

calamities and other natural phenomena during the past decade required 460 major disasters declarations, nearly double the 237 declarations from the previous ten-year period, and more than any other decade on record. The increased number and severity of natural disasters has huge economic impacts on the United States. Comparing the three-year periods of 1989 through 1991, and 1997 through 1999, the federal cost of severe weather disasters rose a dramatic 337 percent in less than ten years. Of the \$35 billion that FEMA has spent in the last 20 years for disaster relief, \$28 billion, or 80 percent, has occurred in the last seven years alone (1993–2000). In addition, the insurance industry has paid more than \$63 billion in insured losses in these seven years.

Fortunately, the Senate Appropriations Committee has reported its Supplemental Appropriations bill and it does not contain the \$389 million rescission from FEMA's contingency fund. I am hopeful that the conference report on this bill will not accept the House provision on FEMA's rescission. We are all aware of the critical and fundamental support that FEMA provides for the victims of natural disasters. It is essential that we do not hinder FEMA's mission by allowing unwarranted rescissions or cuts to FEMA's budget.

Again, I commend the numerous individuals, government agencies, and groups of people in Texas who heroically gave of themselves and assisted their fellow citizens through a major disaster. They serve as an inspiration to us all and I pledge to work together with FEMA and other agencies on behalf of these victims to help them rebuild their lives and renew their spirits.

I urge all Members to support H. Res. 166.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 166, which honors the men and women, community organizations and businesses, and the government entities that provided relief and assistance to the people of Texas in the wake of tropical storm Allison.

It is truly times like these, when Mother Nature strikes suddenly and strongly, that communities must come together to help people whose homes and businesses are damaged or destroyed and who might have suffered loss of life within their families. It is a true testament to the spirit of community to see neighbor selflessly helping neighbor in these circumstances, and I commend the men and women who lent of their time, energy, money, resources, and friendship to make the flooding in Houston and its suburbs less painful for their neighbors.

While the damage was not nearly so severe, I would be remiss if I did not mention the community spirit of Floridians who helped to reduce the pain and suffering that tropical storm Allison brought to the people of Florida. For instance, local fire and rescue workers attempted to save swimmers who regrettably drowned off of Florida Panhandle beaches in the storm-tossed waters of the Gulf. They also worked to save men and women caught off guard by the flooding in Tallahassee and elsewhere in North Florida. Also, electric company and utility employees worked to keep power, water, and information flowing into people's homes and businesses as North Florida was pelted with heavy rain, 40–55 mile-per-hour winds, and 15-foot waves.

It is in their honor, as well, that I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H. Res. 166 and applaud Ms. JACKSON-LEE for introducing this resolution. H. Res. 166 commends the many volunteers, public safety officials, agencies, and businesses that rose to the challenge of tropical storm Allison. The storm took 22 lives and caused at least \$4.8 billion in property damage.

Living in San Francisco, in an area that is prone to natural disasters, I appreciate the commitment and heroism shown by so many people in the wake of a major natural disaster. Thanks to many brave and generous individuals, Houston and the communities around it pulled through the storm and are on the road to recovery.

I came back this morning from Houston, where I had the great pleasure of meeting my 6th grandchild, who was born on Sunday. While the damage in the area is clearly visible, so are the signs of healing. For my own family and all the people who call Houston home, I was pleased to see the recovery already underway. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. COOKSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. COOKSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 166.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COOKSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on H. Res. 166.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR ON H.R. 2149

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2149.

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

There was no objection.

2001 CROP YEAR ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2213) to respond to the continuing

economic crisis adversely affecting American agricultural producers, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2213

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MARKET LOSS ASSISTANCE.

(a) ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this Act as the "Secretary") shall, to the maximum extent practicable, use \$4,622,240,000 of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make a market loss assistance payment to owners and producers on a farm that are eligible for a final payment for fiscal year 2001 under a production flexibility contract for the farm under the Agriculture Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7201 et seq.).

(b) AMOUNT.—The amount of assistance made available to owners and producers on a farm under this section shall be proportionate to the amount of the total contract payments received by the owners and producers for fiscal year 2001 under a production flexibility contract for the farm under the Agricultural Market Transition Act.

SEC. 2. SUPPLEMENTAL OILSEEDS PAYMENT.

The Secretary shall use \$423,510,000 of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make a supplemental payment under section 202 of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-224; 7 U.S.C. 1421 note) to producers of the 2000 crop of oilseeds that previously received a payment under such section.

SEC. 3. SUPPLEMENTAL PEANUT PAYMENT.

The Secretary shall use \$54,210,000 of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide a supplemental payment under section 204(a) of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-224; 7 U.S.C. 1421 note) to producers of quota peanuts or additional peanuts for the 2000 crop year that previously received a payment under such section. The Secretary shall adjust the payment rate specified in such section to reflect the amount made available for payments under this section.

SEC. 4. SUPPLEMENTAL TOBACCO PAYMENT.

(a) SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENT.—The Secretary shall use \$129,000,000 of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide a supplemental payment under section 204(b) of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-224; 7 U.S.C. 1421 note) to eligible persons (as defined in such section) that previously received a payment under such section.

(b) SPECIAL RULE FOR GEORGIA.—The Secretary may make payments under this section to eligible persons in Georgia only if the State of Georgia agrees to use the sum of \$13,000,000 to make payments at the same time, or subsequently, to the same persons in the same manner as provided for the Federal payments under this section, as required by section 204(b)(6) of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000.

SEC. 5. SUPPLEMENTAL WOOL AND MOHAIR PAYMENT.

The Secretary shall use \$16,940,000 of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide a supplemental payment under section 814 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (as enacted by Public Law 106-387), to producers of wool, and producers of mohair, for the 2000 marketing year that previously received a payment under such section. The Secretary shall adjust the payment rate specified in such section to reflect the amount made available for payments under this section.

SEC. 6. SUPPLEMENTAL COTTONSEED ASSISTANCE.

The Secretary shall use \$84,700,000 of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide supplemental assistance under section 204(e) of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-224; 7 U.S.C. 1421 note) to producers and first-handlers of the 2000 crop of cottonseed that previously received assistance under such section.

SEC. 7. SPECIALTY CROPS.

(a) **BASE STATE GRANTS.**—The Secretary shall use \$26,000,000 of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make grants to the several States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to be used to support activities that promote agriculture. The amount of the grant shall be—

(1) \$500,000 to each of the several States; and

(2) \$1,000,000 to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(b) **GRANTS FOR VALUE OF PRODUCTION.**—The Secretary shall use \$133,400,000 of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make a grant to each of the several States in an amount that represents the proportion of the value of specialty crop production in the State in relation to the national value of specialty crop production, as follows:

- (1) California, \$63,320,000.
- (2) Florida, \$16,860,000.
- (3) Washington, \$9,610,000.
- (4) Idaho, \$3,670,000.
- (5) Arizona, \$3,430,000.
- (6) Michigan, \$3,250,000.
- (7) Oregon, \$3,220,000.
- (8) Georgia, \$2,730,000.
- (9) Texas, \$2,660,000.
- (10) New York, \$2,660,000.
- (11) Wisconsin, \$2,570,000.
- (12) North Carolina, \$1,540,000.
- (13) Colorado, \$1,510,000.
- (14) North Dakota, \$1,380,000.
- (15) Minnesota, \$1,320,000.
- (16) Hawaii, \$1,150,000.
- (17) New Jersey, \$1,100,000.
- (18) Pennsylvania, \$980,000.
- (19) New Mexico, \$900,000.
- (20) Maine, \$880,000.
- (21) Ohio, \$800,000.
- (22) Indiana, \$660,000.
- (23) Nebraska, \$640,000.
- (24) Massachusetts, \$640,000.
- (25) Virginia, \$620,000.
- (26) Maryland, \$500,000.
- (27) Louisiana, \$460,000.
- (28) South Carolina, \$440,000.
- (29) Tennessee, \$400,000.
- (30) Illinois, \$400,000.
- (31) Oklahoma, \$390,000.
- (32) Alabama, \$300,000.
- (33) Delaware, \$290,000.
- (34) Mississippi, \$250,000.
- (35) Kansas, \$210,000.
- (36) Arkansas, \$210,000.
- (37) Missouri, \$210,000.
- (38) Connecticut, \$180,000.
- (39) Utah, \$140,000.
- (40) Montana, \$140,000.
- (41) New Hampshire, \$120,000.
- (42) Nevada, \$120,000.
- (43) Vermont, \$120,000.
- (44) Iowa, \$100,000.
- (45) West Virginia, \$90,000.
- (46) Wyoming, \$70,000.
- (47) Kentucky, \$60,000.
- (48) South Dakota, \$40,000.
- (49) Rhode Island, \$40,000.
- (50) Alaska, \$20,000.

(c) **SPECIALTY CROP PRIORITY.**—As a condition on the receipt of a grant under this section, a State shall agree to give priority to the support of specialty crops in the use of the grant funds.

(d) **SPECIALTY CROP DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “specialty crop” means any agricultural crop, except wheat, feed grains, oilseeds, cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco.

SEC. 8. COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

The Secretary shall use \$10,000,000 of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make a grant to each of the several States to be used by the States to cover direct and indirect costs related to the processing, transportation, and distribution of commodities to eligible recipient agencies. The grants shall be allocated to States in the manner provided under section 204(a) of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7508(a)).

SEC. 9. TECHNICAL CORRECTION REGARDING INDEMNITY PAYMENTS FOR COTTON PRODUCERS.

(a) **CONDITIONS ON PAYMENT TO STATE.**—Subsection (b) of section 1121 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(a) of division A of Public Law 105-277 (7 U.S.C. 1421 note), and as amended by section 754 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (as enacted by Public Law 106-387; 114 Stat. 1549A-42), is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **CONDITIONS ON PAYMENT TO STATE.**—The Secretary of Agriculture shall make the payment to the State of Georgia under subsection (a) only if the State—

“(1) contributes \$5,000,000 to the indemnity fund and agrees to expend all amounts in the indemnity fund by not later than January 1, 2002 (or as soon as administratively practical thereafter), to provide compensation to cotton producers as provided in such subsection;

“(2) requires the recipient of a payment from the indemnity fund to repay the State, for deposit in the indemnity fund, the amount of any duplicate payment the recipient otherwise recovers for such loss of cotton, or the loss of proceeds from the sale of cotton, up to the amount of the payment from the indemnity fund; and

“(3) agrees to deposit in the indemnity fund the proceeds of any bond collected by the State for the benefit of recipients of payments from the indemnity fund, to the extent of such payments.”

(b) **ADDITIONAL DISBURSEMENTS FROM THE INDEMNITY FUND.**—Subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

“(d) **ADDITIONAL DISBURSEMENT TO COTTON GINNERS.**—The State of Georgia shall use funds remaining in the indemnity fund, after the provision of compensation to cotton producers in Georgia under subsection (a) (including cotton producers who file a contingent claim, as defined and provided in section 5.1 of chapter 19 of title 2 of the Official Code of Georgia), to compensate cotton ginners (as defined and provided in such section) that—

“(1) incurred a loss as the result of—

“(A) the business failure of any cotton buyer doing business in Georgia; or

“(B) the failure or refusal of any such cotton buyer to pay the contracted price that had been agreed upon by the ginner and the buyer for cotton grown in Georgia on or after January 1, 1997, and had been purchased or contracted by the ginner from cotton producers in Georgia;

“(2) paid cotton producers the amount which the cotton ginner had agreed to pay for such cotton received from such cotton producers in Georgia; and

“(3) satisfy the procedural requirements and deadlines specified in chapter 19 of title 2 of the Official Code of Georgia applicable to cotton ginner claims.”

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking “Upon the establishment of the indemnity fund, and not later than October 1, 1999, the” and inserting “The”.

SEC. 10. INCREASE IN PAYMENT LIMITATIONS REGARDING LOAN DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS AND MARKETING LOAN GAINS.

Notwithstanding section 1001(2) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308(1)), the total amount of the payments specified in section 1001(3) of that Act that a person shall be entitled to receive for one or more contract commodities and oilseeds under the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7201 et seq.) during the 2001 crop year may not exceed \$150,000.

SEC. 11. TIMING OF, AND LIMITATION ON, EXPENDITURES.

(a) **DEADLINE FOR EXPENDITURES.**—All expenditures required by this Act shall be made not later than September 30, 2001. Any funds made available by this Act and remaining unexpended by October 1, 2001, shall be deemed to be unexpended, and the authority provided by this Act to expend such funds is rescinded effective on that date.

(b) **TOTAL AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURES.**—The total amount expended under this Act may not exceed \$5,500,000,000. If the payments required by this Act would result in expenditures in excess of such amount, the Secretary shall reduce such payments on a pro rata basis as necessary to ensure that such expenditures do not exceed such amount.

SEC. 12. REGULATIONS.

(a) **PROMULGATION.**—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Commodity Credit Corporation, as appropriate, shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to implement this Act and the amendments made by this Act. The promulgation of the regulations and administration of this Act shall be made without regard to—

(1) the notice and comment provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the Statement of Policy of the Secretary of Agriculture effective July 24, 1971 (36 Fed. Reg. 13804), relating to notices of proposed rulemaking and public participation in rulemaking; and

(3) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the “Paperwork Reduction Act”).

(b) **CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall use the authority provided under section 808 of title 5, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST).

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to advocate passage of H.R. 2213, a bill to provide economic assistance to farm producers for the 2001 crop year. The current farm recession, in its 4th year, ranks among the deepest in our Nation’s history, along with the Great Depression, the post-World War I and II recessions and the financial ruin of the 1980s.

There are many factors that contribute to this dismal situation. First, energy prices have skyrocketed, pushing diesel fuel and fertilizer to more than twice last year’s prices. Second, overseas markets continue the slump that started with the Asian financial crisis, and that has been compounded by the steadily increasing strength of the dollar abroad.

USDA estimates that the value of the dollar is up to 25 percent relative to our customers' currencies and up 40 percent relative to our competitors' currencies, making our farm commodities significantly less marketable in overseas markets. Finally, tariff charged in our agricultural exports remain high, averaging 5 times those levied by the U.S.

Clearly, additional assistance for our farmers is needed. H.R. 2213 makes a good start on providing such assistance. With the help of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE), in this year's budget, Congress made available funding for fiscal year 2001 and fiscal year 2002 specifically to address the need for the assistance in the 2001 crop year.

The legislation before us today makes \$5.5 billion available for that purpose. In my opinion, this amount is not sufficient to meet the needs of our producers, and I intend to work further as this bill moves forward through the legislative process to improve that message. But today the important point is to move the process along, because the fiscal year 2001 funds will expire unless delivered to hard-pressed farmers by the end of September, it is imperative that a bill be sent to the President for signature before the August recess.

To ensure that outcome, the House must move the legislation this week. Despite its current imperfections, farmers need House passage of H.R. 2213 today.

The Committee on Agriculture is now in the process of writing a new multiyear farm bill that will end the need for these annual emergency packages. We expect to bring that bill to the floor before the end of the year and hope to have it in place for next year's crop. But today we are dealing with the immediate crisis facing farmers in this year's crop, and that is why I am asking my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 2213.

□ 1145

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that there are some misconceptions currently being spread about the bill, including one suggesting that H.R. 2213 will extend the Northeast Dairy Compact. This is simply not the case.

First of all, dairy compacts are not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and, therefore, are not germane to any legislation that our committee would report. Second, there are simply no dairy provisions of any kind in H.R. 2213, as amended.

When I introduced the bill originally, it did include a simple extension of the dairy price support program due to expire at the end of this year, but even that provision has been removed from the amended version.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill even though I, too, wished we could do more. At the outset, let me recognize the work of the gentleman from Texas (Chairman COMBEST) and state for the record that I agree with him that American agriculture is in need of immediate assistance, and that producers of our food and fiber are at risk.

Last year crop prices were at a 27-year low for soybeans, a 25-year low for cotton, a 14-year low for wheat and corn and an 8-year low for rice. Very little recovery has occurred since that time. The need for the \$5.5 billion in assistance provided by this bill is so great that a doubling of this amount could easily be utilized.

Because this is the fourth year in a row that we have provided ad hoc assistance to compensate for low commodity prices, however, I consider it crucial that we provide aid with a view toward the long term.

While the budget should provide us the authority to improve our commodity programs, there are a couple of reasons why the amount made available in the budget will soon appear insufficient. First, aside from amounts in the bill before us, the budget provides \$73.4 billion to add to our baseline over 10 years. During the course of the Committee on Agriculture's hearings, however, representatives of agriculture have responsibly argued for several times that amount.

Second, the budget is not ironclad. The Committee on Agriculture has a budget allocation for fiscal year 2002, but not for the succeeding fiscal years. The remaining \$66 billion is only available to the extent that the on-budget surplus is greater than the Medicare surplus. Our ability to address agriculture's long-term need is now very sensitive to any deterioration in the overall budget surplus.

The reality of the tight budget situation we faced was recently made abundantly clear by a letter from the administration. Prior to the markup of this economic assistance, the OMB Director advised that, if the committee surpassed the \$5.5 billion, he would recommend the President not sign the bill.

A bare majority of my colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture agreed with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Boehner) and me that we needed to save every penny we could to draft a responsible long-term farm bill.

I am proud to say that, by adopting our amendment, the Committee on Agriculture has faced its responsibility to prioritize agriculture's needs within the budget. Our chairman presided over a full debate with the utmost fairness. For those of us who were strong advocates for agriculture, we arrived at a difficult decision.

The bill before the House today provides a reasonable response to our producers who are suffering from the continued slump in the farm economy. Assistance is provided in a very clear way. Take the aid provided for the

most recent crop and prorate the payments to equal \$5.5 billion. I repeat, assistance is provided in a very clear way. Take the aid provided in the most recent crop and prorate the payments to equal \$5.5 billion. Funds will be disbursed to producers quickly and simply.

While I would have preferred alternative ways to deliver this assistance, we are constrained in this manner because the assistance must be provided by September 30.

We also need to analyze all fiscal year 2002 options at the same time in order to provide the right long- and short-term policy mix. Many specialty crops that desire additional assistance over that provided in the bill can only be assisted in fiscal year 2002 money. We can provide such assistance, but it must be provided fairly and consistently in keeping with our long-term strategy.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot disagree with those who say that the \$5.5 billion is inadequate; however, this is all we can afford at the moment. As we pass this bill, it is crucial that we immediately move toward an improved and reliable long-term policy that benefits farmers and taxpayers alike.

I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill even though I wish we could do more.

At the outset, let me recognize the work of Chairman COMBEST and state for the record that I agree with him that American agriculture is in need of immediate assistance and that the producers of our food and fiber are at risk. Last year, crop prices were at a 27-year low for soybeans, a 25-year low for cotton, a 14-year low for wheat and corn and an 8-year low for rice. Very little recovery has occurred since that time. The need for the \$5.5 billion in assistance provided by this bill is so great that a doubling of this amount could easily be utilized.

Because this is the fourth year in a row that we have provided ad hoc assistance to compensate for low commodity prices, however, I consider it crucial that we provide aid with a view toward the long term.

While the Budget should provide us the authority to improve our commodity programs, there are a couple of reasons why the amount made available will soon appear insufficient:

First, aside from amounts in the bill before us, the Budget provides \$73.4 billion to add to our baseline over ten years. During the course of the Agriculture Committee's hearings, however, representatives of agriculture have responsibly argued for several times that amount.

Second, the Budget is not ironclad. The Agriculture Committee has a budget allocation for FY 2002 but not for the succeeding fiscal years. The remaining \$66 billion is only available to the extent that the on-budget surplus is greater than the Medicare surplus. Our ability to address agriculture's long-term need is now very sensitive to ANY deterioration in the overall budget surplus.

The reality of the tight budget situation we face was recently made abundantly clear by a letter from the Administration. Prior to the markup of this economic assistance, the OMB Director advised that if the Committee surpassed the \$5.5 billion, he would recommend that the President not sign the bill.

A bare majority of my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee agreed with Mr. BOEHNER and me that we needed to save every penny we could to draft a responsible long-term farm bill. I am proud to say that by adopting our amendment, the Agriculture Committee has faced its responsibility to prioritize agriculture's needs within the budget. Our Chairman presided over a full debate with the utmost fairness and, for those of us who are strong advocates for agriculture we arrived at a difficult result.

The bill before the House today provides a reasonable response to our producers who are suffering from the continued slump in the farm economy. Assistance is provided in a very clear way: take the aid provided for the most recent crop and prorate the payments to equal \$5.5 billion. Funds will be disbursed to producers quickly and simply. While I would have preferred alternative ways to deliver this assistance, we are constrained to this manner because the assistance must be provided by September 30.

We also need to analyze all FY 2002 options at the same time in order to provide the right long and short-term policy mix. Many specialty crops that desire additional assistance over that provided in the bill can only be assisted with FY 2002 money. We can provide such assistance, but it must be provided fairly and consistently in keeping with our long-term strategy.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot disagree with those who say that \$5.5 billion is inadequate, however this is all we can afford at the moment. As we pass this bill, it is crucial that we immediately move toward an improved and reliable long-term policy that benefits farmers and tax-payers alike.

I urge the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2213, the Fiscal Year 2001 Economic Assistance Act. It provides \$5.5 billion in markets loss payments and other agriculture assistance.

I am pleased that the Committee on the Budget was able to work hand in hand with the Committee on Agriculture to make this bill possible.

Recognizing the needs of farmers, the Committee on Budget reported and the House passed a budget resolution that revised the allocations and budgetary totals for the current fiscal year to accommodate \$5.5 billion in additional emergency agricultural assistance for the crop year of 2001. We budgeted for this emergency. This fits within the budget. It is responsible.

All the Committee on the Budget asked was that the Committee on Agriculture produce a straightforward bill that avoided accounting gimmicks and reserved sufficient funds to meet future crop year needs and permanently reform agricultural assistance programs so we can move away from this Band-Aid approach of the past 3 years. H.R. 2213 more than up holds the Committee on Agriculture's part of this bargain.

As the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, I have the privilege of reporting to my colleagues that this bill is within the budget. I commend the gentleman from Texas (Chairman COMBEST), the gentleman from Georgia (Chairman CHAMBLISS), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), ranking member, for their hard work on this and all the members of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in allowing me to speak on this bill.

I know it has been hard for the members of the Committee on Agriculture, but I am personally disappointed that there appears to be no funding for the conservation programs in the agricultural supplemental. This is especially troubling in light of the fact that it appears that the Committee on Appropriations plans to sharply reduce funding for our major conservation program in the next fiscal year, including the Wetlands Reserve Program, the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program and Farmland Protection Program.

Only 5 percent of the USDA funding rewards voluntary efforts for protecting our drinking water supplies, to provide habitat for wildlife, protect open spaces.

There are many programs where farmers voluntarily want to come forward, but as a result of declining funding levels for conservation programs, three out of four farmers, ranchers and foresters are rejected when they seek cost-sharing to improve the quality of our drinking water supplies; 9 out of 10 are rejected when they offer to sell development rights to help combat sprawl and protect farmland; half of our farmers and ranchers and foresters are rejected when they seek basic technical assistance. Sadly, we are not stepping forward to help the incredibly productive farmland that surrounds our metropolitan area, the urban-influenced farmland.

Mr. Speaker, as we struggle with declining amounts of money because of some decisions that we have made, that, frankly, I think some of us are hoping that people recognize were inappropriate, we need to make sure that we are dealing with efforts to equip and ensure that we maintain the agricultural base.

This is an opportunity for a win-win to protect the environment, to enhance the vast majority of small farmers that are at risk, and to make sure that we are preserving water quality supplies. I am hopeful that we can do better in the future.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the opportunity

to speak today, and I thank him for his leadership on this and other matters relative to the agriculture community in our country.

I rise in strong support of this bill. I would say to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) I share the same concerns that he does about conservation, and I hope we can address that to a greater extent in the farm bill.

But what we are doing today is coming forward with a market assistance package, and I emphasize that because it is not a disaster bill. A market assistance package is necessary for our farmers because, for the fourth year in a row, we are facing low commodity prices all across the spectrum.

This bill is responsible. It addresses the needs of producers. It puts an amount of money in the pocket of producers as quickly as we can do it. Our folks need that relief now. At the same time, if the American people are going to be assured that they are going to continue to have quality food products at low-commodity prices, we need to pass this bill today.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure, but I also want to express some disappointment with the lack of any type of funding for conservation programs within this farm supplemental bill for 2001.

While there is no doubt that our Nation's farmers, ranchers and foresters are struggling financially, this measure merely continues the failed economic policies of the current farm bill, directs cash transfers that many of us believe distort the marketplace and drives commodity prices even further down.

The next farm bill, which the House is currently considering, must be more inclusive and provide creative new revenue streams to assist our Nation's family farmers. It is my hope that voluntary incentive-based conservation programs which provide landowners with much-needed revenue while also assisting them in meeting soil, air and water environmental compliance is a part of the new farm bill.

For instance, programs such as Wetlands Reserve, Wildlife Habitat Incentive Programs and the Farmland Protection Program not only help our farmers to promote preservation of open space, habitat for wildlife and improve water quality, but they also increase farm profitability.

Two-thirds of America's farmers do not benefit from any traditional income support programs under the current farm bill. Furthermore, more than 90 percent of USDA payments go to only one-third of America's farmers

who produce commodity crops. For example, States such as California and Florida receive less than 3 cents from USDA for every dollar they earn. Conservation payments provide an important source of funding that allows farmers throughout all regions of the country to retain their land while providing benefits to society, including cleaner drinking water and improved recreational opportunities.

Currently, funding levels are insufficient to meet the demands of conservation programs. Three out of every four farmers, ranchers and private forest landowners are turned away when they seek to participate and help protect habitat and improve the quality of drinking water supplies through these land conservation programs.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the conservation funding aspect becomes a major feature of the next farm bill. I look forward to working with the leadership on that.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG).

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is Montana's number one industry, but with the cost of farm production at an all-time high and farm incomes sagging, I am deeply concerned about agriculture's future in our State.

H.R. 2213 will provide much-needed help to Montana producers, but the bill fails in many ways. The assistance level provided for in this legislation is not sufficient to address needs of many families this year.

H.R. 2213 fails to address the needs of dairy farmers, sugarcane growers, those who graze their wheat, barley, and oats, as well as producers who are denied marketing loan assistance because they do not have an AMTA contract.

Members who supported the \$5.5 billion in assistance at the committee level argued that a cut in funds to producers this year was necessary to save funds for the new farm bill, but I fear that many producers in my State will now have to face the reality that they may not make it for the next farm bill.

While this bill is far from perfect, it is a first step in keeping Congress' commitment to stand by American farmers and ranchers until a permanent safety net is in place.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Chairman COMBEST) and the staff for all their hard work on behalf of America's rural communities.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS).

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, dramatic increases in energy costs have hurt everybody, especially in the agriculture industry. Today, right now, farmers in my district, a lot of them, are going bankrupt, clearly not able to keep up with their energy bills.

We need to encourage more domestic production of oil and gas, but that is for the future. We will not solve the crisis of today.

I am not really not here to point fingers, assign blame for skyrocketing energy prices, but I am here on behalf of family farmers who do seek solutions. They need our help now.

Despite repeated appeals from my colleagues and myself, this Congress, this leadership has ignored the plight of ordinary citizens who are suffering this energy crisis. Let us face the fact that some farmers and ranchers have seen their gas bills double and triple over the last year, and this is through no fault of their own.

Our economy depends on agriculture, and especially Mississippi, because we are still a rural economy.

This may not be a natural disaster like a tornado or flood, but it is a disaster just the same. It is an economic disaster that threatens the very existence of our farmers.

If we cannot see fit to address these needs through supplemental funding, I challenge the Congress to take up the issue separately.

□ 1200

I have introduced H.R. 478, the Family Farmers' Emergency Energy Assistance Act, which will provide immediate and long-term emergency assistance to our farmers and ranchers, including crop and greenhouse growers and poultry and livestock producers.

H.R. 478 will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide grants to help farmers and ranchers to deal immediately with financial pressures caused by this crisis. This bill would also make low-interest loans available to help deal with the energy crisis for the months ahead.

H.R. 478 defines what constitutes an "energy emergency" and lays out a formula that will work. H.R. 478 is a farm energy crisis bill that will ensure that agriculture producers suffering an energy crisis will get assistance.

I am calling upon our leaders in Congress to move this emergency assistance bill quickly to passage. In a world where reliable energy costs are tantamount to success or failure, we should remember the pain rural America is enduring while we stand here and debate.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING).

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for the farmers of my home State of Mississippi and for this legislation.

Could we do more? Yes. Should we do more? I hope by the end of the day, by the time this Senate takes this up and it goes to the President, that there will be more. In terms of real dollars, Mississippi farmers are facing their 4th year of prices that have not been this low since the Great Depression.

I look forward to working with the committee and the chairman to look at ways in the farm bill that we can have long-term solutions to crises that come up, not only in our commodities and crops, but for farmers who are in other

areas, such as poultry. We need to find ways so that if we do have an energy crisis or spike that we can meet those needs, whether through grants or loans, so that they too can manage their farm income in a way that is predictable and gives them certainty. We need to help our farmers avoid the bankruptcies that we are seeing today in places across my district and in the Southeast.

As we continue to get the emergency assistance and the long-term care, I look forward to working, as chairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus Waterfowl Task Force, in getting the conservation titles of the farm bill in order for the good it does both for our environment and for our farmers.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for yielding me this time, and I want to compliment the chairman of the committee for this supplemental, which goes a long way to preserving the rural legacy of this United States, understanding the fact that every year we lose hundreds of farms all across the Nation. This injection of dollars will go a long way into helping make our farms sustainable and, to a large extent, if we work the right way, making those farms profitable.

I would also ask the Chairman, as we move through the rest of this session, to understand that not only do the AMTA payments make a difference, but the conservation title of the farm bill goes a long way into diversifying a great deal of what happens in our ag communities.

In our ag communities, there is literally an ag corridor; and we need to keep it from being fragmented. In our ag communities, there is also a habitat conservation corridor for wildlife upon which many farmers depend on diversifying their ag businesses. Whether it is hunting or fishing, the conservation title goes a long way into preserving the rural legacy of this country.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the agricultural assistance package, but I must state flatly for the record that I was extremely disappointed last week when this much-needed package was reduced from \$6.5 billion to \$5.5 billion in committee. A majority of the Committee on Agriculture chose not to support me or the chairman in a package that was equal to last year's assistance. This billion dollar cut will cost Oklahoma producers 10 cents a bushel for wheat and effectively kills the LDP graze-out program for 2002. That is unacceptable.

This is the worst time to be cutting funding for agricultural producers. Commodity prices remain low, input prices are increasing and continue to increase dramatically. If anything, we should be increasing our funding for

these programs. Yes, this assistance package is a good first step. It is insufficient to meet the needs of agricultural producers, especially in Oklahoma, but at least it is headed in the right direction.

I want to assure my friends and colleagues here on the floor that while I think this will help producers across the country, and particularly in Oklahoma too, that I intend to work with the other body to ensure that the cuts made last week by the Stenholm-Boehner amendment are restored and that we provide our producers with that minimum \$6.5 billion.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I rise to support this bill but to express my disappointment that the House Committee on Agriculture voted last week to reduce the supplemental aid to farmers in the supplemental farm package last week. I opposed the amendment by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) to reduce the supplemental aid to \$5.5 billion and supported the chairman's proposal to provide \$6.5 billion in support; the same level as in prior years.

Our farmers are struggling, and we must provide them with the aid they need. This funding bill is better than no assistance, but we really needed that additional billion dollars to help our farmers. I consider this a first step towards ensuring that we provide our farmers the support they need.

We continue to wrestle with historically low prices, and yet this year, in our part of the country, we are having very poor planting conditions and are expecting to have lower yields than in prior years. So we need more aid to maintain the same level as prior years, not less. Now is certainly not the time to cut it, particularly with energy costs driving up the cost of fertilizer and everything else.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to help the chairman and other committee members in an effort to restore funding as the process moves forward.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I rise today for eighth district farmers in North Carolina to support H.R. 2213, the 2001 Crop Year Economic Assistance Act. I want to thank the chairman for his continued leadership and diligence in bringing assistance to our Nation's farmers who are in need.

I am supportive of this bill, though I support the \$6.5 even more; and I hope it will bring some relief to our farmers plagued by low commodity prices, rising energy costs, drought, and a slow

world economy. USDA estimates that without government assistance, farmers' income could drop to historical lows, so it is imperative we act now.

H.R. 2213 does not provide the same level of assistance as previous years but I urge my colleagues' support and it is my sincere hope that we can provide more adequate assistance as we move through the legislative process.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to thank him for his hard work and leadership in speeding this crop assistance package to the floor today. Family farmers across Indiana appreciate the gentleman's aggressiveness.

Mr. Speaker, by providing \$5.5 billion in economic assistance, this farm bill represents a much-needed first step in keeping Congress' promise to America's farmers and ranchers, but it is only a first step.

It is said that the sower sows in expectation, and this farm bill fails to meet the expectation of American farmers in at least two respects. First, the assistance level it provides is not sufficient to address the total needs of farmers and ranchers; and, second, the bill's scope is too narrow, leaving many needs completely unaddressed.

At a time when real net cash income on the farm is at its lowest level since the Great Depression, it is not time to cut supplemental aid to farmers. Although I urge my colleagues to support this bill as a first step toward helping our Nation's farmers, I am deeply disappointed that this bill leaves out \$1 billion in farm aid for only a few short-term benefits.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for continuing to move this process along.

We all know that we have great difficulty in ag country. We have low commodity prices, we have higher fuel costs, and the pressure is on farmers across the country and has been. Until we open more markets for our farmers, this pressure will continue to be there because our farmers continue to out-produce their competitors around the world.

There has been a lot said here about the size of this package. As the author of the amendment, along with my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), I believe that the \$5.5 billion, as allocated by the budget, is a sufficient amount of money for aid now. Would I like to do more? Of course, I would like to do more. But the fact is we just went through a budget process and allocated \$5.5 billion for this year's emergency assistance to farmers. To go back on that

now opens the door to the other body to raise the number even higher. I think what we have done here is the fiscally responsible thing to do.

Secondly, we are about to go through the new farm bill. We are going to have a major debate about how to reallocate those resources dedicated in the budget to the new farm bill. Let us not stick our fingers into the pie and take some of next year's money for this year's problems.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) has 7½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, American agriculture is in a predicament. Should we go to the free market system and say survival of the fittest in an international market and price for food and fiber?

It is complicated by a couple of situations. One is the fact that other countries, such as Europe, subsidize their farmers up to five times as much as we subsidize our farmers.

How interested are we in maintaining a vital agricultural economy in the United States? I would suggest to my colleagues that that ability to produce food is even more important than the production of energy for our national security. With our dependency on imported energy, we have seen what can happen when OPEC decides to hold back. Think what might happen with food.

Right now, farmers are faced with low commodity prices. A 27-year low for soybeans, 25-year low for cotton, a 14-year low for wheat and corn, an 8-year low for rice. Over the past 3 years, net cash income fell in real dollars to its lowest point since the depression.

Now is the time that we have to make the decision of standing up for the survival of American agriculture. I would just suggest that farmers need help to survive. In addition to low commodity prices we have seen increased fuel costs of \$2.4 billion over the last year because of higher energy prices.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time. It is with concern today that I rise on the House floor. This is an important piece of legislation. We have worked hard at making certain that the farmers of Kansas and across the country have access to additional resources this year to tide them over; and yet the actions of our House Committee on Agriculture last week, I think, are inadequate in reaching that goal.

I voted against the passage of this bill from the committee, and yet I know it is important for the process to continue. We have hope that additional dollars will be placed in this legislation before this bill returns from the Senate.

Two weeks ago I spoke on the House floor about the difficulties facing farmers in my State. I talked about corn prices at \$1.89 and gasoline at \$1.93. That does not work. Combines and custom cutters are working their way across Kansas now. Wheat prices dropped 25 cents last month; and when I looked at the board this morning, in Dodge City wheat was \$2.71, down another 4 cents.

Assistance today is important. Many of my farmers will not be able to wait around and see what happens with the farm bill and the improvements that we hope to make in agricultural policy in this Congress unless they have some dollars to tide them over now. The crisis is real, and the consequences of our failure to act are significant.

I joined the chairman in supporting an increase for assistance for farmers. Our position failed by one vote, 24 to 23. So even within the House Committee on Agriculture, there is disagreement in the best way to help producers. However, I think now is not the time to hold up this bill over our previous disagreements. It is time for those of us concerned about agriculture and rural America to come together and to work on behalf of our Nation's farmers and ranchers.

I look forward to that process continuing, and I look forward to working with my chairman and the ranking member to see that good things happen in Kansas and American agriculture.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time; and really for the benefit of some of my colleagues who are not from farm country, I thought I would like to take a minute today to talk about what is happening to agriculture here in the United States and around the world. Because it is easy for some people to say the problem is the farm bill, the problem is freedom to farm.

It may well be true that some of the problems we face in agriculture today were exacerbated by the last farm bill. But the truth of the matter is what we are into now is the 4th consecutive year of worldwide record production.

□ 1215

Mr. Speaker, I think against that backdrop with any farm policy in the United States, our farmers would be facing a tough year as it relates to our commodities.

The second thing we have to appreciate, in Europe we see huge subsidies for agriculture. Beyond that, we have permitted, we have allowed our trading competitors to subsidize their exports to the tune of \$6 billion while we limit

ourselves to \$200 million. We have put ourselves and our farmers behind the eight ball relative to our trade policy and relative to our agriculture policy. Ultimately that is all coming together.

There is a desperate need in agriculture today for some kind of help. We are here today, and the Committee on the Budget has responded appropriately. The bill in front of us today is the right answer. Ultimately there will be negotiations between the House and Senate and the White House, and hopefully this can be plussed up. There are serious problems in agriculture, most of which are not controllable by our farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good bill, and I hope all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us in supporting this legislation today.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I associate myself with all of the remarks saying we should do more; but I would also point out that this amount of money today is within the budget that was passed that we have agreed to live under this year. I think that is a significant point. And also, as the chairman pointed out in his opening remarks, time is of the essence.

Mr. Speaker, we must have this bill to the President for his signature by August 1 if we are to have any hope of dealing with the multitude of problems that this bill is designed to help.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to pass this bill today and move the process forward, and encourage the other body to do the same.

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

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and appreciate the good working relationship that we have. Our committee works on behalf of American agriculture, I think, on a bipartisan basis as well as any committee in the Congress.

It is vitally important, and I strongly urge my colleagues who have any reservation about the level of this funding to move forward with this suspension to allow the House to have completed its action so that we make for certain that the \$5.5 billion which was established in the budget resolution is in fact eligible to be paid to farmers by the end of the fiscal year of September 30. I think it also sends a message to farmers that in fact there is some assistance on the way at a very critically needed time.

Mr. Speaker, to the Members who spoke of the committee's action in the next few weeks in reporting a farm bill, I will say that we have heard them and all others. This will be a comprehensive farm bill. It will have a strong conservation title, as some have indi-

cated is needed. It is an area that we are looking at very carefully. It is something that we will be trying to craft to deal with all aspects of American agriculture, and we will be spending a great deal of time on it. It is the intent of our committee to report a bill by the beginning of the August recess so that consideration for a full farm bill in a much-needed sector of the American economy that is suffering tremendously can be moved forward; and that we will be able to send a message to American agriculture that there is help on the way.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the interest, the intensity, and passion of all of my colleagues on the committee.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2213 will provide the much needed help that my farmers in the Second Congressional District need today. The \$5.5 billion is not sufficient to address all the farming needs, but it goes a long way in helping our family farmers. Input costs have skyrocketed for every one including our farming community. I hope this supplemental bill moves quickly to help alleviate some of these costs.

I am happy with the way our peanut farmers concerns have been addressed in this bill, \$25.83 a ton for quota peanuts and \$13.55 for additional peanuts will help ease the burden that our peanut farmers face today.

I am glad that we continue as we should standby our American farmers. This will provide immediate relief while our Committee continues to work hard on drafting the new Farm bill.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2213 and speedily get these funds to our farmers.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2213, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2213, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2299, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 178, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows: