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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 marked up 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 increases above last year’s level:

- $10 million to increase the number of domestic and foreign inspections, and to expand import coverage in all product areas;
- $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;
- $55 million for Food Safety and Inspection Service;
- $79 million for Agricultural Research Service.


GEORGE W. BUSH,

GENERAL LEAVE

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 and extraneous material on H.R. 2330.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The Speaker pro tempore announces that the House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2230).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KAPTUR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Clerk recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

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

Mr. Chairman, we are delighted today to be presenting the Agricultural Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002. I want to acknowledge the good work of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), my ranking member, who has contributed to this process over the last few weeks.

It has been a pleasure working with her and all the members of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies on both sides of the aisle.

I believe we have produced a good bipartisan bill that deals with a lot of the specific issues that Members are concerned about in their districts around the country, ranging from research projects to inspection issues, to FDA issues, to just any possible issue that has come up. There have been 2,500-plus requests from individual Members, and we have done our best to accommodate that.

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 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 marked up 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 increases above last year’s level:

- $10 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;
$10 million to reduce adverse events related to medical products;
$10 million to better protect volunteers who participate in clinical research studies;
$9 million to provide a safer food supply;
$23 million to complete construction of the replacement facility in Los Angeles that we initiated last year;
And full funding of increased pay costs for existing employees.

I want to stress how important this is. In the past, FDA and all other agencies in this bill were forced to reduce the level of services provided to the public, in order to absorb legislated payroll increases. This year, we want to be sure that does not happen. I am sure that we all want to see that there is no slippage in research, application review, inspections, loan servicing, and all the other payroll-intensive operations that are financed through our bill. We worked hard to find these resources. I am glad we were able to do it, and I am sure the agencies will put them to good use.

Mr. Chairman, we all refer to this bill as an agriculture bill, but it does far more than assisting basic agriculture. It also supports human nutrition, the environment, and food, drug, and medical safety. This is a bill that will deliver benefits to every one of our constituents every day no matter what kind of district they represent.

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

The bill is a bipartisan product with a lot of hard work and input from both sides of the aisle. I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida, (Chairman YOUNG), and the gentleman from Wisconsin, (Mr. OBEY), who serve as the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

I would also like to thank all my subcommittee colleagues: the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH); the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON); the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT); the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM); the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON); the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE); the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD); the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO); the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

In particular, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, for all her good work on this bill this year and the years in the past.

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

Mr. Chairman, I include the following Comparative Statement of Budget Authority for the RECORD:
## AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 (H.R. 2330)
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2001</th>
<th>FY 2002</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2002</th>
<th>Bill vs. FY 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enacted</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Secretary:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, Processing, and Marketing</td>
<td>2,906</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>+107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Economist</td>
<td>7,446</td>
<td>7,648</td>
<td>7,704</td>
<td>+258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Appeals Division</td>
<td>12,384</td>
<td>12,786</td>
<td>12,889</td>
<td>+473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Budget and Program Analysis</td>
<td>8,752</td>
<td>9,076</td>
<td>7,081</td>
<td>-591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>10,059</td>
<td>10,261</td>
<td>10,325</td>
<td>+266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common computing environment</td>
<td>39,012</td>
<td>59,269</td>
<td>55,265</td>
<td>+10,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>5,160</td>
<td>5,335</td>
<td>3,536</td>
<td>+244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Executive Operations</td>
<td>81,681</td>
<td>102,357</td>
<td>102,692</td>
<td>+21,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments</td>
<td>182,345</td>
<td>187,561</td>
<td>187,647</td>
<td>+5,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to GSA</td>
<td>(125,026)</td>
<td>(130,266)</td>
<td>(130,266)</td>
<td>(-5,240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building operations and maintenance</td>
<td>(31,136)</td>
<td>(31,372)</td>
<td>(31,436)</td>
<td>(-304)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs, renovations, and construction</td>
<td>(25,943)</td>
<td>(25,943)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous materials management</td>
<td>15,660</td>
<td>15,660</td>
<td>15,660</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental administration</td>
<td>39,831</td>
<td>37,079</td>
<td>37,396</td>
<td>+1,67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers</td>
<td>2,963</td>
<td>2,963</td>
<td>2,963</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>3,118</td>
<td>+56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Communications</td>
<td>8,604</td>
<td>8,846</td>
<td>8,975</td>
<td>+141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Inspector General</td>
<td>68,715</td>
<td>70,839</td>
<td>71,429</td>
<td>+694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the General Counsel</td>
<td>31,012</td>
<td>32,627</td>
<td>32,937</td>
<td>+1,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>+23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Research Service</td>
<td>66,681</td>
<td>67,200</td>
<td>67,620</td>
<td>+420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agricultural Statistics Service</td>
<td>100,550</td>
<td>113,786</td>
<td>114,546</td>
<td>+13,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census of Agriculture</td>
<td>(14,467)</td>
<td>(25,350)</td>
<td>(25,456)</td>
<td>(-10,096)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Research Service</td>
<td>896,035</td>
<td>915,561</td>
<td>971,365</td>
<td>+55,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and facilities</td>
<td>74,037</td>
<td>39,462</td>
<td>78,982</td>
<td>+4,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Agricultural Research Service</td>
<td>970,872</td>
<td>946,053</td>
<td>1,050,227</td>
<td>+79,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and education activities</td>
<td>505,079</td>
<td>407,319</td>
<td>507,452</td>
<td>+2,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Institutions Endowment Fund</td>
<td>(7,100)</td>
<td>(7,100)</td>
<td>(7,100)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension activities</td>
<td>436,475</td>
<td>419,420</td>
<td>436,095</td>
<td>+3,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated activities</td>
<td>41,649</td>
<td>41,849</td>
<td>43,355</td>
<td>+1,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service</td>
<td>979,403</td>
<td>862,572</td>
<td>986,836</td>
<td>+124,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>+26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>529,367</td>
<td>702,925</td>
<td>587,368</td>
<td>+57,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUI user fees</td>
<td>(84,813)</td>
<td>(84,813)</td>
<td>(84,813)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and facilities</td>
<td>9,848</td>
<td>5,189</td>
<td>7,169</td>
<td>-2,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service</td>
<td>539,245</td>
<td>708,114</td>
<td>594,575</td>
<td>+55,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Marketing Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Services</td>
<td>66,191</td>
<td>71,430</td>
<td>71,774</td>
<td>+343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardization user fees</td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>(-1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)</td>
<td>(60,596)</td>
<td>(60,596)</td>
<td>(60,596)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 33))</td>
<td>13,438</td>
<td>13,748</td>
<td>13,745</td>
<td>+101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to states and possessions</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Agricultural Marketing Service</td>
<td>79,976</td>
<td>86,651</td>
<td>87,118</td>
<td>+5,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>31,350</td>
<td>32,076</td>
<td>30,711</td>
<td>-365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection and weighing services</td>
<td>(42,463)</td>
<td>(42,463)</td>
<td>(42,463)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>+22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Safety and Inspection Service</td>
<td>695,171</td>
<td>715,542</td>
<td>720,652</td>
<td>+5,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab accreditation fees</td>
<td>(996)</td>
<td>(1,003)</td>
<td>(1,003)</td>
<td>(-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Food Safety and Inspection Service</td>
<td>695,171</td>
<td>715,542</td>
<td>720,652</td>
<td>+5,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing</td>
<td>3,899,158</td>
<td>3,999,866</td>
<td>4,123,529</td>
<td>+224,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Assistance Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>+23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Service Agency:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>826,563</td>
<td>939,030</td>
<td>945,993</td>
<td>+11,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer from export loans)</td>
<td>(598)</td>
<td>(790)</td>
<td>(797)</td>
<td>(-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer from P.L. 480)</td>
<td>(613)</td>
<td>(972)</td>
<td>(980)</td>
<td>(-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer from ACP)</td>
<td>(264,731)</td>
<td>(272,559)</td>
<td>(274,769)</td>
<td>(-1,025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts</td>
<td>(266,132)</td>
<td>(274,357)</td>
<td>(276,464)</td>
<td>(-10,164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, salaries and expenses</td>
<td>(1,092,695)</td>
<td>(1,213,387)</td>
<td>(1,222,536)</td>
<td>(+10,249)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State mediation grants</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily indemnity program</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Farm Service Agency</td>
<td>830,006</td>
<td>942,123</td>
<td>949,086</td>
<td>+11,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 (H.R. 2330) — Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2001 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2002 Request</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs.</th>
<th>Bill vs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enacted</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:  
  Loan authorizations:  
  Farm ownership loans:  
    Direct              | (127,722)       | (128,000)       | (128,000) | +1,278   |         |
    Guaranteed          | (868,066)       | (1,000,000)     | (1,000,000) | -131,914 |         |
  Subtotal             | (995,888)       | (1,128,000)     | (1,128,000) | +132,192 |         |
  Farm operating loans:  
    Direct              | (552,891)       | (600,000)       | (600,000) | +77,109  |         |
    Unsubsidized guaranteed | (1,075,476)   | (1,500,000)     | (1,500,000) | -424,524 |         |
    Subsidized guaranteed | (569,100)       | (500,000)       | (500,000) | -130,900 |         |
  Subtotal             | (1,797,467)     | (2,800,000)     | (2,800,000) | +632,541 |         |
  Indian tribe land acquisition loans            | (2,000)         | (2,000)         | (2,000) | -2        |         |
  Emergency disaster loans                       | (24,847)        | (25,000)        | (25,000) | +53       |         |
  Soil erosion and        | (100,000)       | (100,000)       | (100,000) |           |         |
  Total, Loan authorizations                  | (3,060,216)     | (3,855,000)     | (3,855,000) | +764,764 |         |
  Loan subsidies:  
  Farm ownership loans:  
    Direct              | 13,756          | 3,366           | 3,366   | -10,390  |         |
    Guaranteed          | 4,427           | 4,500           | 4,500   | +73      |         |
  Subtotal             | 18,183          | 7,866           | 7,866   | -10,317  |         |
  Farm operating loans:  
    Direct              | 47,251          | 53,580          | 53,580  | +6,329   |         |
    Unsubsidized guaranteed | 14,738         | 52,650          | 52,650  | +37,912  |         |
    Subsidized guaranteed | 30,119          | 67,900          | 67,900  | +37,981  |         |
  Subtotal             | 92,108          | 174,030         | 174,030 | +81,922  |         |
  Indian tribe land acquisition loans            | 322             | 118             | 118     | -104     |         |
  Emergency disaster loans                       | 6,120           | 3,363           | 3,363   | -2,757   |         |
  Total, Loan subsidies                  | 116,733         | 185,377         | 185,377 | +68,644  |         |
  ACIF expenses:  
  Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)    | 264,731         | 272,595         | 274,769 | +10,038  | +2,174  |
  Administrative expenses                   | 4,130           | 5,000           | 5,000   | +870     |         |
  Total, ACIF expenses                      | 268,861         | 280,595         | 282,769 | +13,908  | +2,174  |
  Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund   | 365,594         | 465,972         | 468,146 | +82,552  | +2,174  |
  (Loan authorization)                      | (3,060,216)     | (3,855,000)     | (3,855,000) | +764,764 |         |
  Total, Farm Service Agency                | 1,215,600       | 1,408,095       | 1,417,232 | +201,632 | +9,137  |
  Risk Management Agency                     | 65,453          | 74,752          | 75,142  | +9,690   | +390    |
  Total, Farm Assistance Programs           | 1,281,054       | 1,483,437       | 1,492,375 | +211,344 | +9,532  |
  Corporations                               |
  Federal Crop Insurance Corporation        |
  Federal crop insurance fund               | 2,604,660       | 3,037,000       | 3,037,000 | +232,340 |         |
  Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:  
  Operations and maintenance for hazardous waste management (limitation on administrative expenses) | (5,000) | (5,000) | (5,000) |         |         |
  Total, Corporations                        | 28,069,101      | 26,153,000      | 26,153,000 | -1,916,101 |         |
  Total, title I, Agricultural Programs (by transfer) | (259,132) | (274,307) | (275,548) | +10,414 | +2,189 |
  (Loan authorization)                      | (3,060,216)     | (3,855,000)     | (3,855,000) | +764,764 |         |
  (Limitation on administrative expenses)   | (108,059)       | (108,059)       | (108,059) |         |         |

**TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS**

Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment | 709 | 730 | 736 | +27 | +6

Natural Resources Conservation Service:  
  Conservation operations                     | 712,545         | 773,454         | 782,762  | +70,217  | +9,308  |
  Watershed surveys and planning              | 10,844          | 10,960          | 11,030   | +186     | +70     |
  Watershed and flood prevention operations   | 99,224          | 100,413         | 105,743  | +5,330   | +5,330  |
  Resource conservation and development       | 41,923          | 43,048          | 46,361   | +6,418   | +5,313  |
  Forestry incentives program                  | 6,311           | 6,311           | 6,311    | -6,311   |         |
  Agricultural Conservation Program (recision) |                 |                 | -65,000  | -65,000  | -65,000 |
  Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service | 870,847 | 927,875 | 902,896 | +32,049 | -24,979 |
  Total, title II, Conservation Programs      | 871,556         | 928,605         | 903,632  | +32,076  | -24,973 |

**TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS**

Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development | 604 | 623 | 628 | +24 | +5
### AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 (H.R. 2330) — Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2001 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2002 Request</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural Development:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural community advancement program</td>
<td>760,864</td>
<td>692,125</td>
<td>767,495</td>
<td>+6,601</td>
<td>+75,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RD expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>150,084</td>
<td>153,722</td>
<td>134,733</td>
<td>134,733</td>
<td>+4,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer from RDIF)</td>
<td>(408,333)</td>
<td>(419,741)</td>
<td>(422,910)</td>
<td>(422,910)</td>
<td>(+14,577)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer from RDLP)</td>
<td>(5,632)</td>
<td>(5,733)</td>
<td>(3,761)</td>
<td>(3,761)</td>
<td>(+1,259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer from RTRB)</td>
<td>(34,640)</td>
<td>(36,504)</td>
<td>(36,322)</td>
<td>(36,322)</td>
<td>(+1,662)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, RD expenses:</strong></td>
<td>(579,652)</td>
<td>(595,852)</td>
<td>(600,833)</td>
<td>(600,833)</td>
<td>(+21,181)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Rural Development:</strong></td>
<td>880,948</td>
<td>825,847</td>
<td>902,198</td>
<td>+11,250</td>
<td>+76,351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rural Housing Service:**

- **Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:**
  - Loan authorizations:
    - Single family (sec. 502)...
      - (1,071,628) (1,064,650) (1,064,650) (-6,978)
    - Unsubsidized guaranteed
      - (3,136,426) (3,137,968) (3,137,968) (+1,538)
  - Subtotal, Single family
    - (4,208,057) (4,202,618) (4,202,618) (-5,439)
  - Housing repair (sec. 504)
    - (32,324) (32,324) (32,324)
  - Rental housing (sec. 519)
    - (114,070) (114,068) (114,068)
  - Site loans (sec. 524)
    - (5,152) (5,082) (5,082)
  - Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)
    - (99,780) (99,770) (99,770)
  - Multi-family housing credit sales
    - (1,779) (1,778) (1,778)
  - Single family housing credit sales
    - (10,000) (10,000) (10,000)
  - Self-help housing land development fund
    - (4,998) (5,000) (5,000)
  - Total, Loan authorizations
  - Loan subsidies:
    - Single family (sec. 502)
      - 170,371 140,108 140,108 36,263
    - Unsubsidized guaranteed
      - 7,384 40,166 40,166 32,782
  - Subtotal, Single family
    - 183,755 180,274 180,274 3,481
  - Housing repair (sec. 504)
    - 11,426 10,366 10,366 -1,070
  - Rental housing (sec. 519)
    - 56,202 48,274 48,274 -7,928
  - Site loans (sec. 524)
    - 28 28 28
  - Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)
    - 1,517 3,291 3,291 2,774
  - Mutli-family housing credit sales
    - 872 750 750 -122
  - Self-help housing land development fund
    - 278 254 254 -24
  - Total, Loan subsidies
    - 254,080 243,887 243,887 -10,193
  - RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RD)
    - 406,333 419,741 422,910 +14,577 +3,169
  - Rental assistance program:
    - (Sec. 531)
      - 672,604 687,604 687,604 15,000
    - (Sec. 502(c)(5)(G))
      - 5,900 5,900 5,900
  - Total, Rental assistance program
    - 678,504 693,504 693,504 15,000
  - **Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund**
  - Mutual and self-help housing grants
    - 33,925 33,925 33,925
  - Rural housing assistance grants
    - 43,903 38,914 38,914 -4,999
  - Farm labor program account
    - 26,934 29,431 31,431 +1,497 +3,000
  - Subtotal, grants and payments
    - 107,762 101,270 104,270 -3,000
  - **Total, Rural Housing Service**

- **Rural Business-Cooperative Service:**
  - **Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:**
    - (Loan authorization)
      - (36,172) (36,171) (36,171)
    - Administrative expenses (transfer to RD)
      - 3,632 3,733 3,761 +129 +28
  - **Total, Rural Development Loan Fund**
    - 23,085 20,227 20,255 -2,810 +28

- **Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:**
  - (Loan authorization)
    - (14,969) (14,966) (14,966)
  - Direct loans
    - 3,922 3,616 3,616 -296
  - Rural cooperative development grants
    - 6,486 6,486 7,500 +1,014 +1,014
  - Rural empowerment zones and enterprise community grants
    - 14,969 14,967 14,967
  - **Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service**
    - 33,453 45,296 46,338 +12,885 +1,042

**Note:** The above table represents a continuation of the appropriations bill for the AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, and RELATED AGENCIES for fiscal year 2002. The table details various programs and their appropriations, including rural development, rural housing, and rural business-cooperative service programs. The table includes loan authorizations, loan subsidies, and administrative expenses, among other financial details.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2001 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2002 Request</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Utilities Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan authorizations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, %</td>
<td>(121,128)</td>
<td>(121,107)</td>
<td>(121,107)</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, Municipal rate</td>
<td>(234,258)</td>
<td>(234,258)</td>
<td>(234,258)</td>
<td>+500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, FFS</td>
<td>(1,600,000)</td>
<td>(1,600,000)</td>
<td>(1,600,000)</td>
<td>+1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, Treasury rate</td>
<td>(500,000)</td>
<td>(500,000)</td>
<td>(500,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed electric</td>
<td>(120,000)</td>
<td>(120,000)</td>
<td>(120,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Electric</td>
<td>(2,615,486)</td>
<td>(2,615,486)</td>
<td>(4,115,486)</td>
<td>+1,499,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, %</td>
<td>(74,835)</td>
<td>(74,827)</td>
<td>(74,827)</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, Treasury rate</td>
<td>(300,000)</td>
<td>(300,000)</td>
<td>(300,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, FFS</td>
<td>(120,000)</td>
<td>(120,000)</td>
<td>(120,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Telecommunications</td>
<td>(494,635)</td>
<td>(494,627)</td>
<td>(494,627)</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Loan authorizations</td>
<td>(3,110,321)</td>
<td>(3,110,262)</td>
<td>(4,610,292)</td>
<td>+1,499,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan subsidies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, %</td>
<td>12,064</td>
<td>3,609</td>
<td>3,609</td>
<td>-8,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarantee electric</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>+70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, Municipal rate</td>
<td>20,458</td>
<td>20,458</td>
<td>20,458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Electric</td>
<td>32,532</td>
<td>3,689</td>
<td>3,689</td>
<td>-28,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, %</td>
<td>7,753</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>-6,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct, Treasury rate</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Telecommunications</td>
<td>7,753</td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>-5,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Loan subsidies</td>
<td>40,285</td>
<td>5,725</td>
<td>5,725</td>
<td>-34,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD)</td>
<td>34,640</td>
<td>35,604</td>
<td>36,322</td>
<td>+1,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account</td>
<td>74,925</td>
<td>41,329</td>
<td>42,047</td>
<td>-32,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Loan authorization)</td>
<td>(3,110,321)</td>
<td>(3,110,262)</td>
<td>(4,610,292)</td>
<td>+1,499,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Loan authorization)</td>
<td>(174,615)</td>
<td>(174,615)</td>
<td>(174,615)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct loan subsidy</td>
<td>2,584</td>
<td>2,584</td>
<td>2,584</td>
<td>+2,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTB administrative expenses (transfer to RD)</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td>3,107</td>
<td>+114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Rural Telephone Bank Program Account</td>
<td>5,577</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td>+2,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High energy costs grants (by transfer)</td>
<td>(24,000)</td>
<td>(24,000)</td>
<td>(24,000)</td>
<td>+24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance learning and telemedicine program:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Loan authorization)</td>
<td>(400,000)</td>
<td>(400,000)</td>
<td>(400,000)</td>
<td>+100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Loan authorization)</td>
<td>(400,000)</td>
<td>(400,000)</td>
<td>(400,000)</td>
<td>+100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>26,941</td>
<td>26,941</td>
<td>26,941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Rural Utilities Service</td>
<td>107,443</td>
<td>71,352</td>
<td>74,679</td>
<td>-32,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Loan authorization)</td>
<td>(3,684,936)</td>
<td>(3,510,292)</td>
<td>(5,184,907)</td>
<td>+1,499,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs (by transfer)</td>
<td>2,481,127</td>
<td>2,401,520</td>
<td>2,408,141</td>
<td>+7,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Loan authorization)</td>
<td>(449,598)</td>
<td>(486,180)</td>
<td>(490,100)</td>
<td>+40,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Loan authorization)</td>
<td>(8,214,237)</td>
<td>(8,034,077)</td>
<td>(9,708,692)</td>
<td>+1,494,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Nutrition Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child nutrition programs</td>
<td>4,043,086</td>
<td>4,137,086</td>
<td>4,137,086</td>
<td>+94,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from section 32</td>
<td>5,127,579</td>
<td>5,357,256</td>
<td>5,340,708</td>
<td>+231,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary spending</td>
<td>6,488</td>
<td>6,488</td>
<td>6,488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Child nutrition programs</td>
<td>9,541,510</td>
<td>10,088,746</td>
<td>10,088,746</td>
<td>+547,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)</td>
<td>4,043,086</td>
<td>4,137,086</td>
<td>4,137,086</td>
<td>+94,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food stamp program:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>18,416,228</td>
<td>19,556,436</td>
<td>19,556,436</td>
<td>+936,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>+900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico</td>
<td>1,301,000</td>
<td>1,355,550</td>
<td>1,355,550</td>
<td>+34,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The emergency food assistance program</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Food stamp program</td>
<td>20,119,228</td>
<td>21,991,986</td>
<td>21,991,986</td>
<td>+1,872,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodity assistance program</td>
<td>139,991</td>
<td>139,991</td>
<td>152,813</td>
<td>+12,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission</td>
<td>-5,300</td>
<td>-5,300</td>
<td>-5,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food donations programs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food donations programs</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly feeding program</td>
<td>149,670</td>
<td>149,686</td>
<td>149,686</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Food donations programs</td>
<td>150,751</td>
<td>150,749</td>
<td>150,749</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 (H.R. 2330)—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2001 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2002 Request</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food program administration</td>
<td>116,550</td>
<td>125,546</td>
<td>126,656</td>
<td>+1,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Food and Nutrition Service</td>
<td>34,111,116</td>
<td>36,628,604</td>
<td>36,648,036</td>
<td>+2,536,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs</td>
<td>34,111,665</td>
<td>36,629,361</td>
<td>36,648,028</td>
<td>+2,536,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Agricultural Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation</td>
<td>115,170</td>
<td>121,563</td>
<td>122,831</td>
<td>+7,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer from export loans)</td>
<td>0 (224)</td>
<td>0 (224)</td>
<td>0 (224)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer from P.L. 480)</td>
<td>1 (033)</td>
<td>1 (033)</td>
<td>1 (033)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Program level</td>
<td>(119,427)</td>
<td>(122,820)</td>
<td>(126,888)</td>
<td>+7,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program account:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan authorization, direct</td>
<td>(155,327)</td>
<td>(139,389)</td>
<td>(150,000)</td>
<td>(9,327)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan subsidy</td>
<td>113,335</td>
<td>113,335</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td>+8,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean freight differential</td>
<td>20,277</td>
<td>20,277</td>
<td>20,277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program level</td>
<td>(835,159)</td>
<td>(835,159)</td>
<td>(835,159)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>(835,159)</td>
<td>(835,159)</td>
<td>(835,159)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Agricultural Service (transfer to FAS)</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>+167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>+167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Public Law 480:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program level</td>
<td>(835,159)</td>
<td>(835,159)</td>
<td>(835,159)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>971,217</td>
<td>971,379</td>
<td>980,049</td>
<td>+8,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCC Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS)</td>
<td>3,224</td>
<td>3,224</td>
<td>3,224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>+209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account</td>
<td>3,812</td>
<td>4,014</td>
<td>4,021</td>
<td>+209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs (By transfer)</td>
<td>1,080,199</td>
<td>1,096,953</td>
<td>1,106,701</td>
<td>+16,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE VI - FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health and Human Services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Drug Administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation</td>
<td>1,066,173</td>
<td>1,173,673</td>
<td>1,180,623</td>
<td>+114,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription drug user fee act</td>
<td>(146,273)</td>
<td>(161,716)</td>
<td>(161,716)</td>
<td>(+12,443)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>(1,215,446)</td>
<td>(1,335,389)</td>
<td>(1,342,339)</td>
<td>(+128,653)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export and certification</td>
<td>(8,962)</td>
<td>(6,181)</td>
<td>(6,181)</td>
<td>+189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to GSA</td>
<td>(104,736)</td>
<td>(105,116)</td>
<td>(105,116)</td>
<td>+380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug reimportation</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and facilities</td>
<td>31,281</td>
<td>34,281</td>
<td>34,281</td>
<td>+3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Food and Drug Administration</td>
<td>1,087,454</td>
<td>1,210,904</td>
<td>1,217,854</td>
<td>+120,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodity Futures Trading Commission</td>
<td>67,850</td>
<td>70,400</td>
<td>70,700</td>
<td>+2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)</td>
<td>(36,719)</td>
<td>(36,700)</td>
<td>(36,700)</td>
<td>(-19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration</td>
<td>1,165,304</td>
<td>1,281,304</td>
<td>1,288,554</td>
<td>+123,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunger fellowships</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>+2,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Sheep Industry Improvement Center revolving fund</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDA drug reimportation</td>
<td>22,949</td>
<td>22,949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Apple market loss (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>+150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, title VII, General provisions</td>
<td>29,945</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>+125,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE VIII - FY 2001</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND OTHER EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chief Information Officer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common computing environment (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>19,457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-19,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental administration (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2001 Enacted</td>
<td>FY 2002 Request</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Bill vs. Enacted</td>
<td>Bill vs. Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Service Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>48,690</td>
<td>48,690</td>
<td>-48,690</td>
<td>-48,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency conservation program (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>79,824</td>
<td>79,824</td>
<td>-79,824</td>
<td>-79,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Crop Insurance Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal crop insurance corporation fund (emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>12,971</td>
<td>12,971</td>
<td>-12,971</td>
<td>-12,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources Conservation Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed and flood prevention operations (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>109,758</td>
<td>109,758</td>
<td>-109,758</td>
<td>-109,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural community advancement program (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>199,560</td>
<td>199,560</td>
<td>-199,560</td>
<td>-199,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>471,660</td>
<td>471,660</td>
<td>-471,660</td>
<td>-471,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Provisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation technical assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>34,923</td>
<td>34,923</td>
<td>-34,923</td>
<td>-34,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Disease loss compensation (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>-19,000</td>
<td>-19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>473,000</td>
<td>473,000</td>
<td>-473,000</td>
<td>-473,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Livestock assistance program (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>488,922</td>
<td>488,922</td>
<td>-488,922</td>
<td>-488,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRP Additional acreage enrollments (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>-117,000</td>
<td>-117,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Sheep loss assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>-2,265</td>
<td>-2,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Citrus canker compensation (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>57,672</td>
<td>57,672</td>
<td>-57,672</td>
<td>-57,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Apple/peach market loss (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>137,696</td>
<td>137,696</td>
<td>-137,696</td>
<td>-137,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Honey assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-20,000</td>
<td>-20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Livestock indemnity program (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>9,267</td>
<td>9,267</td>
<td>-9,267</td>
<td>-9,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Wool/mohair assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>-19,000</td>
<td>-19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Crop loss disaster assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>1,622,000</td>
<td>1,622,000</td>
<td>-1,622,000</td>
<td>-1,622,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Cranberry assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>-19,000</td>
<td>-19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared appreciation loan arrangements (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-2,000</td>
<td>-2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC grain dealer's guarantee fund (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>2,465</td>
<td>2,465</td>
<td>-2,465</td>
<td>-2,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico food stamp block grant</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii sugar transportation cost assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>7,184</td>
<td>7,184</td>
<td>-7,184</td>
<td>-7,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural development cooperative grants (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>9,978</td>
<td>9,978</td>
<td>-9,978</td>
<td>-9,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and industry loans:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Tobacco quota compensation (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-3,000</td>
<td>-3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Cooperative assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>19,956</td>
<td>19,956</td>
<td>-19,956</td>
<td>-19,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Bullery tobacco (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-50,000</td>
<td>-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC LDP delinquent borrower (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-5,000</td>
<td>-5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food stamp excess shelter allowance (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food stamp vehicle allowance (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-25,000</td>
<td>-25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, title VIII, FY 2001</td>
<td>3,638,849</td>
<td>3,638,849</td>
<td>-3,638,849</td>
<td>-3,638,849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TITLE X - ANTI-DUMPING**

Anti-dumping: |

| 39,912 | 39,912 |

| Grand total: |
| New budget (obligational) authority | 76,676,557 | 73,976,108 | 74,360,443 | -2,218,134 | +384,335 |
| Appropriations | 73,034,026 | 73,961,408 | 74,210,443 | +1,175,815 | +129,035 |
| Rescission | -5,300 | -5,300 | -5,300 | -5,300 |
| Emergency appropriations | (12,971) | (12,971) | (12,971) | (12,971) |
| Contingent emergency appropriations | (3,800,976) | (150,000) | (130,000) | +3,680,976 | +150,000 |
| (By transfer) | (719,987) | (764,774) | (770,903) | +50,918 | +6,129 |
| (Loan authorization) | (1,463,785) | (12,028,476) | (13,713,892) | +2,695,102 | +1,685,216 |
| (Limitation on administrative expenses) | (144,776) | (144,759) | (144,759) | - |

**RECAPITULATION**

| Title I: Agricultural programs | 33,249,000 | 31,636,339 | 31,765,514 | -1,480,366 | +133,175 |
| Title II: Conservation programs | 871,556 | 928,605 | 903,932 | +32,676 | -24,673 |
| Title III: Rural economic and community development programs | 2,481,127 | 2,401,520 | 2,466,414 | +7,907 | +86,869 |
| Title IV: Domestic food programs | 34,111,685 | 36,826,391 | 36,648,928 | +2,536,943 | +19,237 |
| Title V: Foreign assistance programs | 1,080,199 | 1,086,953 | 1,106,701 | +16,492 | +7,974 |
| Title VI: Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration | 1,105,304 | 1,281,304 | 1,288,554 | +123,250 | +7,250 |
| Title VII: General provisions | 39,945 | 1,996 | 155,000 | +125,005 | +153,004 |
| Title VIII, FY 2001 | 3,638,849 | 3,638,849 |
| Title X, Anti-dumping | 39,912 | 39,912 |
| Total, new budget (obligational) authority | 76,676,557 | 73,976,108 | 74,360,443 | -2,318,134 | +384,335 |

1/ In addition to appropriation.
Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me rise to say that this is a good bill that, in fact, is getting better at every stage of the legislative process.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), chairman of the Subcommittee, and our committee staff have worked to draft a fair bill within tight budget allocations; but the underlying amounts in different sections of the bill are far from what is necessary, given many of the needs of rural America and our food assistance programs.

This is the first bill managed by our new chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA). Let me congratulate our new chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), on his maiden voyage as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies and thank the gentleman for his cooperation throughout.

When we turn together, hopefully, will put us in a position to continue to work towards the best possible bill for America’s future.

I want to thank the subcommittee staff: Hank Moore; Martin Delgado; Maureen Holohan; Joanne Orndoff; Jim Richards; Roger Szemraj; and our detaillee, Leslie Barrack.

I also want to thank our new minority staff member, Martha Foley, very much for her hard work.

Mr. Chairman, let us put this bill in perspective. To begin with, overall we have a spending level for 2002 of $74,360 billion of which $15,669 billion is discretionary spending, plus an additional $150 million for the Hinchey apple disaster extension.

Several times today already, each of us have been touched by agriculture and other agencies in this bill: the food that we have eaten; some of the fabrics we are wearing; perhaps, even the blended fuels that were used in the vehicles that brought us to work; or the medications or vitamins that we take on any day.

We have been benefited by the research in this bill, by education and training, by inspection services that are operating at red alert levels now to keep hoof and mouth disease and mad cow disease out of this country, and by marketing services that take the bounty of this land around the world.

Truly, this is the committee that is concerned about food, fiber, the fuels of the future, and the condition of our forests.

Mr. Chairman, nearly 80 percent of the spending in this bill is mandatory spending, including our farm price support programs. Only one-fifth of the bill, 20 percent, is discretionary. Half of the spending in the bill is for food programs which keep America’s people the best-fed people on Earth.

The bill, as reported, is about $260 million in discretionary spending above the President’s request, but a little more than $3 billion below this year’s level due to the absence of natural disaster and other emergency farm provisions.

Earlier, during the discussion on the rule, we discussed several improvements that should be included in this bill that amendments could make possible, but amendments that were denied in the Committee on Rules.

There was an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAUREO) that would recognize that we need more money for the WIC program, the Women, Infants, and Children feeding program, due to the fact that participation is running 80,000 people more per month than the administration had expected predominantly due to higher unemployment levels.

The amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) and others makes room for helping small specialty crop producers who are facing hard times. He has been successful in dealing with one sector, the apple sector, in this bill.

My own effort adopted by the full committee insists that the integrity of producer votes is protected in the pork checkoff program. It directs funds be spent only on those programs that the producers have approved and this directive has been included in the final bill.

Mr. Chairman, there are also other elements that we still need to work through as we amend here on the floor and then as we move to the Senate: one is the Global Food for Education program, which the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. Emerson) have both included in the final bill.

Mr. Chairman, there are also other elements that we still need to work through as we amend here on the floor and then as we move to the Senate: one is the Global Food for Education program, which the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. Emerson) have both included in the final bill.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young), the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, my friend.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young), the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, my friend.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young), the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, my friend.
The gentleman came as a seasoned Member. The gentleman took over this very important role as chairman of the subcommittee, and he not only has produced a good bill, but he produced it in record time.

Although, he is a new chairman, he was the first one with a markup, and I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I also congratulate the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking minority member, who worked very well in partnership to produce a pretty good bipartisan bill.

As usual, there will be some differences, as we proceed, and proceed we will, but I will urge Members to support the bill and be very logical and realistic as we approach the issue of amendments.

Now, on the subject of amendments. We are trying to accommodate Members, as I announced yesterday, to address where we were in the afternoon and see if there was some way to get Members out of here at a reasonable time this evening.

It is pretty obvious we cannot complete consideration of this bill today, so I see no reason to go on into the late hours of the night or the wee hours of the morning.

However, in order to arrive at a reasonable adjournment time today, it is going to be necessary for Members to be willing to limit some debate, to a reasonable adjournment time today, it is going to be offered today and how much time is going to be taken on them. We have had the cooperation of five or six Members who have told us that they will be happy to settle for 10 minutes a side, for instance. We need to fill out the rest of that. We need to know how far we are going to get in the bill today. Then if we can reach agreement on that, then that enables us to have some idea, perhaps, of what we can package so that we know what we are facing when we get back.

But what I would urge Members not to do is to neglect to contact us now, then see their point in the bill passed, so their amendment is not in order, and then try to re-traject their amendment as a look-back at the end of the bill. We will not save any time that way.

If Members have amendments, we need them to be prepared now to bring them up today in the regular order on the bill so that we can get out of here at a reasonable time.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for those comments. We are working hard. Now, if we get the cooperation of the membership, we can accomplish quite a bit of consideration on this bill today and still get us out of here at a reasonable time, and we will talk about that time later.

With that, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) on that side or myself and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) on this side so that we can put those potential amendments into the list of the universe of amendments that we have to deal with.

We will be better able to manage this bill if we can do that. I put Members on notice that it would be a good idea to do that as soon as possible.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to repeat what the gentleman just said. For the benefit of all Members on the floor or all Members whose staff may be watching in their offices, every Member is coming up and telling us they want to get out of here early tonight. It is my understanding that the leadership intends to try to make that happen. But we need to know which Members intend to offer their amendment and which Members do not intend to offer their amendments.

So I would ask every single Member on our side of the aisle, if they are contemplating an amendment or a colloquy today, we took almost 2 hours on colloquies, if they are contemplating any of that, they need to let us know immediately, because we need to do two things.

We need, first of all, to try to establish which amendments are going to be offered today and how much time is going to be taken on them. We have had the cooperation of five or six Members who have told us that they will be happy to settle for 10 minutes a side, for instance. We need to fill out the rest of that. We need to know how far we are going to get in the bill today. Then if we can reach agreement on that, then that enables us to have some idea, perhaps, of what we can package so that we know what we are facing when we get back.

But what I would urge Members not to do is to neglect to contact us now, then see their point in the bill passed, so their amendment is not in order, and then try to re-traject their amendment as a look-back at the end of the bill. We will not save any time that way.

If Members have amendments, we need them to be prepared now to bring them up today in the regular order on the bill so that we can get out of here at a reasonable time.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for those comments. We are working hard. Now, if we get the cooperation of the membership, we can accomplish quite a bit of consideration on this bill today and still get us out of here at a reasonable time, and we will talk about that time later. The universe of amendments will be for today.

With that, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. DeLAURO), a very hard-working and able member of our subcommittee.

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the committee. I thank them for their leadership. Given the kind of budget constraints that we have, there was a lot of hard work and a good bill that has been produced, though there are a few critical issues that remain that we need to continue to work on.

I also want to say thank you to this subcommittee and the associate staff for all their hard work. The bill addresses many of the urgent needs of American families. Let me just take a moment to focus on the crisis in agriculture today. America’s economy and security relies on the strength of agriculture. Yet America’s farmers are facing the toughest times since the Great Depression.

Connecticut is a leader in New England’s agriculture, in eggs, peaches, milk production per cow. The Nation’s oldest agriculture experiment station is just up the street from my home in New Haven. Like other farmers, Connecticut farmers face plunging commodity prices and soaring gas prices. Urban sprawl puts it in the top 10 States in lost farmland. This spring, record low temperatures eliminated almost 40 percent of our peach, pear, grape and apple crops.

I am proud of the funding for programs that reach out and help our farmers: rural development, conservation, pest management, commodity marketing assistance.

This bill also funds food safety efforts, but in my view, as I have expressed before in the House today, does not go far enough. It needs to do more. Americans are more likely to get sick from what they eat today than they were a half century ago, and outbreaks of food sickness are expected to go up by more than 15 percent over the next decade.

Each year 5,000 Americans die from food-borne 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 possible contamination by deadly E. coli.

The Food and Drug Administration Inspects all food except meat, poultry and eggs. Yet, to cover the 30,000 U.S. companies that make this food, the FDA has only 400 inspectors. For the 4.1 million imported food items entering the country, the FDA has less than 120 inspectors. To address this crisis facing the families, I will offer an amendment to increase the funds for inspections and other food safety initiatives.

As we move toward the conference, I also would like to work with the chairman to address the funding shortfall that threatens WIC. If the administration’s unemployment predictions come true, this essential nutrition program for low-income families, which yields more than $3 in savings to the government in reduced spending on programs such as Medicaid, will, in fact, not have enough funds to serve all who are eligible, all eligible women, infants and children.

I look forward to working with the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA) and the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) to address these important issues and others as we debate the bill.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to rise in, in a way, admiration of the committee for their work...
Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), a member of our subcommittee, who single-handedly turned this bill on end and was able to get language to deal with specialty crop producers across our country, a very important and distinguished member of our subcommittee.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), ranking member, for her leadership on this committee and on this issue. I also want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee. I think that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), in his first year as chairman of the subcommittee, has produced a very good bill. I think it has as much promise as working with him in this endeavor.

This bill adds $260 million to the President's request for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It increases funding for farm programs, conservation, rural development, education and research, nutrition, and food safety. When you add in the $5.5 billion in emergency agricultural spending that the House passed earlier this week, total funding for these programs is substantially increased over last year. As with any of these bills, of course, it could be even better. I think we should have made in order the amendment of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DeLAURO) to increase funding for food safety as well as the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) to fund the Global School Lunch Initiative.

But the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA) has written a balanced bill that addresses important priorities for rural America. The bill also includes $150 million for a market loss assistance program for apple growers. I offered this provision in committee with the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. Sweeney), and it was adopted by a strong bipartisan vote of 34 to 24.

I appreciate everything that the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA), the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Chairman DREEFER) have done to protect this funding.

I also would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for their parts in writing the rule as well.

The U.S. apple industry is suffering serious financial hardships for the fifth straight year as a result of low prices, bad weather, and plant diseases. During this time, the total value of U.S. apple production fell more than 25 percent, and losses from the 2000 crop alone will probably top $800 million. This is a nationwide figure and includes losses, not only in New York, but also in Massachusetts, Michigan, Washington State, Pennsylvania, and every other place where apples are grown as a commodity crop.

Some of the apple losses can be blamed on foreign competition, the Chinese, for example, who were found guilty of dumping apple juice concentrate in this country at prices below production costs. Increased tariffs have not significantly improved the price of apple juice in the last year.

Apple producers in New York and the Northeast watched the value of their crop decline as a result of severe hail damage. In Michigan, growers suffered a crippling epidemic of fire blight that destroyed thousands of acres of orchards.

Compared with the billions of dollars that Congress routinely sends to commodity producers, $150 million is a drop in the bucket. This payment, however, will mean the difference between life and death for many growers across the country.

Mr. Chairman, apple growers face the same market, regulatory, trade and weather challenges as do the double AMTA payments necessary for row crop farmers. It is preposterous that Congress routinely sends to commodity producers, $150 million is a drop in the bucket. This payment, however, will mean the difference between life and death for many growers across the country.

Mr. Chairman, apple growers face the same market, regulatory, trade and weather challenges as do the double AMTA payments necessary for row crop farmers. It is preposterous that our foreign policy differentiates so radically between them.

This is a good bill. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support it.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. RILEY).

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk that I intend to withdraw, but first I would like to engage the chairman in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to acknowledge a job well done by the chairman and the ranking member. Agricultural programs are often arcane and seem to benefit only the agricultural community, but through the chairman's leadership, the committee has produced a sound bill that benefits not only the agricultural community, but the Nation as a whole.

It is my understanding that the constraints placed upon the committee prevented funding for nearly all new research projects. One such unfunded project would have been undertaken by researchers at Auburn University, one of the leading agricultural research institutions in the country. This project sought to ensure public health through the development of improvements in poultry.

Mr. Chairman, this study, which I strongly support, will continue safely and efficiently producing poultry, and in an effort to address the environmental, human and animal concerns, I ask for your immediate consideration of a $1.3 million human health poultry-byproduct study at Auburn University. This study will determine the risks associated with poultry production and the contributions the poultry community can make to environmental stewardship and food safety through the development of innovative techniques documenting the presence of pathogens in the various phases of the production cycle and instituting techniques to eliminate them. This study, Mr. Chairman, will safeguard public health, the end-use consumer and the environment, all at minimal taxpayer expense.

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

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk that I intend to withdraw, but first I would like to engage the chairman in a colloquy.
Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me this time. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), my chairman, and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), my ranking member, and their staff for their good work they have done on this bill.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to our remaining time on both sides, please.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has 13 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) has 21 minutes remaining.

Ms. KAPTUR. Could I ask the gentleman if he has any additional speakers?

Mr. BONILLA. Not at this time, but there may be more coming.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), a distinguished member of the authorizing committee.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress can make historic progress in making agricultural programs that enable farmers to survive in today’s markets and to continue providing the highest quality commodities at the lowest cost to consumers.

The House has already passed a bill providing immediate farm relief, and the Committee on Agriculture has moved aggressively to draft a new multiyear farm bill to secure greater long-term stability. Today, we are considering a bill for the next fiscal year that provides $260 million more than the President’s budget; more for research, including some $7 million more in Georgia; more for crop insurance; more in rural electric and communications loans; more for child nutrition and WIC programs; and sets aside more than $79 billion over 10 years in new emergency aid, including $7.4 billion for next year.

While I support a higher overall agriculture budget, it is time to move the process yet again, as we have differences in House and Senate negotiations. Our goal is to save our agricultural system at a time of crisis, and today we can take another step in that direction.

Mr. Chairman, while I am concerned that the bill does not give enough help to small and disadvantaged farmers and research and capacity grants for the 1890 Land Grant Universities, I support the amendment of the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) to do that.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we can move the process forward to bring more help to American agriculture. I urge my colleagues to join in support of this bill. It is a good bill. It moves the process forward, takes drastic steps in the right direction; and, hopefully, we can do what we need to do for America’s agriculture.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), for yielding me this time; and I rise for the purpose of a brief colloquy.

As I am sure the chairman is aware, a serious threat has sprung up in wheat growing areas making the lives of our already-struggling farmers even more difficult. A fungus called Karnal bunt has been found in my district as well as in 21 states. It is a serious threat to producers, elevator operators, and the citizens of our agribusiness who have seen their livelihoods put on hold.

So we look forward to working with my colleague, with the chairman, and with USDA, who are on top of this, andAPHIS, to make sure that we contain it. It is extremely important to our industry.

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

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding to me, and I would like to say that the situation the gentleman has described is accurate, but here are the facts to date:

Seven producers affected, 10 elevator operators affected, 17 fields tested positive, 1.4 million bushels contaminated, and 21 bushels yet to be tested. An elevator operator in my district first discovered the fungus and banded kernels in a load of grain delivered to his facility.

For these and many other reasons, I join my colleagues in working with USDA to contain this outbreak and ensuring the critical assistance provided to producers, elevator operators, and others in agribusiness who have seen their livelihoods put on hold.

So we look forward to working with my colleague, with the chairman, and with USDA, who are on top of this, and APHIS, to make sure that we contain it. It is extremely important to our industry.

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

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

Mr. BONILLA. I thank my friend for yielding, and I would be more than happy and enthusiastic about helping my friend work on this problem. This is not a new problem for wheat producers. Accordingly, we will work to do everything possible to get USDA to act...
in a proper way, not only with the problem but to assist producers with whatever regulations may occur.

Ms. KAPURT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORNBERY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPURT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my chairman for generously yielding that minute, and I just want to say that I share the gentleman’s deep concern about what this particular condition can do to our export market.

We had a situation a couple of years ago where we had USDA officials up before our committee and we asked where on the continent does Karnal bunt exist. I said was it Canada? No, we do not have it in Canada. Is it in the United States? No, it is not in the United States. I yield to my very, very esteemed colleague, Ms. CLAYTON, a very, very esteemed member of the authorizing committee.

Mr. THORNBERY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERY) that this Member is vitally interested in that problem, and he has full cooperation on it.

Ms. KAPURT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say, however, that the costs of remediating that should not only be borne by the public sector. That is one of the things I am hoping to have problems related to trade. Those participating in trade ought to bear the costs of what goes wrong in the transaction.

What has been happening within USDA is we have been transferring the cost of trade to the public sector, and the private entities that benefit have not been carrying their fair share of the load.

So let us hope we can find a solution to that that is fair to all.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. CLAYTON) as the ranking member of the authorizing committee, and one of the hardest-working Members of this Congress.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I want to commend both the chairman and the ranking member for their time and effort. They have been given a very difficult task of meeting the ever-demanding needs of the agricultural sector in the face of a difficult economy for agriculture, but also in the face of a number of environmental threats and trying to move us into the 21st century. They also have been given a very tight allocation, and I understand they are trying to work within the budget. I am on the Committee on the Budget, so I know the constraints that were imposed upon them.

There are many things they did very, very well; and I want to commend them on that. Indeed, they did increase allocations for APHIS, which I will talk a little more about, and that is desperately needed. Those are some current threats that they are trying to provide sufficient funds to address those issues. They also recognized the ever-demanding need for research for agricultural communities and our institutions. Again, I think we have an opportunity to make sure as we increase those research dollars that there is some equity and parity among the institutions that we have. I will have a chance to discuss that little later.

So I want to commend them for all the things they have done. However, I do want to point out a couple of areas that I think we should give consideration to in the future. Although there may be new dollars, there may be constraints. There is still environmental impact issues that we just heard about, the issue of the wheat. The funding in the bill is certainly to be commended. I had raised an amendment in the supplemental that was not approved, although in the notes that went forward, they acknowledged there was a need; and I want to say that we need to at least make the case to our Senator friends that we need to do even more. And as we write the farm bill, hopefully, we will be mindful of that fact.

Nutrition, which is very dear to my heart, I want to commend the Committee on Appropriations for what they have done in those areas. However, I would be remiss if I did not mention that WIC has identified that there is a need for 100,000 more eligible pregnant women and their children who may not receive basic needs. This is an issue that I can do better on. I do not have an amendment for it, do not propose to have an amendment on it; but I just wanted to acknowledge that it is an area where I think we all would acknowledge we need to do more.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I plan to vote for this bill. I also plan to try to make this bill even better. It is a good bill that could be better.

My final point is that I had hoped that the Kaptur amendment for the global lunch program would have been in order by the Committee on Rules. That is not the problem of the agriculture appropriation, but it is an issue for this Congress that we have an opportunity here to not only feed our children but to respond to hungry children across the world.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Ms. DELAURA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONILLA. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for agreeing to this colloquy.

I want to address the pressing need of adequate funding for the WIC program. At current funding levels, States may be unable to serve approximately 200,000 low-income mothers, infants and children. From my State of Connecticut alone, 1,300 people would not be served.

We know that the WIC program currently serves about 47 percent of all infants born in the United States, and we know the WIC dollars are excellent investments. Every dollar spent on WIC yields more than $3 in savings to the government in reduced spending on programs such as Medicaid.

WIC has contributed to better birth outcomes and reduction in childhood anemia, key indicators of the health of American children. The program provides mothers, infants, and children with nutritious supplemental food packages, nutrition education and counseling, and a gateway to pre- and post-natal health care. The program also reduces fetal deaths and infant mortality and reduces low birth-weight rates.

I might just say we have an average participation rate for this fiscal year at about 7.2 million. That reflects the average participation for the first half of the year through March. That historically is the kind of participation that we have seen in the past. December and February are always the lowest participation months. Last year, average participation for the first half of the year was nearly 50,000 below average participation for the year as a whole. According to the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, average WIC participation for the first 8 months of fiscal year 2000 was 80,000 higher than average participation for the first 6 months of the year.

Mr. Chairman, I have a concern that when unemployment increases, as it is doing, so does the poverty rate. And we need to understand that the WIC participation cannot increase as unemployment rises if none of the families that are eligible for WIC as a result of increased unemployment enroll.

I think if we are looking at the kinds of unemployment rates where there is the view that that unemployment rate is going to rise, then we are going to see an additional number of people who need to take advantage of the WIC program. We should do this now. State WIC programs make their decisions this fall about how to run their programs. As we move toward conference, and there are 302(b) reallocations, I would urge the membership to work with the congressional appropriations leadership to bring an amendment to address the potential funding shortfalls for the WIC program. If the administration’s unemployment predictions come true, we will see that this very
essential program will not have enough funds to serve all eligible women, infants, and children.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would be pleased to work with the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAUNO) on this issue. This program has widespread support of the Members in the whole House. As a result of the gentlewoman’s efforts, the subcommittee has placed a priority on the program. We are aware that WIC participation levels can fluctuate above and below those forecast in administration budgets. I look forward to continuing my work with the gentlewoman to address the changes that may be brought on by adjustments in caseloads, and I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAUNO) for her efforts.

Ms. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, even the New York Yankees sometimes lose, and it has been known that on occasion the Los Angeles Lakers lose a ballgame. But, Mr. Chairman, one organization never loses, and that organization has hundreds of victories to its credit and zero defeats in the United States Congress, and that is the pharmaceutical industry.

For decades now, good people in the House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans, have attempted to do something about lowering the cost of prescription drugs in this country so that Americans do not have to pay by far the highest prices in the world for the medicine they need. And year after year with lies, distortions, well-paid lobbyists, massive amounts of advertising, and millions in campaign contributions, the pharmaceutical industry always wins. Americans die and suffer because they cannot afford the outrageous cost of prescription drugs, and we remain the only country in the industrialized world that does not in one way or another regulate the cost of prescription drugs.

As part of this bill, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAUNO), the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and I will be introducing an amendment which is exactly the same as the Crowley amendment that 363 Members of this House voted for last year. This amendment will serve as a placeholder so we can move the reimportation bill forward that was passed overwhelmingly last year, but was not implemented.

In a globalized economy, prescription drug distributors and pharmacists should be able to purchase and sell FDA safety-approved medicines at the same prices as in other countries. The passage of reimportation will lower the cost of medicine by 30 to 50 percent and enable Americans to pay the same prices as people in Canada, Europe, Mexico and all over the world.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal is supported by the Alliance for Retired Americans; the Children’s Foundation; Church Women United; The Communication Workers of America; Families U.S.A.; The National Education Association; Network, a national Catholic social justice lobby; the Presbyterian Church; Public Citizen; The Service Employees International Union, SEIU; and the Universal Health Care Action Network.

Mr. Chairman, every time anyone comes up here to take on the pharmaceutical industry, their disinformation campaign goes forward; and this time in opposition to this amendment the issue is, quote/unquote, “safety.” Every Member here should understand that if we are implementing to compromise safety, it only makes it possible to move the reimportation bill that we passed last year forward.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill; and like many of my colleagues, I hope more funds may become available as we move forward in the appropriations process for critical programs that protect American farmers, conserve our soil and water, provide food aid abroad, and address hunger at home.

I would like to speak for a few moments about one such program. The Global Food for Education Initiative began last year as a pilot program. I want to make clear based on the report language accompanying this bill that the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAUNO), who has fought so hard for the Global Food and Education Initiative.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SANDERS. The Repaupo Creek watershed in my district in New Jersey is in urgent need of a replacement tide gate and dike restoration project. The project is needed for several reasons, the most important of which is to provide flood protection for the residents of Logan and Greenwich Townships in Gloucester County. The Department of Agriculture’s Natural Resource Conservation Service has recommended that this project be completed, and given that New Jersey officials of the Department of Environmental Protection have expressed a desire and willingness to work on this project, I ask the chairwoman on behalf of the subcommittee to agree that there is jurisdiction under present law for USDA to
be sure that it has the tools and the in-
formation and the technology neces-
sary to compete in a world market.
That is what we need for our farmers.
I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for this opportunity to express my strong support for his bill and point out a small provision of it that is extremely important to the farmers of the northeastern part of the Nation, particularly to those in Connecticut. I strongly support the increase in funding for the EQIP program, the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, because it will help us achieve our national attainment goals in the area of clean water.

The AFO/CAFO regulations are expensive. My State has adopted all of the provisions of the AFO/CAFO policy to assure compliance with the AFO/CAFO regulations; and the only reason frankly, the only possible way that small farmers can survive these costly regulations is through the technical assistance that the EQIP funds provide to them to help them determine what projects will, in fact, contain runoff. These funds give them some help in offsetting the costs of developing manure management programs and other modern approaches that will enable them to make a significant contribution to the cleanliness of our waterways and also, in the long run, to the revitalization of Long Island Sound.

In New England, we have very steep, hilly farms. We also have more rainfall than other parts of the country. So the burden on us is, frankly, far higher than the burden on other parts of the country. We are not a part of the country that benefits much from the farm bill through its crop assistance and other payments but so some of its conservation dollars, and these EQIP dollars, are extremely important to us. I thank the chairman for uncapping them and making more resources available for compliance with the AFO/CAFO requirements.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, our Committee has worked hard to bring a good bill to the House. We have made prudent recommendations for the use of the budgetary allocation available to us, and we have done yeoman work on rural development issues such as trade policy, that have caused concern in prior years. I think we have a very good bill, and I know that we will have a good debate. In closing, I would certainly hope that everyone would support this bill on final passage.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, today the House is considering funding for the fiscal year 2002 Agriculture appropriations bill. This bill provides funding for U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration. As a Member of Congress from a large agricultural district who is also concerned about this Nation’s long-term fiscal health, I am concerned that this measure is yet another repeat of past agriculture spending packages—where Congress is providing fewer-and-fewer farmers with financial assistance.

The failure of Congress to make fundamental changes to existing agriculture policy, which had led to many farmers being driven off their land due to the perverse financial incentives, is beyond reasonable belief. It is my hope that future agriculture policy will be equitable, providing federal assistance—when needed—to all producers. It is my hope that future agriculture policy respects the broad diversity of rural America. It is my hope that future agriculture policy provides for clean and safe drinking water, along with improved soil and air quality.

Mr. Chairman, this measure obviously covers more than just financial assistance to American farmers. In addition, it provides important funding for nutrition programs, food inspection, and safety. For these reasons, it is very important that this measure is passed.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, our Committee, in January 1997, when the Asian Longhorned Beetle was first spotted in the United States right in the heart of Brooklyn, I called on the Department of Agriculture to do everything in its power to eradicate this tree-killing pest before it devastated the Northeastern urban forestry network. The strong efforts from the Agriculture Department, in close coordination with State and city agencies, slowed the beetles spread significantly, but sadly, New York has lost more than 5,000 trees in less than 6 years from beetle infestation.

In recent years, I have held numerous community forums on the issue to raise awareness about the beetle’s devastating effects and to discuss strategies to prevent the spread of beetle infestation.

I have also worked closely with my colleagues in the New York delegation to secure adequate funding to stop the beetle before it spreads deeply throughout the Northeast region and into the rest of the country. My goal has always been to provide protection of our farmlands, our forests, and our forests through the containment and complete eradication of the Asian Longhorned Beetle.

This year’s Agriculture Budget provides crucial resources toward that end, with $35 million appropriated to fight the Asian Longhorned Beetle, citrus canker, and the plum pox virus. This is a significant increase in funding for a very significant problem. Unchecked, costs from the spread of the Asian Longhorned Beetle could rise as high as $41 billion nationwide.

I want to thank Congressman BONILLA and Congresswoman KAPTUR for including these significant funds to battle the beetle.

I also want to note that the interior budget currently includes almost $24 million for the U.S. Forest Service for the Cooperative Land Forest Health Management program specifically to fight the spread of the gypsy moth and the Asian Longhorned Beetle.

Resources for the fight against beetle infestation are especially important to New York City. Just this month, 60 trees from Calvary Cemetery in my district in Queens were cut down, chipped, and burned to the root because of beetle infestation. Additional trees were recently cut down in Astoria and Woodside Queens.

In fact, since the beginning of this year, the Brooklyn, Queens region has lost close to 300 more trees to beetle infestation. Manhattan lost more than 500 trees, and the Bronx area lost more than 150 trees. The total loss for the New York City, Long Island area is up to 5,300 trees.

The beetle is simply devastating large portions of the region. With new resources, we will be able to fund areas where there have been significant shortfalls. We will be able to train our residents to identify the beetle and respond appropriately if they spot one. We will be able to increase funds for tree inspections, removal, and reforestation efforts.

Also, we will continue to move forward with new treatments for healthy trees that help prevent beetle infestation. In short, we will battle this menace on all fronts to protect our trees, our environment, and our quality of life.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member certainly recognizes the severe budget constraints under which the full Appropriations Committee and the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee operated. In light of these constraints, this Member is grateful and pleased that this legislation includes funding for several important projects of interest to the State of Nebraska.

First, this Member is pleased that H.R. 2330 provides $461,000 for the Midwest Advanced Manufacturing Alliance (MAFMA). The alliance is an association of 12 leading research universities and corporate partners. Its purpose is to develop and facilitate the transfer of new food manufacturing and processing technologies.

The MAFMA awards grants for research projects on a peer review basis. These awards must be supported by an industry partner willing to provide matching funds. During the seventh year of competition, MAFMA received 39 proposals requesting a total of $1,382,555. Eleven proposals were funded for a total of $348,147. Matching funds from industry for these funded projects total $605,601 with an additional $57,115 from in-kind funds. These figures convincingly demonstrate how successful the approach has been in leveraging support from the food manufacturing and processing industries.

Mr. Chairman, the future viability and competitiveness of the U.S. agricultural industry depends on its ability to adapt to increasing worldwide demands for U.S. exports of intermediate and consumer goods. In order to meet these changing worldwide demands, agricultural research must also adapt to provide more emphasis on adding value to our basic farm commodities. The Midwest Advanced Manufacturing Alliance can provide the necessary cooperative link between universities and industries for the development of competitive food manufacturing and processing technologies. This will, in turn, ensure
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that the U.S. agricultural industry remains competitive in an increasingly competitive global market.

This Member is also pleased that this bill includes $200,000 to fund the National Drought Mitigation Center (NDMC) at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. This project is in its fourth year and has assisted numerous States and cities in developing drought plans and developing drought response teams. Given the nearly unprecedented levels of drought in several parts of our country, this effort is obviously important.

Furthermore, this Member is also pleased that the measure provides $700,000 for efforts at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to improve biomass for feedstocks. The research will benefit the environment and the agricultural economy. It also holds the potential to greatly reduce the nation’s dependence on foreign sources of energy.

Another important project funded by this bill is the Alliance for Food Protection, a joint project between the University of Nebraska and the University of Georgia. The mission of this alliance is to assist the development and modification of food processing and preservation technologies. This technology will help ensure that Americans continue to receive the safest and highest quality food possible.

This Member is also pleased that the legislation funds the following ongoing Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) projects at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln: Food Processing Center: $42,000; non-food agricultural products: $64,000; sustainable agricultural systems: $59,000; Rural Policy Research Institute (RUPRI) (a joint effort with Iowa State University and the University of Missouri): $1,300,000.

In addition, this Member is pleased that the bill directs the Agriculture Research Service to collect and focus $300,000 at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to address sorghum fungal plant pathology concerns. This funding will fill a critical need for fungal pathologists to conduct research for sorghum in the central Great Plains and the United States.

This Member would also note that H.R. 2330 includes $99.77 million for the section 538, the rural rental multifamily housing loan guarantee program. The program provides a Federal guarantee on loans made to eligible persons by private lenders. Developers will receive 10 percent of the cost of the project to the table, and private lenders will make loans for the balance. The lenders will be given a 100 percent Federal guarantee on the loans they make. Unlike the current section 515 direct loan program, where the full costs are borne by the Federal Government, the only costs to the Federal Government under the section 538 Guarantee Program will be for administrative costs and potential defaults.

Mr. Chairman, this Member certainly appreciates the $3.1 billion appropriation for the Department of Agriculture’s Section 502 Unsubsidized Loan Guarantee Program. The program has been very effective in rural communities by guaranteeing loans made by approved lenders to eligible income households in small communities of up to 20,000 residents in nonmetropolitan areas and in rural areas. The program provides guarantees for 30-year fixed-rate mortgages for the purchase of an existing home or the construction of a new home.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, this Member supports H.R. 2330 and urges his colleagues to approve it.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 2330, the FY 2002 Agriculture Appropriations bill. I am pleased that the Appropriations Committee has both supported our farmers and displayed fiscal discipline by remaining close to the President’s budget request. This responsible bill addresses the needs of our nation’s farmers and ranchers while keeping in mind the desire of American consumers to buy affordable and safe agriculture products.

I want to commend the full committee for passing a number of important amendments. Specifically, I am pleased that employees of the Farm Service Agency will be better able to deliver farm ownership, farm operating, and disaster loans through improved salary and expense funding and through additional resources for agricultural credit programs. This assistance will help provide relief as the workload of this vital agency has grown in response to a weakening farm economy.

I am also pleased with the investment this bill makes in the future safety and health of our citizens and our environment. The research that will be facilitated and advanced through this bill will ensure the continued quality of our food supply by improving safeguards. The conservation programs within the bill also reflect foresight. The desire of farmers to preserve American soil exemplifies the respect and attachment they have for the land in which they are invested.

Lastly, I am encouraged by the Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program which will link rural Americans with resources and opportunities previously available only in urban areas. As we seek a prosperous future for our rural residents, we must find ways to stimulate local economies. This bill advances that goal through education and enhanced services that will enable individuals and families to stay in their hometowns while receiving education and health services. Using technology to provide useful links between rural and urban areas will slow the flight to cities and preserve smaller towns and municipalities, which are vital pieces of the American fabric.

I commend the chairman, and all of the members of the committee for crafting this responsible bill.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2330, the Agriculture Appropriations Act, a bill considered on the floor today which makes appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies. But more specifically, I rise in strong opposition to the increase provided in the bill for the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and to other agriculture-related agencies. I am troubled by the fact that one of my constituents has been having trouble with the agency and one that I believe deserves careful consideration by the oversight committees in this chamber.

Recently, the FDA gave final approval of my constituent’s Pre-Market Application for both the Total and Partial Joint implants after an exhaustive and blatantly biased 2-year review, but not before costing his company over $8 million in legal fees, lost wages, and profits.

In April 1999, I received a phone call and letter from TMJ Implants, a company located in Golden Colorado, in my district, which had been having problems with the review of its Premarket Approval Application of the TMJ Total and Fossa-Eminence Prosthesis. Up until last year, the company was the premier market supplier of temporomandibular joint prostheses.

Over the last 2 years, I have taken an active interest and an active role in monitoring the progress of TMJ Implants’ application, which was finally approved in February. On numerous occasions, I met with Dr. Bob Christensen, president of TMJ Implants, to find out information about the approval of the partial and total joint, and personally talked to FDA Commissioner Jane Henney and to members of the Agency about the status of the company’s applications. I was also, and continue to be, in contact with the House Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight, which has sole jurisdiction over the FDA and issues relating to abuse and the internal operations of the agency.

Specifically, I closely followed this case since my office’s first contact with Dr. Christensen and TMJ Implants in early May 1999, after a meeting of the FDA’s Dental Products Panel of the Medical Devices Advisory Committee was held to review the company’s PMA and recommended approval of the PMA by a 90 vote. From this point onward, the FDA engaged in an obvious pattern of delay and deception and even went as far as to remove TMJ Implants’ Fossa-Eminence Prosthesis from the market, which had been approved for almost 40 years. This has done nothing more than to cause harm to patients and cost the company millions of dollars.

This was done at the same time that the application for TMJ Concepts, a competitor of TMJ Implants, sailed through the process. Several allegations have come to light over the last two years detailing the fact that several Agency employees have worked under the direction of TMJ Concepts’ associates. The agency went so far as to reconvene a new Medical Devices Advisory Committee late last year, with a clear majority of its members lacking the required expertise, which denied the company’s application.

It was not until Mr. Bernard Statland, the new Director of the Office of Device Evaluation (ODE) was brought in that the logjam was broken. The PMA was quickly approved.

As the above demonstrates, several concerns remain about the process that has taken place over the last two years. It is no secret that everyone involved in this case believes that there have been significant questions raised about the process—the sluggish pace of the review of the engineering data for both the total and partial joint and, more importantly, the constant “moving of the goal posts” during the review of both PMAs.

Over the last 2 years, my office has received numerous letters from physicians all across the country—from the Mayo Clinic to the University of Maryland—each describing the benefit of the partial joint and the fact that the partial and total joint results in immediate and dramatic improvement in range of motion and increased function.

While I am, of course, pleased that the application has been approved by the FDA after
much delay, the circumstances of the last 2
years calls into question the integrity of the
agency and, it is for this reason that I bring it
to the House's attention.
Dr. Christensen is a true professional and a
pioneer in his field and holder of the first pat-
ents. His implants are widely accepted as ef-
fective and safe throughout the dental and
surgery community—indeed, several of my
constituents have literally had their lives
changed by the procedure. I am convinced
that the work of TMJ is and always has been
based on solid, scientific principles and the
removal of the implants work of TMJ is and al-
ways has been on solid, scientific principles
and the surgical treatment of the patient
who has been erroneous, contrary to the Agen-
cy's earlier findings and the statutory standard
that should be applied. This was devastating
to thousands in the general public and de-
structing to the financial status of the company.
Lately, this year, the House of Representa-
tives will consider legislation reauthorizing the
Food and Drug Administration and I would like
to urge the House Commerce Committee to
hold hearings on the TMJ Implant case and to
conduct a thorough investigation into the FDA's
market approval application of the TMJ Fossa-Eminence
Prosthesis.
I would like to take this opportunity to sub-
mit to the RECORD two articles from FDAWebview which shed light on the TMJ Im-
plant case.
[From FDAWebview, Feb. 28, 2001]
FULL DISCLOSURE: STANDARD IN TMJ
APPROVAL OPENS NEW FDA ERA
Instead of FDA tying itself in knots trying
to guarantee no inappropriate patient expo-
sures to implant devices—and stalling a product
in mid-review as a result—yester-
day's approval of the TMJ Implants Fossa-
Eminence Prosthesis set a new "full disclo-
sure" labeling standard that lifts that self-
imposed burden from the agency and should
expedite other product reviews. TMJ Im-
plants' pre-1976 jaw joint devices was stalled for 20 months.
ration Ph.D. and until new Office of Device Evaluation (ODE)
director Bernard Statland broke the logjam.
In doing this, he was implementing one stage of a
"pharmacologic" or "innovative public use of clinical device information
articulated last year by Center director David Felgai—placing such FDA-held information in the hands of physicians and patients.

According to one of the two attorneys who
tweeted the TMJ Implants submission
through its FDA oreid, Mike Cole (Bergeson & Campbell), yesterday's approval is the first
he's seen in 25 years of dealing with ODE
where the agency stepped back from its "ap-
propriate use'' worries and left them to phy-
sicians, 'You know, we've got a lot of in-
"The message is,'' he told us, "that those
companies that are very conscientious in
conducting clinical studies, find
that they speak much louder than anything
else. Ancodatal information is fine, opinions
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[From the FDA Webview, Feb. 27, 2001]
TOUGHEST DEVICE APPROVAL CLEARS LAST OF
EMBARRASSED FIRM'S IMPLANTS
Ending a 20-month, $6 million ordeal for
Colorado-based TMJ Implants Inc., CDRH Of-
fice of Device Evaluation director Bernard
Statland 2/27 approved the last and most im-
portant of the company's two PMAs—for the
TMJ Fossa-Eminence Prosthesis. Without key
federal involvement in the process—includ-
ing private discussions with several oral
surgeons, it would still be bogged down, ob-
erved TMJ Implants' attorney, former
FDS Office of Device Evaluation director
Will & Emery) who with Mike Cole (Bergeson &
Campbell) helped propel the tortuous review
to its successful conclusion; Rosen ranks
this approval at the top of the toughest FDA
approvals he has experienced, inside or out-
side the agency, including both generic drugs
and medical devices.
FDA reviewers alleged predicted
that the Fossa-Eminence, or partial jaw
implant would never be approved. The only de-
vice of its type every marketed, it attracted
heavy reviewer skepticism. Then, last
month, the company's two-part total joint,
of which the Fossa-Eminence is a compo-
ponent, was approved. This seemed like a con-
solation prize, because the total had been only a small part of the company's business.
TMJ Implants CEO Robert Christensen re-
calls an FDA manager asking whether the
company could be satisfied with a pre-
1976 devices pending classification and PMA
submission, FDA approved a new competi-
tor's total joint, indicating agency satisfac-
tion with that technology removed it from
commerce 20 months ago (the company had
reduced the indications it was requesting
based on FDA and advisory panel sugges-
tions). The new approval lists these indica-
tions:
Internal derangement confirmed to be
pathological in origin by both clinical obser-
vation and radiographic finding. The patient
has moderate to severe pain and/or
disabling dysfunction and has not responded
to less invasive, conventional therapy;
Radiographic anomalies do not satisfac-
to the temporomandibular joint not responsive to
other modalities of treatment; Recurrent fi-
brosis and/or bony ankylosis not responsive to
other modalities of treatment;
Failed tissue graft;
Failed alloplastic joint reconstruction.
These indications all had to be justified by a
prospective clinical study that Christensen
and oral surgeons using these devices had
provided, but that CDRH's Division of Den-
tal, Infection Control and General Hospital Devices had difficulty evaluating. Statland
told FDA Webview he injected himself into
the review because it was "stuck." It helped
that his wife one had a TMJ condition that
did not require surgery—he learned as much
as he could about 'this very complex prob-
lem, which has many causes and many dif-
f rents treatments.'
Not lost in the TMJ Implants con-
troversy, he discovered that the parties' po-
sitions had hardened through communica-
tion breakdowns, which he was able to soft-
ened. "There was venting on both sides,"
Statland said.
"The message is," he told us, "that those
companies that are very conscientious in
conducting clinical studies, find
that they speak much louder than anything
else. Ancodatal information is fine, opinions
of various people and declarations are fine, but with the numbers, I think that’s the take-home lesson.

With TMJ Implants, Statland said, FDA played “a consultative role,” although he would not address Christensen’s complaints that the early stages of the review were far from consultative. “I’m pro-technology,” he stressed. “I want good devices to be out there and going to help people. At the same time, I want full disclosure, so people can make good decisions.”

Rosen acknowledged that after Statland began raising issues dividing the company from reviewers, there were holes in the data (e.g., patients lost to follow-up) that the company had provided and that reviewers apparently didn’t know how to assess. After one round-table discussion, on 2/9, he and Mike Cole worked through the weekend to extract from the company’s prospective clinical study data a subset analysis of patients who had at least three years’ experience with the Fossa-Eminence implant. On 2/13, he presented this to the reviewers, and it answered all of their questions. That left only the labeling, which then moved quickly to completion.

Christensen, who had enlisted legal, political, and constitutional issues dividing the company from reviewers, has not been pleased with the result, although he thinks FDA owes him for some of his extraordinary costs in restoring his two devices to the market. He has resumed full marketing efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. KAP'TUR. Mr. Chairman, through the gentlemen this is our bill at the subcommittee level and full committee level, we very, very much wanted to have a straightforward appropriation for continuation of the Global Food for Education program. Thus far, we have been unable to achieve that in the base bill and we only have been able to achieve report language that essentially says that we, as the Congress, expect that the Secretary of Agriculture will continue a program begun last year that is moving our surplus commodities and food commodities around the world to 35 countries, feeding over 9 million needy children. This program is a win-win for America’s farmers and ranchers and definitely a win-win for hungry children around the world, including young girls who are expected to go to school and receive a decent ration in whatever country they might live.

Unfortunately, in the base bill, there is not $300 million appropriated to continue this program straightforwardly. Rather, all we have is some language that says to the Secretary, “We think it’s a great idea; we hope you can figure out a way to continue the program; and we expect you to continue the program.”

The purpose of this amendment as drafted would be to symbolically take $1,700 from the Secretary’s own accounts and to make those available to the Foreign Agricultural Service. Now, we know $1,700 is not a whole lot, you know $1,700 wouldn’t score. Compare this to the other option that, you know, it goes something like this, Ms. KAP'TUR, she can spend the dollars out of the Commodity Credit Corporation and it doesn’t score.

I do not think there is a person in my district that would understand this kind of budget charade. So the purpose of this amendment is really to draw attention to what is happening here and to say that a large number of our Members on this side of the aisle really want this program to have permanently appropriated dollars. We want to do to that, and we are handcuffed in the procedures allowed through subcommittee and full committee in order to achieve that.

It is not my intention to move forward with this amendment because I do not want to do a fig leaf. I want to do a thoughtful appropriation. But I want to use this amendment as a mechanism to allow others who support this program to speak to and, to the strongest language possible, let the administration know that we are serious. Quite frankly, this bill means so much to me, it is my intention, working with some of my other colleagues, to bring this up in the other body.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAP'TUR) with regard to the continuation of the Global Food for Education Initiative.

Mr. Chairman, the Global Food for Education Initiative was implemented as a pilot program during fiscal year 2001. The Department of Agriculture used $300 million of discretionary funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation to start this pilot program.

Now, the program as it currently operates is having a tremendous impact around the world. In fact, there are some countries where organizations are now building schools, albeit humble rooftops, maybe thatched roof rooftops, so children are coming to receive this food. It has tremendous support from so many of our non-governmental organizations, like Catholic Charities, like ACDI/VOCA, like Mercy Corps, like CARE, the very organizations that the World Food Program works through all across the world to feed those who are most in need.

So the purpose of this amendment as drafted really is to say, look, why are we involved in this budget charade of saying to the Congress: if we directly appropriate $300 million, we can’t do that because we break some sacrosanct budget rule here and, therefore, we can’t appropriate real dollars. So we’ll just put report language in the bill. Compare this to the other option that, you know, it goes something like, Ms. KAP'TUR, she can spend the dollars out of the Commodity Credit Corporation and it doesn’t score.
Act of 2001 so that we actually can authorize this program for a 5-year period. However, it is unlikely that this authorizing legislation will be approved in time to provide a seamless transition from the pilot to the authorized program for fiscal year 2002.

An amendment was offered to continue the pilot program at the current level of funding during our markup in the agriculture appropriations subcommittee, but we determined that, for lots of reasons, it would not be part of our bill today. However, I was pleased at the efforts of the gentleman from Texas to include language explaining that the House of Representatives expects the Department of Agriculture to continue the GFEI pilot program in the fiscal year 2002.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the committee supports the international school feeding programs. I would like to see the GFEI continued for the next fiscal year. Is it the gentleman from Texas' expectation that the Department of Agriculture will continue to fund this program at its current level in fiscal year 2002?

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

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BONILLA. It is hard to speculate as to what the Department is going to do, but I can assure her that this is something that we are all concerned about. I know the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has worked on this as well, along with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern), the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and others. The subcommittee included report language that encourages the Secretary to continue this program at the same level as the current fiscal year. Accordingly, I will be pleased to work with the gentlewoman to see that USDA continues a program that we initiated administratively.

Mrs. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McGOVERN. First of all, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for her tremendous leadership on this issue and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McGovern. The two of them have been vigilant all through our efforts in subcommittee and full committee. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Bonilla, for trying to do as much as he could do. I would hope that we might even consider doing a joint letter to the Secretary as we move toward conference, if that is possible, in order that this program be given the serious attention that it demands at the Department of Agriculture. I want to thank all my colleagues for their tremendous efforts.

Also, I understand Senator Dole has gone through a bit of a procedure at the Cleveland Clinic recently. If he is watching this, I hope our remarks make him feel better. I also want to thank Senator McGovern who has been such a stalwart supporter and innovator, a genius really on this program. We thank him for traveling up here recently to join us in a press conference in front of the Capitol. We hope in their stead here today that we do what is necessary to continue this program.

Mrs. EMERSON. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio. The gentleman from Massachusetts and I thank the gentleman from Texas for his clarification on this issue.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few observations about the conversation that we have just heard with respect to this proposal. I think the key words that Members ought to keep in mind were the words of the subcommittee chairman. When he was asked whether or not he did expect the Department to, in fact, continue this program, he correctly pointed out that it is always difficult to predict what the Department is going to do, but I can assure her that this is something which we obviously ought to do.

I would simply say I think this is a sad example of how we have been tied up by some of the ludicrous accounting rules that get in the way of our achieving needed policy goals.

We are stuck in a battle of accountants and the lawyerly interpretation of what accountants tell us and, as a result, we are prevented from doing something which we obviously ought to do.

We have one problem. The agency has not decided to proceed. This Congress had a choice. It could tell the agency to get off the dime and proceed or it could pass the buck. I think that is unfortunate. It seems to me that if this Congress had indicated today, through an amendment on this legislation, that we were directing them to proceed, the agency would have proceeded. We would then have not had the accounting problem and we could have, in fact, delivered on this program.

We have a simple choice. We have surplus commodities in this country. The question is, will the taxpayers be asked to pay money in order to store them or will they be asked to pay money in order to ship them so they can be used to provide nutrition for young children abroad?
That is a win-win proposition, both for those kids and our farmers. It ought to be a model of cooperation as well, and I think it is indeed unfortunate that we have been prevented from offering the amendment today.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I reserve the right, as we move toward conference, to reject this issue into the debate as we further perfect this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

CHIEF ECONOMIST

For necessary expenses of the Chief Economist, including economic analysis, risk assessment, cost-benefit analysis, energy and new uses of the functions of the World Agricultural Outlook Board, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1622z), and including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $7,704,000.

NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

For necessary expenses of the National Appeals Division, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $25,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $12,669,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the committee. I had intended to offer an amendment to provide funding to make it easier for students to purchase organic and whole foods in the school breakfast and lunch programs, but I will not offer my amendment today. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for their support of my intention to assist schools in purchasing healthy foods for their school breakfast and lunch programs.

This would include organic, locally grown and fresh produce. At a time when our children's health is threatened by such conditions as obesity and type II diabetes, it is more important than ever to ensure that they have healthy options when they eat at school.

Currently, our tax dollars buy a high fat, high caffeine, fast food diet, which is turning into an extremely expensive public health problem. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, youth nutrition and obesity are an epidemic in the United States. The Healthy Farms and Healthy Kids Report states that the awful irony is that our multibillion dollar investment is yielding a multibillion dollar public health crisis in school-aged children while at the same time 83 percent of farmers who are perched precariously on the edge of urban sprawl are threatened with extinction. In many school districts in my State of California and around the Nation, urban, rural, and suburban, it is a real challenge to serve fresh, ethnically diverse meals prepared on-site from whole ingredients obtained by local farms.

With the commitment from the schools and the community, things can be better. In my district, for example, in Berkeley, California, they are facilitating a district-wide food systems-based curriculum supporting garden classrooms and cooking programs in every school.

In Berkeley, local funding has allowed the schools to have a garden in every school, and they are opening fresh salad bars with organic and other fresh foods. So this will help our schools and our local farmers and, of course, our students. With large purveyors like schools, we believe we will demonstrate that we can bring more healthy foods into our schools while lowering the costs but still supporting our farmers. So I would just like to ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) for his help really in the future to secure funds to make it easier to get healthy foods from our farms to our children and to our schools, of course. I look forward to working with him and our ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), to ensure that this provision could possibly be contained in the final version of the fiscal year 2002 Agricultural Appropriations Act.

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

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to work with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Lee) and the folks at USDA to provide some positive direction in this area. There is not a parent out there that is not concerned about good nutrition for children so I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this up and would look forward to again trying to direct USDA, somehow working with the gentlewoman on this issue of organic foods.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Lee) that I fully support her efforts. I think she has raised an exceedingly important issue for our country. Without question, the nutrition of our children will yield the health of the future generation. The high use of sugar and high fats in the diets of our youth are creating an untenable, extremely unhealthy situation in this country that even the Surgeon General has recognized.

One of the hardest challenges we face within the U.S. Department of Agriculture is to get the nutrition part of the agency, which has over half of its budget, to talk to the production side, which is the part the gentlewoman is talking about. That is producers, organic producers, small farmers, must be linked to our local school districts. This has been a tough job. I really support the gentlewoman on her efforts. Her goals of helping our children, I think, are commendable and also getting the Department of Agriculture to see its responsibilities toward our youth by working with farmers who can provide that fresh product in fruits and vegetables, with ethnic and racial sensitivity at the most local of levels, which is where we all live.

So I look forward to working with the gentlewoman as we move the bill in the other body and hopefully we can strengthen this measure as we move forward. I thank the gentlewoman so very much for bringing up this very important issue today.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman and our ranking member for their colloquy and for their assistance and look forward to working with them. I come from an urban community. I look forward to working with our rural and suburban and urban legislators on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $7,941,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $10,325,000.

COMMON COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT

For necessary expenses to acquire a Common Computing Environment for the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the Farm and Foreign Agricultural Service and Rural Development mission areas for information technology, systems, and services, $420,000, to remain available until expended, for the capital asset acquisition of shared information technology systems, including services as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 691-15 and 8 U.S.C. 1401-28: Provided. That obligation of these funds shall be consistent with the Department of Agriculture Service Center Modernization Plan of the county-based agencies, and shall facilitate the concurrence of the Department's Chief Information Officer.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225),
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR
CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congres-
sional Relations to carry out the pro-
grams funded by this Act, including pro-
grams involving intergovernmental affairs
and liaison within the executive branch,
$5,718,000: Provided, That these funds may be
transferred to agencies of the Department
of Agriculture funded by this Act to main-
tain personnel at the agency level: Provided
further, That no other funds appropriated to
the Department by this Act shall be available
to the Department for support of activities of
congressional relations.

OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out serv-
ices relating to the coordination of programs
involving public affairs, for the dissemina-
tion of agricultural information, and the
coordination of information, work, and
programs authorized by Congress in the Depart-
ment of Agriculture, $2,269,900.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the
Inspector General, including employment
pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act
of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and the Inspector
General Act of 1978, $71,429,000, including
such sums as may be necessary for contract-
ing and other arrangements with public
agencies and private persons pursuant to
section 6(a)(9) of the Inspector
General Act of 1978, including not to exceed
$15,000,000 for necessary salaries and expen-
ses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary
for Congressional Relations.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the
General Counsel.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR
RESEARCH, EDUCATION AND ECONOMICS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the
Office of the Under Secretary for Research,
Education and Economics to administer the
laws enacted by the Congress for the Eco-

tical Research Service, the National Agri-
cultural Statistics Service, the Agricultural
Research Service, and the Cooperative State
Research, Education, and Extension Service.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Economic Research Service in conducting economic re-

and liaison within the executive branch,
$5,718,000: Provided, That these funds may be
transferred to agencies of the Department
of Agriculture funded by this Act to main-
tain personnel at the agency level: Provided
further, That no other funds appropriated to
the Department by this Act shall be available
to the Department for support of activities of
congressional relations.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the
Inspector General, including employment
pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act
of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and the Inspector
General Act of 1978, $71,429,000, including
such sums as may be necessary for contract-
ing and other arrangements with public
agencies and private persons pursuant to
section 6(a)(9) of the Inspector
General Act of 1978, including not to exceed
$15,000,000 for necessary salaries and expen-
ses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary
for Congressional Relations.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the
General Counsel.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR
RESEARCH, EDUCATION AND ECONOMICS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the
Office of the Under Secretary for Research,
Education and Economics to administer the
laws enacted by the Congress for the Eco-

tical Research Service, the National Agri-
cultural Statistics Service, the Agricultural
Research Service, and the Cooperative State
Research, Education, and Extension Service.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Economic Research Service in conducting economic re-

and liaison within the executive branch,
$5,718,000: Provided, That these funds may be
transferred to agencies of the Department
of Agriculture funded by this Act to main-
tain personnel at the agency level: Provided
further, That no other funds appropriated to
the Department by this Act shall be available
to the Department for support of activities of
congressional relations.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the
Inspector General, including employment
pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act
of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and the Inspector
General Act of 1978, $71,429,000, including
such sums as may be necessary for contract-
ing and other arrangements with public
agencies and private persons pursuant to
section 6(a)(9) of the Inspector
General Act of 1978, including not to exceed
$15,000,000 for necessary salaries and expen-
ses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary
for Congressional Relations.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the
General Counsel.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR
RESEARCH, EDUCATION AND ECONOMICS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the
Office of the Under Secretary for Research,
Education and Economics to administer the
laws enacted by the Congress for the Eco-

tical Research Service, the National Agri-
cultural Statistics Service, the Agricultural
Research Service, and the Cooperative State
Research, Education, and Extension Service.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Economic Research Service in conducting economic re-

and liaison within the executive branch,
$5,718,000: Provided, That these funds may be
transferred to agencies of the Department
of Agriculture funded by this Act to main-
tain personnel at the agency level: Provided
further, That no other funds appropriated to
the Department by this Act shall be available
to the Department for support of activities of
congressional relations.
June 28, 2001
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the occupancy or use of land and facilities (including land and facilities at the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center) issued by the agency, as authorized by law, and such fees shall be credited to this account, and shall remain available until expended for authorized purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. TIERNEY

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 24.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. TIERNEY:

In title I, under the heading “AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE—SALARIES AND EXPENSES”, insert at the end the following:

SEC. 6. REPORT REGARDING GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOODS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after funds are made available to carry out this section, the tests being performed on acting through the National Academy of Sciences, shall complete and transmit to Congress a report that includes recommendations for the following:

(1) DATA AND TESTS.—The type of data and tests that are needed to sufficiently assess and evaluate human health risks from the consumption of genetically engineered foods.

(2) MONITORING SYSTEM.—The type of Federal monitoring system that should be created to assess any future human health consequences from long-term consumption of genetically engineered foods.

(3) REGULATIONS.—A Federal regulatory structure to approve genetically engineered foods for not more than human consumption.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture $500,000 to carry out this section.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I reseve a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, there is probably no more important responsibility for a government than to protect the well-being of its citizens. For this reason, it is essential that we properly assess the best way to ensure the health safety of genetically engineered foods.

This amendment presented at the desk seeks a National Academy of Sciences study to examine three important health-related aspects of genetically engineered foods. One, whether or not the tests being performed on genetically engineered foods really ensure their health safety and whether or not they are adequate and relevant; two, what type of monitoring system is needed to assess future health consequences from genetically engineered foods; and, lastly, what type of regulatory structure should be in place to approve genetically engineered foods for humans to eat.

In the year 2000, more than 100 million acres of land around the world were planted with genetically engineered crops. This is 25 times as much as was planted just 4 years before. In fact, genetically engineered food crops planted and marketed by United States farmers include 45 kinds of corn, canola, tomatoes, potatoes, soybeans, and sunflowers.

"Today, genetically engineered ingredients are found in virtually all of our foods that are sold on supermarket shelves; and that includes baby foods, potato chips, soda, and vegetables.

Despite the growing presence of genetically engineered foods and despite industry assertions that the foods are safe to eat, the public remains unconvinced. The discovery last year of genetically engineered Starlink corn that was not approved for humans to eat in taco shells was a wake-up call. Now that the cat is out of the bag, Starlink’s manufacturers want the Environmental Protection Agency to declare Starlink safe for human consumption.

Mr. Chairman, that is no way to protect our health. As the Centers for Disease Control noted earlier this month, we need to properly evaluate genetically engineered foods before they get into the food supply. In my home State of Massachusetts, the State legislature is considering legislation that would impose a 5-year moratorium on the growing of genetically engineered foods. Similar legislation is pending in New York. In fact, according to the Grocery Manufacturers of America, as of March this year there were eight bills in six States that would ban or put a moratorium on the planting of genetically engineered crops.

We cannot afford to bury our heads in the sand and let the public’s concerns continue to grow. We need to develop a standard of tests that can be applied to all genetically engineered food to ensure that it is safe for our children and ourselves to eat.

Mr. BONILLA. I continue to reserve my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) insist upon his point of order?

Mr. BONILLA. I continue to reserve my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman continues to insist on his point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Tierney amendment. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) should be congratulated for raising this issue and for asking for a more thorough review of this. I can say that I think most people sufficient to protect our health. The National Academy of Sciences has said, “A solid regulatory system and scientific basis are imperative for acceptance and safe adoption of agricultural biotechnology, as well as for protecting the environment and public health.”

Our current regulatory system, in which the Food and Drug Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the United States Department of Agriculture share jurisdiction over genetically engineered food, may not be the best way to ensure the health and safety of the foods we eat. We need to be certain that testing, regulation and monitoring of genetically engineered foods over the long term are effective and appropriate in determining the potential health effects of eating genetically engineered foods.

I think that is what we are looking for, Mr. Chairman. We want consumers to feel secure when they eat, and we want farmers to be confident when they market their products. We should heed the words from that study, and we should fund the study proposed in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his attention.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) insist upon his point of order?

Mr. BONILLA. I continue to reserve my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman continues to insist on his point of order.

Mr. BONILLA. I continue to reserve my point of order, Mr. Chairman.
in this country would support such a call. People are concerned about the food they eat, and they are certainly concerned about the new technology which may, in one way or another, change the functional characteristics of the food, as well as the properties of the food and the way in which the food interacts in the human medium.

So I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) for his work.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the chairman would just know, this is the second year we have presented this motion; and I think it is a pretty balanced motion. We are trying to make sure that farmers know that they can go to the market with confidence. It is going to do us no good in terms of the economics of our society to have a bunch of farmers that are creating a product in which the consumers have no confidence, so there is no market there.

This particular amendment was a hope to strike the point where we get the National Academy of Science to determine for us what is the best testing regime, what is the best way to monitor this as it goes through, and what is the best way to make sure that we have a regulatory structure to give the confidence at both of those levels.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is correct on that. As a matter of fact, American farmers are quite concerned about the possible genetic engineered products on their markets, because if their markets begin to dry up, as they have in some countries, then American farmers are not able to sell what we know is the best agriculture in the world, here from America. But if the products are genetically engineered, if there has not been much study and there is concern about quality, safety and other things, then our farmers can endure economic loss.

So I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) for raising this issue, and I hope that the gentleman would respectfully consider his amendment as being in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) still insist on his point of order?

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman continues to reserve his point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlemen for their interest in providing wholesome food. It is important. I would like to point out, however, that regarding the Starlink corn question, the gentleman is correct that there has been no ill effects to humans. That is good news.

I would like to also point out that, because we have been cross-breeding for 1,000 years, every food item that we buy in a store, except a couple of varieties of fish, have been genetically modified. This has happened simply because farmers have been looking for ways to improve the quality and cost of food.

I think it is very important that we continue our scientific effort with this new technology of genetic modification. We must also consider the importance of its tremendous potential in developing better food products and more healthy foods. The gentleman can develop food products that have vaccines. Also, especially in the developing countries of this world, we now have the potential of developing the kind of plants and seeds that can grow in those arid soils or those other types of climatic conditions where they could not grow food before. So we need to proceed in our scientific research.

Just a point before I yield for a comment. We have the best regulatory system in the world in terms of our oversight of genetically engineered products. Between the United States Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency, we now have the ability to review, regulate and test these products that are coming to market to assure safety.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TIERNEY. I might respectfully just disagree with the gentleman on the last point, as I think the National Academy of Science does, when they indicated that they think this idea of having three different agencies with overlapping and different responsibilities would be better served to look at what other kind of regulatory structure we could put in place that would give us more confidence.

Also I want to draw a point on the study the gentleman talked about on Starlink. One, I think we want that kind of information before the problem arises, and that is partly why I filed this bill; and, secondly, there is still some controversy swirling around the study the gentleman talked about and the results of it.

I suspect from the gentleman’s comments and the importance he puts on genetically engineered foods that he favors my bill, which would be a comprehensive bill. If we set up the right kinds of test that people could have confidence in, if we set up the right kind of monitoring system that people would know would be something we could rely on, and if we had the right kind of regulatory structure, it would benefit people that take the food and it would benefit the farmers, as well as people that might be skeptical or more on that.

The idea is to follow the advice of the National Academy and do just that. Let them give us the advice through this amendment. I propose, tell us what would be the best testing regime, how would you monitor it, and how would you regulate it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think it is important, and I hope everyone agrees, that we have to depend on scientific information and testing, and not emotions, to be the basis of the decisions we make.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, at this point I want to stress for agricultural research, the gentleman’s objections on technical matters on this, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk reads as follows:

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities as necessary to carry out the agricultural research programs of the Department of Agriculture, where not otherwise provided, $78,862,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): Provided, That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing any research facility of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

For payments to agricultural experiment stations, for cooperative forestry and other research, for facilities, and for other expenses, $507,452,000, as follows: to carry out the provisions of the Hatch Act (7 U.S.C. 361a–1), $180,148,000; for grants for cooperative forestry research (16 U.S.C. 562a–a7), $21,884,000; for payments to the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University (7 U.S.C. 3222), $32,604,000, of which $998,000 shall be made available to West Virginia State College in Institute, West Virginia for special grants for agricultural research (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)), $82,409,000; for special grants for agricultural research on improved pest control (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)), $15,721,000; for competitive research grants (7 U.S.C. 450(b)), $105,767,000; for the support of animal health and disease programs (7 U.S.C. 3195), $5,098,000; for supplemental and alternative crops and products (7 U.S.C. 319d), $950,000; for grants for research pursuant to the Critical Agricultural Materials Act of 1961 (7 U.S.C. 176) and section 1742 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3318), $639,000, to remain available until expended; for the 1994 research program (7 U.S.C. 301 note), $996,000; to remain available until expended; for initial and graduate fellowship grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(6)), $2,993,000, to remain available until expended.
The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman. I come to the floor today on behalf of all the farmers and ranchers in Utah and other western States who are dealing with the devastating outbreaks of Mormon Crickets and grasshoppers. This outbreak, now under declaration of emergency by the Governor of Utah, is considered to be the worst in over 60 years and is spreading over 1.5 million acres.

These insects, which breed undisturbed and untreated on the vast acres of BLM and Forest Service land and then spread to neighboring State and private land, are devouring the crops and rangeland to the tune of what is expected to be at least $25 million worth of damage.

However, this is not all. In Oak City, Utah, for example, the mayor informs me that the crickets have now inundated the community water system at the sealed collection boxes and tanks. They are now moving into towns, where people are attempting to burn their fruit trees to keep them away from their homes, and children are kept indoors.

Line-item funding has been eliminated, and formerly available funds from previous years have all been expended in battling these insects. The plight of these lands has become such a critical concern that I have asked our Subcommittee on Public Lands to hold oversight hearings on this issue next month. Timely and adequate funding has been a continual issue for us.

While I understand there are not any line-item funds for Mormon Cricket and grasshopper treatment in this bill as it stands today, I understand the chairman is aware of the problem we are facing and has committed to ensure there is sufficient APHIS funds for the 2002 fiscal year specific to Mormon Cricket and grasshopper treatment, as well as working with us to ensure the Secretary addresses our emergency problems with contingency funds.

I thank the chairman and look forward to working with him and obtaining emergency funds.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today on behalf of all the farmers and ranchers in Utah and other western States who are dealing with the devastating outbreaks of Mormon Crickets and grasshoppers. This outbreak, now under declaration of emergency by the Governor of Utah, is considered to be the worst in over 60 years and is spreading over 1.5 million acres.

These insects, which breed undisturbed and untreated on the vast acres of BLM and Forest Service land and then spread to neighboring State and private land, are devouring the crops and rangeland to the tune of what is expected to be at least $25 million worth of damage.

However, this is not all. In Oak City, Utah, for example, the mayor informs me that the crickets have now inundated the community water system at the sealed collection boxes and tanks. They are now moving into towns, where people are attempting to burn their fruit trees to keep them away from their homes, and children are kept indoors.

Line-item funding has been eliminated, and formerly available funds from previous years have all been expended in battling these insects. The plight of these lands has become such a critical concern that I have asked our Subcommittee on Public Lands to hold oversight hearings on this issue next month. Timely and adequate funding has been a continual issue for us.
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JOHN MCBRIDE, Director, Alternatives Research and Development Foundation, Eden Prairie, MN.

DEAR DR. MCBRIDE: Thank you for your letter regarding the current stat-
tus of laboratory animals under the Animal Welfare Act (AWA).

I support the use of animals in research but firmly believe that there is a responsi-
bility incumbent upon researchers to provide basic protections to the animals they use. It is obvious that good animal care is essential to ensuring good quality research. Through good animal treatment and minimizing pain-
test, biomedical research gains in both accuracy and humanity.

As someone deeply involved with the proc-
cess of revising and expanding the provisions meant to include birds, mice, and rats. When Congress amended the law, we certainly did not intend to exclude 95 percent of the animals used in research. This is confirmed by our es-
teeled former colleague from the other body, Senator Bob Dole, who, along with my great friend, the late Congressman George Brown, further improved the treatment of lab animals in 1985.

I wish to enter into the RECORD the letter from Senator Dole on this sub-
et.

To correct this 30-year-old wrong, USDA committed the beginning of the rulemaking process to extend the Animal Welfare Act regulations to these animals. I am disappointed that the Agriculture Appropriations Sub-
committee chose to add language that prohibits USDA from going forward with this rulemaking which is long overdue. The scientific community must be held accountable to the public for its treatment of animals. The American public expects animal research to be conducted as humanely as possible. We in Congress cannot assure them that if we not only allow, but also encourage, USDA to exclude the majority of research animals from this law’s protection.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this lan-
guage be stricken in the conference committee between the House and the Senate.

The letter referred to previously fol-
lows:

problem is identified to meet future needs in the FY 2002 bill.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, re-
claiming my time, I thank the chair-
man and appreciate his help on this criti-
cal matter and look forward to ad-
dressing this issue in conference and with the Secretary’s help.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of en-
suring that all warm-blooded animals used in research receive the protection for which the Animal Welfare Act enti-
tles them and, therefore oppose the language that has been included in the bill before us which will continue to deny those protections to those species that constitute the majority of the ani-
mals used in research.

In 1970, the Congress specifically amended the Animal Welfare Act to provide for the protections of all warm-
blooded animals used in experiments. Since then, however, the U.S. Depart-
ment of Agriculture has unfairly and illegally denied those modest safe-
guards to a majority of the research animals, over 20 million birds, rats, and mice used each year.

When Congress amended the law, we certainly did not intend to exclude 95 percent of the animals used in research. This is confirmed by our esteemed former colleague from the other body, Senator Bob Dole, who, along with my great friend, the late Congressman George Brown, further improved the treatment of lab animals in 1985.

Indeed, those amendments have facilitated significant improvements in laboratory ani-
cal care and use, which in turn have bene-
eted research. In fact, I understand that those members of the research community best informed about laboratory animals support the inclusion of birds, mice, and rats. From their work on the front lines, they rec-
ognize, as you and I do, that uniform protec-
tions not only are humane, but also ensure consistent experimental results and level the playing field in vital scientific research. Those who oppose USDA’s efforts to fulfill its court settlement with your organization, I believe, are overlooking the long-term ben-
efits to crafting better science.

We owe much to laboratory animals—that were true in 1985 and is truer today. I would hope that the Bush Administration and Members of the present Congress, some of whom stood with me in 1985 in advancing my amendments, will recognize that all animals used in experimentation deserve the benefit of the modest requirements of the Animal Welfare Act. I would urge them to allow USDA to achieve this end by pursuing a full and fair rulemaking as provided in the set-
tlement agreement.

Wishing you the best of luck not only in de-
defending the Animal Welfare Act, but also in your ongoing efforts to advance humane methods of biomedical research.

June 28, 2001

Let me add that I am writing to you as a volunteer. I am not being paid by any per-
s or group or for stating my views.

Sincerely,

BOB DOLE.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

None of the funds in the foregoing para-
graph shall be available to carry out re-
search related to the production, processing or marketing of tobacco products; Provided, That this paragraph shall not apply to research on the medical, biotechnological, food, and industrial uses of tobacco.

NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

For the Native American Institutions En-
dowment Fund authorized by Public Law 103–382 (7 U.S.C. 301 note), $7,100,000.

For payments for States, the District of Co-
lumbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Is-
lands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa, as follows: payments for cooperative extension work under the Smith-Lever Act, to be distributed under sections 3(b) and 3(c) of said Act, and section 288(b) of the Agriculture Act of 1990, for retirement and employees’ compensation costs for extension agents and for costs of penalty mail for cooperative extension agents and State extension directors, $275,940,000; payments for extension work at the 1994 Institutions under the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 333(b)(3)), $3,273,000; payments for the nutrition and family education pro-
gram for low-income areas under section 3(d) of the Act, $58,366,000; payments for the pest management program under section 3(d) of the Act, $10,759,000; payments for the 4-H farm safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, $5,800,000; payments to upgrade research, ex-
tension, and teaching facilities at the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee Uni-
versity, as authorized by section 1447 of Pub-
lic Law 95–113 (7 U.S.C. 3222b), $12,173,000, to remain available until expended; payments for the rural development centers under sec-
tion 3(d) of the Act, $906,000; payments for youth-at-risk programs under section 3(d) of the Act, $5,481,000; for youth farm safety edu-
cation and certification extension grants, to be awarded competitively under section 3(d) of the Act, $499,000; payments for carrying out the provisions of the Renewable Re-
sources Extension Act of 1978, $3,185,000; pay-
ments for Indian reservation agents under section 3(d) of the Act, $1,996,000; payments for sustainable agriculture programs under section 3(d) of the Act, $5,000,000; payments for rural health and safety education as au-
thorized by section 2390 of Public Law 101–624 (7 U.S.C. 2661 note, 2662), $2,622,000; payments for cooperative extension work by the col-
leges receiving the benefits of the second Morrill Act (7 U.S.C. 322–329), (7)panic Education and Re-
duction including administration of the Smith-Lever Act, and the Act of September 29, 1977 (7 U.S.C. 331–349), and section 2361(c) of the Act of October 21, 1990 (7 U.S.C. 301 note), and to coordinate and provide program leadership for the extension work of the De-
partment and the several States and insular possessions, $18,649,000; funds hereby appropriated pursuant to section 3(c) of the Act of June 26, 1953, and section 506 of the Act of June 22, 1972, shall not be paid to the State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa.
Samoan transition program, $2,500,000; and pay-ment for the Food Quality Protection Act risk mitigation program, $4,531,000; payments for the plant and animal diseases; to carry out in-tegrated activities. For the integrated research, education, and extension competitive grants programs, $660,000.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS
For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs to administer pro-grams enacted by Congress for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; the Agricultural Marketing Service; and the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration; $909,000.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE
Salaries and expenses (including transfers of funds)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, including those pursuant to the Act of February 28, 1947 (21 U.S.C. 124b–c), necessary to prevent, control, and eradicate pests and plant and animal diseases; to carry out inspec-tion, quarantine, and regulatory activi-ties; to discharge the authorities of the Secre-tary of Agriculture under the Acts of March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1468) and December 22, 1967 (101 Stat. 1229–1331) (7 U.S.C. 426–426c); and for field employment, not to exceed $587,386,000, of which $4,096,000 shall be available for the control of out-breaks of insects, plant diseases, animal dis-eases, and pests; for the control of pests and birds to the extent necessary to meet emer-gency conditions: Provided, That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for the cur-rent fiscal year that does not require min-imum matching by the States of at least 40 percent: Provided further, That this appro-priation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $90,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: Pro-vided further, That this appropriation shall be available for the operation and mainte-nance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed four, of which two shall be for re-placement only: Provided further, That, in ad-dition, in emergencies which threaten any segment of the agricultural production in-dustry of this country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the agencies or corporations of the Department such sums as may be deemed nec-essary or advisable only in such emer-gencies for the arrest and eradication of con-tagious or infectious disease or pests of ani-mals, poultry, or plants, and for expenses in accordance with section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred for such emergency purposes in the previous fiscal year merged with such transferred amounts: Provided fur-ther, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the repair and alteration of leased buildings and of buildings otherwise pro-vided the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per-cent of the current replacement value of the building.

In fiscal year 2002 the agency is authorized to collect fees to cover the total costs of prov-ided technical assistance, services requested by States, other political sub-divisions, domestic and international organi-zations, foreign governments, or individuals, provided that such fees are structured such that any entity’s liability for such fees is reasonably based on the technical assistance, goods, or services provided to the entity by the agency, and such fees shall be credited to this account, to remain available until ex-pired, without further appropriation, for providing such assistance, goods, or services. Of the total amount available under this heading in fiscal year 2002, $84,813,000 shall be derived from user fees deposited in the Agri-cultural Quarantine Inspection User Fee Ac-count.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES
For plans, construction, repair, preventive maintenance, environmental support, im-provement, extension, alteration, and pur-chase of fixed equipment or facilities, as au-thorized by 7 U.S.C. 2250, and acquisition of land as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 228a, $7,189,000, to remain available until expended.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE
Marketing grants
For necessary expenses to carry out services related to consumer protection, agricul-tural marketing and distribution, transpor-tation, and regulatory programs, as author-ized by law, and for administration and co-ordination of payments to States, including field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $90,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $33,117,000: Pro-vided, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $25,000 for employ-ment pursuant to law: $83,117,000: Pro-vided, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not ex-ceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES
Not to exceed $42,463,000 (from fees col-lected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for inspection and weighing serv-ices: Provided, That if grain export activities require additional supervision and oversight, or other uncontrollable factors occur, this limitation may be exceeded by up to 10 per-cent with notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD SAFETY
For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Food Saf-ety (including transfers of funds): Provided, That the remainder of the bill shall be available pursuant to law (31 U.S.C. 9701).

Mr. BONILLA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous con-sent that the remainder of the bill through page 25, line 1, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE
For necessary expenses to carry out services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspec-tion Act, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, and the Egg Products Inspection Act, including not to exceed $50,000 for representa-tion allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (15 U.S.C. 41). Funds available under sections 32 and 1017 of Public Law 102–237: Provided, That this appropriation shall be available for the Department of Commerce as authorized by the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of August 8, 1956: (2) transfers otherwise provided in this Act; and (3) not more than $13,995,000 for for-mulation and administration of marketing agreements and orders pursuant to the Agri-cultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and the Agricultural Act of 1961.

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS
For payments to departments of agri-culture, bureaus and departments of mar-kets and similar agencies for marketing ac-tivities under section 204(b) of the Agricul-tural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1623(b)), $1,347,000.

GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION
Salaries and expenses
For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act, for the administration of the Pack-ers and Stockyards Act, for certifying proce-dures used to protect purchasers of farm products, and the standardization activities rel-evant to grain under the Agricultural Mar-keting Act of 1946, including field employ-ment pursuant to the second sentence of sec-tion 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $25,000 for employ-ment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $33,117,000: Pro-vided, That this appropriation shall be avail-a-ble pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not ex-ceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.
from Connecticut (Ms. DeLAURO) and a Member opposed.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DeLAURO) is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment provides emergency funds to address the food safety crisis that faces our Nation today. Today more Americans are getting sick from the food that they eat. Outbreaks of food sickness are expected to go up by as much as 15 percent over the next 10 years. The outbreaks are reported across the spectrum: fish, eggs, beef and lettuce, to name a few. The statistics are staggering. Five thousand Americans die every year from heart disease, and 76 million get ill and 325 are hospitalized. Medical expenses and lost productivity cost us every year $5.6 billion and $9.4 billion respectively.

Two days ago the Excel Corporation recalled 150 million items of ground beef and pork because of possible contamination by deadly E. coli. Sara Lee pled guilty to selling tainted meat linked to a nationwide outbreak of listeriosis in 1995, and 15 people were killed.

Grocery stores are afraid that their food is unsafe. Slaughterhouses are killing cattle before the animals are unconscious because there are not enough inspectors to ensure that the law is enforced.

George Grob, Deputy Director and Inspector General of Health and Human Services states that, and I quote, "Any reasonable person would worry about it. If the inspection process worked really well, there would be fewer recalls."

To address the problem I asked the committee to allow an amendment that would provide a total of $213 million in emergency funds, $90 million for more inspections of imported foods, $73 million for additional inspections of domestic food products, and $50 million for the Food Safety Inspection Service to ensure that it has the resources that it needs to implement food safety procedures and regulations.

The Food and Drug Administration inspects all meat, poultry and eggs. This food, which includes fruit juices, vegetables, cheeses, seafood, is the source of 85 percent of food poisoning in this country. In the United States alone, there are 30,000 companies that produce these food items, and last year recalls of FDA-regulated products rose to 315, the most since the 1980s and 36 percent above average.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment inspects less than 1 percent of imported food, and that market has expanded from 2.7 million items to 4.1 million items in just 3 years. In the domestic market, the FDA does not inspect all high-risk firms more than once a year; other firms are visited only once in 7 years. The FDA employs 400 people to inspect domestic food and would need 500 employees to increase its inspection of imported food from 1 percent to 10 percent would require 1,600 employees.

The FDA needs resources in order to begin to meet its goal, and that is what this amendment does, is to begin the process of increasing the number of inspectors in order to look at imported foods and take the 1 percent of the inspections to 10 percent, and it would add 630 inspectors to guarantee that all high-risk firms are inspected. Once a year, all other firms every 2 years, and all food warehouses every 3 years.

The last part of the amendment says, let us have $50 million for the Food Safety Inspection Service to allow it to reach its goal of looking at reducing food-borne illnesses that are carried by meat and poultry by 25 percent.

The FSIS has held public hearings to look at how we deal with imported food and procedures, risk management, and emergency outbreaks. We only have to look at our European friends to see what they have gone through with foot and mouth and with mad cow illness to understand that what we need to do is to be able to meet any kind of emergency. We need to move forward on food safety, not backwards. If we continue to not provide the kinds of inspection services that are needed, in fact, we will move backwards and jeopardize the health of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of this amendment and to provide the emergency assistance for food safety.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman insist upon his point of order?

Mr. BONIOR. I continue to reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Question: How many times have we all heard: "The government is too blasted big. Get the government out of our lives." I bet my colleagues have heard it a lot. Yet the first time that we have an outbreak of disease someplace, the first time that people die from contaminated food, all of a sudden people say, "Where is the government? What are they doing? Why don't they get off their duffs? Why look at our European friends to see what they have gone through with foot and mouth and with mad cow illness to understand that what we need to do is to be able to meet any kind of emergency. We need to move forward on food safety, not backwards. If we continue to not provide the kinds of inspection services that are needed, in fact, we will move backwards and jeopardize the health of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of this amendment and to provide the emergency assistance for food safety.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist upon his point of order?

Mr. BONIOR. I continue to reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. OBEY. Question: How many times have we all heard: "The government is too blasted big. Get the government out of our lives." I bet my colleagues have heard it a lot. Yet the first time that we have an outbreak of disease someplace, the first time that people die from contaminated food, all of a sudden people say, "Where is the government? What are they doing? Why don't they get off their duffs? Why look at our European friends to see what they have gone through with foot and mouth and with mad cow illness to understand that what we need to do is to be able to meet any kind of emergency. We need to move forward on food safety, not backwards. If we continue to not provide the kinds of inspection services that are needed, in fact, we will move backwards and jeopardize the health of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of this amendment and to provide the emergency assistance for food safety.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.
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Mr. Chairman, 5,000 Americans are going to die this year because of contaminated food, and millions are going to become sick, so I cannot believe that we cannot do better.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and I want to commend her for her terrific efforts in subcommittee and in full committee, and now on the floor, to get appropriate attention to the important question of food safety in our country. It really is staggering to think that 76 million Americans every year have some type of food-borne illness.

Mr. Bonilla. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman for her tremendous efforts in this area, and we have a role that we in this Congress need to be more diligent about, that being food safety.

As a modern society as we are, we question, why does this happen? Part of the reason for it is because our food system, in many ways, is moving very far away from home.

It used to be that you knew the farmer where your eggs came from. You knew the farmer who grew your strawberries. There was local accountability. You knew where your chickens came from. You knew where your beef for your sausage came from, because the people in that community and you went to the stores and the outlets that they operated.

Mr. Chairman, today we live in a very industrialized food system, and industrialized food processing has not necessarily brought with it a safer food system. In fact, last year, 315 Food and Drug Administration regulated food products were recalled, the most recalls in 1 year since the mid-1980s.

It was a 36 percent increase above the average. That's all on record. We know that is, even though we have certain scientific methods in place, the way in which our food is processed actually encourages food-borne illness.

For example, in the area of beef, if you go into some of our slaughter houses and meat-packing plants now, which are very, very mechanized, often, an intestine will be pierced and E. coli will be driven into flesh in the animal that is ultimately then cut up and sold on the meat counter and sold in the supermarket shelf. It is eye cannot necessarily detect the difference there.

Mr. Chairman, some of that is not detected by the human eye. Industrial slaughtering is different than when animals were cut by hand and there were not so many animals slaughtered per day which made it easier to overlook.

Mr. Chairman, some of that is not detected by the human eye. Industrial slaughtering is different than when animals were cut by hand and there were not so many animals slaughtered per day which made it easier to overlook.

It has never been easy to work in a meat processing facility. At the beginning of the 20th century, books were written about what was going on inside these meat-packing plants, and through the 20th century, we tried to improve the situation.

In poultry, for example, if you look at the USDA inspectors who are on a line, the rate at which birds move by themselves has become so fast, the human eye cannot necessarily detect the different types of salmonella and pfisteria and other bacterial microbes that can infect the meat product.

In spite of the fact that we seem to be so modern, some of the very processes that we have in place to ensure that food is grown and processed very far from home has made the system in some ways extremely vulnerable.

It is surprising to us also that in a country as bountiful as ours that we have increasing amounts of food imports.

Over the last 4 years alone, imported foods sold in the United States have increased by 50 percent, from 2.7 million items in 1997 to 4.1 million last year alone. But all of the foreign imports coming in here, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DeLAURO) has accurately described, only 1 percent are inspected.

Most people get sick from food poisoning, they do not report it to the Centers for Disease Control. A lot of times they do not really realize what is wrong with them until a couple of days later. At the local level, there is not an automatic reporting upstream to the CDC. So a lot of the food poisoning goes unreported. The DeLauro amendment would provide additional funds for food inspection.

There is $98 million more for imported food inspection, which we so desperately need at our borders; $73 million for more FDA inspections of domestic food processors. Many processors do not even get inspected once a year; sometimes it takes up to 2 years.

The FDA actually is the agency where 75 percent of the problem is, 75 percent of the outbreaks and problems relate to FDA-inspected facilities. This means inspection is inadequate.

The DeLauro amendment would provide $50 million for USDA food safety and inspection service to carry out new procedures and regulations for meat and poultry food products. For example, USDA is currently addressing port of entry procedures and the development of contingency plans for emergency breakdowns. Remember, we had that problem of strawberries in Michigan causing children to become so ill.

To this day, we were never actually able to track back where the problem was, with those strawberries came from. We knew they were processed in southern California. Their origin was Mexico, and we just could not track it back.

So I think the DeLauro amendment is more than worthy. It is essential.

She has my full support on this. I hope she has the attention of the membership. Let us get this DeLauro amendment incorporated in the final bill that we bring back from the other body. Thank you.
of the agencies that we charge with protecting our food, our food supply, which is ultimately about the man, it is about the safety of every man, women and child in this country. That is all that we are asking about here.

Given the statistics, which are staggering, 5,000 deaths, 73 million people ill, 355,000 people hospitalized, it is unconscionable that we do not recognize this as a crisis and as an emergency.

We cannot allow this to continue. We can do something about it.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry. Is the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DeLAURO) withdrawing her amendment?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD). Is the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DeLAURO) insist on his point of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to continue to move forward with my amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) insist on his point of order?

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I do.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill, and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states, in pertinent part, an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.

The amendment includes an emergency designation under section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and, as such, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Connecticut want to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. DeLAURO. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Then the Chair is prepared to rule on the gentleman’s point of order.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes an emergency designation under section 251(b)(2)(a) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WURTHFIELD). The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM) assumed the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The Committee resumed its seating.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chair, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FARM AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services to administer the laws enacted by the Farm Service Agency, the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Risk Management Agency, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, $651,000.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

Salaries and Expenses (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for carrying out the administration and implementation of programs administered by the Farm Service Agency, Provided, That the Secretary is authorized to use the services, facilities, and authorities (but not the funds) of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make program payments for programs administered by the Agency: Provided further, That other funds made available to the Agency for authorized activities may be advanced to and merged with this account: Provided further, That these funds shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 502(b) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1926), $125,000: Provided, That such funds are hereby authorized to make expenditures, and operations and maintenance expenses, and for reimbursement expenses, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1506(i).

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928–1929, to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, as follows: farm ownership loans, $1,128,000,000, of which $1,000,000,000 shall be for guaranteed loans and $128,000,000 shall be for direct loans; operating loans, $2,600,000,000, of which $1,500,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans, $500,000,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans, and $550,000,000 shall be for direct loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 48a, $2,000,000; for emergency insured loans, $25,000,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters; and for bolt with the Act to make program loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928, $100,000,000.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: farm ownership loans, $7,866,000, of which $4,508,000 shall be for guaranteed loans and $3,358,000 shall be for direct loans; operating loans, $174,030,000, of which $52,650,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans, $67,930,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans, and $53,450,000 shall be for direct loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, $118,000; and for emergency insured loans, $3,363,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $274,769,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for “Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses”.

For administrative and operating expenses, as authorized by the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 6833), $75,142,000: Provided, That not to exceed $700 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1506(i).

CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 301 of the Government Corporation Control Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

For payments as authorized by section 516 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 229b).

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

For fiscal year 2002, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained, but not previously reimbursed, pursuant to section 2 of the Act of August 17, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 713a–11).

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FOR HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

For fiscal year 2002, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not expend more than $5,000,000 for site investigation and cleanup expenses, and operations and maintenance expenses to comply with the requirement of section 107(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. 9601.