately 1,000 acres in Eastern Idaho. PCN is a major pest of potato crops and is one of the most destructive and difficult pests to control. If left uncontrolled, this pest can result in devastating crop yield losses of up to 80 percent. Without this funding, the pest's significant risk of dispersion could lead to a devastating impact on our nation's agriculture production and exports.

The Greater Yellowstone Brucellosis funding is particularly critical to my home state of Idaho. Idaho recently regained its Brucellosis Class Free Status and these funds are critical to continuing a management plan that will allow Idaho to maintain 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 funding for the Nez Perce Bio-Control Center will enable the Center to utilize organism-rearing technology to improve mass rearing capabilities for biological control organisms, thus providing long-term management of invasive weeds.

Another 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.

The final project is the Idaho Food Bank Facility Acquisition and Expansion Program. Currently, the Idaho Food Bank, located in Pocatello, Idaho, cannot process all of the donated food and often turns away delivery trucks and donations due to lack of space. An expansion of the food bank would allow more needy families in Eastern Idaho to utilize the food bank's services.

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) $6,750,000 for APHIS Potato Cyst Nematode Detection and Eradication.

(2) $854,000 for CSREES Increasing Shelf Life of Agricultural Commodities (WA, OR, ID).

(3) $96,994 for ARS National Plant Germplasm Program—Aberdeen, ID.

(4) $628,843 for ARS Aquaculture—Barley Sustainable Feeds—Aberdeen, ID.

(5) $1,093,728 for ARS Aquaculture Rainbow Trout Research—Aberdeen, ID.

(6) $99,000 for ARS Aquaculture Sustainable Feeds—Aberdeen, ID.

(7) $756,000 for CSREES Aquaculture (WA, ID).

(8) $728,000 for CSREES Barley for Rural Development (MT, ID).

(9) $900,000 for APHIS Greater Yellowstone Interagency Brucellosis Committee.

(10) $198,000 for NRCS Idaho One-Plan

(11) $250,000 for APHIS Nez Perce Bio-Control Center.

(12) $1,300,000 for APHIS Tri-State Predator Control in Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming.

(13) $558,000 for CSREES Cool Season Legume Research (ID, WA, ND).

(14) $446,000 for CSREES Grass Seed Cropping for Sustainable Agriculture Research (WA, OR, ID).

(15) 439,000 for CSREES Small Fruit Research (OR, WA, ID).

(16) $702,592 for ARS Sugarbeet Research—Kimberly, ID.

(17) $634,000 for CSREES STEEP III Water Quality in the Northwest.

(18) $6,371,000 for CSREES Wood Utilization (OR, MS, NC, MN, ME, MI, ID, TN, AK, WV).

(19) $1,482,000 for CSREES Potato Research.

(20) Idaho Food Bank Facility Acquisition and Expansion Program.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend Chairwoman DELAURO for her excellent work on this bill and to address a specific issue that is of growing importance to my constituents.

This March, the light brown apple moth (LBAM), an exotic pest native to Australia, was discovered in California. The moth has been damaging to growers in Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, and San Mateo Counties in my district. In Santa Cruz County, nearly 6,000 moths have now been detected.

This pest can affect a wide variety of plants, flowers, fruits and vegetables, and virtually any crop with a leaf is a potential host.

In order to halt the spread of this pest, USDA has imposed a quarantine in California counties where the moth has been found. Growers in these counties must subject their operations to a visual inspection to demonstrate that their facilities are not infested before they can be cleared to ship produce. For growers within 1.5 miles of a confirmed discovery of the moth, each shipment must be cleared by an inspection.

Canada and Mexico have also placed restrictions on the import of California products.

The quarantine and restrictions are a burden on growers in my district as well as on State and county agriculture officials, but it is a burden they recognize is necessary to prevent the further spread of the light brown apple moth.

What is critical is adequate Federal support and funding for the eradication and inspection effort. The USDA provided $5 million for this effort at the outset and they are seeking an additional $12.5 million through the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC). The request has been pending with OMB for several weeks now and it needs to be approved.

Even if the funding is released, it may only carry operations through the end of the year. In the coming years, it may take several million dollars more to ensure the job is complete.

This was a relatively late breaking issue to be addressed in this appropriations bill, and I commend Chairwoman DELAURO for recognizing how serious it is and for including report language that calls on the USDA to secure all funds needed from the Commodity Credit Corporation to eradicate the light brown apple moth. In the Senate, $1 million is included within the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) specifically for this purpose.

As we move forward with this bill and subsequent legislation to deal with agriculture disasters, I look forward to working with the Chairwoman and my colleague, Mr. FARR, to build on what is already in the House and Senate bills in order to ensure that sufficient funding is provided and that it is made available in a timely fashion.

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

The 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 on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3161

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, 2008, 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, $5,505,000: *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.

□ 1600

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I start a period of time in which we're going to take opportunity to talk about SCHIP.

I strike the last word to speak about the expansion legislation that was pulled from the Energy and Commerce Committee. Reportedly, it will be on the floor later this week, and I would like to highlight the damage it will do, if enacted. Specifically, I'd like to take this opportunity to speak about the very popular Medicare Advantage program.

In Illinois, there are 1,715,548 Medicare beneficiaries. Of these, 145,600, or 8 percent, have selected to receive their health care coverage through a Medicare Advantage plan. According to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, there are over 6,000 Medicare beneficiaries in my district that are currently enrolled in a Medicare Advantage program.

One of the most troubling things I have heard about the Democrats' bill is actually from Peter Orzag, who is the Director of the Congressional Budget Office. The Director said that under the Democrats' bill, Medicare Advantage enrollment would fall by approximately 8.2 million currently to 5.5 million in 2012, a reduction of 33 percent from current enrollment levels.

Medicare beneficiaries are among this Nation's most vulnerable citizens, and access to comprehensive high-quality affordable health care is imperative to their well-being. As we well know, the population of the United States over age 65 is growing rapidly. The average Medicare beneficiary is likely to have two or more chronic illnesses. Medicare beneficiaries should have choices for their health care coverage similar to those available to individuals under age 65. We should allow them to choose plans that best meet their unique health care needs and to help them coordinate their care, manage their illnesses, and reduce their out-of-pocket costs.

On average, beneficiaries that choose a Medicare Advantage plan in Illinois are receiving over $60 in extra value each month from their plans. This extra value comes in the form of savings on cost sharing and out-of-pocket protections and on lower part D premiums, or additional benefits like coverage for vision and hearing. Beneficiaries in Medicare Advantage plans report better access to care, more usual sources of care, and more likelihood of seeking care when needed than beneficiaries in traditional fee-for-service operations.

CMS has recently reported that beneficiaries in fee-for-service with no additional sources of coverage have more difficulty getting care and are less likely to have usual source of care than Medicare Advantage enrollees.

All Medicare beneficiaries have access to a Medicare Advantage plan that does not require cost sharing for screenings for breast cancer, cervical cancer and prostate cancer. Recently, CMS has reported that Medicare Advantage enrollees are more likely to receive preventative services, such as immunizations, mammography, and screenings for colorectal and prostate cancers.

Critics have implied that the Medicare Advantage program is contributing to the solvency problems facing the Medicare trust fund. However, these critics fail to recognize the extra value that Medicare Advantage plans provide that address the real drivers in increasing program costs. Medicare Advantage plans help control the volume and intensity of services used by beneficiaries in Medicare part A and part D by coordinating care, improving health outcomes, and monitoring enrollee usage.

Medicare Advantage generates savings in the part D program by helping to drive down the average premium paid by the government and beneficiaries, and by reducing Federal expenditures for beneficiaries eligible for low-income subsidies.

Critics have further distorted the facts by offering information that claims to suggest a ''fairness gap'' between Medicare Advantage payments and the other providers. In fact, Medicare Advantage payment rates increase in direct proportion to the Federal Government's estimates of increases in per capita costs in the fee-for-service program.

Some critics suggest that legislators must choose between providing comprehensive health coverage options to Illinois seniors through the Medicare Advantage program or providing coverage to Illinois uninsured children through SCHIP. Both programs play a crucial role in serving vulnerable populations. We should focus on devoting adequate resources to both SCHIP and Medicare Advantage, while working to maintain and strengthen all components of our Nation's health care safety net.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. GINGREY:

Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $50,050)''.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture by $50,050, a simple 1 percent; a 1 percent reduction in the expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not aimed necessarily at the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, but it aims to make a simple 1 percent reduction in order to shrink the Federal deficit. Why is that necessary? Well, we should be paying for increased spending by reducing other Federal spending, that's the 1 percent I'm calling for, rather than raising taxes or putting the burden on our Medicare seniors, as we do

in this proposed SCHIP reauthorization and expansion, Mr. Chairman.

And as we all know, the Democratic majority, the Energy and Commerce Committee bill, which will be combined with the bill out of the Ways and Means Committee we will be dealing with in the next day or two on this floor, calls for a $50 billion increase over the next 5 years. Now, that's on top of the base program which, in the aggregate, was a $25 billion program over the last 5 years. We're not going to increase that by 10 percent, by 20 percent, by 50 percent, or even by 100 percent. We're increasing it even more than that, going from $25 billion, Mr. Chairman, to $75 billion.

So, that's why I'm standing before the body today and saying, look, this is a small cut; this is a little bit of money. But a little bit of money here and a little bit of money there, I've got lots of amendments where we ought to cut other programs here 1 percent to try to pay for some of these things that we are doing that violate your own rules, your own PAYGO rules.

Mr. Chairman, I will say this; this new SCHIP program, everything's got to have an acronym, doesn't it? And it sells well if it has a catchy little acronym. And the Democratic majority is calling this one, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee came up with a nice, little cutesy acronym for this mass expansion called the CHAMP Act, Children's Health and Medicare Protection Act.

Mr. Chairman, I've got an acronym for this bill which fits it a lot better, and that acronym is the ''CHUMP Act.'' That's what it is, the CHUMP Act, the Children's Health Unfunding Medicare Protection Act. Because, Mr. Chairman, what this bill calls for is to totally wreck, totally destroy Medicare Advantage. Medicare Advantage is that part of the Medicare program where some 8 million out of 41, 42 million seniors have chosen that health care delivery model because they know they get an opportunity for preventative health care, they get an opportunity to have a nurse practitioner, a physician assistant, or maybe even the doctor him- or herself looking at their health care needs and not just providing, as in traditional Medicare, episodic care where there is no coordination. And a lot of times patients, particularly our seniors with multiple systems diseases, will come home from one doctor with a handful of prescriptions and the next week they're going to another doctor with a handful of prescriptions.

The Medicare Advantage program was designed to help prevent that, to put an emphasis on coordination, on connecting the dots so that we wouldn't duplicate services, or in some instances, Mr. Chairman, even provide a level of care or prescription that could be detrimental to the patient, that could be counterproductive.

So, this is why I feel that my amendment, this small amendment to cut by 1 percent the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, is a move in the right direction to say, look, don't do this massive expansion of the SCHIP program; reauthorize it. We all want to reauthorize it. In fact, I think maybe what the President called for in his budget was a little bit on the low side. Maybe increasing it $1 billion a year is not quite enough, if indeed, Mr. Chairman, there are 6 million youngsters who are needy and do not have health insurance in this country.

So, I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I think my colleague from Georgia maybe doesn't understand what bill is on the floor today. This is the Agriculture appropriations bill. There will be an opportunity to discuss SCHIP, and you can continue to do that, but let me just comment about your Agriculture appropriations amendment.

The House bill includes funding for central administration offices to fund current staff. The only increase is for pay costs. And I might just tell you that for all of the staff offices in central administration, that the work that was done by the committee literally cut these offices by about 16 percent. So it was just pay and benefits.

However, you should know I feel the obligation to mention these things to you, that any cuts in these offices will result in the reduction of headquarters staff, not the field staff, because that's the personnel that deals directly on a one-to-one basis with our farmers and with our ranchers so that they can access the system and be able to do what they need to do.

Now, I'm going to give the gentleman an opportunity to withdraw his amendment, because I am prepared to accept your amendment, and I'm happy to accept your amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the Chair seeks to accept the amendment, then that ends the debate; correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the question on the amendment at the conclusion of the debate on the amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. The debate is over then; correct?

Ms. DELAURO. We have accepted the amendment.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I am happy that the Chair is accepting this amendment, but I would like to speak on it as an opportunity to speak about cutting government spending.

Though it's just $50,500, that's far more than the median income in my district. I want the American taxpayers to know that this is an important step, and it's good that they're accepting a limitation on the rapid increase in spending within this legislation.

There are a lot of good points that we have to consider here. We have to consider the totality of government spending when we're debating here on the House floor. The government spending for this fiscal year is over $2.7 trillion. To put that into perspective, Mr. Chairman, that is larger than all the economies of the world, except for two. It is far larger than even the Chinese economy, which is about $1.9 trillion.

The reason why I bring this up is that when we're discussing each of these appropriations bills, we tend to focus on small parts of the appropriations process. We tend to focus on an amendment here, an amendment there, maybe increasing funding here and there and increasing funding in a particular appropriations bill. But we have to talk about what's that doing to the whole of the budget. And if we spend money here in the Department of Agriculture, we may not have that money to fund this SCHIP proposal that the Democrats are bringing to the floor at the end of this week.

Now, to talk about that bill, what they're going to do is not simply cut government spending elsewhere in the budget, elsewhere in the government, reforming programs, eliminating programs that are ineffective and no longer cost-effective for the American taxpayers, but what they do is they go out and find new revenue and raise taxes under this SCHIP proposal.

The Agriculture bill we have here today increases government spending, thereby forcing this new Democrat majority to go out and raise taxes for their new programs. And, Mr. Chairman, they've proposed a lot of new programs, this new Democrat majority, and what we have to do is focus on making sure we balance the budget. Now, balancing the budget, to me, as a fiscal conservative, does not mean going out and getting new revenue.

□ 1615

It means doing things, sensible things, such as the Congressman from Georgia, Mr. GINGREY, my good friend and colleague, is doing here. It cuts 1 percent out of the administrative budget of the Department of Agriculture, just 1 percent.

I have an amendment that I would like to perfect. If 1 percent was acceptable to the Chair, I would like to see if maybe 2 percent would be acceptable and see where we can actually draw the line in cutting government spending, where the breaking point is in this House of Representatives. To that end, I think it is important that we have a discussion on what that proper number is.

I know my colleague from Georgia may have another amendment similar to this next up, I hope, at which point I would like to see if we can actually go a little bit further in cutting government spending. Let's talk about not just the Agriculture appropriations bill, which is the key focus of today, but also the long-term consequences of our just having a narrow, myopic focus on the current bill on the floor. Let's talk about the totality of government spending, ways that we can reform the government, limit the government, and actually get back to what is sensible.

We have a big debate going on right now about the war in Iraq. We have a big debate going on about children's health care. We have a big debate about whether or not the farm bill that we passed last week was the right thing to do and whether or not you should actually have a massive tax increase in order to implement the new programs within that formula. Many of us agree that that wasn't the right thing to do, but, unfortunately, the majority in the House did vote for that massive tax increase.

It is important that we have a discussion on health care and agriculture and the long-term consequences of these issues going forward. Certainly, the bill today and the chairman's willingness to accept a 1 percent cut in the administrative budget is a step in the right direction. We can be thankful for that.

I hope, as we go on in the debate, the Chair will be willing to accept other amendments that limit the rapid increase of funds going to the Department of Agriculture and we can actually rightsize the government. There are many on this side of the aisle who want to cut the size and scope of government. I know that the chairwoman has been willing to examine programs and reform those programs. I hope that she will be willing to accept many of the amendments we have here today.

I also know my colleague from Georgia has a number of amendments like this. It is important that we discuss the long-term consequences of our failure to limit the growth of government.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for Members on both sides of the aisle to understand what is going to transpire here. This is a filibuster masquerading as an amendment. This amendment cuts $50,000, a tiny, tiny symbolic sum, from the administrative account in question. But, as I see it, this is not a real amendment.

What it means is that it simply affords those who offer it, under the guise of talking about spending, to really engage in delay and delay and delay. Because their goal, if they can, is to not have the House finish its appropriations business. Their goal, also, if they can, is to delay the SCHIP bill from coming to the floor and finally being passed by the House.

So after we have seen this administration and their allies in this House borrow $1.2 trillion to pay for tax cuts and after we have seen them borrow another $600 billion to finance that misbegotten war in Iraq, now they pretend that they are contributing to the public good by offering to cut spending by $50,000; not $50 billion, but $50,000.

This is, in plain language, a filibuster. It is the first of many amendments that are being offered by people who are so opposed to the SCHIP proposition, which will be before us tomorrow, that they would prefer to defend $50 billion in tax cuts for people making $1 million a year than they would to see 5 million more kids covered by health insurance in this country. That is really what is afoot here.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself only mildly amused, because the subject really is serious. I find myself only mildly amused by the fact that, 3 days ago, we had the President announce another large, massive increase in foreign aid which he wants us to provide yet this year.

We also now increasingly are coming to understand that the President will be asking for an extension of the surge in Iraq, which will require him to ask the Congress to spend an extra $25 billion to $30 billion above and beyond $140 billion he is planning to ask for in the supplemental already for this year for Iraq. So, yet, we are here mired today in this let's-pretend Potemkin debate over $50,000.

We don't, on this side of the aisle, intend to get bogged down; at least, we don't intend to contribute to the bogging down. So we will let them drone on, drone on and drone on with their Lilliputian amendments.

Meanwhile, we recognize what is happening: If the other side wants to delay the people's business for a while, all that means is that, in the end, our colleagues won't be going home on Friday, they won't be going home on Saturday, and we will still be having Sunday dinner together.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the chairman, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his legislation to make a 1 percent reduction. We have got to start taking these first steps.

Year after year, I feel there is a group of us that come down here talking about how we slow the growth of government, talking about how we make reductions in what the government spends and talking about the necessity to begin with those little, tiny savings, ¼ percent, ½ percent, a solid percent, that will yield a savings. We are talking about $5.5 million. I find it just amazing that we can't even find $50,000 in there. We can't agree to make that kind of reduction. There are ways to do this. That is something government should be doing.

The gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned the SCHIP program. Indeed, in our Committee on Energy and Commerce, we have been quite disheartened that the SCHIP bill that he mentioned is not going through regular order. We didn't have a committee hearing in our Health Subcommittee. We would have welcomed that.

There is nobody against health care for low-income children. What we have great concerns about is all the other stuff, all the pay-fors that are in this bill, all the expansion of policy, taking a block grant, moving it to an entitlement. It brings us back to the initial question with the gentleman's bill on this appropriations bill of making a 1 percent reduction. There has to be a way to yield a savings that will pay for some of these things, because we can't take it out of Medicare Advantage.

The SCHIP legislation that the gentleman mentioned would make an incredible reduction to Medicare Advantage. My goodness, we would see $193 billion in reductions to our Medicare Advantage program over a 10-year period of time, which would be $15.3 billion in cuts to Medicare Part A for seniors. This would include skilled nursing facilities, rehab facilities, and long-term care hospitals. That would be one of the pay-fors in the SCHIP bill that the gentleman referenced.

That is why the gentleman from Georgia has a great amendment that says, let's get going. In title 1, page 1 of this bill, let's start finding a way to make some reductions. $9.6 billion in cuts to Medicare Part D for seniors is in that bill, that SCHIP bill that didn't go through subcommittee, didn't get a complete markup in committee. It is going to be moved to the floor.

So, there, again, the gentleman from Wisconsin's points on this bill is the reason we have this amendment to title 1, section 1 of this bill, to make that reduction in the Secretary's spending, $5.5 million. Certainly, we can find $50,000. $3.6 billion would be cut out of end-stage renal disease in that bill. There has to be a way to start making reductions so that you're paying for the government that you are trying to spend, the money you are trying to spend, the government you are putting out there. There has got to be a way to pay for this. Unfortunately, that is not something that we are seeing considered.

Mr. Chairman, $50,000 may not be much to the Secretary, but it is a lot to my constituents in Tennessee and especially those that are on Medicare Advantage.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to be clear. The gentlewoman may not be aware of it, but we

have accepted this amendment. The majority has accepted Mr. GINGREY's first amendment for $50,000. The gentlewoman said that $50,000 is very important to her constituents. The majority has heard it. Therefore, we accept the amendment. I think we can dispose of this amendment and move forward.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the chairwoman of the subcommittee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I would just say we have accepted the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, clearly, as the Chair of the committee pointed out, this is a filibuster to talk about another issue. Now, you can continue to do that. The sooner you stop filibustering, the sooner we can move on. We have accepted the amendment. But that is up to you.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time.

The gentlewoman's constituents should be very proud that we have accepted the amendment. The $50,000 that is so important to her constituents, to all Americans, has been accepted. We can dispose of this and move forward.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman for accepting the amendment. It is a commonsense way to begin this process that lacks a lot of common sense.

I wish to commend my colleague from Georgia for beginning the process of fiscal responsibility on this next appropriations bill. I would point out, however, that this bill spends $1.04 billion more than last year, an increase of 5.9 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that there aren't many folks across this Nation who got a 5.9 percent increase in their budget this year. So, I think that the amendment of my colleague from Georgia is an appropriate effort to try to begin the process of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I stand here supporting this amendment because as we attempt, and thank goodness we have the support of the majority on this small attempt, to begin to decrease bureaucracy, we are faced with a significant and huge increase in bureaucracy coming later this week.

I say that because my friend, the chairman of the committee, says, well, our goal here is to not finish the business. No, Mr. Chairman, our goal is to bring focus to an issue and to a bill that will not be allowed to get the focus that this bill gets. Because, as you know, Mr. Chairman, the rules of the House that will bring bills to the floor later this week will be of such a nature that Members of the House won't be able to come to the floor and talk about it. They won't be able to come to the floor and offer amendments in an open and deliberative process. They won't be able to exercise the right that they felt, and certainly their constituents felt, they would be given by being elected to this august body.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings.

Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.