

Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown (SC)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Collins  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fossella  
Frank  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon

Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Grucci  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hart  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Collins  
Honda  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inslee  
Isakson  
Israel  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kerns  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Klecza  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Largent  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo

Markey  
Mascara  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Riley  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrock  
Scott

Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shows  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skeen  
Skeltan  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Strickland

Andrews  
Berkley  
Flake  
Gibbons  
Hostettler

Barton  
Burton  
Davis (FL)  
Doggett  
Gutierrez

Stump  
Stupak  
Sununu  
Sweeney  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Towns  
Traficant  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Velazquez

#### NAYS—15

Moran (KS)  
Shays  
Royce  
Scarborough  
Schaffer

#### NOT VOTING—13

Houghton  
McCollum  
Platts  
Putnam  
Ros-Lehtinen

□ 1245

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2330, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 183

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2330) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General

debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule further provides that the bill shall be read for amendment by paragraph, and that the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying the rule shall be considered as adopted.

The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized or legislative provisions in a general appropriations bill.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2330 appropriates \$74.2 billion in fiscal year 2002 budget authority for agriculture and

related programs through the Department of Agriculture and other agencies. This figure is \$2.4 billion less than last year's appropriations, but \$234 million more than the President's request.

The bulk of the spending goes to food stamps, \$22 billion; the Food and Drug Administration, \$1.2 billion; child nutrition programs, \$10.1 billion; supplemental nutrition for Women, Infants and Children, \$4.1 billion; and the Federal Crop Insurance Program, \$3 billion.

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

Madam Speaker, I am particularly pleased that the Committee on Appropriations has included \$150 million for market loss payments for America's apple growers. As a representative of the number one apple-producing district in the Nation, I am acutely aware of the devastating losses sustained by apple growers in the past year.

In our area, for example, countless warehouses, packing houses and other apple-related businesses have either shut down, declared bankruptcy, or downsized dramatically. In county after county, growers find that it costs substantially more to produce a box of apples than the market will pay to buy it.

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, this is an open rule. It has everything to do with the bill

that makes appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and other related agencies for fiscal year 2002. As my colleague from Washington described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Madam Speaker, this is generally a good bill that serves America's farmers as well as the poor and hungry in this land. And I commend the ranking Democrat, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), the chairman of the agriculture appropriations subcommittee, for their work. They have done a fine job working with funding levels that are too low for their important jobs.

The bill funds child nutrition programs at a rate slightly higher than last year. It also increases funding for the food stamp program and gives a small boost to food banks. Funding for the WIC program, which feeds mothers and their children, is given a small increase over last year. Unfortunately, this increase is insufficient to meet the demand for this popular program. Monthly participation is exceeding the administration's projections, which will result in an estimated 100,000 to 200,000 eligible people not being served.

I am disappointed with the actions of the Committee on Rules which failed to make in order an amendment by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) to fund the Global Food for Education Initiative, which is commonly known as the Global School Lunch Program.

Here in this country, the school lunch program has been one of the most successful nutrition programs. A hungry child faces an extra challenge in school. This program promotes education by making sure that each day all children receive at least one nutritious meal.

What works in the United States ought to work around the world. If we believe in education for children, we should promote this program. Also, this is a great help to our farmers, and it is being championed by former Senators George McGovern and Bob Dole.

During consideration of this measure by the Rules Committee last night, I offered a motion to permit the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) to offer her amendment to fund the Global School Lunch Program. The amendment was defeated on a straight party-line vote, with Democrats supporting the program and Republicans opposing it.

The gentlewoman from Ohio's (Ms. KAPTUR) amendment could not be accepted because it went over budget. However, at the same time, this same

Committee on Rules approved an amendment that will add \$150 million over the budget to pay apple growers.

The Rules Committee also denied a request by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) to offer an amendment to increase food safety inspections. Food imports are increasing; yet funding for food inspectors is not adequate to keep pace. This amendment, which is important to our health and safety, should have been made in order.

Madam Speaker, I do not agree with these priorities. I support the bill, but I cannot support the rule that turns down these amendments that I just talked about.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1300

It has been a tough road as well because we have received over 2,500 individual requests for projects from individual Members around the country.

We have done our best to try to take care of everyone that we possibly could.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) mentioned the reference to an amendment involving apples. We know that apple producers are facing a tremendous problem right now in trying to deal with some adverse conditions that they are faced with. This was an amendment presented by our good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), who has worked very hard on this issue; and this amendment has bipartisan support.

Honestly, the Members know that we have tried to keep these authorizing issues and new programs off of our appropriations bill; but in this case, the committee worked its will. And we have this program in this bill. We know that there will be some contentious times in trying to deal with this as we move through this bill, but we expect to do that.

All in all, I think we can all stand up and say we are proud of what we have accomplished here. The Committee on Rules has also worked very hard to deal with some of the problems in moving this bill to the floor. Again I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), and all the members of the Committee on Rules for taking a lot of time and energy to get us to this point and hope that, in a bipartisan way, we can support the rule and the bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who has been a great proponent and advocate for hungry people all over the world and in her own country.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I thank the esteemed ranking member for yielding time to me on this rule on our agriculture appropriation bill for the year 2002. Let me say that it has been a pleasure to work with our new chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA). We think we have perfected the bill as it has moved through subcommittee and full committee. Nonetheless, I must rise reluctantly to oppose this rule.

We did go before the Committee on Rules to try to get the permission to offer amendments here on the floor today. We were refused. I wanted to go through a few of those amendments that we believe are worthy and would make this a much better bill.

Probably one of the most important is the Global Food for Education initiative inspired by the work of Senators Bob Dole and George McGovern. It takes our school lunch program from this country and extends its concept abroad, using food to help over 9 million needy children in 38 countries to both promote their education and help them develop fully by having decent nutrition. We very much want to continue this program. We really believe that we allowed ourselves to become bottled up by artificial budget rules

that prevented us from going on record to do what is right in this current bill. We would very much like to have this Global Food for Education program extended directly by Congress as a part of the regular order in this appropriation bill.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) will probably be speaking against the rule soon on the question of food safety and improved food inspection. On the surface, the bill before us looks like it provides more money for those needs, but it almost only pays costs to staff to hold on to what we have. Can anyone here really accept the fact that the Food and Drug Administration can barely inspect 1 percent of the products coming across our borders every day? That means 99 percent of imported product is not tested. Is that the gold standard of safety we hear so much about? And can we really believe that we have the information on the testing of practices like irradiation and enhanced food safety standards? No. In fact, in the subcommittee bill, we were able to get language on irradiation to do the kind of baseline studies that are necessary to assure irradiated food safety to consumers, but then those were stripped at the full committee level.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. NUSSLE. I thank the gentleman.

It is my understanding that upon adoption of the rule, the appropriations bill will exceed the Subcommittee on Agriculture and Rural Development's 302(b) allocation by \$150 million.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would say to the gentleman that his understanding is correct. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), the chairman of the subcommittee, developed a bill that was within its 302(b) allocation as set by the Committee on Appropriations. However, the bill as reported from the committee included an amendment, which I opposed, by the way. This amendment included additional spending that really should be mandatory and under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture. However, the Committee on Appropriations adopted this amendment, which would provide an additional \$150 million in emergency funding to assist apple producers.

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

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

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

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

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

accommodate this spending in the agriculture bill.

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

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, I think that overall there are many things to commend this bill, but I think there are a number of serious omissions which the House ought to deal with before we pass the bill on to the Senate. To express those concerns, I intend personally to vote against the rule although I will probably, unless something unforeseen happens, support the bill on final passage.

First of all, I believe that we have something approaching a national crisis with respect to public confidence in the safety of the food that we import and that we consume. All of us have seen story after story about the outbreak of serious disease associated with consuming food. We have had over 5,000 Americans die last year from food borne illness.

I saw a horror story a few days ago about the fact that a number of people in South Dakota and Minnesota had gotten deathly ill because they had consumed ground beef that contained ground-up animal thyroids. Those thyroids in the past had not been included in the food supply. But because we now have synthetic thyroid drugs, those animal thyroids are no longer used to the extent they were before to make thyroid medicine and so one meatpacking plant had simply ground the thyroid up with the rest of the animal. The result was that a good many people got deathly sick.

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

And while there is no question that our food supply is among the safest in the world, we still have a lot of problems that could be taken care of if we put the needs of food safety, for instance, ahead of the needs of the wealthiest 1 percent of the people in this country to get a \$53,000 tax cut next year. We have some choices to make, and we are being prevented from making them by the choices that were already made by this House on the tax bill.

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

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

□ 1315

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

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

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

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

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

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

job and their efforts are very much appreciated.

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

There are a couple items that I am very pleased that were included. One is funding for the National Animal Disease Center in Ames. This is in response to real concerns that we have with foot and mouth disease; mad cow disease; those types of problems that can be devastating to our livestock industry; and also for food safety for Americans. Also, they have increased the funding for the AgrAbility program, something that is very dear to me. What this program does is help people continue to farm even with disabilities, and the level of \$4.6 million in this bill for this very important program is very much appreciated.

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

Also, a key element for the Department is food safety. I am very pleased that the FDA has increased funding of \$115 million to a level of \$1.18 billion. That is the largest increase in history. The Food Inspection Service has an increase of \$25.4 million, raising that total to \$720 million, also a very substantial increase to meet the needs that we have to provide not only the best quality food but the safest food anywhere to be found in the world.

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

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

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

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

Specifically, this rule blocks an amendment that I brought to the committee to provide urgent emergency

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

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

Experts like Joe Levitt from the FDA are telling the press that, quote, we do have a real problem. To address this problem, I asked the committee to allow an amendment to provide \$213 million in emergency funds, \$90 million to increase inspection of imported foods from 1 to 10 percent, \$73 million for over 600 new inspectors to inspect all high-risk and domestic firms twice a year and all other domestic firms every 2 years, and \$50 million for the food safety and inspection service to ensure the implementation of new food safety procedures to strengthen our food safety efforts.

The Food and Drug Administration inspects all food except meat, poultry, and eggs. They inspect fruit juices, vegetables, cheeses, and seafood. These foods are the sources of 85 percent of food poisoning; and last year, recalls of FDA-regulated products rose to 315, the most since the mid-1980s, and 36 percent above the average.

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

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

The FDA has only 400 people to inspect all domestic food, and we have 30,000 domestic food producers and food plants in the United States. They have less than 120 people to inspect imported food. Food Safety and Inspection Service has held public hearings on a wide range of issues: procedures for imported food, risk management, emergency outbreaks. We know what has happened in Europe with foot and mouth. We know about the threat of

mad cow. It is vital that the FSIS has the resources it needs. American families should be able to go out to dinner, to buy food, and not be fearful that they or their children or their families are going to be in jeopardy.

In the 1920s, Upton Sinclair wrote in a novel, *The Jungle*, he highlighted the abuses of the meat packaging industry. It brought a wave of reform in this country. We need to move forward on food safety, not to move backward to the days that Sinclair wrote about. This is about providing the agency that was responsible for protecting our food supply, give them the resources to have the inspectors that they need in order that Americans will be safe.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

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

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

As reported, the bill also designates \$150 million in emergencies, which increased both the levels of the budget resolution and the caps by the same amount. It also rescinds \$3.7 billion, but this rescission produces no savings in outlays. As reported by the Committee on Appropriations on June 27, the bill does exceed the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug's 302(b) allocation. Therefore, it does not violate section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which prohibits the consideration of appropriation legislation that exceeds the reporting subcommittee's 302(b) allocation.

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

Indeed, earlier this same week, the House passed a bill that provided that same \$5.5 billion in agricultural emergency assistance. That bill provided \$169 million for the producers of specialty crops. In addition, the budget resolution provided another \$7.3 billion

of agriculture spending in fiscal year 2002 and included a procedure that could increase the total to as much as \$63 billion. The Committee on Agriculture is free to use that portion and allocation as it sees fit for specialty crops.

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

Furthermore, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) agreed that the Committee on Appropriations would revise its 302(b) allocations and reflect the fact that the bill would be offset by other appropriation bills. It was further agreed that the offsets would not come out of the bills that have already passed the House or bring Defense below the levels of the President's budget submission. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is a man of his word. He has done his best in bringing this bill to the floor, as has the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

In view of the good faith comments of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and commitments in this regard, I urge Members not only to support the bill but to support the rule.

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

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

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

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

So this notion that this is not a good rule because some people do not have the opportunity, those opportunities were provided to the subcommittee Members, and there was a full debate on many of these issues. Although I am

a new member of the subcommittee, I am certainly not new to the issues of agriculture. During the last 6 years, and I have been a member of the agricultural authorization committee and I have worked very hard with many Members, including some who are in the Chamber today, on agricultural issues, in trying to solve agricultural problems.

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

□ 1330

A big piece of this bill has to do with research. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa when he says that research is about the future of agriculture. It is also about the future of how we get agriculture out of the recession that agriculture is currently in.

I have an agriculture research lab in my hometown of Peoria. They do marvelous work. The people there are very professional chemists and professional people who do the work that really helps us plan for the future uses of commodities and other fruits and vegetables and specialty crops that we grow in this country.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), a colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington, my colleague on the Committee on Rules, for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, my colleagues understand what we are talking about today is the rule. That is what we are debating right now, about whether we are going to move forward on the rule, an opportunity to put this on the floor, an opportunity to vote on this and get the appropriations bill done before we go home.

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

We should not go too far from understanding that this bill provides \$22 bil-

lion for food stamps. This bill provides \$1.2 billion for the Food and Drug Administration. They know how to administer their business. They know what they are doing, and \$1.2 billion will cover that. Child nutrition programs, \$10.1 billion. The Supplemental Nutritional Program for Women, Infants and Children, known as WIC, \$4.1 billion.

What we are doing with this bill and with this rule is to make sure that the agriculture of this country is not only safe and the food they produce is reliable, but we are also trying to make sure that we look at the resources and assets that we have in this country and say that we believe that conservation programs are important; we think people who are engaged in agriculture are important.

We are making sure that our Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is funded, \$3 billion. We are trying to prepare ourselves to make sure that people who live in rural areas and who are in agriculture know that Washington will deal fairly with them.

But we also recognize that part of the argument we are going to hear today is we are not spending enough money. Well, I might remind my colleagues that we can never spend enough money to make sure that some people in this body will always be happy, but that we do go back to the budget that we set in place earlier in the year, and that this program that we are doing for the 2002 agriculture appropriations act falls in line with what this body said it would do. Then, through the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), we have had an opportunity to craft through many discussions and through many votes a policy of this country that is good on a moving-forward basis.

So I support what we are doing here today. This rule is important for us to continue the process, not only on this appropriations bill, but to make sure that we finish in time and move forward on the commitment that we have to the country, to make sure that the public policy of this Republican Congress and, yes, one that the President will sign, to make sure that people who are involved in agribusiness and consumers and, yes, women and children and people who are on food stamps, will make sure that the system is there and reliable and works properly.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

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

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 194, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—222

Aderholt	Crane	Graham
Akin	Crenshaw	Granger
Armey	Cubin	Graves
Bachus	Culberson	Green (WI)
Baker	Cunningham	Greenwood
Baldacci	Davis, Jo Ann	Grucci
Ballenger	Davis, Tom	Gutknecht
Barr	Deal	Hall (TX)
Bartlett	DeLay	Hansen
Bass	DeMint	Hart
Bereuter	Diaz-Balart	Hastert
Biggert	Doolittle	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	Dreier	Hayes
Blunt	Duncan	Hayworth
Boehlert	Dunn	Hefley
Boehner	Ehlers	Herger
Bonilla	Ehrlich	Hilleary
Bono	Emerson	Hinchey
Boyd	English	Hobson
Brady (TX)	Everett	Hoekstra
Brown (SC)	Ferguson	Holden
Bryant	Flake	Horn
Burr	Fletcher	Hostettler
Buyer	Foley	Hulshof
Callahan	Forbes	Hunter
Calvert	Fossella	Hutchinson
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Hyde
Cannon	Gallegly	Isakson
Cantor	Ganske	Issa
Capito	Gekas	Istook
Castle	Gibbons	Jenkins
Chabot	Gilchrest	Johnson (CT)
Chambliss	Gillmor	Johnson (IL)
Coble	Gilman	Johnson, Sam
Collins	Goode	Jones (NC)
Cooksey	Goodlatte	Keller
Cox	Goss	Kelly



Kennedy (MN)	Oxley	Simpson
Kerns	Paul	Skeen
King (NY)	Pence	Skelton
Kingston	Peterson (PA)	Smith (MI)
Kirk	Pickering	Smith (NJ)
Knollenberg	Pitts	Souder
Kolbe	Pombo	Spence
LaHood	Portman	Stearns
Larsen (WA)	Pryce (OH)	Stump
Latham	Quinn	Sununu
LaTourette	Radanovich	Sweeney
Leach	Ramstad	Tancred
Lewis (CA)	Regula	Tauzin
Lewis (KY)	Rehberg	Taylor (NC)
Linder	Reynolds	Terry
LoBiondo	Riley	Thornberry
Lucas (OK)	Rogers (KY)	Thune
Maloney (NY)	Rogers (MI)	Tiahrt
Manzullo	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
McCrery	Roukema	Toomey
McHugh	Royce	Trafficant
McInnis	Ryan (WI)	Upton
McKeon	Ryun (KS)	Vitter
Mica	Saxton	Walden
Miller (FL)	Scarborough	Walsh
Miller, Gary	Schaffer	Wamp
Moran (KS)	Schrock	Watkins (OK)
Morella	Sensenbrenner	Watts (OK)
Myrick	Sessions	Weldon (FL)
Nethercutt	Shadeegg	Weller
Ney	Shaw	Whitfield
Northup	Shays	Wicker
Norwood	Sherwood	Wilson
Nussle	Shimkus	Wolf
Osborne	Shuster	Wu
Ose	Simmons	Young (AK)
Otter		Young (FL)

## NAYS—194

Abercrombie	Frost	Meehan
Ackerman	Gephardt	Meeks (NY)
Allen	Gonzalez	Menendez
Andrews	Gordon	Millender-
Baca	Green (TX)	McDonald
Baird	Gutierrez	Miller, George
Baldwin	Hall (OH)	Mink
Barcia	Harman	Mollohan
Barrett	Hastings (FL)	Moore
Becerra	Hilliard	Moran (VA)
Bentsen	Hinojosa	Murtha
Berkley	Hoeffel	Nadler
Berman	Holt	Napolitano
Berry	Honda	Neal
Bishop	Hookey	Oberstar
Blagojevich	Hoyer	Obey
Blumenauer	Inslee	Oliver
Borski	Israel	Ortiz
Boswell	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Brady (PA)	Jackson-Lee	Pascarell
Brown (FL)	(TX)	Pastor
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Payne
Capps	John	Pelosi
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)
Cardin	Jones (OH)	Phelps
Carson (IN)	Kanjorski	Pomeroy
Carson (OK)	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Rangel
Clayton	Kildee	Reyes
Clement	Kilpatrick	Rivers
Clyburn	Kind (WI)	Rodriguez
Combest	Kleczka	Roeimer
Condit	Kucinich	Ross
Costello	LaFalce	Rothman
Coyne	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
Cramer	Langevin	Rush
Crowley	Lantos	Sabo
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Sanchez
Davis (CA)	Lee	Sanders
Davis (FL)	Levin	Sandlin
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer
DeFazio	Lipinski	Schakowsky
DeGette	Lofgren	Schiff
Delahunt	Lowey	Scott
DeLauro	Lucas (KY)	Serrano
Deutsch	Luther	Sherman
Dicks	Maloney (CT)	Shows
Doggett	Markey	Smith (WA)
Dooley	Mascara	Snyder
Doyle	Matheson	Solis
Edwards	Matsui	Spratt
Engel	McCarthy (MO)	Stark
Eshoo	McCarthy (NY)	Stenholm
Etheridge	McCollum	Strickland
Evans	McDermott	Stupak
Farr	McGovern	Tanner
Fattah	McIntyre	Tauscher
Filner	McKinney	Taylor (MS)
Ford	McNulty	Thompson (CA)
Frank		Thompson (MS)

Thurman	Velazquez	Weiner
Tierney	Visclosky	Wexler
Towns	Waters	Woolsey
Turner	Watson (CA)	Wynn
Udall (CO)	Watt (NC)	
Udall (NM)	Waxman	

## NOT VOTING—18

Barton	Houghton	Rahall
Bonior	Largent	Ros-Lehtinen
Boucher	Meek (FL)	Slaughter
Burton	Owens	Smith (TX)
Conyers	Platts	Thomas
Dingell	Putnam	Weldon (PA)

## □ 1401

Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. MANZULLO, TAYLOR of North Carolina, and BALDACCI changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained due to emergency dental work during rollcall vote No. 207. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall vote No. 207.

### SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ed Thomas, one of his secretaries.

### ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, as amended (47 U.S.C. 396(i)), I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for Fiscal Year 2000.

GEORGE W. BUSH.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 28, 2001.

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material on H.R. 2330.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to House Resolution 183 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2330.

## □ 1402

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2230) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, with Mr. GOODLATTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I believe we have produced a good bipartisan bill that deals with a lot of the specific issues that Members are concerned about in their districts around the country, ranging from research projects to inspection issues, to FDA issues, to just any possible issue that has come up. There have been 2500-plus requests from individual Members, and we have done our best to accommodate that.

Mr. Chairman, I am just delighted that we have seen good, strong bipartisan support for the effort we have undertaken in putting this bill together.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring before the House today the fiscal year 2002 appropriations bill for Agriculture, Rural Development, the Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies.

My goal this year has been to produce a bipartisan bill, and I believe we have done a good job in reaching that goal.

The subcommittee began work on this bill in early March, before the administration produced its budget. We had 6 public hearings