

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, due to inclement weather in Indiana, I was regrettably delayed in my return to Washington, DC and therefore unable to be on the House Floor for rollcall votes 359, 360, 361 and 362. Had I been here I would have voted "no" for rollcall vote 359, "aye" for rollcall vote 360, "no" for rollcall vote 361, and "aye" for rollcall vote 362.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I missed four votes in the House of Representatives on July 12, 2004. Had I been in attendance I would have made the following votes:

Vote on the Holt amendment to H.R. 4755—Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for FY05. Had I been in attendance, I would have vote "aye."

Vote on the Hefley amendment to H.R. 4755—Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for FY05. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted "no."

Vote on the Motion to Recommit—4755—Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for FY05. Had I been in attendance, I would have vote "aye."

Vote on passage of H.R. 4755—Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for FY05. Had I been in attendance, I would have vote "aye."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on July 9, 2004, I was unable to be present for the following votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall 348, to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair, I would have voted nay;

On rollcall 349, on the motion to adjourn, I would have voted nay;

On rollcall 350, on ordering the previous question, I would have voted nay;

On rollcall 351, on agreeing to House Resolution 711, I would have voted nay;

On rollcall 352, on tabling the motion to reconsider, I would have voted nay;

On rollcall 353, on the motion to adjourn, I would have voted nay;

On rollcall 354, on the motion to recommit with instructions, I would have voted nay;

On rollcall 355, on agreeing to the Gordon amendment, I would have voted yea;

On rollcall 356, on agreeing to the Jackson-Lee amendment, I would have voted yea;

On rollcall 357, on agreeing to the Larson amendment, I would have voted yea;

On rollcall 358, on the motion to recommit with instructions, I would have voted yea.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill (H.R. 4766) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and other extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 710 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4766.

The Chair designates the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) assume the chair temporarily.

□ 2006

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4766) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, with Mr. TERRY (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am very proud to present the agriculture appropriation bill to the full House tonight. It is a bill that we are proud of. It is a product of a bipartisan effort that we have had on our subcommittee and our full committee. The subcommittee that produces this bill has a history of working in a bipartisan way and always trying to include the input of every member of the subcommittee on an annual basis.

This is a subcommittee that had to entertain over 2,100 individual requests for items to be included in this bill, and we did the best we could. This year, we had an unusual constraint, and that is a tighter budget, a more fiscally responsible budget that has forced us to appropriately present a bill that is \$67 million less than it was last year. And I might point out that the bill we did last year was below the previous year as well.

So fiscal conservatives should be proud of this product as well, and those who support agriculture issues in this country should be proud. Agriculture research, Food and Drug Administration, there are so many parts to this bill that affect so many people in this country. This bill, of course, also funds the Food Stamp program, the Women, Infants and Children program, we fund Food Safety, and the list goes on and on.

We have a very good subcommittee, and I mention them on a regular basis, but I would like to take the opportunity tonight to mention some of the people behind the scenes that do the grunt work day in and day out, oftentimes when Members of Congress are back in their congressional districts meeting with constituents and spending time with family. They are the ones back here going through every line item and looking for every opportunity to make this bill a good bill, which is what we are presenting here this evening.

Martha Foley, of the minority staff, is someone we work with in good faith, and she does a great job for us every day; Maureen Holohan, Leslie Barrack, and Joanne Perdue of the majority staff. We also had two detailees helping us this year, Tom O'Brien and Mike Gregoire. And then, of course, I would like to single out the clerk, Martin Delgado, who is clerking for the first time for this subcommittee and doing an outstanding job.

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee began work on this bill with the submission of the President's Budget on February 2nd. We had ten public hearings beginning on February 25th, and we completed our hearings on March 25th. The transcripts of these hearings, the Administration's official statements, the detailed budget requests, several thousand questions for the record, and the statements of Members and the public are contained in eight hearing volumes that are all printed.

The Subcommittee and Full Committee marked up the bill on June 14th and June 23rd, respectively. I can confirm to you that the interest in this bill is completely bipartisan. However, I would point out that my own support for a member's needs independent on that member's support of the Committee in general, and of this bill in particular.

Mr. Chairman, you may hear a lot of talk today about funding items that are not in this bill, or accounts that may be a little short, but I can assure you and the members of this body that given the allocation we had, that this is a fair, and fiscally-responsible bill.

This bill has increases over fiscal year 2004 in some cases, or over the budget request in

others, for programs that have always enjoyed strong bipartisan support. Those increases include:

Agricultural Research Service, \$69 million above the request;

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, \$92 million above last year, but \$20 million below the request;

Food Safety and Inspection Service, \$45 million above last year;

Farm Service Agency, \$25 million above last year;

Natural Resources Conservation Service, \$34 million below last year, but \$84 million above the request;

Rural Community Advancement Program, \$86 million below last year, but \$125 million above the request;

For the Women, Infants, and Children program the bill is \$295 million above last year, and \$120 million above the request;

Food and Drug Administration, \$84 million over last year, and \$32 million below the request.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, we refer to this bill as the agriculture bill, but it goes farther than assisting basic agriculture. It also supports rural and economic development, human nutrition, agricultural exports, land conservation, as well as food, drug, and medical safety. This bill will deliver benefits to every one of your constituents every day, no matter what kind of district you represent.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am submitting for the RECORD at this point tabular material relating to the bill.

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs Reques
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary.....	5,062	5,185	5,185	+123	---
Executive Operations:					
Chief Economist.....	8,656	14,949	10,810	+2,154	-4,139
National Appeals Division.....	13,589	14,826	14,526	+937	-300
Office of Budget and Program Analysis.....	7,694	8,146	8,246	+552	+100
Homeland Security staff.....	496	1,491	508	+12	-983
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	15,402	22,093	15,608	+206	-6,485
Common computing environment.....	118,585	136,736	120,957	+2,372	-15,779
Office of the Chief Financial Officer.....	5,650	8,063	5,811	+161	-2,252
Working capital fund.....	---	12,850	12,850	+12,850	---
Total, Executive Operations.....	170,072	219,154	189,316	+19,244	-29,838
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights....	803	819	803	---	-16
Office of Civil Rights.....	18,123	22,283	19,452	+1,329	-2,831
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration..	669	808	669	---	-139
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental					
payments.....	(155,546)	(203,938)	(165,883)	(+10,337)	(-38,055)
Payments to GSA.....	123,179	128,319	128,319	+5,140	---
Building operations and maintenance.....	32,367	41,642	35,564	+3,197	-6,078
Repairs, renovations, and construction.....	---	33,977	2,000	+2,000	-31,977
Hazardous materials management.....	15,519	15,730	15,730	+211	---
Departmental administration.....	22,119	26,361	22,939	+820	-3,422
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional					
Relations.....	3,774	4,263	3,852	+78	-411
Office of Communications.....	9,174	10,288	9,378	+204	-910
Office of the Inspector General.....	76,825	78,392	78,392	+1,567	---
Office of the General Counsel.....	34,495	38,589	35,486	+991	-3,103
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education,					
and Economics.....	592	805	592	---	-213
Economic Research Service.....	70,981	80,032	76,575	+5,594	-3,457
National Agricultural Statistics Service.....	128,161	137,594	128,661	+500	-8,933
Census of Agriculture.....	(25,279)	(22,520)	(22,520)	(-2,759)	---
Agricultural Research Service:					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,082,468	987,597	1,057,029	-25,439	+69,432
Buildings and facilities.....	63,434	178,000	202,000	+138,566	+24,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service.....	1,145,902	1,165,597	1,259,029	+113,127	+93,432
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension					
Service:					
Research and education activities.....	617,780	501,540	628,607	+10,827	+127,067
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund.....	(9,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)	(+3,000)	---
Extension activities.....	439,125	421,174	440,349	+1,224	+19,175
Integrated activities.....	50,195	76,865	66,255	+16,060	-10,610
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers.....	5,935	5,935	5,935	---	---
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education,	1,113,035	1,005,514	1,141,146	+28,111	+135,632
and Extension Service.....					
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and					
Regulatory Programs.....	721	804	721	---	-83
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses.....	716,329	828,361	808,823	+92,494	-19,538
Buildings and facilities.....	4,967	4,996	4,996	+29	---
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection	721,296	833,357	813,819	+92,523	-19,538
Service.....					

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services.....	74,985	85,998	75,892	+907	-10,106
Standardization user fees.....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected).....	(62,577)	(64,459)	(64,459)	(+1,882)	---
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32).....	15,392	15,800	15,800	+408	---
Payments to states and possessions.....	3,318	1,347	1,347	-1,971	---
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service.....	93,695	103,145	93,039	-656	-10,106
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:					
Salaries and expenses.....	35,678	44,150	37,540	+1,862	-6,610
Limitation on inspection and weighing services....	(42,463)	(42,463)	(42,463)	---	---
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety.....	595	803	595	---	-208
Food Safety and Inspection Service.....	779,882	838,660	824,746	+44,864	-13,914
Lab accreditation fees	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	---	---
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing....	4,602,719	4,836,271	4,923,548	+320,829	+87,277
Farm Assistance Programs					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.....	631	933	631	---	-302
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses.....	982,934	1,007,877	1,007,597	+24,663	-280
(Transfer from export loans).....	(841)	(1,033)	(1,033)	(+192)	---
(Transfer from P.L. 480).....	(1,053)	(3,119)	(1,269)	(+216)	(-1,850)
(Transfer from ACIF).....	(281,350)	(305,011)	(289,445)	(+8,095)	(-15,566)
Subtotal, transfers from program accounts.....	(283,244)	(309,163)	(291,747)	(+8,503)	(-17,416)
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	(1,266,178)	(1,317,040)	(1,299,344)	(+33,166)	(-17,696)
State mediation grants.....	3,951	4,000	4,000	+49	---
Dairy indemnity program.....	100	100	100	---	---
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency.....	986,985	1,011,977	1,011,697	+24,712	-280
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	(128,396)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(+71,604)	---
Guaranteed.....	(944,395)	(1,400,000)	(1,400,000)	(+455,605)	---
Subtotal.....	(1,072,791)	(1,600,000)	(1,600,000)	(+527,209)	---
Farm operating loans:					
Direct.....	(613,860)	(650,000)	(650,000)	(+36,140)	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	(1,192,920)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	(+7,080)	---
Subsidized guaranteed.....	(264,678)	(266,253)	(266,253)	(+1,575)	---
Subtotal.....	(2,071,458)	(2,116,253)	(2,116,253)	(+44,795)	---
Indian tribe land acquisition loans.....	(2,000)	(2,000)	(2,000)	---	---
Natural disasters emergency insured loans.....	---	(25,000)	---	---	(-25,000)
Boll weevil eradication loans.....	(100,000)	(60,000)	(100,000)	---	(+40,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(3,246,249)	(3,803,253)	(3,818,253)	(+572,004)	(+15,000)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	28,350	10,700	10,700	-17,650	---
Guaranteed.....	5,100	7,420	7,420	+2,320	---
Subtotal.....	33,450	18,120	18,120	-15,330	---
Farm operating loans:					
Direct.....	88,519	65,585	65,585	-22,934	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	39,724	38,760	38,760	-964	---
Subsidized guaranteed.....	33,799	35,438	35,438	+1,639	---
Subtotal.....	162,042	139,783	139,783	-22,259	---
Indian tribe land acquisition.....	---	105	105	+105	---
Natural disasters emergency insured loans.....	---	3,235	---	---	-3,235
Total, Loan subsidies.....	195,492	161,243	158,008	-37,484	-3,235
ACIF expenses:					
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)....	281,350	305,011	289,445	+8,095	-15,566
Administrative expenses.....	7,901	8,000	8,000	+99	---
Total, ACIF expenses.....	289,251	313,011	297,445	+8,194	-15,566
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund... (Loan authorization).....	484,743 (3,246,249)	474,254 (3,803,253)	455,453 (3,818,253)	-29,290 (+572,004)	-18,801 (+15,000)
Total, Farm Service Agency.....	1,471,728	1,486,231	1,467,150	-4,578	-19,081
Risk Management Agency.....	71,001	91,582	72,044	+1,043	-19,538
Total, Farm Assistance Programs.....	1,543,360	1,578,746	1,539,825	-3,535	-38,921
Corporations					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund.....	3,765,000	4,095,128	4,095,128	+330,128	---
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses.....	22,937,000	16,452,377	16,452,377	-6,484,623	---
Hazardous waste management (limitation on expenses).....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
Total, Corporations.....	26,702,000	20,547,505	20,547,505	-6,154,495	---
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs.....	32,848,079	26,962,522	27,010,878	-5,837,201	+48,356
(By transfer).....	(283,244)	(309,163)	(291,747)	(+8,503)	(-17,416)
(Loan authorization).....	(3,246,249)	(3,803,253)	(3,818,253)	(+572,004)	(+15,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(110,040)	(111,922)	(111,922)	(+1,882)	---

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment.....	741	936	731	-10	-205
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations.....	847,971	710,412	813,673	-34,298	+103,261
Watershed surveys and planning.....	10,500	5,083	11,083	+583	+6,000
Watershed and flood prevention operations.....	86,487	40,173	86,487	---	+46,314
Watershed rehabilitation program.....	29,629	10,091	30,091	+462	+20,000
Resource conservation and development.....	51,641	50,760	51,641	---	+881
Farm bill technical assistance.....	---	92,024	---	---	-92,024
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service...	1,026,228	908,543	992,975	-33,253	+84,432
Total, title II, Conservation Programs.....	1,026,969	909,479	993,706	-33,263	+84,227
TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development...	632	929	632	---	-297
Rural Development:					
Rural community advancement program.....	752,956	541,979	667,408	-85,548	+125,429
Tree assistance (sec. 747).....	---	---	---	---	---
(Transfer out).....	(-28,000)	---	---	(+28,000)	---
Total, Rural community advancement program..	752,956	541,979	667,408	-85,548	+125,429
RD expenses:					
Salaries and expenses.....	141,032	149,749	143,625	+2,593	-6,124
(Transfer from RHIF).....	(440,687)	(465,886)	(448,889)	(+8,202)	(-16,997)
(Transfer from RDLFP).....	(4,247)	(6,656)	(4,321)	(+74)	(-2,335)
(Transfer from RETLP).....	(37,630)	(39,933)	(38,323)	(+693)	(-1,610)
(Transfer from RTB).....	(3,152)	(3,328)	(3,152)	---	(-176)
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts.	(485,716)	(515,803)	(494,685)	(+8,969)	(-21,118)
Total, RD expenses.....	(626,748)	(665,552)	(638,310)	(+11,562)	(-27,242)
Total, Rural Development.....	893,988	691,728	811,033	-82,955	+119,305
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family direct (sec. 502).....	(1,351,397)	(1,100,000)	(1,100,000)	(-251,397)	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	(2,709,094)	(2,725,185)	(3,309,297)	(+600,203)	(+584,112)
Subtotal, Single family.....	(4,060,491)	(3,825,185)	(4,409,297)	(+348,806)	(+584,112)
Housing repair (sec. 504).....	(34,797)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(+203)	---
Rental housing (sec. 515).....	(115,857)	(60,000)	(116,063)	(+206)	(+56,063)
Site loans (sec. 524).....	(5,045)	(5,045)	(5,045)	---	---
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	(99,410)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+590)	---
Multi-family housing credit sales.....	(1,491)	(1,501)	(1,501)	(+10)	---
Single family housing credit sales.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	---	---
Self-help housing land develop. (sec. 523)	(2,421)	(5,000)	(10,000)	(+7,579)	(+5,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(4,329,512)	(4,041,731)	(4,686,906)	(+357,394)	(+645,175)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Loan subsidies:					
Single family direct (sec. 502).....	125,274	127,380	127,380	+2,106	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	39,668	33,608	33,608	-6,060	---
Subtotal, Single family.....	164,942	160,988	160,988	-3,954	---
Housing repair (sec. 504).....	9,555	10,171	10,171	+616	---
Rental housing (sec. 515).....	49,830	28,254	54,654	+4,824	+26,400
Site loans (sec. 524).....	---	---	---	---	---
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	5,915	3,490	3,490	-2,425	---
Multi-family housing credit sales.....	659	727	727	+68	---
Single family housing credit sales.....	---	---	---	---	---
Self-help housing land develop. (sec. 523)	75	---	---	-75	---
Total, Loan subsidies.....	230,976	203,630	230,030	-946	+26,400
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RD).	440,687	465,886	448,889	+8,202	-16,997
Rental assistance program:					
(Sec. 521).....	574,689	586,100	586,100	+11,411	---
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D)).....	5,865	5,900	5,900	+35	---
Total, Rental assistance program.....	580,554	592,000	592,000	+11,446	---
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund.....	1,252,217	1,261,516	1,270,919	+18,702	+9,403
(Loan authorization).....	(4,329,512)	(4,041,731)	(4,686,906)	(+357,394)	(+645,175)
Mutual and self-help housing grants.....	33,799	34,000	34,000	+201	---
Rural housing assistance grants.....	45,949	42,500	42,500	-3,449	---
Farm labor program account.....	36,093	36,765	36,765	+672	---
Subtotal, grants and payments.....	115,841	113,265	113,265	-2,576	---
Total, Rural Housing Service.....	1,368,058	1,374,781	1,384,184	+16,126	+9,403
(Loan authorization).....	(4,329,512)	(4,041,731)	(4,686,906)	(+357,394)	(+645,175)
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:					
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:					
(Loan authorization).....	(39,764)	(34,213)	(34,213)	(-5,551)	---
Loan subsidy.....	17,206	15,868	15,868	-1,338	---
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD).....	4,247	6,656	4,321	+74	-2,335
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund.....	21,453	22,524	20,189	-1,264	-2,335
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
(Loan authorization).....	(14,914)	(25,003)	(25,003)	(+10,089)	---
Direct subsidy.....	2,776	4,698	4,698	+1,922	---
Rural cooperative development grants.....	23,858	21,000	23,500	-358	+2,500
Rural empowerment zones and enterprise communities grants.....	12,592	---	11,419	-1,173	+11,419
Renewable energy program.....	22,864	10,770	15,000	-7,864	+4,230
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service.....	83,543	58,992	74,806	-8,737	+15,814
(Loan authorization).....	(54,678)	(59,216)	(59,216)	(+4,538)	---

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

Rural Utilities Service:					
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans					
Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5%.....	(240,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)	(-120,000)	---
Direct, Municipal rate.....	(1,000,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(-900,000)	---
Direct, FFB.....	(1,900,000)	(1,620,000)	(2,000,000)	(+100,000)	(+380,000)
Direct, Treasury rate.....	(750,000)	(700,000)	(1,000,000)	(+250,000)	(+300,000)
Guaranteed electric.....	(99,410)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+590)	---
Guaranteed underwriting.....	(1,000,000)	---	(1,000,000)	---	(+1,000,000)
Subtotal, Electric.....	(4,989,410)	(2,640,000)	(4,320,000)	(-669,410)	(+1,680,000)
Telecommunications:					
Direct, 5%.....	(145,000)	(145,000)	(145,000)	---	---
Direct, Treasury rate.....	(248,525)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(+1,475)	---
Direct, FFB.....	(120,000)	(100,000)	(125,000)	(+5,000)	(+25,000)
Subtotal, Telecommunications.....	(513,525)	(495,000)	(520,000)	(+6,475)	(+25,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(5,502,935)	(3,135,000)	(4,840,000)	(-662,935)	(+1,705,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5%.....	---	3,648	3,648	+3,648	---
Direct, Municipal rate.....	---	1,350	1,350	+1,350	---
Guaranteed electric.....	60	60	60	---	---
Subtotal, Electric.....	60	5,058	5,058	+4,998	---
Telecommunications:					
Direct, 5%.....	---	---	---	---	---
Direct, Treasury rate.....	124	100	100	-24	---
Subtotal, Telecommunications.....	124	100	100	-24	---
Total, Loan subsidies.....	184	5,158	5,158	+4,974	---
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	37,630	39,933	38,323	+693	-1,610
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account..	37,814	45,091	43,481	+5,667	-1,610
(Loan authorization).....	(5,502,935)	(3,135,000)	(4,840,000)	(-662,935)	(+1,705,000)
=====					
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:					
(Loan authorization).....	(173,503)	---	(175,000)	(+1,497)	(+175,000)
Direct loan subsidy.....	---	---	---	---	---
RTB administrative expenses (transfer to RD)..	3,152	3,328	3,152	---	-176
Total, Rural Telephone Bank Program Account.	3,152	3,328	3,152	---	-176
High energy costs grants (by transfer).....	(27,835)	---	---	(-27,835)	---
Distance learning, telemedicine, and broadband program:					
Loan authorizations:					
Distance learning and telemedicine.....	(300,000)	---	(50,000)	(-250,000)	(+50,000)
Broadband telecommunications.....	(598,101)	(331,081)	(464,038)	(-134,063)	(+132,957)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(898,101)	(331,081)	(514,038)	(-384,063)	(+182,957)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

Loan subsidies:					
Distance learning and telemedicine:					
Direct.....	---	---	710	+710	+710
Grants.....	38,770	25,000	25,000	-13,770	---
Broadband telecommunications:					
Direct.....	13,039	9,884	9,884	-3,155	---
Grants.....	8,947	---	9,000	+53	+9,000
Total, Loan subsidies and grants.....	60,756	34,884	44,594	-16,162	+9,710
=====					
Total, Rural Utilities Service.....	101,722	83,303	91,227	-10,495	+7,924
(Loan authorization).....	(6,574,539)	(3,466,081)	(5,529,038)	(-1,045,501)	(+2,062,957)
=====					
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs.....	2,447,943	2,209,733	2,361,882	-86,061	+152,149
(By transfer).....	(513,551)	(515,803)	(494,685)	(-18,866)	(-21,118)
(Loan authorization).....	(10,958,729)	(7,567,028)	(10,275,160)	(-683,569)	(+2,708,132)
=====					
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services.....	595	799	595	---	-204
Food and Nutrition Service:					
Child nutrition programs.....	6,717,780	6,060,860	6,227,595	-490,185	+166,735
Transfer from section 32.....	4,699,661	5,319,697	5,152,962	+453,301	-166,735
Discretionary spending.....	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Child nutrition programs.....	11,417,441	11,380,557	11,380,557	-36,884	---
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC).....	4,611,861	4,787,250	4,907,250	+295,389	+120,000
Food stamp program:					
Expenses.....	26,403,176	30,501,798	29,047,276	+2,644,100	-1,454,522
Reserve.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	---	---
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico and Samoa	1,402,805	---	1,448,522	+45,717	+1,448,522
The emergency food assistance program.....	140,000	140,000	140,000	---	---
Total, Food stamp program.....	30,945,981	33,641,798	33,635,798	+2,689,817	-6,000
Commodity assistance program.....	149,115	169,416	178,797	+29,682	+9,381
Nutrition programs administration.....	137,488	152,227	133,742	-3,746	-18,485
Total, Food and Nutrition Service.....	47,261,886	50,131,248	50,236,144	+2,974,258	+104,896
=====					
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs.....	47,262,481	50,132,047	50,236,739	+2,974,258	+104,692
=====					

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service:					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation.....	131,368	143,077	137,722	+6,354	-5,355
(Transfer from export loans).....	(3,286)	(3,440)	(3,440)	(+154)	---
(Transfer from P.L. 480).....	(1,069)	(1,102)	(1,102)	(+33)	---
Total, Salaries and expenses program level.....	(135,723)	(147,619)	(142,264)	(+6,541)	(-5,355)
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:					
Program account:					
Loan authorization, direct.....	(130,892)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(-30,892)	---
Loan subsidies.....	103,274	86,420	86,420	-16,854	---
Ocean freight differential grants.....	27,835	22,723	22,723	-5,112	---
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:					
Program level.....	(1,184,967)	(1,185,000)	(1,180,002)	(-4,965)	(-4,998)
Appropriation.....	1,184,967	1,185,000	1,180,002	-4,965	-4,998
Salaries and expenses:					
Foreign Agricultural Service (transfer to FAS)	1,069	1,102	1,102	+33	---
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA).....	1,053	3,119	1,269	+216	-1,850
Subtotal.....	2,122	4,221	2,371	+249	-1,850
Total, Public Law 480:					
Program level.....	(1,184,967)	(1,185,000)	(1,180,002)	(-4,965)	(-4,998)
Appropriation.....	1,318,198	1,298,364	1,291,516	-26,682	-6,848
CCC Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):					
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS).....	3,286	3,440	3,440	+154	---
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA).....	841	1,033	1,033	+192	---
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account.....	4,127	4,473	4,473	+346	---
McGovern-Dole international food for education and child nutrition program grants.....	49,705	75,000	75,000	+25,295	---
Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs.....	1,503,398	1,520,914	1,508,711	+5,313	-12,203
(By transfer).....	(4,355)	(4,542)	(4,542)	(+187)	---

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4766)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs Request
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation.....	1,378,779	1,494,517	1,462,517	+83,738	-32,000
Prescription drug user fee act.....	(249,825)	(284,394)	(284,394)	(+34,569)	---
Medical device user fee act.....	(31,654)	(33,938)	(33,938)	(+2,284)	---
Animal drug user fee act.....	(5,000)	(8,000)	(8,000)	(+3,000)	---
Subtotal.....	(1,665,258)	(1,820,849)	(1,788,849)	(+123,591)	(-32,000)
Mammography clinics user fee (outlay savings).....	(16,576)	(16,919)	(16,919)	(+343)	---
Export and color certification.....	(6,649)	(6,838)	(6,838)	(+189)	---
Payments to GSA.....	(119,594)	(123,015)	(129,815)	(+10,221)	(+6,800)
Buildings and facilities.....	6,959	---	---	-6,959	---
Total, Food and Drug Administration.....	1,385,738	1,494,517	1,462,517	+76,779	-32,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Commodity Futures Trading Commission.....	89,901	95,327	93,327	+3,426	-2,000
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(40,900)	---	(42,900)	(+2,000)	(+42,900)
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration.....	1,475,639	1,589,844	1,555,844	+80,205	-34,000
TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Hunger fellowships.....	2,982	---	2,500	-482	+2,500
National Sheep Industry Improvement Center revolving fund.....	496	---	500	+4	+500
Tree assistance (sec. 747).....	14,912	---	---	-14,912	---
Northern Great Plains Regional Authority.....	1,491	---	---	-1,491	---
Denali Commission.....	994	---	---	-994	---
Food stamp program freeze.....	1,988	---	---	-1,988	---
Total, title VII, General provisions.....	22,863	---	3,000	-19,863	+3,000
OTHER APPROPRIATIONS					
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (P.L.108-199) Conservation Programs					
Natural Resources Conservation Service (Sec. 102(d)):					
Emergency watershed protection program (emergency)	149,115	---	---	-149,115	---
Tree assistance program (emergency) (Sec. 102(e)).....	12,426	---	---	-12,426	---
Emergency conservation prog. (emergency) (Sec. 102(f))	12,426	---	---	-12,426	---
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Livestock indemnity prog. (emergency) (Sec.102(g))	497	---	---	-497	---
Total, Other appropriations.....	174,464	---	---	-174,464	---
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	86,761,836	83,324,539	83,670,760	-3,091,076	+346,221
Appropriations.....	(86,587,372)	(83,324,539)	(83,670,760)	(-2,916,612)	(+346,221)
Emergency Appropriations.....	174,464	---	---	-174,464	---
(By transfer).....	(801,150)	(829,508)	(790,974)	(-10,176)	(-38,534)
(Loan authorization).....	(14,335,870)	(11,470,281)	(14,193,413)	(-142,457)	(+2,723,132)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(150,940)	(111,922)	(154,822)	(+3,882)	(+42,900)

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I wish to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), for a very good working relationship this year and the type of hearings that help us all build a better Nation.

This fiscal 2005 agriculture appropriation bill has been put together under some of the most trying budget circumstances that we have ever seen. And even though this is an appropriation bill, and I guess people refer to it as one of those green-eyeshade bills, it is important for the American people to know that what this bill is really all about is that no child in our country should go hungry; that American agriculture begins to regain some global market edge internationally; and that we keep winning more markets rather than losing markets, and taking actions that can help that.

This bill affects every American consumer in whether or not the meat that we eat is safe. It involves new research into the new plants, many of them undergirding new medicines of the future. Really, the best agriculture and food and drug research in the world. This bill touches every single person in our country and so many people around the world.

So I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA) for all his efforts, as well as the majority staff, under the direction of our new majority clerk, Martin Delgado, who is joined by Maureen Holohan, Leslie Barback, Joanne Perdue, and our detailees Tom O'Brien and Mike Gregoire. I also want to thank our minority clerk, who is with us here tonight, Martha Foley, for her efforts not only on behalf of our membership but of our entire country, for her very, very hard and largely unrecognized work.

Last year, I described this bill as a size 7 shoe for a size 10 foot. Well, it is a new year now. We have 293 million Americans in our country, more than last year. But, unfortunately, the bill this year has an even smaller shoe size but a bigger foot. Our needs are increasing as a country, but our resources are increasing. So we now have a size 6 shoe for a size 11 foot. And if you think the bunions are starting to pinch now, new stories regarding the early steps in preparing for next year's bill suggests matters will only be getting worse. Much more difficult.

The bill before us today provides a total of slightly more than \$83 billion, that is no small change, with nearly \$66 billion, or 80 percent, four-fifths of the bill, that we are mandated to spend. That means that programs, such as our Food Stamp program, we must spend those dollars to meet growing needs in the country. And in this year's bill that totals about \$33 billion.

If you think the economy is improving, you will not find evidence of that claim in this bill. In fact, this bill con-

tains \$16.772 billion in what we call discretionary spending. That is the part of the bill where we can really try to direct resources to very important needs in the country, but this year we have a \$67 million reduction over the prior year. And, in fact, it is a 6 percent reduction compared to 2 years ago for the fiscal 2003 budget. In fact, it is \$1.100 billion below that.

So this bill is not going up by any measure. And with more mandatory spending necessary to meet unmet economic needs, that cuts into the discretionary spending that we have so many draws upon all over this country.

The people who live in agricultural America and our small towns have the same needs and concerns as their friends in big cities. They need jobs, and more often than not are experiencing plant shutdowns. There are huge job washouts in many small towns in this country. And, in fact, there are no new employers that are readily seen on the horizon. We have offshoring of so much of our work and higher unemployment in many, many corners of rural America. People there need health care, but often have fewer hospitals, or much longer distances to travel to secure care. And the accounts in this bill dealing with telemedicine for rural America are severely underfunded.

People in rural America want economic development, but they find the services available to them are so over-subscribed or heavily weighted towards loan, that they often cannot get the assistance they need. People in rural America want community services, but they find that their smaller population base and smaller economic base make it even harder to finance the water and sewer systems, clean water systems, the power utility systems, and the telecommunication systems that so many other Americans, frankly, take for granted.

So the fiscal 2005 agriculture appropriation bill is a classic exercise in the futility of a budget process that has effectively obligated the bulk of Federal funds before we have really had a fair opportunity to address all the needs of our Nation here at home. Decisions made in recent years by some in this Congress on taxes and on foreign policy are sapping our ability to meet real domestic obligations.

To date, our country has spent over \$100 billion in Iraq and Afghanistan, and that number grows every day. Imagine if we could take that money and divide it, \$2 billion for each of our 50 States to share with their local towns and cities, what an incredible difference that would make.

□ 2015

But that is not the choice that we will make tonight.

I know that while the gentleman from Texas worked to provide funding within our restrictive allocation, there are a number of shortcomings that we need to recognize. Because of these

budget limitations, the bill before us will cut the community facilities program by \$36 million, so all the Members that asked us for more help for their particular communities, we could not do that.

In the rural water and sewer grant program, we are \$86 million underfunded. That is just to meet where we were last year, because the needs are so much greater.

It looks as though we are going to be at least \$150 million short in the women, infants and children's food program, WIC, and nearly \$15 million short in the commodity supplemental food program under this bill, despite appreciated increases. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his efforts there.

At the same time, we are also in this bill forced to debate tomorrow cutting renewable energy programs. We are also not funding needed market development tools. And we have a Department of Agriculture that may be preparing to extend additional credits to Iraq, but meanwhile forgiving \$4 billion in accumulated principal and interest owed by the Rafidain Bank of Iraq. We want to make sure that whatever is done relative to Iraq upholds existing law and does not permit the type of fraud that occurred during the 1980s and 1990s and the misuse of the Commodity Credit Corporation programs in arming Saddam Hussein and strengthening his power. That was done during the Reagan-Bush administrations and the Bush-Quayle administrations, over the strong objections of this Congress.

They say that we cannot expand the senior farmers market program to all States so that needy seniors can purchase locally grown fruit and vegetables from farmers who earn from the market, not transfer payments. Yet we know that over half the States in the Union still do not even have beginning funds to bring that important program on-line to really help farmers who are diversified close to our cities.

In international trade, there continues a downward trend as the U.S. moves for the first time in its history toward becoming a net food importer. Meanwhile, the Department of Agriculture cannot give us effective solutions for controlling and assessing liability for invasive species that are a huge and rising cost to the American taxpayer due to misapplied free trade policies, mismanaged, misapplied, misguided.

In this bill, there are hundreds of millions of dollars of tax money that has to be diverted to take care of the Asian longhorn beetle in New York, Chicago and many other places and the emerald ash borer in places like Michigan and Ohio. Those bills should not come to rest at the foot of the American taxpayer. They should be paid for by the commercial interests that bring those critters into this country, and they should not be getting off Scott free for the damage that they are causing. Nonetheless, we have to fund those

remediation programs in this bill. Those costs have been rising exponentially during this decade of the 1990s and into this new millennium.

Officials that are charged with ensuring the safety of our food supply cannot answer basic questions about how many cattle have been tested to ensure public health and safety or tell us when procedures for dealing with this national need will at long last be satisfied. It is amazing that the Department of Agriculture cannot do that. What a shame.

Meanwhile, export markets remain closed even to producers who are willing to pay themselves for the testing so that our export customers can reopen their markets. America's family farmers and ranchers have always had a vision for America's future. They daily demonstrate a willingness to work harder and smarter than their competitors. They possess a keen appreciation for the fact that their accomplishments provide a safe and bountiful food supply which allows most Americans to expend their energies in other industries and business endeavors. We need to support the efforts of these productive Americans by providing them with the tools for continued success, fair prices, fair trade policies, fair access to new technologies, and fair and consistent standards imposed on imported products that do not place economic burdens on domestic producers.

Mr. Chairman, in closing my more formal remarks this evening, let me just say that it has been a great pleasure to work on both sides of the aisle to complete the bill that we will bring to the floor tomorrow for amendment. We look forward to working with our colleagues on completing it tomorrow.

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

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

Earlier, Mr. Chairman, I recognized the fine work that the subcommittee staff has done. I would now like to single out a young man in my office, Walt Smith, a fine young man from Hillsboro, Texas, that is known to all agriculture interests and groups around the country, who worked side by side with the subcommittee staff to put this bill together. We wanted to acknowledge the good work that he does as well.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), the distinguished vice chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Texas knows, I have been and remain concerned about the funding level for the renewable energy program. The bill before us today funds this program at \$15 million; and even though this funding level is a \$4.2 million increase above the budget request, it is \$8 million below the fiscal year 2004 funding level.

As we have discussed, this program is important to Iowa and the whole country, particularly in the wind and biomass areas, because it makes grants available to rural, small businesses, agricultural producers and others who purchase renewable energy systems or make energy improvements. This program has the potential to improve rural living standards and economic opportunities and to create jobs. In short, there is a significant value-added component for rural areas that comes with this program.

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

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

Mr. BONILLA. The gentleman from Iowa has been a champion of the renewable energy program, and I think all of his constituents back home clearly understand that. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa, and I have appreciated his input on this subject as we have been putting this bill together. As we have discussed, this year has been a difficult one in terms of funding decisions we have had to make.

Mr. LATHAM. I know that the chairman has worked very hard to fashion a balanced bill and that he has done everything possible to accommodate the concerns of all Members. I had intended to offer an amendment to increase the renewable energy funding level by \$8 million. However, with the chairman's assurances that we will work in conference to raise the funding level of this program, I will not offer that amendment.

Mr. BONILLA. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman has my assurances that I will work with him and do everything I can to increase the renewable energy program funding level in conference. Again, I congratulate the gentleman for his stout work on this issue day in and day out.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman very much. I look forward to working with him on this.

Mr. Chairman, I want to encourage Members to support this bill as it is a well-balanced measure. The chairman has done an outstanding job of trying to ensure that sufficient resources are available for the broad range of programs that are funded under this bill.

Like many of the Members, I have my thoughts as to some programs that I wish could be a bit more generously funded, but given the need to produce a balanced product under the agricultural allocation, I am pleased with this bill.

I want to comment on a few other areas of interest that I believe are important beyond the renewable energy program that the chairman and I just discussed. For example, we must continue to focus on agricultural research which I think is an area that holds great promise for the future of agriculture economies and the consuming public that those economies feed.

I also think that we should remain diligent about the development of an

animal identification program that is reliable and easy to work with for all parties needing to access it. In this regard, it is important that we have adequate resources for animal health monitoring and surveillance, and this bill contains such resources.

Also, I want to mention my support for land conservation which this bill funds. In this regard, I know many Members have constituencies with interests in the conservation security program. The program is of considerable interest in Iowa, not only among those in the agriculture production arena but also those who are generally concerned about the environment in general. I share that concern and want to see the conservation security program as a concept developed in an optimal way. On the other hand, it would be unwise to begin full-scale implementation of the CSP and spend billions of dollars before that program is fine-tuned.

In numerous conversations that I and my staff have had about the CSP in Iowa and elsewhere, the prevailing view is that the CSP program needs work. Both corn and soybean association representatives as well as others with whom I have talked support CSP, but at this point they believe that the program is not ready to go forward at full speed.

I also want to personally thank the chairman and the staff that did such a tremendous job on this bill.

One extraordinarily important item in the bill is the full funding for the National Animal Disease Center at Ames, Iowa. It is a large number in the bill. It is one that the staff and the chairman have really worked hard to secure those funds for us. I certainly thank the President for including funding for the Animal Disease Center in his budget request. This is an extraordinarily important facility similar to the CDC for livestock and animals and very, very important for the security of our Nation, when we talk about anthrax, when we talk about mad cow disease, all of those things. It is very, very important that we have this facility on-line and that it is completed on a timely, expedited basis.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a very respected and extraordinarily hard-working member of our subcommittee.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and for being a member of this great committee.

I want to compliment the chairman on the good work done in bringing this bill to the floor, but I also want to point out I think something that all of us on the committee, the committee that spends the money on agriculture in America and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, what we realize is a problem, and that is that we have in this great country of ours, we still have nutritional problems and people going to bed at night hungry.

One of the big difficulties in the way the budget process is set up in this country is that 80 to 85 percent of the money we spend goes to mandatory food programs. That leaves only about 16 percent or so that is discretionary. Why we need to have more input into how the Federal Government spends its money on food and nutrition is because half of the budget of the USDA is dedicated towards nutrition. So it is not a small program. It is more than half of the entire budget of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. That is important. That is good. That is a good priority. But we still have areas where the demand is increasing.

Frankly, food and nutrition is so essential to life and we talk on the committee about problems we are having with obesity, what we ought to be doing with our nutritional programs, particularly in schools as we feed kids. The United States government has some specialized programs in the school lunch program and the school breakfast program, and we assist schools. Those are for kids who come from a low-income family, but essentially the school lunch program that all the kids eat is a public policy because it is run by the schools, and in that program alone you will notice that when I look through what America buys to feed kids, it is not exactly the same as what we have invested money in doing research on, in telling people what is healthy for Americans. That is, our nutritional voice does not meet our spending practices.

I am a big advocate for trying to get more fresh fruits and vegetables in schools. Schools have used the school lunch program and school breakfast program to provide for vending machines in schools, for finding other ways to raise money and have not really paid attention to the fact that the health of the children and the students is really dependent on how well they are fed and how good that health is. The committee has addressed a lot of these issues, but we are also faced with the same problems that other committees are and that is our discretionary funding is limited.

□ 2030

And what we have seen with that is the food stamps, as the economy goes up and down, and as the Members know, it has been sort of in a recession in the last few years, that means more people have been unemployed. Yes, we see people getting back on the employment rolls, and that is a good thing; but we still have had since 2001 a 45 percent increase in demand for the food stamp program.

We have taken a lot of steps in that area to try to streamline it and better manage the program through automatic debit cards, to swipe cards rather than having to go through the line and go through this ticket process of whether the stamps one is using are eligible to buy the product that they picked off the shelf, and the debit card

allows it to show that right away on the computer and does not sort of put the recipient and the cashier in an awkward situation.

The WIC program, the Women, Infants and Children, we have a program in America to feed women who are expecting in prenatal conditions and in postnatal conditions, giving them nutritious food to feed the infant. It is a very successful program. It is one that America can be very proud of. But we see that may need an increase, meaning that people just do not have the resources to buy that kind of food, or it is not readily available in their neighborhood.

I have spoken of a school lunch and school breakfast program. We have a Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program called TEFAP. The money that has been flatlined for a number of years, we may need in the future to increase that.

We have the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. That is mainly the things we have seen, Meals on Wheels and other entities taken to senior citizens where the commodity foods are put into a local senior citizen nutritional program. The money has been frozen in that despite the fact that we have an aging population in America; and as that aging population increases, and it is going to increase tremendously because I was just told the demographics of California, the census data shows that by the year 2015, one out of every five persons over the age of 65 will live in the State of California, that is going to be a huge burden on the State. It could also be a great asset because these people have come with a lot of experiences; but on the other hand, as we know, the aging population is staying alive longer, and we are going to need more services, and those are usually expensive services. So these types of programs may be hurt in the future if they are flatlined.

So the point of my raising this is that I am really excited to be a member of this committee. I think it is a tremendous committee that works in a very strong, bipartisan fashion. The chairman has been excellent. The staff has been excellent. The other members of the committee, we all get along very well and try to work out our differences. And what I am trying to point out in my comment today is that despite the good workings inside Congress and despite the fact that we are the wealthiest country on the Earth and the most agriculturally abundant and productive, I mean just in abundance alone, one of the three counties I represent produces 85 crops.

When I talked to Members here in Congress and to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, I found that there was no other State in the United States that produced 85 crops alone. California, being the largest ag State, has the greatest variety in it, and what I would like to see our country do is move more into buying the fruits and vegetables and the things that we de-

scribe in our nutrition. Frankly, the things we see in all these fad diets that are going on right now, those are all about healthy foods and healthy fruits and vegetables, and if we use the government resources to purchase those more and get those into the school lunch program, into the WIC program, into the feeding programs, into the senior meals programs, and, frankly, into our institutional feeding. We feed the military. We feed hospitals. We feed big institutions like the Federal Prison System. If we could get our sister States and counties and cities to be able to work on their institutional feeding, we could do a much better job of getting the kind of food that is necessary to the people who need it, and we could have a better distribution of how agriculture functions in America.

So I want to compliment the committee on the direction it is headed. I think we have a few problems on the horizon. I think if we put our minds to it, we can address those.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH), a new Congresswoman, who will provide to this Congress a much-needed, strong voice for agriculture and rural area.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

I rise this evening in support of this legislation. It provides essential funding for programs important to farmers, ranchers, and consumers across South Dakota. I am pleased that it contains increases in funding for the Food Safety and Inspection Service by \$45 million and for the Food and Drug Administration by \$72 million. I commend the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), ranking member, as well as other members of the subcommittee and their staff for working together to forge the difficult compromises that are evident in this bill.

I do, however, want to voice a couple of concerns I have about funding levels for some of the programs addressed in this appropriations measure. I have heard from several of my constituents, concerns about funding levels for two very important programs in South Dakota. One of the programs I hear about consistently from the agricultural producers in my State is the Environmental Quality Incentives Program or EQIP. EQIP offers financial and technical assistance for eligible farmers and ranchers to enable them to implement environmentally beneficial land management practices.

I am pleased that EQIP was reauthorized in the 2002 farm bill and given increasing authorization levels over the next several years. Unfortunately, I feel this appropriations bill significantly underfunds this important program. It falls \$190 million below what the 2002 farm bill had authorized. I understand and appreciate the need for

fiscal restraint, but I disagree with some of the priorities reflected in this bill, particularly the funding level for the EQIP program.

The ramifications of this funding level are made quite clear when we consider the backlog of projects that exist under this important program. By some estimates, the backlog for EQIP funding nationwide is in excess of \$1 billion, with the backlog in South Dakota alone in the tens of millions of dollars. These are commendable projects that do a great deal to improve water quality and wildlife habitat across the country.

I appreciate the stringent budgetary constraints under which we are currently operating, but this is not the program that should be the target of such substantial cuts.

Another important program is the Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program, or WHIP. WHIP is a voluntary program for people who want to develop and improve wildlife habitat on private land. USDA provides both technical assistance and up to 75 percent cost-share assistance to establish and improve fish and wildlife habitat.

WHIP has proven to be a highly-effective and widely-accepted program across the country. By targeting wildlife habitat projects, WHIP provides assistance to conservation-minded landowners who are unable to meet the specific eligibility requirements of other USDA conservation programs.

Unfortunately, this bill would fund WHIP at \$25 million below its authorized levels for fiscal year 2005. While \$25 million may not seem like a large sum of money relative to other amounts considered by this body, keep in mind that this bill funds the entire program at \$60 million. The difference between \$85 million and \$60 million is almost 30 percent. This is a significant shortfall, and one I think should be reevaluated in conference.

Again, I voice my overall support for this legislation and will vote in favor of final passage, but I am concerned with some of the funding choices that were made. I urge my colleagues that will serve as conferees to seek additional funding for both the EQIP and WHIP programs.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT).

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

I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), chairman of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

For the past 3 years, the committee and Congress have supported funding for the Tri-States Joint Peanut Research project between Auburn University, the University of Florida, and the University of Georgia. In the past this project has focused on a sod-based rota-

tion with peanuts, cotton, and other row crops.

This year the project was renamed the Tri-States Initiative to incorporate fruits, nut crops, and vegetables in the rotation. This created some confusion and was unfortunately viewed as a new start and subsequently received no funding. As the gentleman is aware, producers in southern States face the problem of compacted soils, which can be greatly improved with the use of proper crop rotation. This research would allow southeastern producers to make informed decisions on how to diversify their operations while increasing farm profitability and improving soil characteristics.

The Tri-States Initiative is a reasonable extension of a previously funded project. Since the project was viewed as a new start, I ask the chairman to be supportive of restoring the fiscal year 2004 funding for the project in conference.

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

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The gentleman is correct. The naming of this program did cause confusion, but it is clear that this is a continuation of the program that the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Subcommittee has funded for the past 3 years. The Tri-State Initiative conducts important commodity research in Alabama, Florida, and Georgia; and I would be happy to work with the gentleman to restore funding for this program in conference.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his response, and I appreciate his willingness to work with me in conference to restore this important program.

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

As we close this evening, I just want to say that the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) and I intend to offer a biofuels amendment tomorrow to the bill with great hope that we can help push America into a new energy age, a new renewable energy age, starting right in rural America; and I wanted to acknowledge that while she is still on the floor with us tonight.

I did also want to, for the record, thank deeply Roger Szemraj of our own staff for the tremendous work that he does and for the time he takes away from his own family to be with us even tonight on this floor as we move this important bill for fiscal year 2005 agriculture appropriations.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING) having assumed the chair, Mr. TERRY, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4766) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 2045

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE GARRETT LEE SMITH MEMORIAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a subject that is very difficult for many of us to address, and that is the subject of suicide.

Last Friday, along with the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), I introduced H.R. 4799, the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act. This legislation offers a comprehensive strategy toward addressing suicide, suicide prevention and mental health in high schools and on college campuses.

So why is it important to address this critical issue? I would like people to consider these facts.

Number one, more children and young adults die from suicide each year than from cancer, heart disease, AIDS, birth defects, stroke and chronic lung disease combined.

Number two, over 4,000 children and young adults take their own lives