June 28, 2001

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

NOT VOTING—13

Barton
Houghton
Smith (TX)
Burton
Moynihan
Flattis
Davis (FL)
Pet nan
Gutierrez
Res-Keihnes

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2180

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2180.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JACOBS). The amendment the Committee shall rise and reconsider:--

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused the Committee of the Whole to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. General debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. Amendments in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as ordered to the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 183 is an open rule providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 2330, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 183 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 183

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2330) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole 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 in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Finally, the rule allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2330 appropriates $74.2 billion in fiscal year 2002 budget authority for agriculture and related programs through the Department of Agriculture and other agencies. This figure is $2.4 billion less than last year’s appropriations, but $234 million more than the President’s request. The bulk of the spending goes to food stamps, $22 billion; the Food and Drug Administration, $2 billion; child nutrition programs, $10.1 billion; supplemental nutrition for Women, Infants and Children, $4.1 billion; and the Federal Crop Insurance Program, $3 billion.

In addition, this bill provides $1 billion for the Agriculture Research Service; $720 million for the Food Safety and Inspection Service; and $946 million for the Farm Service Agency.

Madam Speaker, I am particularly pleased that the Committee on Appropriations has included $150 million for market loss payments for America’s apple growers. As a representative of the number one apple-producing dis-

district in the Nation, I am acutely aware of the devastating losses sustained by apple growers in the last year. In our area, for example, countless warehouses, packing houses and other apple-related businesses have either shut down, declared bankruptcy, or downsized dramatically. In county after county, growers find that it costs substantially more to produce a box of apples than the market will pay to buy it.

And, unlike many farms that can easily switch crops when prices are down for one commodity, apple growers cannot simply pull up their orchards and grow something else for a few years until apple prices go back up again. In the face of unfair competition from China and other Asian nations, our growers have few tools with which to fight back.

Apple growers are an unusually independent breed. They have suffered ups and downs of the market for years without asking for any kind of Federal assistance that has long been common for other types of farming. But never before have we suffered the kinds of losses we are experiencing right now. For that reason, I would like to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and their colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations for recognizing the dire situation in apple country and for providing this much-needed assistance.

Madam Speaker, this is a fair bill. It funds a number of high-priority programs while cutting out wasteful, unnecessary and duplicative spending. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support both this open rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 2330.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me the customary time.

Madam Speaker, this is an open rule. It has everything to do with the bill that makes appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and other related agencies for fiscal year 2002. As my colleague from Washington described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

This allows germane amendments under the 5-minute rule. This is the normal amending process in the House. All Members, on both sides of the aisle, will have the opportunity to offer amendments that do not violate the rules for appropriations bills.

Madam Speaker, this is generally a good bill that serves America’s farmers as well as the poor and hungry in this land. And I commend the ranking Democrat, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms.
Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BONILLA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from yielding me this time, and I thank the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), for her hard work. It has been a long, tough road for many of us; but in the end I think we can proudly say this is a bipartisan bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule, and in strong support of the bill that will follow. This is a good, bipartisan bill. I have worked strongly and consistently as chairman of this subcommittee to try to be inclusive, working closely with every Member on both sides of the aisle to try to address as many of the issues as we possibly could in putting this bill together.

Our subcommittee heard many hours of testimony in previous days to get to this point. Many of the hours we spent listening to witnesses involved food safety, and that is something that both of us have worked on, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and I, to address these issues. There is great concern in the communities about the threats that exist from diseases that are now prevalent in other countries, primarily in Europe, that many of us are concerned about. Livestock producers, especially with the threat of foot-and-mouth disease and mad cow disease, are concerned, and we have addressed many of these concerns.

We have worked in a bipartisan way to increase the number of inspectors for the Food and Drug Administration to give them the resources to do their job. All of the inspection accounts that are important to keep our food supply and our industry safe from threats from abroad we have addressed in a strong way, and I think I speak for every member of the subcommittee as well, who would agree.

Madam Speaker, I do not agree with these priorities. I support the bill, but I cannot support the rule that turns down these amendments that I just talked about.
money for those needs, but it almost only pays costs to staff to hold on to what we have. Can anyone here really accept the Food and Drug Administration can barely inspect 1 percent of the products coming across our borders every day? That means 99 percent of imported product is not tested. Is that the gold standard of safety we hear so much about? And can we really believe that we have the information on the testing of practices like irradiation and enhanced food safety standards? No. In fact, in the subcommittee bill, we were able to get language on irradiation to do the kind of baseline studies that are necessary to assure irradiated food safety to consumers, but then those were stripped at the full committee level.

In the area of biofuels funding, the Bush administration and made over 100 recommendations to try to help America move forward and become more energy independent, but not a single one of those recommendations asks the Secretary of Agriculture to do anything. Yet we know that ethanol and biofuels and fuels based on biomass are in our sustainable energy future and that the Department of Agriculture should not be exempt from this important national challenge.

Finally, in the area of 4-H, we will be offering an amendment here on the floor to try to provide some of the initial funding for the measures that were passed here in the House this past week and in the Senate last week to celebrate the anniversary of 4-H. Let us put the money that is in the authorizing bill in this appropriation bill so that, in fact, there is no lapse of time.

For all these reasons, I do oppose the rule and look forward to the debate on the bill as the afternoon proceeds. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me the time and the committee for allowing me this opportunity to speak against the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSELE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. NUSSELE. Madam Speaker, I wish to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the very distinguished, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would be pleased to enter into such colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSELE. I thank the gentleman. It is my understanding that upon adoption of the rule, the appropriations bill will exceed the Subcommittee on Agriculture and Rural Development’s 302(b) allocation by $150 million. The committee does not intend a wholesale reprioritization of the budget to address this matter. I am pleased to yield the time to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Speaker, the gentleman’s understanding is correct. It is my understanding that the committee included an amendment that would provide an additional $150 million in emergency funding to assist apple producers.

Some Members expressed concern over the emergency designation, which in effect would increase spending above the level assumed by the budget resolution, so, that designation will be eliminated from the bill by the rule before us at the present time. As a result of this amendment, this bill will be $150 million over the 302(b) allocation. However, the Committee on Appropriations has not exceeded our 302(a) allocation as set by the Committee on the Budget.

I want to assure the gentleman from Iowa and Members that it was not the intent and it is not the policy of the Committee on Appropriations to present a bill that is in excess of its allocation. It is simply the fact that after extensive discussions with the leadership, the Committee on Agriculture, and the Committee on the Budget, it was determined that the most expeditious way to resolve the matter and get this bill on the floor was the elimination of the emergency designation.

Mr. NUSSELE. It is my further understanding that the Committee on Appropriations will increase the subcommittee’s 302(b) allocation to the level provided by this bill and adjust the 302(b) allocations for other subcommittees by an offsetting amount.

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Speaker, the gentleman’s understanding is correct. It is the intent of the Committee on Appropriations to address this matter the next time it meets to consider revisions to the allocations by increasing the 302(b) allocation for this bill to a level equal to the amount this bill passed by the House and to reduce other allocations for outstanding bills to accommodate this spending in the agriculture bill.

The committee does not intend a wholesale reprioritization of the budget to address this matter. We are also somewhat limited in our options because we have already passed three bills out of the House. It is not the intent of the Appropriations Committees to reduce the 302(b) allocations of bills previously passed by the House to accommodate this spending in the agriculture bill.

Nevertheless, this does not mean the committee is precluded from a later reallocation as we work on these bills with the Senate during conference deliberations. Further, I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that it is my intention that the defense allocation will be preserved and maintained. Defense is a very large proportion of our budget, and we do not want to be in conformance with the Budget Act and that our bills are consistent with their allocations. I assure the gentleman that we will fully abide by the provisions of the Budget Act.

Mr. NUSSLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his clarification of this matter.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I think that overall to say about the adequacy of our inspection system for foodstuffs that come into the United States, for instance, we see that they inspect less than 1 percent of everything that is imported into this country. We believe that that constitutes a true crisis. I think that if we do not act on this crisis, it will hurt not only consumers but the very farmers that many of us represent, because farmers depend on a high level of consumer confidence in order to be able to sell their products.

And while there is no question that our food supply is among the safest in the world, we still have a lot of problems that could be taken care of if we
put the needs of food safety, in fact, of the wealthiest 1 percent of the people in this country to get a $33,000 tax cut next year. We have some choices to make, and we are being prevented from making them by the choices that were already made by this House on the tax bill.

We also have the question about whether or not WIC is being funded adequately. It certainly appears to me that the funding level in this bill is not adequate. Yet we are not, under the rule, going to be allowed to do anything about that.

And then, thirdly, we have the effort that we tried to make in the full committee to take surplus food which we have in this country and make it available to children around the world. We have a program at USDA that did that last year; and we have been urged by Senator George McGovern and Senator Bob Dole, two people, who in the history of this Congress on a bipartisan basis have been more about nutrition programs than most of us have ever heard, they both urge us to continue this program. USDA will not get off the dime and make up their mind one way or another. We tried to get that done as well in this bill and were blocked procedurally from doing so.

So for these reasons, it seems to me that we ought to vote down this rule and bring back a rule that will allow us to recognize a legitimate crisis with respect to public confidence in the safety of our food supply, and also allow us to address the other two issues that I have mentioned here today.

So I would urge a no vote on the rule so that we can get a better rule under which to debate this otherwise fairly constructive bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies.

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and very much appreciate him yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the Committee on Rules for a fair, open rule and for their work. This will bring this bill to the floor in a manner that will open debate and bring out a lot of different points of view. I appreciate that a lot.

I also want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), for a great job that he has done and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), for all the work and cooperation that we have seen on both sides.

The staff on this bill has done a tremendous job and their efforts are very much appreciated.

This is a bipartisan bill and it is brought to the floor with, I think, agreement that the nation needs of the people who are needing assistance for food, is met and that it is a bill that I think we can all support in the House.

There are a couple items that I am very pleased that were included. One is funding for the National Animal Disease Center in Ames. This is in response to real concerns that we have with foot and mouth disease; mad cow disease; those types of problems that can be devastating to our livestock industry; and also for food safety for Americans. Also, they have increased the funding for the AgrAbility program, something that is very dear to me. What this program does is help people continue to farm even with disabilities and the $6 million in this bill for this very important program is very much appreciated.

This bill funds our research in a manner that agriculture is desperately in need of, new opportunities, new ways of getting value to our products. The way to do that is through research. So I am very pleased with the emphasis that the chairman has put on research.

Also, a key element for the Department is food safety. I am very pleased that the FDA has increased funding of $115 million to a level of $1.18 billion. That is the largest increase in history.

The Food Inspection Service has an increase of $25.4 million, raising that total to $720 million, also a very substantial increase to meet the needs that we have to provide not only the best quality food but the safest food anywhere to be found in the world.

So, again, I ask Members to support this rule, support this bill. It is good for agriculture. It is good for all of our citizens.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURA).

Ms. DELAURA. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. It busts the budget caps. There has been a double standard applied to some programs within this bill, and I was fully supportive of the assistance to apple growers in this country, because I think it is the right thing to do to help an industry out when they do what help.

On the other hand, what they have done here with the Committee on Rules is they have made an exception for one emergency and have said no to all other emergencies that face American families. Whether it is family farmers facing the loss of their family farms, whether it is biodiesel fuels, Meals on Wheels, low-income nutrition assistance, we have emergencies that we need to address. We just cannot pick and choose which ones we want and which ones are politically advantageous.

Specifically, this rule blocks an amendment that I brought to the committee to provide urgent emergency funds to address the food safety crisis. Americans are more likely to get sick from food than they were a half century ago, and the outbreak of food sickness is expected to go up by as much as 15 percent over the next decade. Each year, some of my colleagues have mentioned this already, 5,000 Americans die from foodborne illnesses. 76 million get ill and 325,000 are hospitalized. Just 2 days ago, the Excel Corporation recalled 190,000 pounds of ground beef and pork because of the possible contamination by deadly E. Coli in Kentucky, in Tennessee, in Georgia. Sara Lee pled guilty to selling tainted meat that was linked to a nationwide listeriosis in 1998 that killed 15 people. Grocery stores are afraid that their food is unsafe to sell.

Lest one thinks that these are things that we just made up, we have a number of headlines from recent news: A Big Recall of Meat Amid E. Coli Fears; Sara Lee Fined in Meat Recall Linked to 15 Deaths; USDA Blamed in Slaughter Violations; Grocers Demand Produce Inspections; Contaminated Food Makes Millions Ill Despite Advances.

Experts like Joe Levitt from the FDA are telling the press that, quote, we do have a real problem. To address this problem, I asked the committee to allow an amendment to gross 325 million in emergency funds, $90 million to increase inspection of imported foods from 1 to 10 percent, $73 million for over 600 new inspectors to inspect all high-risk and domestic farms twice a year and all other domestic farms every 2 years, and $523 million for the food safety and inspection service to ensure the implementation of new food safety procedures to strengthen our food safety efforts.

The Food and Drug Administration inspects all food except meat, poultry, and eggs. They inspect fruit juices, vegetables, cheeses, and seafood. These foods are the sources of 85 percent of food poisoning; and last year, recalls of FDA-regulated products rose to 913, the most since the mid-1980s, and 36 percent above the average.

FDA inspects less than 1 percent of imported food that comes into the United States, and this is a market that has expanded from 2.7 million items coming in to our country to 4.1 million items, and that increase has happened in just the last 3 years.

In the domestic market, the FDA inspects high risk firms no more than once a year and other firms are inspected only once in 7 years.

The FDA has only 400 people to inspect all domestic food, and we have less than 120 people to inspect imported food. Food Safety and Inspection Service has held public hearings on a wide
range of issues: procedures for imported food, risk management, emergency outbreaks. We know what has happened in Europe with food and mouth. We know about the threat of mad cow. It is vital that the FSIS has the resources it needs. American families should be able to go out to dinner, to buy the processed meat, and not be fearful that they or their children or their families are going to be in jeopardy.

In the 1920s, Upton Sinclair wrote in a novel, The Jungle, he highlighted the abuses of the meat packing industry. It brought a wave of reform in this country. We need to move forward on food safety, not to move backward to the days that Sinclair wrote about. This is about providing the agency that the days that Sinclair wrote about.

It brought a wave of reform in this country. We need to move forward on the emergency designation, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and I have agreed, and we just shared that colloquy on the floor a moment ago, that the designation would be stricken by this rule and that the bill would be protected from resulting points of order.

Furthermore, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young) agreed that the Committee on Appropriations would revise its 302(b) allocations and reflect the fact that the $5.5 billion in agricultural emergency would be stricken by this rule and the bill would be protected from resulting points of order.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Nussle), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. NUSSEL. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the rule and to speak in favor of H.R. 2330, providing appropriations for agriculture and related agencies. As reported by the Committee on Appropriations, this bill is technically consistent with the budget resolution and complies with the Congressional Budget Act. As the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, I wish to report to my colleagues that H.R. 2330 provides $15.7 billion in budget authority and $15.97 billion in outlays for fiscal year 2002. The bill does not provide any additional appropriations.

As reported, the bill also designates $300 million in emergencies, which increased both the levels of the budget resolution caps by the same amount. It also rescinds $3.7 billion, but this rescission produces no savings in outlays. As reported by the Committee on Appropriations on June 27, the bill does exceed the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug’s 302(b) allocation. Therefore, it does not violate section 302(c) of the Budget Act, which prohibits the consideration of appropriation legislation that exceeds the reporting subcommittee’s 302(b) allocation.

Members may be aware that I am concerned and have been concerned that the reported bill designates $150 million in emergencies for the purpose that is already accommodated in the budget resolution. This designation had the effect of increasing the levels of the budget resolution and the statutory caps by the same amount. The budget resolution clearly anticipated the need for additional agricultural assistance by increasing the Committee on Agriculture’s allocation by $5.5 billion in fiscal year 2001.

Indeed, earlier this same week, the House passed a bill that provided that same $5.5 billion in agricultural emergency funding for $169 million for the producers of specialty crops. In addition, the budget resolution provided another $7.3 billion of agriculture spending in fiscal year 2002 and included a procedure that could increase the total to as much as $63 billion. The Committee on Agriculture is free to use that portion and allocation as it sees fit for specialty crops.

While I continue to have concerns about the emergency designation, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and I have agreed, and we just shared that colloquy on the floor a moment ago, that the designation would be stricken by this rule and that the bill would be protected from resulting points of order.

A big piece of this bill has to do with research. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa when he says that research is about the future of agriculture. It is also about the future of how we get agriculture out of the recession that agriculture is currently in. I have an agriculture research lab in my hometown of Peoria. They do marvelous work. The people there are very professional chemists and professional people who do the work that really helps us plan for the future uses of commodities and other fruits and vegetables and specialty crops that we grow in this country.

So the emphasis on research in this bill is extraordinary. The amount of money dedicated to research in this bill is extraordinary. It makes an awful lot of sense. I think, to pass the rule and certainly pass the bill. There will be some opportunities for some people to make modifications or offer amendments, and then there will be additional time, obviously later on, when there is a conference.

But today I think is the day to pass the rule, pass this good bill, keep things moving, and really assist those in agriculture who need the kind of assistance and help and research funds that this bill provides.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Sessions), my distinguished colleague and classmate.

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young) and commitments in this regard. I urge Members not only to support the bill but to support the rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LaHood), my distinguished colleague and classmate.

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Hastings) for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I want to pay my compliments to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Bonilla) and his staff and also to the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. Kaptur) and the staff on the Democratic side for putting together a good bill. I think there is no doubt that every Member that is on the subcommittee, of which I am the newest Member, believes that this is a good bill. Even though there are some who believe that the rule did not allow for some consideration of opportunities to solve some problems, many of those problems were discussed in the subcommittee and many of which were agreed upon. As many amendments as people wanted to offer were able to be offered, thanks to the chairman. I know that the ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. Kaptur) offered many amendments, some of which were adopted, some of which were not. Other Members had the same concerns.

So this notion that this is not a good rule because some people do not have the opportunity, those opportunities were provided to the subcommittee Members, and there was a full debate on many of these issues. Although I am a new member of the subcommittee, I am certainly not new to the issues of agriculture. During the last 6 years, and I have been a member of the agricultural authorization committee and I have worked very hard with many Members, including some who are in the Chamber today, on agricultural issues, in trying to solve agricultural problems.

Agriculture is in a recession. This bill does provide a solution of many of the problems that we have with respect to the recession that currently exists.

Agriculture is in a recession. This bill helps agriculture in solving many of the problems that we have with respect to the recession that currently exists.

Agriculture is in a recession. This bill helps agriculture in solving many of the problems that we have with respect to the recession that currently exists.
an opportunity to put this on the floor, an opportunity to vote on this and get the appropriations bill done before we go home.

I think it is important to understand that what this rule provides for is an incredible amount of money for some very important projects, to some things that sustain America, to some things that we have, how we deal with people in our country.

We should not go too far from understanding that this bill provides $22 billion for food stamps. This bill provides $1.2 billion for the Food and Drug Administration. They know how to administer their business. They know what they are doing, and $1.2 billion will cover that. Child nutrition programs, $10.1 billion. The Supplemental Nutritional Program for Women, Infants, and Children, known as WIC, $4.1 billion. The Nutritional Program for Women, Infants, and Children, known as WIC, $4.1 billion. The Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, known as WIC, $4.1 billion.

So I applaud the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) for his hard work, and our chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and also the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the Committee on Rules who has worked carefully to make sure that this rule is fair and open. Lastly, I would like to give accolades to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), who is our chairman, who has worked very diligently to make sure that the rule that was crafted not only exemplified what this body would be in favor of, but would also be something that people in his home State of California would be proud of.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I think this is a good rule. It is an open rule that we typically have for appropriations bills.

As was mentioned earlier, there was some criticism by members of the Committee on Rules not allowing some amendments to be made in order. I think what the Committee on Rules really did was protect the product of the Appropriations Committee.

Yes, there were some waivers in this; but essentially the will of the Committee on Appropriations was such that they went through their process and added some issues to this bill that required waivers. We gave them, and protected the product that they desired.

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

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Biggert). The question is on the resolution. The question was taken; and the Yeas and Nays were ordered to be recorded, and reported to the House. The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 194, not voting 18, as follows:

YEAS—222

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abercrombie</th>
<th>Ackerman</th>
<th>Allen</th>
<th>Andrews</th>
<th>Baird</th>
<th>Baldwin</th>
<th>Banker</th>
<th>Barrett</th>
<th>Bass</th>
<th>Berreuter</th>
<th>Bole</th>
<th>Hostettler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ackerman</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>Baird</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>Berreuter</td>
<td>Bole</td>
<td>Hostettler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ackerman</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>Baird</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>Berreuter</td>
<td>Bole</td>
<td>Hostettler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ackerman</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>Baird</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>Berreuter</td>
<td>Bole</td>
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Mr. BONILLA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and that I may include tabular marks, and that I may include tabular material, and extraneous material on H.R. 2330.

Mr. Chairman, I am just delighted that we have seen good, strong bipartisan support for the effort we have undertaken in putting this bill together. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring before the House today the fiscal year 2002 appropriations bill for Agriculture, Rural Development, the Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies.

My goal this year has been to produce a bipartisan bill, and I believe we have done a good job in reaching that goal. The subcommittee began work on this bill in early March, before the administration produced its budget. We had 6 public hearings beginning on March 8. The transcripts of these hearings, the administration’s official statements, the detailed budget requests, several thousand questions for the record and the statements of members and the public are all contained in six hearing volumes.

In order to expedite action on this bill, we completed our subcommittee’s hearings on May 6. The subcommittee and full committee markup on the bill on June 6 and June 13 respectively.

We have tried very hard to accommodate the requests of Members, and to provide increases for critical programs. We received 2,532 individual requests for specific spending, from almost every Member of the House. Reading all of the mail I received, I can confirm to you that the interest in this bill is completely bipartisan. This bill does have significant increases over fiscal year 2001 for programs that have always enjoyed strong bipartisan support. Those increases include:

- Agricultural Research Service, $79 million;
- Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, $55 million;
- Food Safety and Inspection Service, $25 million;
- Farm Service Agency, $201 million;
- Natural Resources Conservation Service, $77 million; and
- Food and Drug Administration, $120 million.

I would like to say that I am very happy that we were able to provide significant increases for the Food and Drug Administration. I think it is vitally important for that agency to have the resources to perform its public health mission. We are able to provide FDA the following:

- $15 million to prevent outbreak of BSE, or Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy, which is commonly known as “Mad Cow disease”;
- $10 million to increase the number of domestic and foreign inspections, and to expand import coverage in all product areas;