

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend all the members of committee, the staff of our committee, both Republican and Democrat, and the staff and members of the SEC. I urge everyone to support this bill.

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am awaiting the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) who has indicated he would come over to the floor.

If I could inquire of the Chair as to how much time is remaining on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to H.R. 3060, the Emergency Securities Response Act.

This legislation amends a provision that I authored, which the Congress approved as part of the H.R. 3657, Market Reform Act of 1990, to give the SEC the power to suspend trading of securities and to issue emergency orders consistent with the public interest and the protection of investors (See CONGRESS RECORD, September 28, 1990, at H8376-8383). This provision grew out of the investigations that the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, which I then chaired, carried out into the 1987 stock market crash. One of the things we found was that the SEC lacked many of the types of emergency authorities that the CFTC had, and we felt it was desirable that they be granted broader emergency authorities.

My objection to the legislation is not that it expands the SEC's authority to suspend trading or issue emergency orders from 10 days up to 30 days, with further extensions of up to 90 days possible. Indeed, in an earlier version of this legislation (H.R. 4997, introduced in 1988, I had actually proposed allowing the SEC to exercise its emergency authorities for periods of up to 30 days). So, I have no problem with doing so today.

Instead, my concerns about the bill we are debating today is that it expands the range of coverage of this emergency provision from the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to the full range of federal securities laws. This has the effect of expanding coverage of the provision to cover all the federal securities laws. And while there may be some good reasons to extend these authorities to the Securities Act of 1933, the Investment Company Act of 1940, the Investment Advisors Act of 1940, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Securities Investors Protection Act of 1970, I believe that the effect of this provision is to extend the reach of section 12(k) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 781(k)(2)) to allow the SEC to issue exemptions from the Public Utilities Holding Company Act of 1935 (known as "PUHCA"), which regulates the activities of large, multi-state, electric or natural gas holding companies.

While the Financial Services Committee may successfully have absconded with the Energy and Commerce Committee's securities jurisdiction, the last time I checked PUHCA was within the jurisdiction of the Energy and Commerce Committee. Our Committee has

held no hearings or had any other process with respect to whether granting the SEC emergency powers to grant exemptions to PUHCA was warranted or in the public interest. Given the Commission's rather shoddy record in recent years of administering the Act, I am not comfortable with granting such an exemption today. I am particularly concerned when I have seen no justification from the SEC or its staff for giving the SEC such authority, no analysis of the possible impact of this on PUHCA or on our nation's electricity or natural gas markets, and no indication that the lack of such authority has posed any problems for PUHCA-companies post-September 11.

I would also note that while H.R. 3060 has provisions requiring the SEC to consult with and consider the views of the CFTC whenever exercising its emergency authorities with respect to a stock-index future, there is no similar requirement with respect to the FERC when PUHCA is concerned. Given the fact that PUHCA and the Federal Power Act were passed simultaneously, and that both laws deal with regulation of energy markets, such consultation may be needed in this area as well. We at least should have been given the chance to consider it.

At the very minimum, the Energy and Commerce Committee should have been given a referral of this bill so that it could consider the need for this provision and any amendments to it affecting matters within our jurisdiction. I have been informed that in lieu of such a referral, the Majority may have exchanged letters on this matter. However, no one on the Minority of the Committee has been granted access to these letters, so I have no idea what they say or whether the Committee's substantive and jurisdictional interests have been preserved.

This is not the proper way to legislate. I object to bringing up this bill today.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3060.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### 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 on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2330, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2330, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the conference report on 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 Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, November 8, 2001, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 9, 2001, at page H7962.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAP- TUR) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring before the House today the conference report on H.R. 2330, providing appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, the Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies for fiscal year 2002.

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the good work of my friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), my ranking member who has contributed greatly to this process. It has been a real pleasure working with her and all the members of the subcommittee in getting to this point today. It has really been a pleasure, and I want to acknowledge that as we present this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have produced a good, bipartisan conference agreement that does a lot to advance important nutrition, research and rural development programs and still meet our conference allocations on discretionary and mandatory spending. My goal this year has been to produce a bipartisan bill, and I believe we have done a good job in reaching that goal.

This conference agreement does have significant increases over fiscal year 2001 for programs that have always enjoyed strong bipartisan support, and they include: Agriculture Research Service, \$83 million for salaries and expenses and \$45 million for buildings and facilities; Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service, \$45 million; Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, \$83 million; Food Safety and Inspection Service, \$20 million; Farm Service Agency, \$240 million; Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund \$232 million; Natural Resources Conservation Service, \$55 million; Rural Economic and Community Development Programs, \$101 million;

Domestic Food Programs, \$3.7 billion, including the Food Stamp Program, \$1.9 billion in reserve to respond to economic conditions; and WIC, \$305 million to respond to economic conditions that may worsen; the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs including Public Law 480, \$34 million; and the Food and Drug Administration, \$120 million.

Mr. Speaker, we all refer to this bill as an “agriculture bill,” but it does far more than assist basic agriculture. It also supports human nutrition, the environment, and food and drug and medical safety. This is a bill that will deliver benefits to every one of our citizens every day.

I would say to all Members, if they can support this conference agreement, they can tell all of their constituents that they voted to improve their lives while maintaining fiscal responsibility.

The conference agreement is a bipartisan product with a lot of hard work and input from both sides of the aisle. I would like to thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG),

chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, as well as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, who put in a lot of hard work and contributed to this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank all of my subcommittee colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAUBO), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. Speaker, I would again like to single out in particular the ranking member, who has put so much effort into this bill, and my friend, the gen-

tlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), for all her hard work.

Mr. Speaker, we have tried our best to put together a good, solid bill that works for all of America. Much of it is compromise, to be sure, but I believe it is a good compromise and good policy.

In closing, I would also like to thank the subcommittee staff for all of their hard work. None of this could get done without the strong, good commitment, the hard work that the staff puts in day in and day out: Hank Moore, the subcommittee clerk; Martin Delgado; Maureen Holahan; Joanne Orndorff; Leslie Barrack; Martha Foley of the staff of the gentleman for Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and Jim Richards, a great American, who is in my personal Congressional office. Without their good work we would not have a bill here today.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to support this conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD tabular material related to this bill.

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES  
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 (H.R. 2330)**  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS</b>						
<b>Production, Processing, and Marketing</b>						
Office of the Secretary .....	2,908	2,992	3,015	2,992	2,992	+ 84
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20) .....	3,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-3,000
Executive Operations:						
Chief Economist.....	7,446	7,648	7,704	7,648	7,704	+ 258
National Appeals Division.....	12,394	12,766	12,869	12,766	12,869	+ 475
Office of Budget and Program Analysis.....	6,750	6,978	7,041	6,978	7,041	+ 291
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	10,029	10,261	10,325	10,261	10,029	.....
Common computing environment.....	39,912	59,369	59,369	59,369	59,369	+ 19,457
Office of the Chief Financial Officer .....	5,160	5,335	5,384	5,335	5,384	+ 224
Total, Executive Operations.....	81,691	102,357	102,692	102,357	102,396	+ 20,705
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	628	647	652	647	647	+ 19
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments.....	182,345	187,581	177,647	187,581	187,647	+ 5,302
Payments to GSA.....	(125,266)	(130,266)	(130,266)	(130,266)	(130,266)	(+ 5,000)
Building operations and maintenance.....	(31,136)	(31,372)	(31,438)	(31,372)	(31,438)	(+ 302)
Repairs, renovations, and construction.....	(25,943)	(25,943)	(15,943)	(25,943)	(25,943)	.....
Hazardous materials management .....	15,665	15,665	15,665	15,665	15,665	.....
Departmental administration .....	35,931	37,079	37,398	37,079	37,079	+ 1,143
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers.....	2,993	2,993	2,993	3,493	3,243	+ 250
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.....	3,560	3,684	3,718	3,684	3,718	+ 158
Office of Communications.....	8,604	8,894	8,975	8,894	8,894	+ 290
Office of the Inspector General.....	68,715	70,839	71,429	70,839	70,839	+ 2,124
Office of the General Counsel.....	31,012	32,627	32,937	32,627	32,627	+ 1,615
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics.....	555	573	578	573	573	+ 18
Economic Research Service.....	66,891	67,200	67,620	67,200	67,200	+ 309
National Agricultural Statistics Service.....	100,550	113,786	114,546	113,786	113,786	+ 13,236
Census of Agriculture .....	(14,967)	(25,350)	(25,456)	(25,350)	(25,350)	(+ 10,383)
Agricultural Research Service.....	896,835	915,591	971,365	999,438	979,464	+ 82,629
Buildings and facilities.....	74,037	30,462	78,862	99,625	118,987	+ 44,950
Total, Agricultural Research Service.....	970,872	946,053	1,050,227	1,099,063	1,098,451	+ 127,579
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:						
Research and education activities.....	505,079	407,319	507,452	542,842	542,062	+ 36,983
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund .....	(7,100)	(7,100)	(7,100)	(7,100)	(7,100)	.....
Extension activities .....	432,475	413,404	436,029	433,546	439,473	+ 6,998
Integrated activities .....	41,849	41,849	43,355	42,350	42,853	+ 1,004
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service .....	979,403	862,572	986,836	1,018,738	1,024,388	+ 44,985
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs .....	634	654	660	654	654	+ 20
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:						
Salaries and expenses .....	529,397	702,925	587,386	602,754	620,490	+ 91,093
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20) .....	5,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-5,000
AQI user fees .....	(84,813)	(84,813)	(84,813)	(84,813)	(84,813)	.....
Buildings and facilities .....	9,848	5,189	7,189	5,189	7,189	-2,659
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service .....	544,245	708,114	594,575	607,943	627,879	+ 83,434
Agricultural Marketing Service:						
Marketing Services .....	65,191	71,430	71,774	71,430	71,430	+ 6,239
Standardization user fees .....	(4,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(+ 1,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected) .....	(60,596)	(60,596)	(60,596)	(60,596)	(60,596)	.....
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32) .....	13,438	13,874	13,995	13,874	13,995	+ 557
Payments to states and possessions .....	1,347	1,347	1,347	1,347	1,347	.....
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service .....	79,976	86,651	87,116	86,651	86,772	+ 6,796
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:						
Salaries and expenses .....	31,350	32,907	33,117	34,000	33,117	+ 1,767
Limitation on inspection and weighing services .....	(42,463)	(42,463)	(42,463)	(42,463)	(42,463)	.....
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety .....	459	476	481	476	476	+ 17
Food Safety and Inspection Service.....	695,171	715,542	720,652	715,747	715,642	+ 20,471
Lab accreditation fees 1/ .....	(998)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(+ 2)
Total, Food Safety and Inspection Service.....	695,171	715,542	720,652	715,747	715,642	+ 20,471
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing .....	3,907,158	3,999,886	4,113,529	4,210,689	4,234,485	+ 327,327
<b>Farm Assistance Programs</b>						
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.....	588	606	611	606	606	+ 18

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES  
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 (H.R. 2330) — continued**

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>Farm Service Agency:</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	826,563	939,030	945,993	939,030	939,030	+ 112,467
(Transfer from export loans) .....	(588)	(790)	(797)	(790)	(790)	(+ 202)
(Transfer from P.L. 480) .....	(813)	(972)	(980)	(972)	(972)	(+ 159)
(Transfer from ACIF) .....	(264,731)	(272,595)	(274,769)	(272,595)	(274,769)	(+ 10,038)
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts.....	(266,132)	(274,357)	(276,546)	(274,357)	(276,531)	(+ 10,399)
Total, salaries and expenses .....	(1,092,695)	(1,213,387)	(1,222,539)	(1,213,387)	(1,215,561)	(+ 122,866)
State mediation grants .....	2,993	2,993	2,993	3,993	3,493	+ 500
Dairy indemnity program.....	450	100	100	100	100	-350
Agricultural conservation program (supplemental appropriations, P.L. 107-20).....	-45,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+ 45,000
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency .....	785,006	942,123	949,086	943,123	942,623	+ 157,617
<b>Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:</b>						
<b>Loan authorizations:</b>						
<b>Farm ownership loans:</b>						
Direct.....	(127,722)	(128,000)	(128,000)	(146,996)	(146,996)	(+ 19,274)
Guaranteed.....	(868,086)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(+ 131,914)
Subtotal.....	(995,808)	(1,128,000)	(1,128,000)	(1,146,996)	(1,146,996)	(+ 151,188)
<b>Farm operating loans:</b>						
Direct.....	(522,891)	(600,000)	(600,000)	(611,198)	(611,198)	(+ 88,307)
Unsubsidized guaranteed .....	(1,075,468)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(+ 424,532)
Subsidized guaranteed .....	(369,100)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(505,531)	(505,531)	(+ 136,431)
Subtotal.....	(1,967,459)	(2,600,000)	(2,600,000)	(2,616,729)	(2,616,729)	(+ 649,270)
Indian tribe land acquisition loans .....	(2,002)	(2,000)	(2,000)	(2,000)	(2,000)	(-2)
Emergency disaster loans .....	(24,947)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(+ 53)
Boll weevil eradication loans .....	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	.....
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(3,090,216)	(3,855,000)	(3,855,000)	(3,890,725)	(3,890,725)	(+ 800,509)
<b>Loan subsidies:</b>						
<b>Farm ownership loans:</b>						
Direct.....	13,756	3,366	3,366	3,866	3,866	-9,890
Guaranteed.....	4,427	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	+ 73
Subtotal.....	18,183	7,866	7,866	8,366	8,366	-9,817
<b>Farm operating loans:</b>						
Direct.....	47,251	53,580	53,580	54,580	54,580	+ 7,329
Unsubsidized guaranteed .....	14,738	52,650	52,650	52,650	52,650	+ 37,912
Subsidized guaranteed .....	30,119	67,800	67,800	68,550	68,550	+ 38,431
Subtotal.....	92,108	174,030	174,030	175,780	175,780	+ 83,672
Indian tribe land acquisition .....	322	118	118	118	118	-204
Emergency disaster loans .....	6,120	3,363	3,363	3,363	3,363	-2,757
Total, Loan subsidies.....	116,733	185,377	185,377	187,627	187,627	+ 70,894
<b>ACIF expenses:</b>						
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA).....	264,731	272,595	274,769	272,595	272,595	+ 7,864
Administrative expenses .....	4,130	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	+ 3,870
Total, ACIF expenses.....	268,861	280,595	282,769	280,595	280,595	+ 11,734
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund .....	385,594	465,972	468,146	468,222	468,222	+ 82,628
(Loan authorization) .....	(3,090,216)	(3,855,000)	(3,855,000)	(3,890,725)	(3,890,725)	(+ 800,509)
Total, Farm Service Agency.....	1,170,600	1,408,095	1,417,232	1,411,345	1,410,845	+ 240,245
Risk Management Agency.....	65,453	74,752	75,142	73,752	74,752	+ 9,299
Total, Farm Assistance Programs.....	1,236,641	1,483,453	1,492,885	1,485,703	1,486,203	+ 249,562
<b>Corporations</b>						
<b>Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:</b>						
Federal crop insurance corporation fund .....	2,804,660	3,037,000	3,037,000	3,037,000	3,037,000	+ 232,340

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES  
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 (H.R. 2330) — continued**

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:</b>						
Reimbursement for net realized losses .....	25,264,441	23,116,000	23,116,000	23,116,000	23,116,000	-2,148,441
Operations and maintenance for hazardous waste management (limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	.....
<b>Total, Corporations</b> .....	<b>28,069,101</b>	<b>26,153,000</b>	<b>26,153,000</b>	<b>26,153,000</b>	<b>26,153,000</b>	<b>-1,916,101</b>
<b>Total, title I, Agricultural Programs</b> .....	<b>33,212,900</b>	<b>31,636,339</b>	<b>31,759,514</b>	<b>31,849,392</b>	<b>31,873,688</b>	<b>-1,339,212</b>
(By transfer) .....	(266,132)	(274,357)	(276,546)	(274,357)	(276,531)	(+10,399)
(Loan authorization) .....	(3,090,216)	(3,855,000)	(3,855,000)	(3,890,725)	(3,890,725)	(+800,509)
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(108,059)	(108,059)	(108,059)	(108,059)	(108,059)	.....
<b>TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS</b>						
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment .....	709	730	736	730	730	+21
<b>Natural Resources Conservation Service:</b>						
Conservation operations .....	712,545	773,454	782,762	807,454	779,000	+66,455
Watershed surveys and planning .....	10,844	10,960	11,030	10,960	10,960	+116
Watershed and flood prevention operations .....	99,224	100,413	111,143	100,413	106,590	+7,366
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20) .....	35,500	.....	.....	.....	.....	-35,500
Watershed rehabilitation program .....	.....	.....	.....	10,000	10,000	+10,000
Resource conservation and development .....	41,923	43,048	48,361	48,048	48,048	+6,125
Forestry incentives program .....	6,311	.....	.....	7,811	6,811	+500
Agricultural Conservation Program (rescission) .....	.....	.....	-45,000	.....	.....	.....
<b>Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service</b> .....	<b>906,347</b>	<b>927,875</b>	<b>908,296</b>	<b>984,686</b>	<b>961,409</b>	<b>+55,062</b>
<b>Total, title II, Conservation Programs</b> .....	<b>907,056</b>	<b>928,605</b>	<b>909,032</b>	<b>985,416</b>	<b>962,139</b>	<b>+55,083</b>
<b>TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS</b>						
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development .....	604	623	628	623	623	+19
<b>Rural Development:</b>						
Rural community advancement program .....	760,864	692,125	767,465	1,004,125	806,557	+45,693
(By transfer) .....	.....	.....	.....	(13,000)	.....	.....
RD expenses:						
Salaries and expenses .....	130,084	133,722	134,733	133,722	133,722	+3,638
(Transfer from RHIF) .....	(408,333)	(419,741)	(422,910)	(422,241)	(422,241)	(+13,908)
(Transfer from RDLPF) .....	(3,632)	(3,733)	(3,761)	(3,733)	(3,733)	(+101)
(Transfer from RETLP) .....	(34,640)	(35,804)	(36,322)	(36,000)	(36,000)	(+1,360)
(Transfer from RTB) .....	(2,993)	(3,082)	(3,107)	(3,082)	(3,082)	(+89)
(Transfer from TLP) .....	.....	.....	.....	(2,000)	(2,000)	(+2,000)
<b>Total, RD expenses</b> .....	<b>(579,682)</b>	<b>(595,882)</b>	<b>(600,833)</b>	<b>(600,778)</b>	<b>(600,778)</b>	<b>(+21,096)</b>
<b>Total, Rural Development</b> .....	<b>890,948</b>	<b>825,847</b>	<b>902,198</b>	<b>1,137,847</b>	<b>940,279</b>	<b>+49,331</b>
<b>Rural Housing Service:</b>						
<b>Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:</b>						
Loan authorizations:						
Single family (sec. 502) .....	(1,071,628)	(1,064,650)	(1,064,650)	(1,095,046)	(1,079,848)	(+8,220)
Unsubsidized guaranteed .....	(3,136,429)	(3,137,968)	(3,137,968)	(3,137,968)	(3,137,968)	(+1,539)
Subtotal, Single family .....	(4,208,057)	(4,202,618)	(4,202,618)	(4,233,014)	(4,217,816)	(+9,759)
Housing repair (sec. 504) .....	(32,324)	(32,324)	(32,324)	(32,324)	(32,324)	.....
Rental housing (sec. 515) .....	(114,070)	(114,068)	(114,068)	(114,068)	(114,068)	(-2)
Site loans (sec. 524) .....	(5,152)	(5,090)	(5,090)	(5,090)	(5,090)	(-62)
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538) .....	(99,780)	(99,770)	(99,770)	(99,770)	(99,770)	(-10)
Multi-family housing credit sales .....	(1,779)	(1,778)	(1,778)	(1,778)	(1,778)	(-1)
Single family housing credit sales .....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	.....
Self-help housing land development fund .....	(4,998)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(+2)
<b>Total, Loan authorizations</b> .....	<b>(4,476,160)</b>	<b>(4,470,648)</b>	<b>(4,470,648)</b>	<b>(4,501,044)</b>	<b>(4,485,846)</b>	<b>(+9,666)</b>
Loan subsidies:						
Single family (sec. 502) .....	176,371	140,108	140,108	144,108	142,108	-34,263
Unsubsidized guaranteed .....	7,384	40,166	40,166	40,166	40,166	+32,782
Subtotal, Single family .....	183,755	180,274	180,274	184,274	182,274	-1,481
Housing repair (sec. 504) .....	11,456	10,386	10,386	10,386	10,386	-1,070
Rental housing (sec. 515) .....	56,202	48,274	48,274	48,274	48,274	-7,928
Site loans (sec. 524) .....	28	28	28	28	28	+28
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538) .....	1,517	3,921	3,921	3,921	3,921	+2,404
Multi-family housing credit sales .....	872	750	750	750	750	-122
Self-help housing land development fund .....	278	254	254	254	254	-24
<b>Total, Loan subsidies</b> .....	<b>254,080</b>	<b>243,887</b>	<b>243,887</b>	<b>247,887</b>	<b>245,887</b>	<b>-8,193</b>

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES  
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 (H.R. 2330) — continued**

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RD).....	408,333	419,741	422,910	422,241	422,241	+13,908
Rental assistance program:						
(Sec. 521).....	672,604	687,604	687,604	702,604	695,104	+22,500
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D)) .....	5,900	5,900	5,900	5,900	5,900	.....
Total, Rental assistance program.....	678,504	693,504	693,504	708,504	701,004	+22,500
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund .....	1,340,917	1,357,132	1,360,301	1,378,632	1,369,132	+28,215
(Loan authorization) .....	(4,476,160)	(4,470,648)	(4,470,648)	(4,501,044)	(4,485,846)	(+9,686)
Mutual and self-help housing grants .....	33,925	33,925	33,925	35,000	35,000	+1,075
Rural housing assistance grants.....	43,903	38,914	38,914	38,914	38,914	-4,999
Farm labor program account .....	29,934	28,431	31,431	28,431	31,431	+1,497
Subtotal, grants and payments .....	107,762	101,270	104,270	102,345	105,345	-2,417
Total, Rural Housing Service .....	1,448,679	1,458,402	1,464,571	1,480,877	1,474,477	+25,798
(Loan authorization) .....	(4,476,160)	(4,470,648)	(4,470,648)	(4,501,044)	(4,485,846)	(+9,686)
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:						
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:						
(Loan authorization) .....	(38,172)	(38,171)	(38,171)	(38,171)	(38,171)	(-1)
Loan subsidy .....	19,433	16,494	16,494	16,494	16,494	-2,939
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD) .....	3,632	3,733	3,761	3,733	3,733	+101
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund .....	23,065	20,227	20,255	20,227	20,227	-2,838
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:						
(Loan authorization) .....	(14,969)	(14,966)	(14,966)	(14,966)	(14,966)	(-3)
Direct subsidy .....	3,902	3,616	3,616	3,616	3,616	-286
Rural cooperative development grants .....	6,486	6,486	7,500	8,000	7,750	+1,264
Rural empowerment zones and enterprise community grants.....	.....	14,967	14,967	14,967	14,967	+14,967
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service .....	33,453	45,298	46,338	46,810	46,560	+13,107
(Loan authorization) .....	(53,141)	(53,137)	(53,137)	(53,137)	(53,137)	(-4)
Rural Utilities Service:						
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Electric:						
Direct, 5%.....	(121,128)	(121,107)	(121,107)	(121,107)	(121,107)	(-21)
Direct, Municipal rate.....	(294,358)	(294,358)	(794,358)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(+205,642)
Direct, FFB.....	(1,600,000)	(1,600,000)	(2,600,000)	(2,600,000)	(2,600,000)	(+1,000,000)
Direct, Treasury rate.....	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(750,000)	(750,000)	(+250,000)
Guaranteed electric .....	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	.....
Subtotal, Electric.....	(2,615,486)	(2,615,465)	(4,115,465)	(4,071,107)	(4,071,107)	(+1,455,621)
Telecommunications:						
Direct, 5%.....	(74,835)	(74,827)	(74,827)	(74,827)	(74,827)	(-8)
Direct, Treasury rate.....	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	.....
Direct, FFB.....	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)	.....
Subtotal, Telecommunications.....	(494,835)	(494,827)	(494,827)	(494,827)	(494,827)	(-8)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(3,110,321)	(3,110,292)	(4,610,292)	(4,565,934)	(4,565,934)	(+1,455,613)
Loan subsidies:						
Electric:						
Direct, 5%.....	12,064	3,609	3,609	3,609	3,609	-8,455
Guaranteed electric .....	10	80	80	80	80	+70
Direct, Municipal rate.....	20,458	.....	.....	.....	.....	-20,458
Subtotal, Electric.....	32,532	3,689	3,689	3,689	3,689	-28,843
Telecommunications:						
Direct, 5%.....	7,753	1,736	1,736	1,736	1,736	-6,017
Direct, Treasury rate.....	.....	300	300	300	300	+300
Subtotal, Telecommunications.....	7,753	2,036	2,036	2,036	2,036	-5,717
Total, Loan subsidies.....	40,285	5,725	5,725	5,725	5,725	-34,560

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES  
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 (H.R. 2330) — continued**  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD).....	34,540	35,804	36,322	36,000	36,000	+1,360
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account.....	<u>74,925</u>	<u>41,329</u>	<u>42,047</u>	<u>41,725</u>	<u>41,725</u>	<u>-33,200</u>
(Loan authorization) .....	(3,110,321)	(3,110,292)	(4,610,292)	(4,565,934)	(4,565,934)	(+1,455,613)
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:						
(Loan authorization) .....	(174,615)	.....	(174,615)	(174,615)	(174,615)	.....
Direct loan subsidy.....	2,584	.....	2,584	3,737	3,737	+1,153
RTB administrative expenses (transfer to RD).....	2,993	3,082	3,107	3,082	3,082	+89
Total, Rural Telephone Bank Program Account .....	5,577	3,082	5,691	6,819	6,819	+1,242
High energy costs grants (by transfer) .....	.....	(24,000)	(24,000)	(24,000)	(24,000)	(+24,000)
Distance learning and telemedicine program:						
(Loan authorization) .....	(400,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(-100,000)
(Loan authorization) (proposal) .....	.....	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(80,000)	(+80,000)
Grants/loans subsidy costs.....	26,941	26,941	26,941	51,941	49,441	+22,500
Local Television loan program account:						
(Loan authorization) .....	.....	.....	.....	(322,580)	(258,065)	(+258,065)
Direct loan subsidy.....	.....	.....	.....	25,000	20,000	+20,000
LTLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD).....	.....	.....	.....	2,000	2,000	+2,000
Total, Rural Utilities Service .....	107,443	71,352	74,679	127,485	119,985	+12,542
(Loan authorization) .....	(3,684,936)	(3,510,292)	(5,184,907)	(5,463,129)	(5,378,614)	(+1,693,678)
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs... (By transfer) .....	2,481,127	2,401,520	2,488,414	2,793,742	2,581,924	+100,797
(Loan authorization) .....	(449,598)	(486,180)	(490,100)	(504,056)	(491,056)	(+41,458)
.....	(8,214,237)	(8,034,077)	(9,708,692)	(10,017,310)	(9,917,597)	(+1,703,360)

## TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services.....	569	587	592	587	587	+ 18
Food and Nutrition Service:						
Child nutrition programs.....	4,407,445	4,729,490	4,746,038	4,746,038	4,914,288	+506,843
Transfer from section 32.....	5,127,579	5,357,256	5,340,708	5,340,708	5,172,458	+44,879
Discretionary spending.....	6,486	2,000	2,000	500	500	-5,986
Total, Child nutrition programs.....	9,541,510	10,088,746	10,088,746	10,087,246	10,087,246	+545,736
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC) .....	4,043,086	4,137,086	4,137,086	4,247,086	4,348,000	+304,914
Food stamp program:						
Expenses .....	18,618,228	19,556,436	19,556,436	19,556,436	19,556,436	+938,208
Reserve .....	100,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+1,900,000
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico .....	1,301,000	1,335,550	1,335,550	1,335,550	1,335,550	+34,550
The emergency food assistance program .....	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	.....
Total, Food stamp program.....	20,119,228	21,991,986	21,991,986	22,991,986	22,991,986	+2,872,758
Commodity assistance program .....	139,991	139,991	152,813	139,991	152,813	+12,822
Rescission.....	.....	-5,300	.....	-5,300	-3,300	-3,300
Food donations programs:						
Needy family program .....	1,081	1,081	1,081	1,081	1,081	.....
Elderly feeding program .....	149,670	149,668	159,668	149,668	149,668	-2
Total, Food donations programs.....	150,751	150,749	160,749	150,749	150,749	-2
Food program administration.....	116,550	125,546	126,656	127,546	127,546	+10,996
Total, Food and Nutrition Service.....	34,111,116	36,628,804	36,658,036	37,739,304	37,855,040	+3,743,924
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs.....	34,111,685	36,629,391	36,658,628	37,739,891	37,855,627	+3,743,942

## TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

Foreign Agricultural Service:						
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation.....	115,170	121,563	122,631	121,563	121,813	+6,643
(Transfer from export loans) .....	(3,224)	(3,224)	(3,224)	(3,224)	(3,224)	.....
(Transfer from P.L. 480) .....	(1,033)	(1,033)	(1,033)	(1,033)	(1,033)	.....
Total, Program level.....	(119,427)	(125,820)	(126,888)	(125,820)	(126,070)	(+6,643)
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:						
Title I - Program account:						
Loan authorization, direct.....	(159,327)	(139,399)	(150,000)	(159,327)	(154,664)	(-4,663)
Loan subsidy .....	113,935	113,935	122,600	130,218	126,409	+12,474
Ocean freight differential .....	20,277	20,277	20,277	20,277	20,277	.....

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES  
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 (H.R. 2330) — continued**

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:</b>						
Program level.....	(835,159)	(835,159)	(835,159)	(850,000)	(850,000)	(+ 14,841)
Appropriation.....	835,159	835,159	835,159	850,000	850,000	+ 14,841
<b>Salaries and expenses:</b>						
Foreign Agricultural Service (transfer to FAS) .....	1,033	1,033	1,033	1,033	1,033	.....
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA) .....	813	972	980	972	972	+ 159
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>1,846</b>	<b>2,005</b>	<b>2,013</b>	<b>2,005</b>	<b>2,005</b>	<b>+ 159</b>
<b>Total, Public Law 480:</b>						
Program level.....	(835,159)	(835,159)	(835,159)	(850,000)	(850,000)	(+ 14,841)
Appropriation.....	971,217	971,376	980,049	1,002,500	998,691	+ 27,474
<b>CCC Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):</b>						
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):						
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS) .....	3,224	3,224	3,224	3,224	3,224	.....
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA) .....	588	790	797	790	790	+ 202
<b>Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account.....</b>	<b>3,812</b>	<b>4,014</b>	<b>4,021</b>	<b>4,014</b>	<b>4,014</b>	<b>+ 202</b>
<b>Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs.....</b>						
(By transfer) .....	1,090,199	1,096,953	1,106,701	1,128,077	1,124,518	+ 34,319
	(4,257)	(4,257)	(4,257)	(4,257)	(4,257)	.....
<b>TITLE VI - FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</b>						
<b>Food and Drug Administration</b>						
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation.....	1,066,173	1,173,673	1,183,573	1,183,670	1,183,670	+ 117,497
Prescription drug user fee act .....	(149,273)	(161,716)	(161,716)	(161,716)	(161,716)	(+ 12,443)
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>(1,215,446)</b>	<b>(1,335,389)</b>	<b>(1,345,289)</b>	<b>(1,345,386)</b>	<b>(1,345,386)</b>	<b>(+ 129,940)</b>
Export and certification.....	(5,992)	(6,181)	(6,181)	(6,181)	(6,181)	(+ 189)
Payments to GSA.....	(104,736)	(105,116)	(105,116)	(105,116)	(105,116)	(+ 380)
Drug reimportation .....		2,950				
Buildings and facilities.....	31,281	34,281	34,281	34,281	34,281	+ 3,000
<b>Total, Food and Drug Administration.....</b>	<b>1,097,454</b>	<b>1,210,904</b>	<b>1,217,854</b>	<b>1,217,951</b>	<b>1,217,951</b>	<b>+ 120,497</b>
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>						
Commodity Futures Trading Commission .....	67,850	70,400	70,700	70,400	70,700	+ 2,850
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(36,719)	(36,700)	(36,700)	(36,700)	(36,700)	(- 19)
<b>Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration .....</b>	<b>1,165,304</b>	<b>1,281,304</b>	<b>1,288,554</b>	<b>1,288,351</b>	<b>1,288,651</b>	<b>+ 123,347</b>
<b>TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS</b>						
Hunger fellowships .....	1,996	1,996	4,000	1,996	2,496	+ 500
National Sheep Industry Improvement Center revolving fund .....	5,000		1,000		1,000	- 4,000
Limit crop insurance education .....			-6,000		-6,000	-6,000
Mallard Pointe conservation .....				150	150	+ 150
Jamestown conservation .....				450	250	+ 250
Child and adult care feeding program .....				10,000	10,000	+ 10,000
CCC Apple market loss.....			150,000		75,000	+ 75,000
Klamath Basin (supplemental appropriations, P.L. 107-20) .....	20,000					-20,000
Food Stamp program (supplemental appropriations, P.L. 107-20) .....	-39,500					+ 39,500
Global food for education (supplemental appropriations, P.L. 107-20) .....	22,949					-22,949
Yakima Basin (supplemental appropriations, P.L. 107-20) .....	2,000					-2,000
APHIS transfer to Alaska (supplemental appropriations,.....					15,000	+ 15,000
Dairy price support extension .....					5,000	+ 5,000
Sugar beets .....					5,000	+ 5,000
Tobacco .....						
<b>Total, title VII, General provisions .....</b>	<b>12,445</b>	<b>1,996</b>	<b>149,000</b>	<b>12,596</b>	<b>107,896</b>	<b>+ 95,451</b>
<b>TITLE VIII - FY 2001</b>						
<b>NATURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND OTHER</b>						
<b>EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS</b>						
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</b>						
Office of the Chief Information Officer:						
Common computing environment (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	19,457					-19,457
Departmental administration (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	200					-200

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES  
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 (H.R. 2330) — continued**  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>Farm Service Agency</b>						
Salaries and expenses (contingent emergency appropriations).....	49,890	.....	.....	.....	.....	-49,890
Emergency conservation program (contingent emergency appropriations)...	79,824	.....	.....	.....	.....	-79,824
<b>Federal Crop Insurance Corporation</b>						
Federal crop insurance corporation fund (emergency appropriations) .....	12,971	.....	.....	.....	.....	-12,971
<b>Natural Resources Conservation Service</b>						
Watershed and flood prevention operations (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	109,758	.....	.....	.....	.....	-109,758
<b>Rural Development</b>						
Rural community advancement program (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	199,560	.....	.....	.....	.....	-199,560
<b>Total, Department of Agriculture .....</b>	<b>471,660</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>-471,660</b>
<b>General Provisions</b>						
Conservation technical assistance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	34,923	.....	.....	.....	.....	-34,923
CCC Disease loss compensation (contingent emergency appropriations) ....	19,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-19,000
Dairy assistance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	473,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-473,000
CCC Livestock assistance program (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	488,922	.....	.....	.....	.....	-488,922
WRP Additional acreage enrollments (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	117,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-117,000
CCC Sheep loss assistance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	2,395	.....	.....	.....	.....	-2,395
CCC Citrus canker compensation (contingent emergency appropriations) ...	57,872	.....	.....	.....	.....	-57,872
CCC Apple/potatoes market loss and quality (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	137,696	.....	.....	.....	.....	-137,696
CCC Honey assistance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	20,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-20,000
CCC Livestock indemnity program (contingent emergency appropriations)...	9,978	.....	.....	.....	.....	-9,978
CCC Wool/mohair assistance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	19,956	.....	.....	.....	.....	-19,956
CCC Crop loss disaster assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)...	1,622,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,622,000
CCC Cranberry assistance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	19,956	.....	.....	.....	.....	-19,956
Shared appreciation loan arrangements (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	2,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-2,000
SC grain dealer's guarantee fund (contingent emergency appropriations)....	2,495	.....	.....	.....	.....	-2,495
Puerto Rico food stamp block grant.....	-5,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+5,000
Hawaii sugar transportation cost assistance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	7,184	.....	.....	.....	.....	-7,184
Rural development cooperative grants (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	9,978	.....	.....	.....	.....	-9,978
<b>Business and industry loans:</b>						
(Loan authorization) .....	(1,160,232)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-1,160,232)
Loan subsidy (contingent emergency appropriations).....	9,978	.....	.....	.....	.....	-9,978
CCC Tobacco quota compensation (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	3,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-3,000
CCC Cooperative assistance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	19,956	.....	.....	.....	.....	-19,956
CCC Burley tobacco (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	50,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-50,000
CCC LDP delinquent borrower (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	5,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-5,000
Food stamp excess shelter allowance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	15,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-15,000
Food stamp vehicle allowance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	25,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-25,000
<b>Total, General Provisions.....</b>	<b>3,167,289</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>-3,167,289</b>
<b>Total, title VIII, FY 2001 .....</b>	<b>3,638,949</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>-3,638,949</b>
<b>TITLE X - ANTI-DUMPING</b>						
Anti-dumping .....	39,912	.....	.....	.....	.....	-39,912
<b>Grand total:</b>						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	76,659,577	73,976,108	74,359,843	75,797,465	75,794,443	-865,134
Appropriations .....	(73,015,628)	(73,981,408)	(74,359,843)	(75,802,765)	(75,797,743)	(+2,782,115)
Rescission.....	.....	(-5,300)	.....	(-5,300)	(-3,300)	(-3,300)
Emergency appropriations .....	(12,971)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-12,971)
Contingent emergency appropriations .....	(3,630,978)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-3,630,978)
(By transfer) .....	(719,987)	(764,774)	(770,903)	(782,670)	(771,844)	(+51,857)
(Loan authorization) .....	(11,463,780)	(12,028,476)	(13,713,692)	(14,067,362)	(13,962,986)	(+2,499,206)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(144,778)	(144,759)	(144,759)	(144,759)	(144,759)	(-18)

1/ In addition to appropriation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, obviously I rise in very strong support of this bill and say it is truly an improvement over the original measure that passed the House 4 months ago. The conference committee actually did make it better. And while there are individual items with which we could each disagree, and those items will continue to be a focus for myself and other subcommittee members as we move ahead with other appropriations bills during this session, the product before us truly is worthy of our support.

Let me reciprocate to my very able colleague and fairly new chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) for successfully guiding us through the challenges surrounding his first bill as our subcommittee chair. And I think that the buoyant attitude of the members and the cooperative spirit in which they worked is due to the tone that he set on the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I want to issue my own thanks to our subcommittee staff that worked so very hard, such long hours, and they are never covered by C-SPAN, and the American people do not get to see the depth of their dedication: Hank Moore and Martin Delgado, Maureen Holahan, Joanne Orndorff, Jim Richards, and our detailee, Leslie Barrack, as well as Roger Szemraj from our own office and Julie Little as well. They just did an outstanding job of representing the interests of this House in this conference.

I wanted to pay special thanks to Martha Foley, who is our lone minority staff member, who ably and successfully represented our side of the aisle in painstaking negotiations with the other body. I am just so pleased she is able to be with us here on the floor today. I hope that all of her relatives and friends are watching because she surely deserves the appreciation of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we bring to you a conference report that is \$860 million below the enacted level for the last fiscal year, but it is \$1.8 billion over the administration's request and \$1.4 billion over the original bill that passed the House.

Now, should anyone have concerns about these points of comparison, let me respectfully point out that our needs today are far different from those that were submitted with the President's budget earlier this year, and they are substantially different from those that our Nation faced prior to September 11.

As I pointed out earlier this year, we are touched in our country by agriculture many times each day. It might be in the food we eat, the fabrics we wear, the biofuels that are being produced or the medications or vitamins that are prescribed. We are touched each day by research, by education, by

training, by our food and animal, plant and health inspection services and by marketing services.

This bill continues the essential points that nearly 80 percent of the spending in this bill is mandatory. When one combines all the food assistance programs and the farm price support programs, only about 20 percent of what we can really affect in the bill is discretionary. Over half is what is projected to be spent in this measure is for food programs. That includes Food Stamps, the Women, Infant and Children Food Program and the Child and Elderly Nutrition Programs.

Now, there are significant accomplishments in this conference bill. We have provided an increase of \$211 million for the WIC program over the initial House bill. With recent economic difficulties and increasing unemployment, we have added funds that are available in the program, should we need them. In fact, we have established a \$2 billion reserve for the Food Stamp Program to reflect these concerns, the largest reserve we have ever had in this program.

I might just mention, if you look at New York City and many of the service workers that worked in the World Trade Center who are contract workers and have no benefits, those families absolutely have the right to be fed, to have a good holiday season; and this program will help cushion the blows that this economy and the situation we are facing with regard to terrorism is having on American families.

□ 1745

So we provided the largest reserve we ever have in the history of this program.

We have provided \$10 million in supplemental funding for the Senior Farmers Market Nutrition program, an effort that has been more successful than anyone had anticipated and one which we hope will be continued as a part of the regular farm bill.

Both these funds are to support the program in addition to the other resources from the Commodity Credit Corporation that we hope the Secretary will use to sustain and hopefully expand this program to the full \$25 million level.

Let me also mention we have the strongest possible language included in the statement of managers to be certain the Secretary of Agriculture understands that we expect her to continue the Global Food for Education program. This program can help boys and girls throughout the world get the necessary food while receiving education; and when we think about what is going on in Afghanistan and the surrounding region, it is particularly vital that we see the impact that this program can have in the months and years ahead.

We have so many Members here in the House to thank, Members like the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), the gentleman from Ohio

(Mr. HALL), and certainly our retired Members from the other body, Bob Dole and George McGovern, for inspiring and carrying us through on the vision for this program and what it can do around the world.

The House did go along in this measure also with the higher Senate level for title II of the Food for Peace Program, PL-480, as the House had instructed before we went to conference. I respectfully and seriously thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and the staff for their efforts in securing this important funding.

We do have some successes with increasing food safety funding, particularly with respect to the Food and Drug Administration. The bill provides 10.7 percent over last year's level, and we know how important that agency is now in safeguarding our food supply and the safety of our pharmaceuticals.

It also includes the additional funds to fully fund the pay increases so essential to keeping staff in place and adding staff where necessary so that we can deal with threats to public health and ensuring public health and safety here at home.

We also included an increase of \$15 million over last year for BSE prevention and enforcement. This is commonly known as mad cow disease. We have seen what it has done in other parts of the world, and we know that increasing monitoring of imports and inspection of feed mills here at home is essential to keeping that tragedy out of the American food chain.

We have included additional funds for food safety activities, including our import inspections and monitoring activities; and we have also important successes in this bill on funding for animal welfare, for rural development, for water and housing programs and research programs at our 1890 Institutions.

I know that the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), who has worked so hard in order to increase funding, will speak on this matter very shortly; and we thank her so very much for her leadership and dedication on this important improvement to what our country offers, not just here at home but around the world.

Let me just say as I wrap up here, I am concerned about inadequate funding levels for food safety activities, particularly in the wake of what happened on September 11; and I am really encouraged that Secretary Thompson has recommended over \$61 million in supplemental funds for the purpose of strengthening FDA's food safety and security activities. This truly is a step in the right direction, but only a step; and we look forward to working with the Bush administration on improving those numbers.

We also had research funding requests from hundreds and hundreds of members that had to be reduced due to limits imposed in this bill. Hopefully in future years, we will be able to find a way to meet these important research

activities which are the seed bed for innovation and advancement in our Nation.

Let me also say that the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) was such a leader on this matter in our subcommittee, and this deals with the assistance to specialty-crop producers, particularly apple producers, that in the conference bill we have provided \$75 million to assist those who have been so adversely affected by weather and drought conditions. In our original bill we had hoped to get \$150 million. We just did not have the funds. We just did not have the allocation to do that; and I wanted to again recognize the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT), who have my personal commitment to work with them to make sure producers get the help they need.

On two final points, let me just say the conferees were successful in retaining language to retain the pork check-off program. We expect the Department to honor the votes of producers to terminate that program or to put any settlement agreement to a new vote.

Finally, and this is truly emotional for all Americans, we were so pleased to be able to work with the able gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) to include language naming our very well-respected Farmer to Farmer program as the John Ogonowski Farmer to Farmer Program. John Ogonowski was the pilot of American Airlines Flight 11 which crashed into one of the World Trade Towers and citizen of Massachusetts.

He had exemplified the intent of the Farmer to Farmer program in reaching out among others to Cambodian producers, new immigrants to our shores, who had the need of improved skills to maximize their farming proficiencies, and naming this program for him offers the program an example of an outstanding American who knew both the responsibilities and joy of helping others to improve their situation while taking satisfaction from the accomplishment that such help provides.

Today, in the Sun newspaper from Massachusetts, there was a story that talks about American Airlines pilot John Ogonowski, and it talks about the former Under Secretary of Agriculture August Schumacher, who was a friend of John Ogonowski, and talked about how he was a fourth generation farm boy who never forgot his roots and he made real differences with his new entry programs for farmers in our country. John Ogonowski's father, Alexander Ogonowski, also a farmer, was overwhelmed when he learned of this great honor for his son and American patriot; and he said it is a little too much right now to even comment on.

As we move this bill to the floor today, we especially honor pilot John Ogonowski, and all those who fly on behalf of our commercial airlines and all those in service to our country in every

walk of life. We owe them the freedom of expression that we enjoy here in this Chamber today.

I include for the RECORD the article from the Sun newspaper.

BILL AIMS TO RENAME U.S. FARM PROGRAM FOR LATE DRACUT PILOT

(By Kathleen Deely)

DRACUT—A federal program in which U.S. farmers help their counterparts overseas will be named after deceased Dracut resident John Ogonowski if a bill before Congress is approved.

Ogonowski, who died piloting American Airlines Flight 11 when it was hijacked and crashed into the World Trade Center on Sept. 11, had for years harvested hay and produce on his 150-acre farm on Marsh Hill Road.

Renaming the Department of Agriculture's Farmer-to-Farmer program after Ogonowski has been included in the federal Agriculture Appropriation bill for 2002. The House and Senate are expected to pass the legislation, which will then go to President Bush for his signature, in the next few weeks.

John's sister, Carol Ogonowski, said naming the program after her brother is "one of many tributes that John deserves."

"John would be honored. It's only a fitting tribute to his life that touched so many others," she said.

The program is similar to the New Entry Sustainable Farming Project that Ogonowski ran for Cambodian farmers on his Whitegate Farm for several years. The partnership between Tufts University, the University of Massachusetts Extension Service and the state Department of Food and Agriculture helps immigrants grow their native vegetables and learn the farming industry.

Likewise, the program provides agricultural technical assistance to developing countries around the world and increases food production there.

The idea to name the program after Ogonowski came from August Schumacher Jr., the former undersecretary for farming and international agricultural programs, who was a friend of Ogonowski.

U.S. Rep. Martin Meehan, a Lowell Democrat, worked to have the name changed included in the 2002 agriculture bill.

"John was a fourth-generation farm boy who never forgot his roots," said Meehan. "He made a real difference with his New Entry programs."

Attaching Ogonowski, who was a full-time pilot, to the project makes sense, those who knew him said, because farming was his true passion.

John's father, Alexander Ogonowski, also a farmer, was overwhelmed when he learned of the honor.

"It's a little too much right now," he said.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAUBRO), a member of the subcommittee without whose excellent work this bill would not have been possible.

Ms. DELAUBRO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for yielding me the time, and I rise in strong support of this conference report.

It addresses the many and often competing priorities of agriculture, health and nutrition; and I want to say thanks to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), the chairman; and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member, for their leadership, and the subcommittee and associate staff for their hard work.

Connecticut is a leader in New England's agriculture, in eggs, peaches, milk production per cow. Like other farmers, Connecticut farmers are facing the toughest times since the Great Depression: plunging commodity prices, urban sprawl which puts it in the top 10 States in lost farm land. This spring, record low temperatures eliminated almost 40 percent of our peach and pear crops.

I am proud of the funding for programs that reach out and help our farmers: rural development, conservation, pest management, and commodity marketing assistance. I am also proud of the extension of dairy price supports through May 31, 2002. This program is an essential safety net for Connecticut's dairy farmers, all the more so since reauthorization of the Northeast Dairy Compact has not happened yet.

The compact is vital to the very existence of Connecticut's 228 dairy farms, each one a small family farm, and their way of life. In 2000, it returned \$4.8 million in income back to these dairy farms. This is an average of \$21,000 per farmer. Congress must address this issue. Without the compact, New England's farms are lost.

The conference report also funds coverage for more than 7.5 million WIC participants. I cannot emphasize enough how important WIC is in addressing the economic problems that this country faces. As unemployment increases, so does the number of families eligible for WIC. This essential nutrition, which currently serves approximately 47 percent of all infants born in the United States, provides low-income mothers and their children with nutritious supplemental food packages, nutrition education and counseling and a gateway to pre- and post-natal health care.

WIC does more than help families get through tough times. It contributes to better birth outcomes and reductions in childhood anemia.

This bill also funds safety efforts, but we do need to do more to protect American families from potential bioterrorist threats. Each year, 5,000 Americans die from food-borne illnesses; 76 million get ill, and 325,000 are hospitalized.

FDA inspects all types of food except meat, poultry and eggs. Yet, to cover the 37,000 companies that make this food, the FDA has only 400 inspectors. For the 4.1 million imported food items, the FDA has less than 120 inspectors. These inspectors can barely cover 1 percent of the food coming into the country. In today's times, this is a crisis waiting to happen unless we do something.

I also want to work through the supplemental funding process to provide assistance to America's apple farmers. There are apple farmers in the State of Connecticut and the plunging market prices for apples are destroying the years of hard work put in by these dedicated men and women. We must be there for them.

Once again, I am proud of the work of the conference committee. I am proud to serve on the agriculture appropriations subcommittee. My thanks to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for their leadership throughout the year in support of America's farmers and America's families.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a very distinguished member of our subcommittee, and I just hope that his constituents know how hard he works on their behalf. It is truly a joy to have someone with his vision and abilities working on this subcommittee.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for yielding me the time.

I rise in strong support of this bill. I was just back here thinking that this is the one appropriations bill that comes to the floor with aroma and with taste. This is about food, and we often do not appreciate how much work goes into supporting the diversity of agriculture in the United States. We hear a lot of debate about the commodity programs in this country and the debate we ought to have. It is healthy.

What my colleagues do not know is all of the agriculture in this country gets not one bit of help from our U.S. Department of Agriculture except in academic areas like research dollars for finding alternatives to pesticides and herbicides; to research dollars that improve the nutritional quality of food for our school children and for adults and senior citizens; for programs that really benefit agriculture without giving a direct subsidy to crops such as marketing promotions where we are able to assist with local raised money to promote crops grown in America and other countries.

I would like to thank the chairman of this committee because he has taken the lead in being able to put specialty crops back up where they need to be, giving them more attention. In my district, one county, we grow 85 different crops. That is more crops than any other State, other than the State of California, grows in the United States.

One of the things that we are working on and continue to work on that with the authorization from the Committee on Agriculture is the ability to buy out development rights from farmers so that the agriculture can remain protected forever in agricultural areas and that we can preserve the prime agricultural lands of the United States just as we would preserve the great forests and the great river basins of this country.

Lastly, one of the things that this committee is very actively involved in and I hope we will move even more so in the direction is that we have spent a lot of money in this country determining what are the nutritional values of food that ought to be served, particularly to school children and infants; but we do not buy that same

food. We need to shift our buying policy from the U.S. Government to buy more of the foods that we advertise and recommend as healthy foods. Those are organic foods that are fresh fruits and vegetables. Those are the specialty crops of America.

This bill moves a lot of that policy forward; and I would like to compliment the committee, I would like to compliment the Secretary of Agriculture for her good work in working closely with this committee, and I would like to think that in a bipartisan way the Democrats and Republicans can come together and unite around agriculture in America, and this is the bill for it.

I urge an "aye" vote.

□ 1800

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), a distinguished member of the authorizing committee who I must say works tirelessly to connect the work of the authorizing committee to the Committee on Appropriations, and certainly in her work on the 1890 colleges and assistance to Africa, there is no better advocate in this House.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the conference report before us, and to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their diligent work on this bill. I thank the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and his diligent staff for their efforts.

As always, this appropriation bill has required them to make many difficult choices and to weigh many competing priorities. However, in so doing, they have chosen well and have provided this House with a conference report that deserves quick passage. I would like to thank the appropriators especially for their efforts in two areas. First of all, as mentioned, I would like to express my thanks to the chairman and the ranking member for increasing the funding for research and extension of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

The minority-serving land grants, including the Historically Black Colleges and Universities, the American Indian College and Hispanic-serving Institutions, have long played a positive role in advancing the interests of the minority agricultural community.

This bill increases funding for both research and extension at the Black Colleges and Universities. The chairman and the ranking member have been very helpful in this effort and they deserve to be recognized for their friendship with the minority land grant universities.

Finally, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their efforts in maximizing the funds available to all of the nutrition programs in this bill. This is an agricultural commodity and nutrition bill.

Providing nutritious food for American children and working families is

one of the most important responsibilities of this bill. Unfortunately, the shameful hunger always outpaces the limited dollars available to address this plague. I know that making decisions about how best to spend our nutrition dollars are always difficult ones, and I commend the gentlemen.

They also deserve a thanks for their efforts to ensure that the innovative and popular Senior Farmer's Market Program can continue, and for their diligence in working to preserve the integrity and increase the caseload of the WIC program.

This conference report provides \$10 million so that this popular program for seniors will continue. This report also expresses its expectation that the administration will do its part by releasing funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation for the program. I add my voice to this, and urge the administration to follow the recommendation of the conference report by releasing \$15 million so that we can strengthen and expand the Senior Farmers Market Program.

We must continue to increase funds to nutrition programs and to eradicate hunger from our midst. We could not have a more lofty goal for this Congress. There is no excuse for hungry families in America today. This bill is one small part of a problem that requires our continuous effort, but it is indeed a very important part which benefits millions of Americans. I urge my colleagues to support this program. I thank the entire committee and the chairman and the ranking member for their support.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of conducting a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA).

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows that members of our subcommittee have been concerned about food safety, and we know that contaminated food products cause an estimated 76 million food-borne illnesses annually in our country. Seafood represents more than 10 percent of the documented illnesses in the United States.

The conferees have accepted report language offered by the other body that calls for the Food and Drug Administration to report by January 1 regarding implementation of regulations by the General Accounting Office with respect to the compliance of seafood producer with HACCP, the Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points.

That language concluded by calling for the development of food safety technologies that could ensure constant safe temperatures of seafood throughout the food chain. As a point of clarification, since some might construe the phrase "food chain" in a fashion different than we intend, would the chairman agree with me that our intent is to review the development of

food safety technologies through the food supply chain?

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

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the gentlewoman that our intent with respect to the accepted language is the “food supply chain.”

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his concurrence.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 2330, the Fiscal Year 2002 Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriations bill. I also wish to express some concern with the level of resources dedicated to FDA pre-market device review functions.

The rapid increase in private and public sector biomedical research efforts will contribute to the development of many new breakthrough technologies to improve healthcare in the near term. It is my concern that FDA does not have sufficient resources dedicated to the pre-market review function at the Center for Devices and Radiological Health to quickly review these products so they may be used safely with patients. In the House version of the Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriations bill, we directed the FDA to provide updates on medical device application review performance in January and July 2002. I urge the agency to adhere to this language and provide these reports to the members of our Committee on a timely basis. I also look forward to working with the Administration in the coming months to ensure that next year's budget includes a request for sufficient resources to meet the statutory review times for medical devices.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my appreciation that this year's Agriculture Appropriations Conference Report will rename the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Farmer-to-Farmer Program after Captain John Ogonowski, who died on September 11, 2001 while piloting American Airlines' Flight 11.

Captain John Ogonowski was a highly respected resident of Dracut, Massachusetts, a pilot, and a fourth-generation farmer of his 150-acre farm. John also sponsored a program for Southeastern Asian immigrants to learn to farm and maintain their agriculture heritage through the New Entry Sustainable Farming Project—a partnership between Tufts University, the University of Massachusetts Extension Service, and Massachusetts's Department of Food and Agriculture. He provided land to these immigrants and became a close friend to many.

Similar to the program that John sponsored, the USDA Farmer-to-Farmer Program will be renamed the John Ogonowski Farmer-to-Farmer Program. This program provides assistance to farmers in developing countries to help increase food production and distribution, and improve the effectiveness of farming and marketing operations.

John made a notable difference in the lives of many immigrants learning to farm, and it is only fitting that the Farmer-to-Farmer Program, which embodies John's commitment to training new farmers, will now carry his name.

It is comforting to know that John's family and friends will have this lasting tribute to him, which encompasses his love of the land and

his commitment to helping others. If his family, including the members I have gotten to know—his wife, Margaret; his children, Laura, Caroline, and Mary Katharine; and his brother, James—are any indication of the kind of person John was, then he was a truly magnificent man, both in spirit and in his deeds. Their strength of heart and commitment to John's legacy, combined with tributes like this, will ensure that John's memory never dies.

I am grateful for the willingness of Chairman BONILLA and Ranking Member KAPTUR to include this designation in the Conference Report. I also want to thank August Schumacher, Jr., John's friend and the former Under Secretary for Farming and International Agriculture Programs, for his commitment to remembering John. I imagine that John would be truly grateful, and modest, in his acceptance of such an honor.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2002 Agriculture Appropriations legislation (H.R. 2330) that would provide \$75.9 billion in funds for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, and other related agencies. I believe we must support our nation's agriculture programs and am very pleased that this year's bill includes sufficient federal funding for nutrition research programs.

I am particularly pleased that this legislation includes \$979 million in additional federal funding for the Agriculture Research Service (ARS), a division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The ARS conducts and funds a variety of research projects, including nutrition research. The ARS provides funding for six human nutrition research centers, including the Children's Nutrition Research Center (CNRC) at Baylor College of Medicine in Houston, Texas. The CNRC is the only human nutrition research center which focuses primarily on pediatric nutrition and helps to make recommendations about childhood diets.

As the representatives for the CNRC, I applaud the innovative pediatric nutrition research which the CNRC conducts each year. I am also pleased that this bill includes an additional \$400,000 for the CNRC so they can expand their pediatric nutrition research next year. I believe that this investment will not only save lives but also reduce health care costs as we learn more about what is the best, most nutritional food for our children to eat. This additional funding will fund valuable research which will help families to provide nutritional food for their children so that these children will live longer, healthier lives.

There are many examples of CNRC's research which will have a direct impact on our lives. For instance, CNRC researchers are currently examining the nutritional factors necessary for optional health and development of infants and children of all ages. Another CNRC study is working to identify the factors that influence children's eating habits and how best to help children and families to adopt healthier habits to avoid the long-term health problems linked to poor nutrition, such as obesity, diabetes, stroke, and osteoporosis. The CNRC is also doing research on the nutrition of mothers and their infants during pregnancy and lactation. These studies will examine the optimal dietary calorie, protein, and mineral requirements for maternal health during pregnancy and lactation. With this study, mothers and their infants will learn more about the nec-

essary nutrients they need to maintain optimal health during pregnancy and lactation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill which provides necessary funding for agriculture and nutrition research programs.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in support of the conference report for H.R. 2330, the Agriculture appropriations legislation for fiscal year 2002.

This Member would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), the Chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, and the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the Subcommittee, for their hard work in bringing this conference report to the Floor.

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

First, this Member is pleased that the conference report provides \$452,000 for the Midwest Advanced Food Manufacturing Alliance (MAFMA). The Alliance is an association of twelve leading research universities and corporate partners. Its purpose is to develop and facilitate the transfer of new food manufacturing and processing technologies.

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

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

This Member is also pleased that the conference report includes \$196,000 to fund the National Drought Mitigation Center (NDMC) at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. This project is in its fourth year and has assisted numerous states and cities in developing drought plans and developing drought response teams. Given the nearly unprecedented levels of drought in several parts of our country, this effort is obviously important.

Another important project funded by this conference report is the Alliance for Food Protection, a joint project between the University of Nebraska and the University of Georgia,

which received \$293,000 under the conference report. The mission of this Alliance is to assist the development and modification of food processing and preservation technologies. This technology will help ensure that Americans continue to receive the safest and highest quality food possible.

This Member is also pleased that the legislation funds the following ongoing Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) projects at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln:

Food Processing Center, \$42,000; Non-food agricultural products, \$64,000; Sustainable agricultural systems, \$59,000; Rural Policy Research Institute (RUPRI) (a joint effort with Iowa State University and the University of Missouri), \$1,040,000.

This Member would also note that the conference report includes a loan subsidy of \$3.9 million for the Section 538 rural rental multi-family housing loan guarantee program, which is to support \$99.77 million in loan authorizations. The program provides a Federal guarantee on loans made to eligible persons by private lenders. Developers will bring ten percent of the cost of the project to the table, and private lenders will make loans for the balance. The lenders will be given a 100% Federal guarantee on the loans they make. Unlike the current Section 515 direct loan Program, where the full costs are borne by the Federal Government, the only costs to the Federal Government under the 538 Guarantee Program will be for administrative costs and potential defaults.

Mr. Speaker, this Member certainly appreciates the appropriations for the \$40.166 million loan subsidy for the Department of Agriculture's Section 502 Unsubsidized Loan Guarantee Program, which is to support \$3.1 billion in loan authorizations. The program has been very effective in rural communities by guaranteeing loans made by approved lenders to eligible income households in small communities of up to 20,000 residents in non-metropolitan areas and in rural areas. The program provides guarantees for 30-year fixed-rate mortgages for the purchase of an existing home or the construction of a new home.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, this Member supports the conference report for H.R. 2330 and urges his colleagues to approve it.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of the FY 2002 Agriculture Appropriation conference report. On the whole, it is a very good bill, and I commend Chairman BONILLA and Ranking Member KAPTUR and the entire Subcommittee staff and minority staff for their efforts. As good as it is, it does have several shortcoming that I will address in a minute.

#### AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

I am pleased, however, at the level of support for agricultural research in this bill. Basic research is one of the best investments the government can make, but it's too easy for critics to poke fun at projects in this bill without ever considering the importance of the underlying research. USDA scientists and their collaborators at land grant universities work every day to ensure our food security, to preserve the competitiveness of American agriculture in a global economy, and to fight against bio-terrorism.

I am proud to represent Cornell University, which is the recipient of many of these special research grants. By way of illustration, Cornell

scientists are using USDA funds to investigate the causes and cures of fire blight, a disease that is infecting apple orchards across the country. In the five years of this research program, they have made progress in disease detection, development of biological controls, controlling the problems of antibiotic resistance, development of disease-resistant cultivars and rootstocks, plant nutrition, and chemical control. It will take at least another five years before we can evaluate the long-term success of preliminary findings.

#### FARMERS MARKETS

The FY 2002 agriculture bill is also notable for its support of farmers market programs. Farmers markets are also one of the best investments we can make in American agriculture. Not only do they provide farmers with a direct market for their crops, but they also give city residents access to fresh, locally-grown produce. Many of the farmers in my district live within 100 miles of New York City and sell their produce in the dozens of markets throughout the City. Most of these markets would not exist if not for programs that allow low-income families to use their food stamp and WIC benefits at the markets. I am also pleased that the conference report funds the new senior farmers market coupon program for low-income elderly shoppers.

I would like to point out one provision that is especially important to the farmers' market community in my state. The bill contains funds for a pilot program in New York to implement wireless handheld technology in the markets. This innovation is critical to the survival of farmers markets in low income communities, as food stamps and WIC benefits are increasingly delivered electronically through electronic benefit transfer (EBT) cards. Because farmers markets operate outdoors with limited access to electricity or telephone lines, it is much more difficult for people to use their EBT cards in the markets. New York has been testing this technology on a limited basis with great success, and will be able to use these funds to expand the program into more markets across the State. It is my hope that this pilot will prove to be so successful that the Department will adopt it as a model for a nationwide wireless EBT program.

#### RURAL BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT

Another provision in this bill will provide greatly needed assistance to help New York retain jobs and employers displaced by the September 11 terrorist attacks on New York City. These events have created a massive need for the City and surrounding communities to replace millions of square feet of office space equipped with advanced telecommunications services including broadband service. The New York City metropolitan area is experiencing a huge demand for this type of office space, both for immediate relocation as well as for remote, redundant back-up locations.

My colleagues in the New York Congressional delegation, the Mayor, and the Governor want to keep as many of these displaced jobs in New York as possible. We believe that the Rural Utilities Service telecommunications loan and grant programs have a key role to play in this effort. There are existing RUS broadband borrowers in the Hudson River Valley of New York who can help accommodate companies who are trying to resume normal business operations just outside of the city. This provision will make it

possible for these borrowers to respond quickly to preserve New York jobs.

We already know that New York will need to deploy additional broadband communications services rapidly to accommodate the increasing demand emerging in some of the rural areas in upstate New York. Connecting businesses, data facilities, and telecommuters to New York city are critical to recovery efforts. The conference report give the Administrator of RUS certain flexibilities and encouragement to expeditiously process loan applications from existing RUS broadband borrowers who are responding to recovery and rebuilding effort in New York.

The measure is self-executing, needs no new regulation, and requires no additional funding. It provides needed regulatory flexibility so the RUS can work with qualified, existing borrowers to receive additional financing to respond to this crisis. It also allows the RUS to modify terms of a borrower's existing loan, in order to provide operational flexibility to better respond to this crisis.

There are already several RUS borrowers in New York State. One, Hudson Valley DataNet, has already qualified for the broadband program and is providing broadband services in the Hudson Valley area, less than 100 miles north of New York City. This region of New York will be essential to the recovery effort for many companies seeking to restore operations, as well as companies seeking remote, secure, redundant data locations. Given the dramatic increase in demand for new deployment, however, the RUS needs this new authority to help:

- Carriers respond to the intense need to deploy services immediately for the recovery effort. These companies will need help to expedite their applications through RUS procedures, redefine terms of existing loans, and make adjustments to some of the existing program requirements to accommodate the recovery effort in New York State;

- Communities in the Hudson Valley, which are surrounded by rural areas that fall just above the 20,000-population limit for the broadband program that could benefit from some RUS process flexibility;

- RUS borrowers who wish to receive RUS financing to extend or acquire facilities into New York city for the express purpose of providing high capacity service connections into the Hudson Valley. These direct connections will provide a means for City-based companies to have broadband access to their secure redundant data site in the Hudson Valley.

This measure will not have an adverse impact on other borrowers or future borrowers participating in RUS loan and grant programs. The language permits the Administrator to use some flexibility in handling applications related to the recovery effort in New York and expedite processing. Any project funded through this authority will be fully scrutinized for financial feasibility. Providing regulatory flexibility to the RUS to process applications related to the recovery effort in New York will help many companies and their employees resume normal operations and restore the area's economy.

#### APPLE MARKET LOSS ASSISTANCE

As I mentioned at the beginning of my statement, there are parts of this bill that are not as great as the few I have highlighted. In particular, I am very disturbed that the conference report cuts the Apple Market Loss Assistance

Program to \$75 million, a 50 percent reduction from the House-passed bill. I worked very hard with my colleagues JIM WALSH and JOHN SWEENEY to include this provision in the House version of H.R. 2330. The Appropriations Committee approved \$150 million for the Apple Market Loss Assistance Program by a very strong bipartisan vote, and the House passed it overwhelmingly.

The U.S. apple industry is suffering serious financial hardship for the fifth straight year. Though the causes can be attributed to a variety of factors, the essence of the problem is low prices, compounded by bad weather and plant diseases. Between 1995 and 1998, U.S. apple prices fell precipitously, down 27 percent. In 1998, apple prices fell more than 20 percent in a single year, to their lowest point in over a decade. Prices never rebounded in 1999, and were hard hit again in 2000. During the last five years, the overall value of the U.S. apple production fell 25 percent—and losses from the 2000 crop alone are estimated to be nearly \$500 million.

A good share of the apple industry's trouble comes from the illegal dumping of apple juice concentrate by China, an issue that the U.S. TR has since addressed. Even so, increased tariffs have not made a significant improvement in the price of apple juice in the late year. In addition to low prices, apple producers in New York and the northeast incurred "quality losses"—reduction in sales prices resulting from severe hail damage to their crops. In Michigan, growers suffered a crippling epidemic of fire blight that destroyed thousands of acres of orchards.

The newspapers have been full of reports of growers pulling up their orchards and selling prime farmland for real estate development because they can no longer make a living from apples. Our Apple Market Loss Assistance Program is a very modest lifeline to farmers who are barely hanging on. While I am very grateful for the \$75 million, it is not nearly enough to combat the conditions I have described.

The cut to the Apple Market Loss Assistance program is one more example of how U.S. agricultural policy shortchanges specialty crops at the expense of program crops. Most of the money delivered by U.S.DA this year is mandatory spending dictated by the authorizing committee, that we do not have the authority to touch. Not a dollar of those billions goes to specialty crop growers. The same is true for the additional billions that we pay in supplemental and emergency payments every year.

I worked very hard with many of my colleagues to correct this imbalance earlier this year when the farm bill was on the floor. Unfortunately, our effort fell short by a few votes. It is my hope that the other body will pass a farm bill that evens out our priorities and results in a better deal for specialty crop growers in the end. Until that time, the greatly reduced Apple Market Loss Assistance Program is the only help we can offer our growers.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PUT OUR CHILDREN FIRST  
RESOLUTION OF 2001

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 228) expressing the sense of the Congress that the children who lost one or both parents or a guardian in the September 11, 2001, World Trade Center and Pentagon tragedies (including the aircraft crash in Somerset County, Pennsylvania) should be provided with all necessary assistance, services, and benefits and urging the heads of Federal agencies responsible for providing such assistance, services and benefits to give the highest possible priority to providing such assistance, services and benefits to those children, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 228

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That this resolution may be cited as the "Put Our Children First Resolution of 2001".

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress is grateful to the Federal, State, and local agencies for their actions to deliver prompt services to the children and families impacted by the events of September 11, 2001, and recognizes their efforts to expedite and streamline these important services.

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that the children who lost 1 or both parents or a guardian in the September 11, 2001, World Trade Center and Pentagon tragedies (including the aircraft crash in Somerset County, Pennsylvania) should be provided with such immediate assistance, services, and benefits for which they are eligible and which are necessary for their well-being, including—

(1) foster care assistance;  
(2) adoption assistance;  
(3) medical, nutritional, and psychological care;  
(4) educational services; and  
(5) such additional care or services as may be necessary.

(c) The Congress urges each Federal, State, and local agency responsible for providing assistance, services, and benefits referred to in subsection (b) to—

(1) act without delay to provide such assistance, services, and benefits to children described in that paragraph; and

(2) to the maximum extent possible, take such steps as are necessary to ensure that such assistance, services, and benefits are provided in the case of any such child within 60 days of the date of the determination of the death of the child's parent, parents, or guardian.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 228, as amended, offered

by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). The resolution expresses Congress' gratitude for the efforts of numerous Federal, State and local agencies in moving quickly to provide services and support to children and families affected by the tragedies of September 11. It urges continued swift assistance.

Since the events of September 11, this Congress has worked with great speed to respond to the Nation's emergency needs. We provided \$40 billion in emergency funding to respond to the tragedies and shore up our national security.

The House passed important legislation to stimulate the economy and support the unemployment and health care needs of dislocated workers. Sweeping new airline measures passed each body which should become law shortly.

Defense and other appropriation measures were amended to account for our new national security and other needs.

At the same time, workers on the front lines of our social services agencies, especially in the New York City and Northern Virginia areas, respond quickly to deliver services and support.

I would like to take a moment to report on the activities of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services agency and the State and City of New York in responding to the needs of children and families affected by the attack on our country.

HHS began responding to the attack the very day it happened providing disaster medical assistance teams, medical supplies, and mental health assistance to the affected areas. Within days HHS released emergency funds for child care, temporary food and shelter, emergency meals, child welfare services and health care. In total, HHS provided more than \$126 million for these essential services. HHS also used its emergency powers to cut through red tape to speed aid to the needs of children and families affected.

Similarly, the City and State of New York have reacted with speed and compassion to transform routine service programs into disaster response teams. What we have seen and salute today is the quick responses by so many local service providers to the needs of our fellow citizens, and especially families with children who lost one or even both parents in the September attacks.

These responses reinforced to terrorists and the world what we already knew, that we can shake America but we cannot break America. We will respond and we will rebound even stronger than before.

Perhaps the most striking examples of America coming together to respond to this tragedy have been the numerous occasions of neighbors helping neighbors and public and private agencies working together with government and charitable funds to support needy families.

Charitable donations have come from people across the economic spectrum,