

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for greenhouse nurseries in Ohio;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for aquaculture in Ohio;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for hydroponic tomato production in Ohio;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for wood utilization in Oregon, Mississippi, North Carolina, Minnesota, Maine, Michigan, Idaho, Tennessee, Arkansas, and West Virginia;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for the National Grape and Wine Initiative in California;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for income enhancement demonstration in Ohio;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for Appalachian Horticulture Research in Mississippi;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for the Competitiveness of Agriculture Products in Washington;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for Value-Added Product Development for Agriculture resources in Montana.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member named in this request or a designee, or by the Member who caused it to be printed in the RECORD or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate; and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Except as otherwise specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. An amendment shall be considered to fit the description stated in this request if it addresses in whole or in part the object described.

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

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I calculate the time that would be required to dispose of all the amendments made in order by this unanimous consent agreement, it appears to me that it amounts to about 6½ hours just of palaver, without the time consumed by votes; or for that matter, without the time consumed by slippage as we go through the procedures around here.

That means that if every person offers each amendment that is provided for in this unanimous consent request, and if they take the time allotted, we will be here until at least 10:30 or 11 o'clock before we even get to the votes.

Given the fact that there are many amendments, that means, as I see it, that we could be here as late as 2 o'clock tomorrow morning. I would ask Members to keep that in mind when they are determining whether or not they actually want to offer many of these amendments.

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

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with the gentleman more. The gentleman knows that I have tried to work through this bill as expeditiously as possible. I would concur that we try to expedite this process and minimize the speeches that could be associated with these amendments.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

1512

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5384) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the bill had been read through page 82, line 14.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except those specified in the previous order of the House of today, which is at the desk.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BONILLA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONILLA:

At the end add:

Sec. _____. The limitation in section 721 shall not apply below a program level of \$1,127,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Hopefully, this will set an example for dealing with the remaining amendments. We have cleared this amendment that deals with putting money back into the EQIP program. We have cleared it with the minority, and I ask for an "aye" vote.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek the time in opposition?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. PAUL:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement or administer the National Animal Identification System.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It says none of the funds made available in this act may be used to implement or administer a National Animal Identification System. I think at this time one thing that this country doesn't need is another huge bureaucracy tracing and following every animal in the country.

1515

That is exactly what this new program will do. It means that each animal will be tagged with a radio frequency ID, all cattle, swine, sheep, goats, horses poultry, bison, deer, elk, llamas and alpacas.

For one, what you own on your farm should be your property, and that information should be private unless there is some type of a subpoena. There is a fourth amendment issue here.

Also, there is the issue of just why this is being done. A lot of people have claimed, and I agree with this, that this is a benefit to the large agribusiness farmers, and it is a great detriment to the small farmers who will be burdened with this great effort to accumulate data which will be of benefit to some private big companies.

Actually, the database will be controlled by private companies. It will be said that this is a voluntary program, but it has also been told me by the Agriculture Department that if it isn't 100 percent agreed to by the year 2008, it will become mandatory. So it is a little bit of 1984 newspeak about exactly how voluntary it is.

But we certainly don't need this type of program. We already have plenty of programs that trace and monitor movement. There are health requirements and brands and all the other efforts. This, to me, is a bureaucratic boondoggle that we don't need.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I come from cattle country out in Colorado. I can tell you that one of the things that has gotten our cattle producers worked up more than anything in recent times is this animal identification program. They are very, very worried about it.

The feeling is that it is going to take the small producer and put them absolutely out of business. The initial estimates for a national ID program range from \$122 million to \$550 million, and who will be responsible for that? USDA? The producer? The packer? Again, we don't know, because we have not defined the range and scope of the program.

The Australian Beef Association condemns their mandatory ID program because it is the farmers and the ranchers that have been forced to shoulder the burden. We can understand the need to deal with the Mad Cow problem, but at the same time, the idea that the possibility that every animal you have on your farm, including your chickens and your horses, all of the animals, would have to be identified by some kind of an electronic means is something that just doesn't make any sense at all.

We have spent about \$86 million on it already. I think that we ought to go back to the committee and reconsider this. At this time, I would hope that we would not put any money into it whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment that prohibits funds from being directed to an National Animal Identification program, which amounts to a total about \$33 million this year. We all know this is a tough budget year, and in no way does this amendment intend to diminish the hard work performed by Chairman BONILLA and his staff. In fact, I applaud the Committee for decreasing the total bill by \$7 billion below last year's level. Given our well-known budget problems, it is necessary that we evaluate what programs are working and what ones are not. When I look at the Animal ID program, one that the USDA has spent \$85 million on in the last three years and at the earliest estimations, is expected to be fully operational by 2009, I do not see a program that needs \$33 million more, rubber-stamped for it. Especially given that this program has seemingly very little direction and has produced very little so far, even though all 50 states are now of reg-

istering, very few animals are registered. The Department itself has changed its opinion on the fundamental direction of the program between May and August of last year, moving from defined timeline of implementation for a single national mandatory system to the collection of massive databases. When the Department, the States, as well as the numerous producer groups needed to assist in such a massive undertaking are undecided on even the goals of the program: Is it animal safety and disease control, or food safety? Let alone a course of action, this is not a program we simply need to throw more money at.

Initial estimates for a National ID program range from \$122 to \$550 million, and who will be responsible: USDA, the producer, the packer? Again we don't know because we have not defined the range and scope of the program. The Australian Beef Association condemns their mandatory ID program because it is the farmers and ranchers that have been forced to shoulder the burden. As this is currently set up, this makes for a massive invasion in privacy rights and will in many cases reinvent the wheel with current branding systems already in place. Furthermore, we must better define how implementation of Country of Origin Labeling will fit into this? We are foolish to look at Animal ID and Congress in a vacuum. In the report of this appropriations bill, the committee expressed concern for the program regarding "mixed signals" about participation and registration. Animal ID accounts for only about 4 percent of APHIS budget but I feel that this money would be better spent on programs like Avian Flu prevention and Emergency programs that are clearly defined, and do not threaten property rights.

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

I certainly appreciate the intent of what the gentlemen are trying to accomplish. I have a lot of sympathy for it, but I oppose the American Farm Bureau at this time. The reason is, we do need to identify those animals who are involved in the food chain for human consumption.

Yet, at the same time, because our language, we worked very closely with the authorizing committee, requires that before it is implemented that we have comments in the Federal Registry which at that time people can weed out those nonessential animals, because I don't want a national bureaucracy knowing about every single animal that I own or a rancher or farmer may own.

During that comment period, it certainly would be my intention, and I think most of us on the authorizing and on the appropriating committee, to make sure what you are saying is correct. So, at this point, I also want to point out that we are delaying any of these funds to be available to the USDA until it publishes the advance notice of proposed rulemaking about the plan. We are doing everything we can in a public comment period.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the authorizing committee, Mr. GOODLATTE.

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

I rise in opposition to the amendment.

While I appreciate the intent of the amendment and the questions that have led to it, the appropriations measure as reported contains language on animal identification that should be sufficient to address its concerns. Since becoming chairman of the Agricultural Committee, we have conducted five hearings on the national identification, national animal identification system.

It is clear that animal ID has the potential to significantly improve our animal health monitoring system and enhance our ability to respond to an animal health emergency. Unfortunately, many of the livestock producers I talk with about the USDA's animal ID system, still have questions about cost, liability, regulatory burden, confidentiality and barriers to commerce that have yet to be addressed.

It is reasonable to expect that an individual producer could look at a USDA document and determine what he would be required to do under either the voluntary program or the mandatory program that will follow on later.

Today, it is simply not possible. The Appropriations Committee has included language in their bill that holds funding until the Secretary of Agriculture publishes an advance notice of proposed rulemaking outlining how USDA's animal ID system will work. This informal process will provide the details necessary to have a full and thoughtful debate about animal ID and allow us to find our way forward with this important public policy initiative.

For those who worry an ANPR might slow down an animal ID implementation, I offer this observation, if USDA is not prepared to quickly answer these fundamental questions about its plans, then USDA is in no position to be moving forward in any case.

Mr. PAUL's amendment has the best of intentions. However, the underlying bill has provided the mechanism to work through the issues he seeks to address. For this reason, I believe his amendment should be defeated.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that if the gentleman from Georgia does not want another huge bureaucracy, he must support my amendment, because that is what he is going to get. It has already been funded. Even though there is pretense that there is a restraint on funding, it has already been funded, so it is in motion.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER).

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Paul amendment. The proposed national animal ID system will force small family farmers and ranchers to spend thousands of dollars as well as comply with

new paperwork and monitoring regulations to implement and operate the national ID system. This unnecessary financial burden could ruin small farms.

As we all know, many of America's small farms are struggling to survive in today's environment. They are teetering on a line that fluctuates with the seasons, with disease and with ever-changing markets. The national animal ID system will only push these farmers further into financial troubles. By forcing small farms to adhere to unfair bureaucratic regulation, you will be driving third and fourth generation farmers out of the only livelihood they have ever known.

In town hall meetings across my district, constituents have expressed to me their concerns with the proposed program. They are afraid of losing their farms because of big brother looking over their shoulder and forcing them to adhere to unrealistic and intrusive regulations.

I urge my colleagues to support the Paul amendment and stand up for the thousands of hardworking small farmers in our country.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition of this amendment. Although I have to say that the way the Department so far has administered this thing, I have some sympathy for what you are saying, but not for the same reasons.

We have spent \$84 million so far. We haven't accomplished a whole lot. In Canada, they put this up for \$6 million. In Australia, they set their system up for \$10 million. We could have done this for a lot less money if we had gone about it in the right way.

I introduced a bill some time ago to make a mandatory system. But the fact of the matter is, if you don't think we need a national ID system in this country, you have got your head in the sand, because we are going to have a problem. It is going to be foot and mouth, or it will be something else.

If we don't have a system, we are in big trouble. We are never going to get back in the Japanese market, some of these other markets, if we don't have an ID system in this country that works. So this is not the right way to go, and I urge rejection of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KINGSTON. How much time is remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 30 seconds left.

Mr. KINGSTON. I will yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Texas if 10 seconds will help him.

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to urge an "aye" vote to try to slow up at least a brand new bureaucracy that is going to play havoc with our small farmers.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to urge a "no" vote and say that

we are going to join Mr. PAUL in fighting a new bureaucracy and also to weed out an excessive burden on small farmers and too much information to the Federal Government. That is why we have delayed the funding of this until the advanced notice for proposed rulemaking has been filed, and we are going to work on a bipartisan basis to get that right. So please vote "no."

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

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Texas knows, I have a great deal of respect for him. He and I do not agree very often, but I think that he is a very thoughtful watchdog in this House, and I appreciate the fact that he is suspicious of government overreach whenever it comes from.

Having said that, I want to echo the words of the gentleman from Minnesota. If you think that we are going to be able to sell our meat products on international markets without eventually having a system like this, you are smoking something that ain't legal. It simply is not going to happen. To defend the ability of our producers to export, we are going to have to have a decent animal ID system. We are also going to have to have a decent animal ID system in order to protect the public health of our own citizens. So we need to have this go forward.

What the committee is doing is recognizing that the Agriculture Department has handled this issue so badly that they have given incompetence a bad name. And what the committee has therefore done is to say that until the department gets its act in order, there will be no funds provided, but we leave the possibility open for funding once they get their act together. That is the responsible way to force the agency to quit jerking farmers around. I mean, it is like watching a tennis game; bump, bump, bump. They change their mind every 5 minutes. You cannot keep your eye on the ball. One day they have one approach; one day they have another. And as a result, farmers are frustrated, consumers are confused, and taxpayers are bilked for a heck of a lot more money than this system ought to cost. We would not even be having this debate today if USDA had handled this in a fashion which was in any way competent, but they did not. So now we pay the price with debates such as this.

I would urge that the House support the committee in this position. It is taking the responsible path on this issue. And I would urge that we turn down the amendment even though I fully appreciate the frustration that lies underneath the actions of the people who have offered the amendment today.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the comments of Mr. OBEY and Mr. PETERSON. I think that there is not any question that on all sides of this issue there has been great frustration with the way in which the USDA has handled this issue.

In exchange, in the budget hearing this year, we find on one day it is a mandatory program and the next day it is a voluntary program. What we are doing is, we continue to put at risk the industry and its ability to be able to protect the ranchers, and on the other hand, it does not deal with looking at, how do we protect the public health?

The bill does address this issue, and it acknowledges what the problems are. And I think that we said very clearly that until there is a complete and a detailed plan for the program included, not limited to, pro-legislative changes, cost estimates, means of program evaluation, and that such a plan is published as an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking that these are the kinds of requirements that have been put in by the committee.

And I want to urge my colleagues, though I understand, again, what the frustration is about this issue, to oppose the amendment and move with what the committee has put forward.

□ 1530

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOREN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOREN:

Page 82, after line 14, insert the following:
SEC. 753. None of the funds provided by this Act for the Agricultural Research Service may be obligated or expended to reprogram programs and resources currently operating at Lane, Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would allow the scientists and support staff at the Agriculture Research Lab in Lane, Oklahoma, to continue their valuable work at the facility. The lab is important not only to my district and the State of Oklahoma, but also makes significant contributions to agriculture in the region, Nation, and across the globe.

When the center was established in 1985, it was in response to the need for new and improved innovations in agriculture for the south central region of this country. I believe that need still exists.

The ARS lab at Lane shares a facility with Oklahoma State University's Wes Watkins Research and Extension Center, named for one of my predecessors in Congress.

To give you an example of the work being done at this lab, scientists at Lane are leading research on watermelon vine decline. Watermelon growers have determined this to be the most important challenge they will face in the coming years. But with the experience and leadership that exists at Lane, they are confident they can meet this challenge.

The facility is recognized nationally and internationally as a center for excellence for vine crop research, especially on watermelons and cantaloupe. It is important our research facilities be spread across the State and country to provide the best research for varying soil types and climates.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I want to say on behalf of the Chair, we are ready to accept this amendment. I know you have worked very hard on this facility, and I know your passion for it. The committee accepts the amendment.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the other side and the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIAHRT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TIAHRT:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to promulgate regulations without consideration of the effect of such regulations on the competitiveness of American businesses.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It just says that none of the funds made available in this act will be used to promulgate regulations without consideration of the effect that such regulations would have on

the competitiveness of American businesses.

Mr. Chairman, over the last generation, Congress has created barriers to keeping and creating jobs in America. There are at least eight major barriers in which our policies have been preventative of keeping jobs in America. They consist of health care policy that is driving the fastest growth in costs in America, making it more difficult to keep and create jobs. It includes a tax policy that punishes success. It includes litigation costs that result in court costs, lawyer fees and higher liability insurance costs. It includes an energy policy that has prevented exploration, expansion of refinement capability, and new renewable energy resources. It includes trade policy that hasn't been properly enforced. And it has allowed American companies to be targeted by foreign-owned government businesses. It includes an education policy that is not meeting the needs of the next more technological economy. It includes research and development funding that is not focused on the ideas that will move us into a strong position for tomorrow's products in the next economy. And it includes a regulatory policy that slows the growth of our economy by taking an adversarial role which works against those that create and keep jobs in America.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain just one example of how the funding in this bill has been used by government agencies to prevent us from creating and keeping jobs in America.

Creekstone Farms is a small Kansas beef processing plant in my congressional district that has sought permission from the United States Department of Agriculture since early 2004 to voluntarily conduct BSE tests or screening tests on cattle. USDA has repeatedly refused to allow BSE test kit manufacturers to sell the test kits to companies who want to voluntarily test for BSE.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, the American food system is completely safe with many checks and balances built into our production, processing, distribution, and retail system. Mad cow disease has never made it into our markets. In December of 2003, USDA detected the first case of mad cow disease, but that case never made it into our system. It is completely safe. Our food supply is completely safe.

But concerns developed overseas in several of our export markets, specifically in Japan and South Korea. They banned our meat products from their markets. Since then, we have lost over \$4 billion in sales and thousands of jobs, some of them right in Kansas.

South Korea and Japan are looking for more confidence in their meat supply. We believe it is perfectly safe, but they want something to tell their consumers.

Creekstone proposed a screening test on a voluntary basis of each carcass so that they could provide that level of confidence to the consumers in South

Korea and in Japan. But when they went to the United States Department of Agriculture to get permission to do this screening, they were told no. Not only was Creekstone told no, but the company that manufactured these test kits for BSE was told, no, you cannot sell these kits to Creekstone.

Whatever happened to the old adage that the consumer is always right? In America, we have built a strong economy by meeting the needs of the consumers, by opening new markets to a developing level of confidence.

For example, the side air bags in an automobile: an automobile that has side air bags, gives some people more confidence that it is safe and therefore they are willing to spend a little extra money on buying a car with side air bags. But not all cars have side air bags. The Department of Transportation said, yes, it is fine. If you want to meet those customers' needs and they want to pay a little more, then go ahead and voluntarily put side air bags in automobiles.

Unlike the Department of Transportation, USDA has said that you cannot use this type of voluntarily based marketing to meet consumers needs, so they have completely shut off this area of letting us develop this new market, and the consumers in South Korea and Japan still don't have enough confidence to buy American beef. We have lost that market now to Australia and New Zealand, and it is going to be difficult for us to gain it back.

Creekstone has an idea to regain this market, but it is the government-regulation bureaucracy that is preventing us from opening that market and keeping and creating jobs in America.

Mr. Chairman, this is just one example of how regulations can keep us from expanding and preparing for the next economy. Other nations are preparing for the next economy, but we are not.

Mr. Chairman, I realize this is authorization on an appropriations bill and it is my intent to ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment, but I will not withdraw from the fight of creating a strong economy for tomorrow's future.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully withdraw this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

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

SEC. _____. (a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "Livestock Identification and Marketing Opportunities Act".

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) For purposes of animal health investigation and surveillance, there needs to be

an identification system that can trace animals from the time of first movement of the animal from its original premise to the time of slaughter of the animal in less than 48 hours.

(2) The beef industry estimates that the United States cattle industry lost approximately \$3,000,000,000 in export value on beef, beef variety meats, hides, and tallow during the 12 months after a December 2003 diagnosis in the United States of bovine spongiform encephalopathy. A livestock identification system may have prevented some of this loss.

(3) In order to be as efficient as possible, the livestock identification system needs to be automated and electronic with participants using compatible technologies.

(4) The livestock identification system needs to be flexible enough to adapt to changes in technology and to the demands of the industry and the markets.

(5) The best technology available should be used for the livestock identification system while still allowing for registration into the system for livestock owners who are economically disadvantaged.

(6) Confidentiality of information on animal movements, sales, and ownership is necessary to ensure that livestock owners have the confidence to comply with and fully participate in the livestock identification system.

(7) Besides animal disease surveillance, the livestock identification system should provide a commercial information exchange infrastructure that would allow for enhanced marketing opportunities.

(c) LIVESTOCK IDENTIFICATION BOARD.—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established a board to be known as the “Livestock Identification Board”.

(2) **DUTIES.**—The duties of the Board shall be to—

(A) establish and maintain an electronic livestock identification system that—

(i) is capable of tracing all livestock in the United States from the time of first movement of the livestock from its original premise to the time of slaughter of such livestock in less than 48 hours;

(ii) tracks all relevant information about the livestock, including—

(I) the livestock identification number or the group or lot identification number for the livestock, as applicable;

(II) the date the livestock identification number or the group or lot identification number was assigned;

(III) the premise identification number;

(IV) the species of the livestock;

(V) the date of birth of the livestock, to the extent possible;

(VI) the sex of the livestock;

(VII) any other information the Board considers appropriate for animal disease surveillance; and

(VIII) any other information that the person who owns or controls the livestock voluntarily submits to the Board;

(B) maintain information obtained through the livestock identification system in a centralized data system; and

(C) determine the official identification technology to be used to track animals under the livestock identification system.

(3) **POWERS.**—The Board may—

(A) prescribe and collect fees to recover the costs of the livestock identification system; and

(B) establish and maintain a grant program to assist persons with fulfilling the requirements of the livestock identification system.

(4) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) **VOTING MEMBERS.**—The Board shall be composed of 7 voting members appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation

with the Chair and ranking minority member of the relevant congressional committees, of whom—

(i) 1 member shall be a representative of cattle owners;

(ii) 1 member shall be a representative of swine owners;

(iii) 1 member shall be a representative of sheep and goat owners;

(iv) 1 member shall be a representative of poultry owners;

(v) 1 member shall be a representative of livestock auction market operators;

(vi) 1 member shall be a representative of meat processors; and

(vii) 1 member shall be a person actively engaged in the livestock industry.

(B) **NON-VOTING MEMBERS.**—The Board shall include 2 non-voting members appointed by the Secretary, in consultation with the Chair and ranking minority member of the relevant congressional committees, of whom—

(i) 1 member shall be a representative of the Department of Agriculture; and

(ii) 1 member shall be a representative of State or tribal veterinarians or State or tribal agriculture agencies.

(C) TERMS.—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Each member shall be appointed for a term of 3 years, except as provided by clauses (ii) and (iii).

(ii) **TERMS OF INITIAL APPOINTEES.**—As designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment, of the voting members first appointed—

(I) the members appointed under clauses (ii), (iv), and (v) of subparagraph (A) shall be appointed for a term of 2 years; and

(II) the members appointed under subparagraphs (iii) and (vii) of subparagraph (A) shall be appointed for a term of 1 year.

(iii) **VACANCIES.**—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the member's predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term. A member may serve after the expiration of that member's term until a successor has taken office. A vacancy in the Board shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(D) **CHAIRPERSON.**—The Chairperson of the Board shall be elected by its members.

(E) **APPOINTMENT.**—The Secretary shall appoint all members of the Board not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this section.

(5) MEETINGS.—

(A) **INITIAL MEETING.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Board shall hold its initial meeting.

(B) **SUBSEQUENT MEETINGS.**—The Board shall meet at the call of the Chairperson.

(6) **QUORUM.**—4 voting members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

(7) **PAY.**—Members of the Board shall serve without compensation.

(8) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—Each member of the Board shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(9) **STAFF.**—The Board may appoint and fix the pay of personnel as the Board considers appropriate.

(10) **CONTRACTS.**—The Board may contract with or compensate any persons for goods or services.

(11) **RULES AND REGULATIONS.**—The Board may issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(12) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Board shall implement the livestock identification system es-

tablished pursuant to this section not later than December 31, 2008.

(B) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, and quarterly thereafter until December 31, 2010, the Board shall submit to the Secretary of Agriculture and the relevant congressional committees a report on the status of the implementation of the livestock identification system, including—

(i) for each species subject to the system, the number of animals or groups of animals tracked by the system; and

(ii) the percentage of each animal species subject to the livestock identification system that are tracked by the system, which shall be determined by dividing the number submitted under clause (i) for a species by the total number of animals of such species in the United States.

(d) **PREMISE IDENTIFICATIONS.**—Not later than nine months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish a premise identification system for all premises in the United States. The premise identification data shall be made available to the Board and shall include—

(1) a premise identification number;

(2) the name of the entity that owns or controls the premise;

(3) contact information for the premise, including a person, address, and phone number;

(4) the type of operation at the premise; and

(5) the date the premise number was assigned.

(e) **ENFORCEMENT; FIRST ENTRY INTO COMMERCE.**—Subject to subsection (f)(2), the Secretary of Agriculture shall verify that each animal, or group of animals, where applicable, subject to the livestock identification system established pursuant to subsection (c) is properly identified upon first entry of the animal into commerce. Any animal or group of animals that the Secretary determines is not properly identified shall be identified using the official identification technology before entering commerce.

(f) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION FOR OTHER ANIMAL SPECIES.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The owner of an animal or group of animals, where applicable, that is not subject to the livestock identification system established pursuant to subsection (c) may voluntarily subject such animal or group of animals to tracking by such livestock identification system.

(2) **ENFORCEMENT EXEMPTION.**—The voluntary tracking of such animal or group of animals shall not make the animal or group of animals subject to the enforcement actions of the Secretary under subsection (e).

(g) RELEASE OF LIVESTOCK IDENTIFICATION NUMBERING INFORMATION.—

(1) **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.**—Information obtained through the livestock identification system established pursuant to subsection (c) or the premise identification system established pursuant to subsection (d) is exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) **CHARACTER OF LIVESTOCK IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM INFORMATION.**—Except as provided in paragraphs (3) and (4), information obtained through the livestock identification system or the premise identification system—

(A) may not be released;

(B) shall not be considered information in the public domain; and

(C) shall be considered commercial information that is privileged and confidential.

(3) **LIMITED RELEASE OF INFORMATION AUTHORIZED.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the Board may release information obtained through the livestock identification system or the premise identification system (other

than information voluntarily submitted pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(A)(ii)(VIII)) regarding particular livestock if—

(A) a disease or pest poses a significant threat to the livestock that the information involves;

(B) the release of the information is related to actions the Board may take under this section; and

(C) the person obtaining the information needs the information for reasons consistent with the public health and public safety purposes of the livestock identification system, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) LIMITED RELEASE OF INFORMATION REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the Board shall promptly release information obtained through the livestock identification system or the premise identification system (other than information voluntarily submitted pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(A)(ii)(VIII)) regarding particular livestock—

(i) to the person who owns or controls the livestock, if the person requests such information;

(ii) to the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of animal disease surveillance;

(iii) to a State or tribal veterinarian or a State or tribal agriculture agency for the purpose of animal disease surveillance;

(iv) to the Attorney General for the purpose of investigation or prosecution of a criminal act;

(v) to the Secretary of Homeland Security for the purpose of national security;

(vi) to the Secretary of Health and Human Services for the purpose of protection of public health; and

(vii) to the government of a foreign country, if release of the information is necessary to trace livestock threatened by disease or pest, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) INFORMATION VOLUNTARILY SUBMITTED.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), on the request of a person who owns or controls livestock, the Board shall release information voluntarily submitted to the Board pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(A)(ii)(VIII) regarding such livestock to such person or to another person.

(5) CONFLICT OF LAW.—If the information disclosure limitations or requirements of this subsection conflict with information disclosure limitations or requirements of a State law and such conflict involves interstate or international commerce, this subsection shall take precedence over the State law.

(h) REPORT ON IMPACT OF LIVESTOCK IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on a livestock identification system, including—

(1) the lessons learned and the effectiveness of the animal identification system pilot programs funded in fiscal year 2005;

(2) an analysis of the economic impact of a livestock identification system on the livestock industry; and

(3) the expected cost of implementing a livestock identification system.

(i) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (f) of section 282 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1638a) is amended—

(1) by striking “CERTIFICATION OF ORIGIN.” and all that follows through “To certify the country of origin” and inserting “CERTIFICATION OF ORIGIN; EXISTING CERTIFI-

CATION PROGRAMS.—To certify the country of origin”; and

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (E) as paragraphs (1) through (5), respectively.

(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “Board” means the Livestock Identification Board established under subsection (c)(1).

(2) The term “livestock” means cattle, swine, sheep, goats, and poultry.

(3) The term “premise” means a location that holds, manages, or boards animals.

(4) The term “relevant congressional committees” means the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(5) The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$33,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2009.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa for 5 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer today is an amendment that is made up of an original bill that I drafted as a stand-alone bill actually to establish a livestock identification plan. It is called the LIMO Act, the Livestock Identification and Market Opportunities Act.

We have heard debate here on the gentleman from Texas' amendment, and it is recognized I believe throughout the industry, certainly the industry in Iowa and the industry across the country that I have had the opportunity to interrelate with, that we must go to a livestock identification plan at some point.

If we are going to make a change, the quicker the better. We are losing market share in Asia right now because we are not able to identify our livestock. I took the initiative to travel to different locations on the globe to inspect their livestock identification systems, including some of the locations in Europe, including Canada and especially Australia, where I tracked their livestock from birth to slaughter and each one of those stops that they have there. They were very helpful and cooperative.

As I looked at all the models that were out there and worked with our major commodities groups that we have here in this country and sat down and sorted through the differences, we produced this bill that I think stands alone as the single most carefully thought-out crafted and customized piece of livestock identification that has been presented to this Congress.

It recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota's contribution for protection of the Freedom of Information Act

and a number of other interests and points that needed to be incorporated into this legislation.

But what it does is it establishes a livestock identification board and keeps the control of the data within the hands of the producers. This is a quasi-private sector entity that will be established. It establishes a board that is made up of seven members, voting members. There is one each representing the beef industry, one for swine, one for poultry, which includes chicken and turkeys, one for sheep and goats together, and also a voting position that would be a member-at-large as well as a representative from the meat processors and another representative from the livestock auctioneers. Those would be the voting members of the board.

Also on the board would be two ex-officios that would be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, as would the entire board. Those ex-officios would be one from USDA, our Secretary of Agriculture's appointment, and one from the State veterinarians or Tribal veterinarians organizations. So we have a producer-driven consortium that runs this, and they will be the controllers of the data.

We set up the standards by which the data would be available to the Secretary of Agriculture in the event of the necessity to eradicate disease and give Freedom of Information Act protection.

So this process we have protects the producers from having their data within the control of the USDA; it makes it within the click of a mouse of the Secretary of Agriculture if there is a disease that needs to be eradicated. So we find the best of both worlds.

But the firewall is there. The Secretary can only access the data that is necessary for eradication, and the balance of the data that would be entered into this program would be data that would be voluntarily submitted then by the producers, and they could then use this data for market opportunity, for breeding purposes, for marketing purposes, and particularly our purebred breeders will be able to utilize it.

This is an idea whose time has come. It is carefully well thought out, and this is the opportunity presented to this Congress for evaluation by the Members.

I recognize that it is policy that would be amended on to an appropriations bill, and I recognize the gentleman's point of order; but I hope that this Congress recognizes the necessity to take a careful look at this well-thought-out livestock identification plan that gives Freedom of Information Act protection.

It is driven by the membership, by the producers. They will be able to control their own data, and they will also control then the input into that data. We will let them apply some fees, and the fees then can go to fund the operation of the management of the data,

and I am convinced it will be far cheaper than what will be done by the agency.

But the important part is this: it respects the contributions made by the other entities out there. The cattle industry, for example, the swine industry, they have been out there doing their contributions from a volunteer perspective.

Envision, if you will, a house with many rooms and different electricians coming into each room, wiring the lights and hanging the lights, but not wiring every room and not hanging lights in every room, just some rooms, the room for beef, the room for pork; but we don't have a junction box, we don't have a way to bring the power in.

This bill is the junction box in that house. It brings the power in that lights up all the work that has been done by the other entities, including the USDA, and it wires the rooms that haven't been wired to this point, such as sheep and goats, and it allows for group identification.

That is pretty much the quick once-over of the livestock identification bill, the LIMO Act, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, recognizing the point of order that has been pointed out by the chairman, I would respectfully ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman's amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

□ 1545

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. CHABOT:
At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 203 of the Agriculture Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623) or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who carry out a market program under such section.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. Chairman, our national debt is now \$8.3 trillion. Each day we add another \$1.7 billion to it. Each American's share is about \$28,000. Think about that. In order for the United States to be debt free, every American, all 299 million of us, would have to write a check for about \$28,000. Each year the Department of Agriculture writes checks underwritten by the American taxpayer to foot the bill for the Market Access Program, MAP, a

program that pays industry associations, cooperatives and State and regional trade groups to market their wares overseas.

Now, should these groups market these wares overseas? Absolutely. We want them to be successful. We want them to create jobs. But they ought to do it on their dime, not on the dime of the American taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, we have spent more than a billion tax dollars on a program with dubious economic benefits. We cannot even be sure that these tax dollars are not simply saving those groups money that they would have spent on overseas marketing anyway.

So who is receiving those tax dollars? The National Potato Research and Promotion Board has received well over \$1 million. The Raisin Administrative Committee has received nearly \$3 million, and a group called Asparagus USA has received hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of funding. That is a lot of asparagus.

It is also the type of wasteful spending that leads to big deficits and higher taxes. Mr. Chairman, in these difficult budget times, if we cannot cut a program like MAP, I think we are in serious trouble.

While MAP at a cost of a couple hundred million dollars annually might by some be just considered a blip in a \$2.7 trillion budget, the cost of these programs add up, and the cumulative effect of programs like MAP is the reason that we have this \$8.3 trillion debt.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward. It would simply prohibit the Agriculture Department from funding the MAP Program. It is supported by groups like the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, and Taxpayers for Common Sense, to name a few. It is a commonsense amendment, Mr. Chairman.

We are spending too much money, and it is time to start cutting wasteful spending program by program and restore some fiscal sanity to this House.

I urge my colleagues to cast a vote for taxpayers and support this amendment.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly applaud all of the efforts of Mr. CHABOT for cutting spending and so forth. And yet I find myself on the opposite side with him on this. The reason is that Tom Friedman has written a very famous book right now called, *The World is Flat*. And the world is flat, and it is flat because we are in a global economy, where a farmer in the Philippines or in Indonesia or in Russia can compete with a farmer from Ohio or Georgia, just as easy as if he was in the same country.

What the MAP program does is it helps sell our goods overseas. Two or three hours ago when we opened up this bill, I said that one of our farmers' big challenges right now is foreign subsidies competing against American ag products. Well, quite often, the World Trade Organization seems to allow foreign farmers to have subsidies but not American farmers.

Mr. Chairman, this is one tool that helps us combat that. I would point out that the ag exports at this point are over \$64 billion, the highest level in history. And one reason is this, is because the Market Access Program has shown our farmers, whether you are growing Vidalia onions or peanuts or strawberries, how to sell your goods overseas.

And for every \$1 billion in sales overseas, there is about 16,000 domestic jobs that are created. In fiscal year 2005, almost 1 million Americans had jobs that depend on U.S. American agricultural exports. MAP is an integral part of that program. And yet it is not just for farmers alone, here, come get your check. They have to contribute up to 50 percent of the program's cost. And since 1992, the MAP participants have increased their contributions from 30 percent to 166 percent.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Chabot Amendment.

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, can I ask how much time we have?

The CHAIRMAN. Each side has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. CHABOT to limit funding to the Market Access Program. This very important program helps boost U.S. agricultural exports.

U.S. agricultural exports are expected to be \$64.5 billion in 2006, resulting in a trade surplus of more than \$1 billion. Just a year ago, this trade surplus was significantly higher, but with increased subsidized foreign competition, all U.S. economic sectors have seen a steady increase in trade deficits.

Agriculture is still one of the few sectors of the American economy to enjoy a trade surplus, and it is programs such as MAP that enable this. Exports also provide needed jobs throughout the U.S. economy and generate economic activity in the nonfarm economy.

Nearly every State exports agricultural commodities. Agricultural exports in 2001 generated an estimated 912,000 full-time civilian jobs, including 461,000 jobs in the nonfarm sector. MAP helps the U.S. meet heavily subsidized foreign competition.

Mr. Chairman, the European Union spent more than \$3.25 billion in 2003 on agricultural export subsidies, compared to about \$30 million by the U.S. The EU and other foreign competitors are moving aggressively in providing other forms of assistance to maintain and expand their share of the world market at the expense of U.S. farmers and ranchers.

In recent years, they have devoted approximately \$1.2 billion for market development and related activities. Without U.S. policies and programs to counter such subsidized competition, American farmers and ranchers will be at a substantial disadvantage.

MAP is specifically targeted to help small businesses, farmer cooperatives and trade associations to meet this subsidized foreign competition. It is not a subsidy to big business as some would want you to believe; in fact, it represents a successful public-private partnership.

MAP is administered on a cost-share basis by the U.S. Department of Agriculture with farmers, ranchers and other participants required to contribute up to 50 percent toward the program. In fact, since 1992, for every dollar contributed by Federal funding, MAP participants have increased their contributions from 30 percent to 166 percent.

According to the USDA, every Federal dollar invested has resulted in \$16 in additional U.S. agricultural exports.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I urge my colleagues to vote against this misguided amendment. MAP helps U.S. agricultural exports meet foreign competition, improves U.S. trade, strengthens farm income and protects American jobs.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Chabot amendment. I know that its passage is very unlikely, but this is the type of thing that a conservative Congress should be doing. In fact, the Citizens Against Government Waste says, facing a massive Federal deficit, there is no reason taxpayers should be underwriting the advertising campaigns of multimillion dollar corporations.

Cutting funding for these programs would save precious taxpayer dollars and provide a dose of common sense to our agricultural programs.

In addition to that, the National Taxpayers Union says, this program is "an egregious example of Congress's unlimited appetite for special interest funding." Mr. CHABOT has already mentioned the \$8.3 trillion national debt. What is even worse is that the Congressional Budget Office says we are going to add \$350 to \$400 billion each of the next 10 or 11 years to that debt.

If we cannot do this, then we cannot call ourselves conservatives.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to read another portion of the National

Taxpayers Union letter. They say that the National Taxpayers Union and its members strongly favor free trade and the private efforts of American businesses that engage in both export and import operations.

However, it is absurd to force overburdened taxpayers to subsidize commodity producers as diverse as the Cherry Marketing Institute and the Mohair Council of America in their strategies to market their products overseas.

In fact, taxpayer subsidized trade is not really free trade at all. The more U.S. taxpayers are forced to support economically dubious programs, such as the MAP, the less credibility our Nation has in adhering to free trade principles. One would think that with the Federal deficits looming far into the future, and government spending out of control, Congress would take swift action to abolish some of the most wasteful and unnecessary Federal programs.

Although MAP is indeed relatively small when compared with other massive bureaucracies found in Washington, the elimination of smaller programs will hopefully present Congress with an opportunity to begin trimming corporate welfare and pork barrel spending from the Federal budget.

Mr. Chairman, again, I just want to emphasize in concluding, we want these organizations to advertise overseas. We want them to be successful. We want them to create jobs, but they need to do it on their money and not on the taxpayer's money.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GORDON

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORDON:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. 753. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in contravention of the Federal buildings performance and reporting requirements of Executive Order 13123, the National Energy Conservation Policy Act, and the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this amendment is going to be accepted.

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

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. We would be happy to accept the amendment. If the gentleman would like to submit his remarks for the RECORD, we can vote on this and move on, again with favorable support for the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I understand the message.

Despite the high cost of energy and existing laws enforcing conservation, Federal agencies still do not give energy efficiency a priority and continually fall short of meeting their requirements.

Our estimates are that the Federal Government wasted almost half a billion dollars in the last 2 years by not meeting its requirements—or roughly equivalent to 8,200 barrels of oil every day—a total of 6 million barrels over the last 2 years.

This happens because the laws already on the books are not taken seriously enough. The National Energy Conservation Policy Act (NECPA), last year's Energy Bill (EPACT), and a related Executive Order all clearly state that agencies shall meet aggressive but reasonable energy efficiency goals and standards and to prepare reports to the Department of Energy, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Congress and on the agencies' performance. Yet the Federal Regulations that govern new building construction are 17 years out of date and the reports reach the Congress months or years after the data is available.

The amendment I am offering today would increase the incentive for agencies receiving appropriations under the Agriculture Appropriations bill to comply with the law by tying Federal buildings performance to appropriations.

This amendment simply states that none of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in contravention of Federal buildings performance requirements. Therefore, agencies must adhere to existing law when constructing, leasing or refurbishing any building with money appropriated under this act.

These relatively simple steps in designing new buildings in conformance with current law, measuring building performance, and procurement of energy efficient products will contribute to substantial energy savings in the Federal sector—lessons that have already been learned outside the Federal Government.

Increased energy conservation in the Federal sector means cleaner air, cleaner water, and in a time of soaring energy costs, keeping money in taxpayers pockets.

How can we expect consumers and industry to make sacrifices and commit to energy conservation when the Federal Government fails to make it a priority for itself?

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARTER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER:

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

SEC. 7. Not more than \$3,600,000 of the funds made available in this Act under section 522(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(e)) may be used for program compliance integrity under section 515 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1515).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, it is very seldom that we get good news around here, but the purpose of this amendment is the continuation of a program that is a success.

Tarleton State University has put together a data mining program in which they have been examining the operations of the crop insurance program. And they have to date saved this country \$450 million in waste, fraud and abuse from the crop insurance program. And it is estimated that they have at least prevented the same.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good program that returns 22 to 1 on its expenditures.

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

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

Mr. BONILLA. Let me just first compliment the gentleman from Texas for his hard work on this issue. This school should erect a statue in his honor for all of the effort that he has put in this tirelessly for the last few weeks.

The gentleman is correct. This has been a good program in years past, but it was not an authorized program this time around. And we have tried to work with the gentleman to try to figure out a solution to this.

Mr. Chairman, I am telling the gentleman that we would be happy to accept the amendment. I know that it has been an ordeal to get the language just right so we could move forward with this issue. I want to let the gentleman know that we would be happy to continue to work with him on this.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the ranking member, also, for working with me on this.

□ 1600

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I rise in support of this amendment. As I understand, it is a place holder for the opportunity for us to further discuss and refine the opportunity to continue funding of data mining.

I chair the subcommittee that has responsibility for crop insurance, and this to me is one of the most successful programs in weeding out and finding fraud and abuse. I encourage the con-

ferees. I was glad to hear the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BONILLA's remarks, as we try to find an opportunity to make certain this program continues. As a member of the authorizing committee, I look forward to working with you to see that the necessary authorization occurs. It is an awfully important program and one that we will hold a hearing on in the future in hopes that we can expand this opportunity to other areas of the Department's operations. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the chairman for his support and also Mr. GOODLATTE, the chairman of the committee, has expressed his support of this program also. It is the future of looking at how we do government, and I am excited to be able to be going forward on this.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 301 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13211).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, we have worked on this language, and I have corrected some problems we had with it. And we are happy to accept the language if the gentleman will accept our support for this.

Mr. ENGEL. I certainly will, and I will submit my statement for the RECORD.

Let me say that what we are trying to do here is to move America off its addiction to foreign oil by requiring USDA to abide by the law and at least three-quarters of the fleets that they purchase will have to be fuel-flexible cars, and I am delighted that you will go along with this.

We rarely have an opportunity to meet the needs of our farmers while also directly meeting the needs of our national security. But we do today.

President Bush was right to say we are addicted to oil. But now we in Congress need to take action. We need bold action to end this addiction. We need ethanol—not as an additive but as a full fledged alternative.

And though I am loath to use this metaphor during the debate on the Agriculture bill, we have a chicken and the egg problem with ethanol. Should we put more ethanol on the market and hope people buy cars that can use it or have more cars on the market and hope people will turn to ethanol?

I believe we need to get more flexible fuel vehicle on the road. And, I believe we should use the purchasing power of the federal government to pursue this.

Now some may not like the federal government interfering in markets. To this I would respond, this is about national security and that is the federal government's responsibility. And with the war on terror, we must look at all options—not just putting our military overseas but what we can do right here at home.

Some might not like the federal government interfering with consumer's choices. To this I would respond that the U.S. government is the largest consumer of goods and services on the planet. And to meet our responsibility to protect the American people, we have to take this step toward weaning ourselves from foreign oil.

Furthermore, Congress has already spoken on this issue—however the Administration—both Democratic and Republicans Administrations—have failed to comply.

In 1992 the Congress passed the Energy Policy Act and in section 303 of that law, Congress set out targets for the fleet of federal motor vehicles to be alternative fuel vehicles. By 1999, 75 percent of vehicles purchased or leased were supposed to be Alternative Fuel. We aren't even close.

According the GSA's Federal Fleet Report for FY2005 only 26 percent of new vehicles acquired were AFV.

And only 15 percent of the whole existing federal fleet is AFV.

In 2005, the Department of Agriculture had 41,154 cars—and only 3,267 were E-85 capable. In fact, 85 percent of the Ag Department's fleet is still gasoline only. Of the 4,108 vehicles purchased by the Department of Agriculture in FY2005 77 percent were gasoline only.

The number of flex fuel cars on the road today is less than 8 million out of more than 130 million on the road today.

We must do better than that if we are going to get the gas stations to start providing E-85 as an alternative fuel.

Of the 175,000 "fuel stations;" nation wide, only about 700 have E85 available.

And though there are more than 150,000 flex fuel cars in New York there is not one station that sells E85 in New York.

Let's take this first step and use the federal government's purchasing power to make alternative fuels a reality.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. HEFLEY: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$178,120,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will take the admonition of Mr. BONILLA and Mr. OBEY that we are going to be here way into the night if everybody takes all their time, and so I will not do that. I want the chairman to know I have 8 pages of scintillating argument here; but since I do not think it is going to change your mind anyway, let me just say that this is the amendment that you are familiar with that would cut 1 percent of the discretionary funding in the bill. It amounts to \$178 million, which represents one penny off every dollar.

Mr. Chairman, I rise again today to offer an amendment to cut the level of discretionary funding in this appropriations bill by 1 percent. This amount equals \$178.12 million dollars which represents only one penny off of every dollar.

As most members are aware, I have offered a series of similar amendments to several appropriations bills. I think it is important to state the affect these amendments would have on the deficit if they would be accepted on all spending bills.

We have to draw a line somewhere. The budget we have for next year is simply too large. We can do something about the deficit right now.

By voting for my amendment you are stating that American tax payers should not have to pay higher taxes in the future because we couldn't control our spending today.

Some of the projects in this FY 07 Agriculture Appropriations bill include over \$4 million for Shrimp aquiculture research in 7 states. The USDA even testified in 2005 that this project's objectives of developing a sustainable domestic shrimp farming industry in the United States were met and completed in 1987. If the USDA concluded that the project's objectives were met 18 years before, why has Congress continued to fund this program at this level?

We also fund over \$6.4 million for wood utilization and we've paid nearly \$86 million on this program since 1985, \$2.5 million for cotton research in Texas designed for in part, to expand the demand for cotton research in West Texas, almost \$2 million to research red imported fire ants in Mississippi, as well as \$878,000 for catfish genome research in Alabama.

These are just a few examples of the funding included in these appropriations bills.

The 07 Agriculture appropriations bill still provides nearly \$17.8 billion in official discretionary spending, which represents over a \$1 billion increase from the previous year and almost \$500 million over the President's request. The authorizing and appropriating committees successfully eliminated a considerable amount of mandatory spending with help from the Deficit Reduction Act, but appropriators still shifted another \$650 million from manda-

tory to discretionary spending which distorts some of the numbers. Last year the discretionary funds in this bill were essentially flat funded, but mandatory spending rose exponentially. We seem to be playing hot potato with these funds by trading off every year.

Our budget should be no different from the taxpayers' budgets at home. When we have less money, we should spend less money. It really is that simple.

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

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

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

Mr. BONILLA. I will be very brief.

The gentleman is sincere in his effort in bringing this amendment forward year after year after year, and the majority of House opposes it year after year after year; and once again we oppose it today.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATHAM

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LATHAM:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. 7 _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay salaries and expenses of personnel who implement or administer section 741 of this Act or section 508(e)(3) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)(3)) or any regulation, bulletin, policy, or agency guidance issued pursuant to such section for the 2007 and the 2008 reinsurance years, except that funds are available to administer such section for policies for those producers who, before the date of the enactment of this Act, had in effect a crop year 2006 crop insurance policy from a company eligible for the opportunity to offer a premium reduction under such section for the 2006 reinsurance year.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that has to do with crop insurance. As we all know last year in

the ag appropriations bill there was an amendment in that that prohibited funding to do audits of companies that offer the premium reduction program. And that language, which I will read, says: "This amendment would provide time for an independent analysis of the program and the regulatory resources required by USDA to satisfy the statutory requirements. It would give the authorizing committees time to evaluate the premium discounting program and make proper adjustments in the law before it has expanded."

Folks, here we are again. We have a prohibition extending another year in this bill as far as funding. And what this does is stop companies from offering a reduced premium on their crop insurance to farmers.

I understand that there are folks who do not like this program. There have been concerns raised about the way it has been implemented, about practices that some companies have maybe used in selling the product.

In the bill last year when we put the prohibition or the limitation of funding in, that was to give USDA and the authorizing committee time to evaluate it. We have written to USDA. They have responded that they cannot find any problems with the program, and that is their position. There were concerns earlier and those concerns have been met.

In the limitation last year, the authorizing committee was asked to make recommendations to change the program if there were problems. That has not happened.

Mr. Chairman, I am a former insurance agent. I used to sell crop insurance. There is no industry that I like or love any more than this industry. And so it is very difficult for me to look at this and be totally objective. But I honestly believe that this Congress has got to look at the benefit of the producers. I will not in any way, shape or form harm the crop insurance industry. That is the last thing that we can do here because this is a way of farmers managing their risk that they have on their farms, and we have got to make sure that they have those policies available for them to cover their losses.

Having said that, the authorizing committee has not given a recommendation. I think that we have to look at what the authorizing committee on the House side and the other body have to say on this. We will have an opportunity in conference to takes this issue on; and if I could engage the chairman, Mr. Chairman, I would offer to at this time withdraw this amendment if, in fact, I could get your commitment that we would, in fact, in a realistic basis address this issue to make sure that we do the right thing for our producers.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BONILLA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman knows absolutely we will continue to

□ 1615

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am here to confess my reading incomprehension. I have listened to many of my conservative friends talk about the wonders of the free market, of the importance of letting the consumers make their best choices, of keeping government out of economic activity, of the virtues of free trade, but then I look at various agricultural programs like this one. Now, it violates every principle of free market economics known to man and two or three not yet discovered.

So I have been forced to conclude that in all of those great free market texts by Ludwig von Mises, Friedrich Hayek and all the others that there is a footnote that says, by the way, none of this applies to agriculture. Now, it may be written in high German, and that may be why I have not been able to discern it, but there is no greater contrast in America today than between the free enterprise rhetoric of so many conservatives and the statist, subsidized, inflationary, protectionist, anti-consumer agricultural policies, and this is one of them.

In particular, I have listened to people, and some of us have said let us protect workers and the environment in trade; let us not have unrestricted free trade; but let us have trade that respects worker rights and environmental rights. And we have been excoriated for our lack of concern for poor countries.

There is no greater obstacle, as it is now clear in the Doha round, to the completion of a comprehensive trade policy than the American agricultural policy, with one exception, European agricultural policy, which is much worse and just as phony.

Sugar is an example. This program is an interference with the legitimate efforts at economic self-help in many foreign nations.

So I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Oregon. Here is a chance for some of my free-enterprise-professing friends to get honest with themselves, and now maybe we will see some born-again free enterprisers in the agricultural field.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), ranking member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just a couple of comments here. Whatever you want to say about this, this program does not cost the taxpayers any money. There has been no cost for the last number of years, and I guess you could make the argument

try to work with the gentleman. I know we have had some differences on this issue, but no one has worked harder on this issue in the last few weeks and months than the gentleman from Iowa.

I have said to the gentleman privately, and I will now say publicly, that the people in Iowa, not just in the gentleman's district, that the people in the State should canonize the gentleman, Mr. LATHAM, for his hard work on a long list of issues that he has worked on in this subcommittee for many years now.

There are some years as the gentleman knows where he consistently is more successful on a long list of issues that is about twice as long. I am the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Iowa usually gets double of his requests in the bill. That is how hard he works, and that is how effective he is. So whether you win or lose on this issue in the end, I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that the people on both sides of this issue should realize that you doing everything possible and we certainly will continue to work with the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman very much. It would be my hope and ambition at this point to bring all the parties together, to finally bring some type of resolution to it, to have a fair and honest discussion with no personal attacks, things like that, that unfortunately we have seen throughout some of this debate on the issue.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 Offered by Mr. BLUMENAUER:

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

SEC. 7. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who make loans available under section 156 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272) to processors of domestically grown sugarcane at a rate in excess of 17 cents per pound for raw cane sugar or to processors of domestically grown sugar beets at a rate in excess of 21.6 cents per pound for refined beet sugar.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 90 second.

Mr. Chairman, the United States sugar program is one of the most archaic and misguided Federal policies

that we have. It artificially raises the prices of sugar. It harms U.S. customers and consumers, and prevents developing nations from competing in the global market place.

One of the deep concerns I have is that people are circulating here with a straight face the assertion that this is a no-cost program. Nothing could be further from the truth. It drives up the price for American consumers each year, upwards of \$2 billion a year. It undercuts industries that use sugar as a means of production like the confectionery industry. And it is part of an enormous environmental damage, like the everglades, where we are spending \$7.5 billion in clean-up.

In the course of the debate this afternoon, we will have opportunities for people to focus on the need to eliminate this program. This amendment is a small step towards sanity, making a 6 percent reduction in the guaranteed price if it is adopted.

I strongly urge that my colleagues look at the facts surrounding this, look at what is going to be good for the consumer, for the environment, for the taxpayer, and taking a step toward a rational agriculture policy.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Blumenauer amendment which calls for reductions of the loan rates established in the 2002 farm bill for both refined beet sugar and raw cane sugar.

Mr. Chairman, farmers have crafted their business plans based on the assurances of the 2002 farm bill. Farmers have invested time and money in that crop often with capital borrowed from the bank. It is unfair now to reduce the returns that farmers counted on when planning, financing, and planting that crop.

This debate concerning the sugar program is an important one. However, it is a debate that my committee will conduct at the appropriate time during the authorization of the new farm bill. As chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, I have already held farm bill field hearings this year and will be holding additional farm bill hearings this summer and fall.

During this process, and not when we are on the floor debating an appropriations bill, is the correct time for discussing and making possible changes to U.S. sugar policy.

Mr. Chairman, in my capacity as chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, it is my responsibility to look at all of agriculture and consider what is best for the United States and our farmers and ranchers. The policy that was put in place by the 2002 farm bill must remain intact. I stand by this commitment to farmers and ranchers and urge a "no" vote on the Blumenauer-Flake amendment.

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

that it maybe has some impact on the prices consumers pay, but I would just like to read to the gentleman on the other side of this what the consumers think about this.

We just did a poll on this, and they were asked, how concerned are you about sugar prices? Thirty-three percent are concerned; 64 percent are not concerned.

They were asked: Still thinking of the sugar price in 2005, the average price is 43 cents. The average price in 1990 was 43 cents. In 1980, it was 43 cents. So what do you think about this? Twenty-seven percent said it was expensive; 69 percent said it is not expensive.

How important do you think it is for the United States to be able to produce food domestically instead of with foreigners? The previous gentleman was talking about the Europeans. Right now, if we got rid of the sugar program, we would end up importing sugar from Europe which has a price 50 percent higher than the price in the United States. So, when asked about that, the consumers, these are consumers, said that 93 percent think it is important we produce it here in the United States; 6 percent think it is not important.

So you vote on the line with the American consumers, and they are not concerned about this. I tell you who is concerned about this is the people that use sugar in their candy bars and other kinds of things, and I will guarantee you we can cut the price of sugar in half or to a quarter what it is now, and I will guarantee you the price of a Hershey bar will not change in the grocery store. We have seen that over the years.

So this is a good program. We are bringing in 1.5 million tons of sugar that we do not need in this country. Mr. POMEROY's and my farmers, in North Dakota and Minnesota, could produce all that sugar right here in the United States, but we bring it in, and we help 41 countries, most of them poor countries.

This is a program that has worked. It has been consistent. It makes sense. It does not cost the taxpayers any money. The consumers in the United States support it, and we should defeat this amendment and continue this program going and have any discussion that we are going to have in the farm bill next year.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

I would like to respond to Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts about whether or not Republicans are free market oriented or not. I would like to respond, but I cannot. I honestly have no response to that. I honestly cannot understand how we, as Republicans, can pretend to be in favor of free market economics and

still support this kind of program. I do not know how long we can do it and still say that we are free market oriented.

I think it was said best by former Senator Phil Gramm a while ago when he was asked about farm policy and these types of subsidies. He said our farm policy would make a Russian commissar puke. I do not know how to improve on that. You just look at these programs and say, how can we do this year after year after year?

It is said that this does not cost anything, that this is a no-cost program. Well, the sugar program and its price supports, its import quotas and production allotments is not no-cost.

According to the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, monetary transfers to producers from consumers and taxpayers as a result of government policy amounted to over half their gross receipts in 2002-2004. Half of the gross receipts from these sugar producers came from either consumers or taxpayers because of government policy regulating the price.

In the year 2000, a GAO study estimated the cost to consumers in 1998 was \$1.9 billion. No cost? It is nearly \$2 billion of cost.

It is a benefit to producers of about \$1 billion and a net loss to the U.S. economy of \$900 million. The sugar program is a classic example of the principle of concentrated benefits and diffuse costs.

Nobody is going come here and lobby to Congress because a candy bar costs a cent more or two cents or five cents more, but sugar producers are sure going to lobby when they reap huge benefits.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, this is our annual debate, and this is an appropriations bill, not a farm bill. I think this discussion should occur in the course of the farm bill. We have many sugar producers in Nebraska who bought a sugar processing plant based on the 2002 farm bill. So we think that it is important it be considered at the right time.

Sugar prices in the United States are low by world standards. Grocery shoppers in other developed countries pay 30 percent more for sugar than the U.S.

America already has one of the most open sugar markets in the world, importing sugar from 41 countries whether we need that sugar or not. As the world's second largest sugar importer, the United States is the only major sugar-producing country that is a net importer.

Lastly, I would like to mention this: Ten African Nations, and many others around the world, receive the U.S. premium price, and so the U.S. sugar program benefits many developing countries. This certainly is something that we need to consider.

So I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the

gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), a distinguished senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding at this time, and I compliment him for this very good, well-thought-out amendment.

You are hearing a lot of statistics on the floor here, but let me throw some out there that are absolutely correct, and they are backed up by the references that I will make.

The sugar program costs the United States consumers up to \$1.9 billion every year, and a recent Department of Commerce report noted that the domestic price of United States wholesale refined sugar over the last 25 years has been two to three times the world price, two to three times the world price.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Department of Commerce, American taxpayers are paying over \$200,000 per job for every year, every year, to subsidize low-wage, low-skilled growing and harvesting jobs.

This is absolutely nuts. The Department of Commerce estimates that between 1997 and the year 2002, 10,000 confectionary manufacturing jobs were lost due to the high price of sugar right here in the good ole U.S.A.

A responsible sugar policy would result in a net increase in employment in the higher paying sugar manufacturing and confectionary industries and in increased savings to the American taxpayer.

I urge my colleagues to support a responsible sugar policy that benefits U.S. food manufacturers, increases U.S. exports, helps consumers save money at the grocery store, decreases government spending, and creates more jobs for U.S. workers. That's why I'm voting for the Blumenauer-Flake Amendment to H.R. 5384.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I very much thank my chairman for yielding.

We are at a time when we have the greatest trade imbalance that we have ever had in the history of our country, and the effect of this amendment would be to significantly encroach upon a sugar program that has kept domestic sugar production part of the agricultural production in this country.

It is very much on the bubble. Throw open the doors, there are countries around the world heavily subsidizing their domestic product, providing a global dump price well below fair cost to production, meaning the end of U.S.

production, reliance entirely upon imported sugar.

Now, that has a consequence that goes well beyond trade imbalance because, at that point in time, the pricing of our groceries, turning in part upon the sugar ingredient found in so many of our processed foods, is like the oil we import and burn, out of our control. Volatile pricing of global sugar, volatile pricing of groceries.

What we have with the sugar program is fair pricing, a stable food market, a program that needs to continue.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Two very brief points. One is, because of the nature of this lavish subsidy, it has concentrated activity so that 1 percent of the sugar producers get 42 percent of the benefit. A massive amount goes to just two companies in Florida alone.

Second, it is driving jobs overseas. We have three-quarters of 1 million workers who are in sugar-using industries that are at a competitive disadvantage and are moving out of the United States.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this Blumenauer amendment.

Nearly every year an anti-sugar farmer amendment is offered to the agriculture appropriations bill, and almost every year, the same misinformation is recklessly spread about sugar farmers. This is an appropriations bill, not a farm bill.

All U.S. commodities covered under the 2002 farm bill receive loans from the Federal Government. Sugar is not receiving special treatment.

Sugar prices for farmers have declined since 1990. Over that same period, the price of candy, cookies, cake, and ice cream have steadily risen by as much as 50 percent. Food companies, not the sugar farmers, are making the big profits.

America already has one of the most open sugar markets in the world, importing sugar from 41 countries whether we need the sugar or not.

In light of this information and in the spirit of fairness, I ask my House colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The only difference is that sugar farmers rarely default on their loans. Sugar farmers pay loans back with interest.

Loan levels for sugar farmers have remained unchanged for 20 years, even though the cost of doing business has steadily risen— inflation since 1985 has been 81 percent.

Sugar prices in the United States are low by world standards. Grocery shoppers in other developed countries pay 30 percent more for sugar than U.S. consumers. And, U.S. retail prices remained steady, at 43 cents per pound, in 2005, despite the devastating hurricanes that ravaged cane country in Louisiana and Florida. Remarkably, 43 cents was the average U.S. retail sugar price as long ago as in 1990, and even in 1980.

Sugar prices for farmers have declined since 1990. Over that same period the price of candy, cookies, cake and ice cream have steadily risen, by as much as 50 percent. Food companies, not sugar farmers, are making the big profits.

America already has one of the most open sugar markets in the world, importing sugar from 41 countries whether we need the sugar or not. As the world's second largest sugar importer, we're the only major sugar-producing country that is a net importer.

146,000 Americans are employed by sugar and depend on strong sugar policy. A vote for the Blumenauer Amendment to H.R. 5384 is a vote against 146,000 hard-working farmers and workers in 19 States.

In light of this information and in the spirit of fairness, I ask my House colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute again to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), my colleague and the cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me just talk about some of the groups outside that are supporting this amendment.

This is the Consumer Federation of America: "American consumers pay almost \$1 billion per year for sugar and products containing sugar than they would if the U.S. market for sugar were fully competitive."

The National Taxpayers Union: "Sugar interests like to make the claim that the Federal sugar program is run at no cost to the taxpayer, yet they conveniently ignore the cost of staffing and operating the bureaucracy necessary to run this monstrous program."

Also, we talked about the cost to the consumer that is borne, about \$1 billion dollars a year.

Consumers for World Trade: "The U.S. sugar program is an outdated entitlement program that props up uncompetitive farmers at the expense of American consumers."

The sugar program is making it increasingly difficult to have real free trade agreements because it is impacting on the Doha round, and any other round we have on trade negotiations it makes it more difficult because of trade distorting practices like our sugar program.

□ 1630

The Competitive Enterprise Institute said: "How can a domestic program that raises a family's cost, harms the environment, and hurts poor farmers in developing countries be justified?"

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, the only justification for a farm program is to ensure adequate production and processing capacity for our own security. Now, it has been talked about here today about how terrible the sugar program is. The fact is every country does this. To uni-

laterally disarm our producers makes absolutely no sense in the world trade scheme, and we simply cannot be allowed to be led down this path.

At the point when the rest of the world is willing to give up their subsidies and play on a level playing field, our producers can be just as successful as they are, if not more so. But until that time comes, and it is not likely to show up in my lifetime, we have to ensure adequate production and processing for the American people.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close? I just have one speaker remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The sponsor of the amendment, the gentleman from Oregon, has the right to close.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I will go ahead and close.

This has been a very interesting debate. It is just the wrong place for this debate. This is important agricultural policy that should not be determined based upon a 20-minute debate in the middle of an appropriation bill that funds agricultural programs. This is a debate that needs to wait until the 2007 farm bill.

I hear the arguments. I am very much interested in good policy for agriculture, including addressing some of the concerns that have been raised about the sugar policy. This isn't the place to do it.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I look forward to addressing this in the writing of a new farm bill.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I want to inquire as to the time remaining. We have 2 minutes left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I hope I don't use the whole minute, but just to say that as a Republican who believes in free markets, it is one of the big contradictions for me to constantly see some of my conservative colleagues argue for a Depression program, a program from the Depression era.

This is a program that costs a billion dollars, it distorts the marketplace, and the reason we are debating it here is because we rarely get an opportunity to debate this kind of issue. It needs to be gone.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, one of the problems here is this is not, with all due respect, some sort of major massive pruning. We are talking about a 6 percent reduction on how the American consumer and taxpayer is on the hook. That is not unilaterally disarming. That is not a massive overhaul. We need this modest step.

I look forward to working with the chairman of the Ag Committee, although I hope he is not the chairman of the Ag Committee next session, but in

whatever capacity I look forward to working with him to have that honest debate. The last time it went through the legislative process, the sugar provisions got worse, not better. It was more egregious. There were more things that were added to it to make it work against the consumer and the taxpayer.

Only in Washington, D.C. would this be regarded as no-cost. That survey that has been talked about should have asked consumers: Do they like paying two to three times the world price of sugar? Do they like driving overseas thousands of confectionery jobs, making our trade imbalance worse? Do they like working against the ecological health of the everglades and then spending \$7.5 billion of taxpayer money to start cleaning up some of the toxic residue of the sugar industry? And do they want to discriminate against poor countries like Ethiopia, Mozambique, and Mali that could benefit from freer trade in sugar?

I urge support of the Blumenauer-Flake amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. SLAUGHTER:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following section:

SEC. 753. Of the total amount made available in title VI in the first undesignated paragraph under the heading "FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES", \$1,000,000 is available to the Center for Veterinary Medicine for application review activities to assure the safety of animal drugs with respect to antimicrobial resistance, pursuant to section 512 of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, in addition to all other allocations for such purpose made from such total amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief.

As a microbiologist as well as a Member of Congress, I have been very concerned for some time about the overuse of antibiotics and the rise of drug-resistant bacteria. So what we are asking

today is just a sum of money, \$1 million, to be set aside from the FDA budget to begin to study the overuse of antibiotics in animals and using animals basically as incubators to breed the drug-resistant bacteria.

I think it is a matter of top concern. It has been labeled that by the CDC and the World Health Organization, which says it has become a crisis; so I am pleased to put this amendment forward today.

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

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

MR. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, we have worked with the gentlewoman on this amendment, and I am happy to accept the amendment and would move it to a vote if the gentlewoman would agree.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I appreciate that very much, and thank you, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address an issue that concerns me not just as a microbiologist, but as a mother and a grandmother as well.

Americans have a right to trust the safety of the food they eat and feed their families.

Today, that safety has been put in jeopardy by a new threat, one that is the unintended result of our own advancements.

The threat comes from antibiotic resistant bacteria.

We take antibiotics for granted in this country. Just over 60 years ago, a pneumonia diagnosis was a death sentence. A case of bacterial meningitis would have been hopeless.

With the introduction of antibiotics, however, we have been able to treat these, and many other, once fatal diseases.

Unfortunately, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have reported that the most significant human infections are becoming resistant to the antibiotics commonly used to treat them.

In fact, antibiotic resistance has been labeled a "top concern" by the CDC, and the World Health Organization has called the situation a crisis.

Resistant bacterial infections increase health care costs by 4 to 5 billion dollars each year.

Two million Americans acquire a bacterial infection annually during stays at hospitals. Seventy percent of the infections they contract are resistant to the drugs prescribed for treatment.

Salmonella infections, the cause of food poisoning, 1.4 million illnesses, and 500 deaths in America every year are increasingly resistant to the numerous drugs used against them.

And thirty-eight patients in American hospitals die every day as a result of diseases contracted during their stay that no longer respond to antibiotics.

While the overuse and misuse of antibiotics in humans is a factor contributing to this problem, it is not its only cause.

There are currently seven classes of antibiotics used in both animals and humans, including basic drugs like Penicillin.

In fact, 70 percent of all U.S. antibiotics are used by meat producers on their livestock for nontherapeutic purposes.

Unwittingly, we are permitting animals to serve as incubators for resistant bacteria.

And as a result, a parent on a trip to the grocery store could end up bringing home meat contaminated with diseases that will put their family's health at risk and prove difficult to treat.

In 2003, a National Academy of Sciences report stated that if we hope to make headway against this danger, we must reduce overuse of antibiotics not just in humans, but in animals and agriculture as well.

This huge and tremendously important task has fallen largely on the FDA's Center for Veterinary Medicine.

And yet, despite its position on the front lines of this fight, the CVM is ill-equipped to carry out its duties. It needs additional resources to review the drugs currently approved for animal use.

The amendment I am offering here today will give CVM the much needed boost necessary to do its job.

It will make available 1 million dollars from within its budget to make sure we have the drugs we need to treat bacterial infections.

With all of the new challenges modern medicine faces, we cannot allow a resurgence of ailments no longer seen as a source of concern.

Our failure to address this problem will result in a less secure, and less healthy, future for our children and grandchildren.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this common-sense amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. GUTKNECHT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. GUTKNECHT:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. 7 _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to implement the limitation in section 720 of this Act.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE—BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES" and the amount made available for "COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE—RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES" by \$65,319,000 and \$16,681,000, respectively.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, it is a very simple amendment, but I think it is very important and one that an awful lot of groups are paying attention to.

There is a program we have had in the farm bill for a very long time, the Wetland Reserve Program, that has become extremely important on a variety of fronts. It is important to wildlife, it is important to our water quality, it is important to flood control, and I think it is important to most Americans who care about the environment.

It is especially important to those of us in Minnesota. We have 10,000 lakes. We take water very seriously. And the Wetland Reserve Program is something that we want to do everything we can to preserve and keep at its current levels.

Currently, we authorize in the farm bill about 250,000 acres for the Wetland Reserve Program. And I understand how difficult it has been for the sub-committee and the chairman and the staff to squeeze all of the requests into the amount of money that they have been allocated in this appropriation bill, so I have a great deal of empathy for the problems that they have. But I wanted to come to the floor today to offer an amendment to restore to 250,000 acres the overall authorization for the Wetland Reserve Program.

Currently, under this bill that authorization drops to about 144,000 acres. I understand that the committee had to find \$82 million. And by passing this amendment we create an \$82 million hole in their bill, and I am empathetic to that. So what we have done, working with the Department, we take \$65 million from the ARS Facilities area and \$16.5 million from the CSREES Research and Education Activities fund.

No one likes to take money from those funds, but as we looked at all the potentials for offsets, those were the best we could find. So, Members, I think this is an important amendment. I think it is one that will be watched by the Ducks Unlimited, the Pheasants Forever, lots of the wildlife groups and sportsmen groups, and it is important as well to the folks who are really concerned about preserving our wetlands and improving our environment.

So this is a very important amendment, and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the Gutknecht amendment.

MR. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I know the gentleman has worked hard to try to perfect the language in this amendment; but as we see it, very clearly the gentleman's amendment scores at zero. So it would, in essence, not have the effect the gentleman is hoping to have on the WRP program, but it will cost \$82 million in cuts.

This is for a program that the Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture cited for \$159 million in overpayments over 5 years. So I am glad to see that mismanagement does not

bother the gentleman from Minnesota, but it certainly bothers me and other Members of this body.

Again, there is a technicality here that we have a problem with, as we have had some professional staff review this language over and over again. So I would ask the gentleman, since his amendment would not accomplish what he is trying to accomplish, if he would withdraw the amendment and perhaps seek a different remedy.

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

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I would be more than happy to work with the chairman on this. We worked with the professionals who draft these amendments. We told them what we wanted. We were willing to find offsets. We worked with the Department for those offsets. We understand those offsets do cause some heartburn for the Department, but it is my understanding they can work with those offsets.

I would appreciate it if we could at least adopt this amendment, and we will work with you through the conference committee process to perfect that language, if that is necessary. I hope that this body wants to send a clear message that the Wetlands Reserve Program is a high-priority program. And I would work with you on that, but I would like to have this amendment adopted, even if it is not perfect in your eyes.

MR. BONILLA. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, it is not a matter of my eyes; it is a matter of the professionals that have scrubbed this language; and again, the gentleman would not be accomplishing what he is hoping to accomplish.

I might say as an aside, too, there is an issue related to this. We understand that there may have been some unethical and perhaps even illegal activity by the Department involved directly with this issue, in terms of attempting to lobby Congress on it. And I want to say for the record that we are not done with this issue after we vote on this amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment offered by my colleague from Minnesota.

Whether it is breeding grounds in the north or wintering grounds in the south, the Wetland Reserve Program—WRP—is worthy of strong funding. Besides wildlife habitat restoration, WRP has an impressive record of providing flood protection, improving water quality and conserving water quantity.

Farmer interest in these programs greatly exceeds the availability of funds. For example, in 2005 in my district, there were 240 farmers with unfunded applications totaling 34,000 acres and \$49 million. These lands are marginal, high risk lands that are vulnerable both to floods and droughts because of the high content of hydric soils. These marginal lands detract from a farmer's cash flow and tend to experience repeated losses requiring disaster recovery assistance. Furthermore, it has been

shown that WRP can reduce expenses in Federal crop insurance and other farm programs.

WRP provides a lump sum easement payment that assists financially distressed farmers. The easement payment may be used to pay off current debts or to meet current operating fund needs. Additionally, WRP may provide farmers with both a temporary alternative source of income through the wetlands restoration contract and a permanent source of income from the recreational and lease hunting income generated by the restored wetland wildlife habitat. The public benefits from both the reduced demand placed on disaster assistance funds from lands that previously experienced repeated losses and from significant long-term conservation benefits obtained from the protection of wildlife habitat, improvement of water quality, increase of flood storage and reduction of soil erosion.

As the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee, I have seen avian influenza become increasingly more important. Although there has not been a case of a human contracting the disease from a wild bird anywhere in the world, it is feasible. The more we can disperse wild birds and improve their overall health, the less risk we will have, especially in an area that my colleague from Minnesota and I represent, the Mississippi Flyway.

Let's not continue with empty rhetoric of supporting the 2002 farm bill. In 2002 we passed a farm bill consisting of an annual 250,000 acres of land to be enrolled in the WRP. If we are going to say that we support the 2002 farm bill, then we should support this amendment because it does just that and I strongly encourage its adoption.

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

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

MR. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my distinguished ranking member, Ms. DELAURO, might engage in a colloquy with me about what remains on the bill. We are a little puzzled, and I include my side on this.

If Members are serious about offering amendments, I wonder where they are, on my side as well as on the minority's side. If we can't get Members here, perhaps we should seek a remedy to move through this bill and finish it.

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman makes a good point. I know we have called those on our side to come down, and I do not know the disposition on your side. It looks to me like we have on our side three amendments, and I was just trying to tally up on your side. There are about five or six; is that correct?

MR. BONILLA. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I know the gentlewoman would agree on her side that she is not a babysitter, nor am I. If I had an amendment to offer, I would be in a three-point stance ready to go on something that was of great importance to my constituents.

So I would throw out for thought that perhaps after another 5 minutes passes, if nobody is here, we might look for a unanimous consent to shut it down and move to final passage.

Ms. DELAUBO. That is something I would very much like to consider, Mr. Chairman. So let us wait the 5 minutes and see what we have.

MR. BONILLA. We will wait 5 minutes, and if we don't see anyone, then perhaps we can work on a UC, again with a bipartisan shutdown of the bill and move forward.

□ 1645

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. WEINER of New York.

Amendment No. 17 by Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. PAUL of Texas.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. CHABOT of Ohio.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 184, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

AYES—234

Ackerman	Blumenauer	Carson
Allen	Boehlert	Case
Andrews	Bono	Chandler
Baca	Boswell	Chocola
Baird	Boucher	Clay
Baldwin	Brady (PA)	Cleaver
Bartlett (MD)	Brown (OH)	Clyburn
Bean	Brown-Waite,	Conyers
Becerra	Ginny	Costa
Berkley	Burton (IN)	Costello
Berman	Camp (MI)	Crowley
Berry	Capps	Cubin
Biggert	Capuano	Cuelar
Bilirakis	Cardin	Cummings
Bishop (GA)	Cardoza	Davis (AL)
Bishop (NY)	Carnahan	Davis (CA)

Davis (IL)	Langevin	Rohrabacher	LaHood	Nussle	Shadegg
DeFazio	Lantos	Ross	Latham	Osborne	Shaw
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Rothman	LaTourette	Otter	Sherwood
Delahunt	Leach	Royal-Allard	Lewis (CA)	Pastor	Shimkus
DeLauro	Lee	Ruppersberger	Lewis (KY)	Paul	Shuster
Dent	Levin	Rush	Linder	Pearce	Simpson
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Ryan (OH)	Lucas	Pence	Skelton
Dingell	Lipinski	Sabo	Lungren, Daniel E.	Peterson (PA)	Smith (TX)
Doggett	LoBiondo	Salazar	Mack	Petri	Sodrel
Doyle	Lofgren, Zoe	Sánchez, Linda T.	Manzullo	Pitts	Sullivan
Ehlers	Lowey	Sánchez, Loretta	Marchant	Pombo	Tancredo
Emanuel	Lynch	Sanders	McCrery	Price (GA)	Tanner
Engel	Maloney	Saxton	McHenry	Putnam	Taylor (NC)
Eshoo	Markley	Schakowsky	McKeon	Radanovich	Terry
Etheridge	Marshall	Schiff	McMorris	Rahall	Thomas
Fattah	Matheson	Schwartz (PA)	Mica	Regula	Thornberry
Ferguson	Matsui	Schwarz (MI)	Miller (FL)	Rehberg	Tiaht
Filner	McCarthy	Simmons	Miller, Gary	Reichert	Turner
Fitzpatrick (PA)	McCaul (TX)	Slaughter	Mollohan	Renzi	Walden (OR)
Fossella	McCollum (MN)	Smith (NJ)	Moran (KS)	Reynolds	Wamp
Frank (MA)	McCotter	Smith (WA)	Murphy	Rogers (AL)	Weldon (FL)
Frelinghuysen	McDermott	Solis	Northup	Rogers (KY)	Westmoreland
Gerlach	McGovern	Souder	Norwood	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
Gilchrest	McHugh	Spratt	Nunes	Schenk	Wilson (SC)
Gillmor	McIntyre	Stark	Brown, Corrine	Kennedy (RI)	Young (AK)
Gonzalez	McKinney	Stearns	Davis (FL)	Gohmert	Sessions
Gordon	McNulty	Strickland	Evans	Gutierrez	Larson (CT)
Green (WI)	Meehan	Stupak	Feeley	Hunter	Meek (FL)
Green, Al	Meeks (NY)	Sweeney	Gibbons	Issa	Payne
Green, Gene	Melancon	Tauscher	Kennedy (RI)	Snyder	
Grijalva	Michaels	Taylor (MS)			
Gutknecht	Millender-	Thompson (CA)			
Harman	McDonald	Thompson (MS)			
Harris	Miller (MI)	Tiberti			
Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)	Tierney			
Herseth	Miller, George	Towns			
Higgins	Moore (KS)	Udall (CO)			
Hinchey	Moore (WI)	Udall (NM)			
Hinojosa	Moran (VA)	Upton			
Hoekstra	Murtha	Van Hollen			
Holden	Nadler	Velázquez			
Holt	Napolitano	Visclosky			
Honda	Neal (MA)	Walsh			
Hooley	Oberstar	Wasserman			
Hoyer	Obey	Schultz			
Inglis (SC)	Olver	Waters			
Inslee	Ortiz	Watson			
Israel	Owens	Watt			
Jackson (IL)	Oxley	Waxman			
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pallone	Weiner			
Jefferson	Pascarella	Weldon (PA)			
Jindal	Pelosi	Wells			
Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)	Watson			
Jones (OH)	Pickering	Wexler			
Kanjorski	Platts	Wilson (NM)			
Kaptur	Poe	Woolsey			
Kelly	Pomeroy	Wu			
Kildee	Porter	Wynn			
Kilpatrick (MI)	Price (NC)				
Kind	Pryce (OH)				
King (NY)	Ramstad				
Kirk	Rangel				
Kucinich	Reyes				
	Rogers (MI)				

NOES—184

Abercrombie	Castle	Gallegly	
Aderholt	Chabot	Garrett (NJ)	
Akin	Coble	Gingrey	
Alexander	Cole (OK)	Goode	
Bachus	Conaway	Goodlatte	
Baker	Cooper	Granger	
Barrett (SC)	Cramer	Graves	
Barrow	Crenshaw	Hall	
Barton (TX)	Culberson	Hart	
Bass	Davis (KY)	Hastings (WA)	
Beauprez	Davis (TN)	Hayes	
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Jo Ann	Hayworth	
Blackburn	Davis, Tom	Hefley	
Blunt	Deal (GA)	Hensarling	
Boehner	DeLay	Herger	
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hobson	
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hostettler	
Boozman	Doolittle	Hulshof	
Boren	Drake	Hyde	
Boyd	Dreier	Istook	
Bradley (NH)	Duncan	Jenkins	
Brady (TX)	Edwards	Johnson (CT)	
Brown (SC)	Emerson	Johnson (IL)	
Burgess	English (PA)	Johnson, Sam	
Butterfield	Everett	Jones (NC)	
Buyer	Farr	Keller	
Calvert	Flake	Kennedy (MN)	
Campbell (CA)	Foley	King (IA)	
Carter	Forbes	Kingston	
Cantor	Ford	Kline	
Cantrell	Fortenberry	Knollenberg	
Capito	Foxx	Kolbe	
Casper	Franks (AZ)	Kuhl (NY)	

NOT VOTING—14

Brown, Corrine	Gohmert	Larson (CT)
Davis (FL)	Gutierrez	Meek (FL)
Evans	Hunter	Payne
Feeley	Issa	
Gibbons	Kennedy (RI)	Snyder

□ 1717

Messrs. WALDEN of Oregon, BARTON of Texas, BARROW, BASS, SAM JOHNSON of Texas, WILSON of South Carolina, TURNER, REGULA, KUHL of New York and NEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. HINCHEY, ROGERS of Michigan, MURTHA, HOEKSTRA, PETERSON of Minnesota, CHOCOLA, RUSH, KIRK, BERRY, BOSWELL, WELDON of Pennsylvania and SALAZAR changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MINNESOTA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 345, noes 76, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]

AYES—345

Ackerman	Andrews	Baldwin
Aderholt	Baca	Barrow
Akin	Bachus	Bartlett (MD)
Alexander	Baird	Barton (TX)
Baker	Bass	

Bean	Gonzalez	Millender-	Stupak	Udall (NM)	Waxman
Beauprez	Goode	McDonald	Sullivan	Upton	Weiner
Becerra	Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Tancredo	Van Hollen	Weldon (PA)
Berkley	Gordon	Miller (MI)	Tanner	Velázquez	Weller
Berman	Graves	Miller (NC)	Taylor (MS)	Viscosky	Westmoreland
Berry	Green (WI)	Miller, Gary	Terry	Walden (OR)	Wexler
Bilirakis	Green, Al	Mollohan	Thompson (CA)	Walsh	Whitfield
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Moore (KS)	Thompson (MS)	Wamp	Wilson (NM)
Bishop (NY)	Gutierrez	Moore (WI)	Tiaht	Wasserman	Wilson (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Gutknecht	Moran (KS)	Tiberi	Schultz	Wolf
Blumenauer	Harman	Murphy	Tierney	Waters	Woolsey
Boehlert	Harris	Musgrave	Towns	Watson	Wu
Bonner	Hart	Nadler	Udall (CO)	Watt	Young (FL)
Bono	Hastings (FL)	Napolitano			
Boozman	Hastings (WA)	Neal (MA)			
Boren	Hayes	Ney	Abercrombie	Eshoo	Murtha
Boswell	Hayworth	Northup	Barrett (SC)	Farr	Myrick
Boucher	Hefley	Norwood	Biggert	Flake	Neugebauer
Boustany	Herger	Nussle	Blackburn	Foley	Nunes
Bradley (NH)	Herseth	Oberstar	Blunt	Gibbons	Otter
Brady (PA)	Hinchey	Obey	Boehner	Granger	Radanovich
Brady (TX)	Hinojosa	Olver	Bonilla	Grijalva	Reichert
Brown (OH)	Hoekstra	Ortiz	Boyd	Hall	Rush
Brown (SC)	Holden	Osborne	Capps	Hensarling	Ryun (KS)
Brown-Waite,	Holt	Owens	Carter	Higgins	Schmidt
Ginny	Honda	Oxley	Castle	Hobson	Shaw
Burgess	Hooley	Pallone	Clay	Hulshof	Simpson
Burton (IN)	Hostettler	Pascrill	Cleaver	Hyde	Abercrombie
Butterfield	Hoyer	Pastor	Conaway	Jackson (IL)	Istook
Buyer	Inglis (SC)	Paul	Cooper	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Calvert	Inslee	Pearce	Crowley	Smith (TX)	Sanders
Camp (MI)	Israel	Pence	Culberson	Bartlett (MD)	Sensenbrenner
Campbell (CA)	Istook	Peterson (MN)	Cummings	Burton (IN)	McHenry
Cannon	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (PA)	Cummins	Duncan	McKinney
Cantor	(TX)	Petri	Knollenberg	Franks (AZ)	Shadegg
Capito	Jefferson	Pickering	Davis (IL)	Flake	Tancredo
Capuano	Jenkins	Pitts	Davis (TN)	Miller (FL)	Paul
Cardin	Jindal	Platts	Delahunt	Gohmert	Tiberi
Cardoza	Johnson (CT)	Poe	DeLay	Goode	Udall (NM)
Carnahan	Johnson (IL)	Pombo	Dreier	Hayworth	Wilson (NM)
Carson	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy	Edwards	McDermott	Petri
Case	Jones (NC)	Porter	Emanuel	McMorris	Poe
Chabot	Jones (OH)	Price (GA)	Emerson	Miller, George	Price (GA)
Chandler	Kanjorski	Price (NC)		Moran (VA)	Renzi
Chocola	Kaptur	Pryce (OH)			
Clyburn	Keller	Putnam			
Coble	Kennedy (MN)	Rahall			
Cole (OK)	Kildee	Ramstad			
Conyers	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rangel			
Costa	Kind	Regula			
Costello	King (IA)	Rehberg			
Cramer	King (NY)	Renzi			
Crenshaw	Kirk	Reyes			
Cubin	Kline	Reynolds			
Cuellar	Kucinich	Rogers (AL)			
Davis (AL)	Kuhl (NY)	Rogers (KY)			
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Rogers (MI)			
Davis (KY)	Lantos	Rohrabacher			
Davis, Jo Ann	Larsen (WA)	Ros-Lehtinen			
Davis, Tom	Latham	Ross			
Deal (GA)	LaTourette	Rothman			
DeFazio	Leach	Royal-Allard			
DeGette	Lee	Royce			
DeLauro	Levin	Ruppersberger			
Dent	Lewis (GA)	Ryan (OH)			
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lewis (KY)	Ryan (WI)			
Diaz-Balart, M.	Linder	Sabo			
Dicks	Lipinski	Salazar			
Dingell	LoBiondo	Sánchez, Linda			
Doggett	Lofgren, Zoe	T.			
Doolittle	Lowey	Sanchez, Loretta			
Doyle	Lucas	Sanders			
Drake	Lungren, Daniel	Saxton			
Duncan	E.	Schakowsky			
Ehlers	Lynch	Schiff			
Engel	Mack	Schwartz (PA)			
English (PA)	Maloney	Schwartz (MI)			
Etheridge	Manzullo	Scott (GA)			
Everett	Markey	Scott (VA)			
Fattah	Marshall	Sensenbrenner			
Feeney	Matheson	Serrano			
Ferguson	Matsui	Sessions			
Filner	McCarthy	Shadegg			
Fitzpatrick (PA)	McCaul (TX)	Shays			
Forbes	McCullom (MN)	Sherman			
Ford	McCotter	Sherwood			
Fortenberry	McCrery	Shimkus			
Fossella	McGovern	Shuster			
Foxx	McHenry	Simmons			
Frank (MA)	McHugh	Skelton			
Franks (AZ)	McIntyre	Smith (NJ)			
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Smith (WA)			
Gallegly	McKinney	Sodrel			
Garrett (NJ)	McNulty	Solis			
Gerlach	Meehan	Souder			
Gilchrest	Meeks (NY)	Spratt			
Gillmor	Melancon	Stark			
Gingrey	Mica	Stearns			
Gohmert	Michaud	Strickland			

NOES—76

Stupak	Udall (NM)	Waxman
Sullivan	Upton	Weiner
Miller (FL)	Tancredo	Weldon (PA)
Miller (MI)	Tanner	Velázquez
Miller (NC)	Taylor (MS)	Viscosky
Miller, Gary	Terry	Westmoreland
Mollohan	Thompson (CA)	Walsh
Moore (KS)	Thompson (MS)	Wamp
Moore (WI)	Tiaht	Wasserman
Moran (KS)	Tiberi	Schultz
Murphy	Tierney	Waters
Musgrave	Towns	Watson
Nadal (CO)	Udall (CO)	Watt

on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 34, noes 389, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

AYES—34

Abercrombie	Istook	Royce
Barrett (SC)	Johnson, Sam	Sanders
Bartlett (MD)	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Burton (IN)	McKinney	Shadegg
Duncan	McMorris	Sullivan
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Tancredo
Flake	Paul	Tiberi
Gohmert	Pearce	Udall (NM)
Goode	Petri	Wilson (NM)
Hayworth	Poe	Young (AK)
Hefley	Price (GA)	Renzi

NOES—389

Ackerman	Cardoza	Farr
Aderholt	Carnahan	Fattah
Akin	Carson	Feeley
Alexander	Carter	Ferguson
Allen	Case	Filner
Andrews	Castle	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Baca	Chabot	Foley
Bachus	Chandler	Forbes
Baird	Chocola	Ford
Baker	Clay	Fortenberry
Baldwin	Cleaver	Fossella
Barrow	Clyburn	Foxx
Barton (TX)	Coble	Frank (MA)
Bass	Cole (OK)	Frelinghuysen
Bean	Conaway	Galligly
Beauprez	Conyers	Garrett (NJ)
Becerra	Cooper	Gerlach
Berkley	Costa	Gibbons
Berman	Costello	Gilchrest
Berry	Cramer	Gillmor
Biggert	Crenshaw	Gingrey
Bilirakis	Crowley	Gonzalez
Bishop (GA)	Cubin	Goodlatte
Bishop (NY)	Cuellar	Gordon
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Granger
Blackburn	Cummings	Graves
Blumenthal	Davis (AL)	Green (WI)
Blunt	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Boehlert	Davis (IL)	Green, Gene
Boehner	Davis (KY)	Grijalva
Bonilla	Davis (TN)	Gutierrez
Bonner	Davis, Jo Ann	Gutknecht
Bono	Davis, Tom	Hall
Boozman	Deal (GA)	Harman
Boren	DeFazio	Harris
Boswell	DeGette	Hart
Boucher	Delahunt	Hastings (FL)
Boustany	DeLauro	Hastings (WA)
Boyd	DeLay	Hayes
Bradley (NH)	Dent	Hensarling
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Herger
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Herseth
Brown (OH)	Dicks	Higgins
Brown (SC)	Dingell	Hinchey
Brown-Waite,	Doggett	Hinojosa
Ginny	Doolittle	Hobson
Burgess	Doyle	Hoekstra
Butterfield	Drake	Holden
Buyer	Dreier	Holt
Calvert	Edwards	Honda
Camp (MI)	Ehlers	Hooley
Campbell (CA)	Emmanuel	Hoyer
Cannon	Emerson	Hulshof
Cantor	Engel	Hyde
Capito	English (PA)	Inglis (SC)
Cappo	Eshoo	Inslee
Capuano	Etheridge	Israel
Cardin	Everett	Jackson (IL)

□ 1726

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. CAPUANO changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to explain how I would have voted on May 23, 2006 during rollcall votes Nos. 179, 180, 181, 182, and 183 during the second session of the 109th Congress.

Rollcall vote No. 179 was on ordering the previous question.

Rollcall vote No. 180 was on passage of H. Res. 830, providing for consideration of H.R. 5384, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

Rollcall vote No. 181 was on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4681, the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006.

Rollcall vote No. 182 was on agreeing to the Weiner amendment to H.R. 5384.

Rollcall vote No. 183 was on agreeing to the Kennedy amendment to H.R. 5384.

I respectfully request that it be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that if present, I would have voted “yes” on all of these rollcall votes.

Thank you for your time and careful consideration of this important matter.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote