

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2744,  
AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOP-  
MENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMIN-  
ISTRATION, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 2006

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 520, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2744) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 520, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 26, 2005, at page H9204.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring before the House today the conference report on H.R. 2744, which is the Agriculture appropriations bill, which not only covers agriculture, but the Food and Drug Administration and related agencies for fiscal year 2006.

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the good work of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), my ranking member and good friend, 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.

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 spending 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 2005 for programs that have always enjoyed strong bipartisan support, and they include the following: Agricultural Research Service, \$33 million; Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service, \$33 million; Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, \$7 million; Food Safety and Inspection Service, \$21 million; Farm Service Agency, \$48 million; Natural Resources Conservation Service, \$12 million; Rural Economic and Community Development Programs, \$115 million; Domestic Food Programs, \$6.5 billion; and the FDA, \$40 million.

We have delayed implementation of the country-of-origin labeling for meat, produce and peanuts until 2008. The House voted for delay on COOL while this bill was considered on the floor. There are serious concerns about how this law would be implemented, and this delay gives the Department and the committee of jurisdiction the time to make this policy work.

Mr. Speaker, we refer to this bill as the agriculture bill, but it does far more than assist just basic agriculture. It also supports rural and economic development, human nutrition, agricultural exports, land conservation, as well as food, drug and medical safety. This is a bill that will deliver benefits to every one of our constituents every

day, no matter what kind of district you represent.

I would say to all Members that they can support this conference agreement and 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 the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who serve as the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations. They have been very supportive in moving not only this bill, but other appropriations bills through the Congress as quickly as possible.

I 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 this staff puts in day in and day out, sometimes well into the night and covering many weekends: Martin Delgado, the subcommittee clerk; Maureen Holohan, Leslie Barrack, and Jamie Swafford of the majority staff; and Martha Foley on the minority staff. In addition, I want to thank our detailee Tom O'Brien, and a great Texas Aggie, Walt Smith, from my personal staff.

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 - FY 2006

H.R. 2744 (H.Rept. 109-255)

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
<b>TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS</b>						
<b>Production, Processing, and Marketing</b>						
Office of the Secretary.....	5,083	5,127	5,127	5,127	5,127	+44
<b>Executive Operations:</b>						
Chief Economist.....	10,234	10,539	10,539	10,539	10,539	+305
National Appeals Division.....	14,216	14,524	14,524	14,524	14,524	+308
Office of Budget and Program Analysis.....	8,162	8,298	8,298	8,298	8,298	+136
Homeland Security staff.....	769	1,466	934	1,166	934	+165
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	16,462	16,726	16,462	16,726	16,462	---
Common computing environment.....	124,580	142,465	60,725	118,072	110,072	-14,508
Office of the Chief Financial Officer.....	5,696	5,874	5,874	5,874	5,874	+178
Working capital fund.....	12,747	---	---	---	---	-12,747
<b>Total, Executive Operations.....</b>	<b>192,866</b>	<b>199,892</b>	<b>117,356</b>	<b>175,199</b>	<b>166,703</b>	<b>-26,163</b>
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights....	811	821	811	821	821	+10
Office of Civil Rights.....	19,730	20,109	20,109	20,109	20,109	+379
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration..	664	676	676	676	676	+12
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments.....	(162,559)	(221,924)	(183,133)	(187,734)	(187,734)	(+25,175)
Payments to GSA.....	127,292	147,734	147,734	147,734	147,734	+20,442
Building operations and maintenance.....	35,267	74,190	35,399	40,000	40,000	+4,733
Hazardous materials management.....	15,408	15,644	15,644	12,000	12,000	-3,408
Departmental administration.....	22,445	23,103	23,103	23,103	23,103	+658
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.....	3,821	3,846	3,821	3,846	3,821	---
Office of Communications.....	9,290	9,509	9,509	9,509	9,509	+219
Office of the Inspector General.....	77,663	81,045	79,626	81,045	80,336	+2,673
Office of the General Counsel.....	35,574	40,263	38,439	40,263	39,351	+3,777
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics.....	587	598	598	598	598	+11
Economic Research Service.....	74,170	80,749	75,931	78,549	75,931	+1,761
National Agricultural Statistics Service.....	128,444	145,159	136,241	145,159	140,700	+12,256
Census of Agriculture.....	(22,226)	(29,115)	(29,115)	(29,115)	(29,115)	(+6,889)
<b>Agricultural Research Service:</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	1,102,000	996,107	1,035,475	1,109,981	1,135,004	+33,004
Buildings and facilities.....	186,335	64,800	87,300	160,645	131,195	-55,140
<b>Total, Agricultural Research Service.....</b>	<b>1,288,335</b>	<b>1,060,907</b>	<b>1,122,775</b>	<b>1,270,626</b>	<b>1,266,199</b>	<b>-22,136</b>
<b>Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:</b>						
Research and education activities.....	655,495	545,500	662,546	652,231	676,849	+21,354
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund.....	(12,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)	---
Extension activities.....	445,631	431,743	444,871	453,438	455,955	+10,324
Integrated activities.....	54,712	35,013	15,513	55,784	55,792	+1,080
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers.....	5,888	5,935	7,810	5,888	6,000	+112
<b>Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service.....</b>	<b>1,161,726</b>	<b>1,018,191</b>	<b>1,130,740</b>	<b>1,167,341</b>	<b>1,194,596</b>	<b>+32,870</b>
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs.....	715	724	724	724	724	+9
<b>Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	808,106	855,162	842,520	807,768	815,461	+7,355
Animal welfare (user fees) (leg. proposal) NA.	---	(10,858)	---	(10,858)	---	---
Buildings and facilities.....	4,927	4,996	4,996	4,996	4,996	+69
<b>Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.....</b>	<b>813,033</b>	<b>860,158</b>	<b>847,516</b>	<b>812,764</b>	<b>820,457</b>	<b>+7,424</b>

## AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION-AND RELATED AGENCIES - FY 2006

H.R. 2744 (H.Rept. 109-255)

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
<b>Agricultural Marketing Service:</b>						
Marketing Services.....	75,092	84,114	78,032	76,643	75,376	+284
Agriculture marketing service standardization (user fees) (leg. proposal) NA.....	---	(2,918)	---	(2,918)	---	---
Standardization user fees.....	(5,000)	---	---	---	---	(-5,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected).....	(64,459)	(65,667)	(65,667)	(65,667)	(65,667)	(+1,208)
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32).....	15,800	16,055	16,055	16,055	16,055	+255 M
Discretionary appropriations.....	---	---	---	---	20,000	+20,000
Payments to states and possessions.....	3,816	1,347	1,347	3,847	3,847	+31
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service.....	94,708	101,516	95,434	96,545	115,278	+20,570
<b>Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards</b>						
Administration:						
Salaries and expenses.....	37,001	15,717	38,400	38,443	38,443	+1,442
Grain inspection, packers and stockyards administration (user fees) (leg. proposal) NA.....	---	(24,701)	---	(24,701)	---	---
Limitation on inspection and weighing services....	(42,463)	(42,463)	(42,463)	(42,463)	(42,463)	---
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety.....	590	602	590	602	602	+12
<b>Food Safety and Inspection Service.....</b>						
Food safety inspection (user fees) (leg. prop) NA.....	---	(139,000)	---	(139,000)	---	---
Lab accreditation fees.....	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	---
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing....	4,962,393	4,616,997	4,783,567	5,007,601	5,040,574	+78,181
<b>Farm Assistance Programs</b>						
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign						
Agricultural Services.....	626	635	635	635	635	+9
Farm Service Agency:						
Salaries and expenses.....	999,536	1,050,875	1,023,738	1,043,555	1,030,000	+30,464
(Transfer from export loans).....	(994)	(1,839)	(1,839)	(1,839)	(1,839)	(+845)
(Transfer from P.L. 480).....	(2,914)	(3,217)	(3,217)	(3,217)	(3,217)	(+303)
(Transfer from ACIF).....	(291,414)	(309,137)	(297,127)	(309,137)	(304,591)	(+13,177)
Subtotal, transfers from program accounts.....	(295,322)	(314,193)	(302,183)	(314,193)	(309,647)	(+14,325)
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	(1,294,858)	(1,365,068)	(1,325,921)	(1,357,748)	(1,339,647)	(+44,789)
State mediation grants.....	3,968	4,500	4,250	4,250	4,250	+282
Grassroot source water protection program.....	---	---	---	4,250	3,750	+3,750
Dairy indemnity program.....	100	100	100	100	100	---
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency.....	1,003,604	1,055,475	1,028,088	1,052,155	1,038,100	+34,496
<b>Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program</b>						
Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Farm ownership loans:						
Direct.....	(208,320)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(208,000)	(208,000)	(-320)
Guaranteed.....	(1,388,800)	(1,400,000)	(1,400,000)	(1,400,000)	(1,400,000)	(+11,200)
Subtotal.....	(1,597,120)	(1,600,000)	(1,600,000)	(1,608,000)	(1,608,000)	(+10,880)
Farm operating loans:						
Direct.....	(644,800)	(650,000)	(650,000)	(650,000)	(650,000)	(+5,200)
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	(1,091,200)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	(1,100,000)	(1,150,000)	(+58,800)
Subsidized guaranteed.....	(282,720)	(266,253)	(266,256)	(283,000)	(274,632)	(-8,088)
Subtotal.....	(2,018,720)	(2,116,253)	(2,116,256)	(2,033,000)	(2,074,632)	(+55,912)
Indian tribe land acquisition loans.....	(2,000)	(2,000)	(2,020)	(2,000)	(2,020)	(+20)
Natural disasters emergency insured loans.....	---	(25,000)	---	---	---	---
Boll weevil eradication loans.....	(100,000)	(60,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	---
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(3,717,840)	(3,803,253)	(3,818,276)	(3,743,000)	(3,784,652)	(+66,812)

## AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION-AND RELATED AGENCIES - FY 2006

H.R. 2744 (H.Rept. 109-255)

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
<b>Loan subsidies:</b>						
<b>Farm ownership loans:</b>						
Direct.....	11,145	10,240	10,240	10,650	10,650	-495
Guaranteed.....	7,361	6,720	6,720	6,720	6,720	-641
Subtotal.....	18,506	16,960	16,960	17,370	17,370	-1,136
<b>Farm operating loans:</b>						
Direct.....	65,060	64,675	64,675	64,675	64,675	-385
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	35,246	36,360	36,360	33,330	34,845	-401
Subsidized guaranteed.....	37,631	33,282	33,282	35,375	34,329	-3,302
Subtotal.....	137,937	134,317	134,317	133,380	133,849	-4,088
Indian tribe land acquisition.....	105	80	81	80	81	-24
Natural disasters emergency insured loans.....	---	2,735	---	---	---	---
Total, Loan subsidies.....	156,548	154,092	151,358	150,830	151,300	-5,248
<b>ACIF expenses:</b>						
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)....	291,414	309,137	297,127	309,137	304,591	+13,177
Administrative expenses.....	7,936	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	+64
Total, ACIF expenses.....	299,350	317,137	305,127	317,137	312,591	+13,241
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund... (Loan authorization).....	455,898 (3,717,840)	471,229 (3,803,253)	456,485 (3,818,276)	467,967 (3,743,000)	463,891 (3,784,652)	+7,993 (+66,812)
Total, Farm Service Agency.....	1,459,502	1,526,704	1,484,573	1,520,122	1,501,991	+42,489
Risk Management Agency.....	71,468	87,806	77,806	73,448	77,048	+5,580
Total, Farm Assistance Programs.....	1,531,596	1,615,145	1,563,014	1,594,205	1,579,674	+48,078
<b>Corporations</b>						
<b>Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:</b>						
Federal crop insurance corporation fund.....	4,095,128	3,159,379	3,159,379	3,159,379	3,159,379	-935,749 M
<b>Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:</b>						
Reimbursement for net realized losses.....	16,452,377	25,690,000	25,690,000	25,690,000	25,690,000	+9,237,623 M
Hazardous waste management (limitation on expenses).....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---
Total, Corporations.....	20,547,505	28,849,379	28,849,379	28,849,379	28,849,379	+8,301,874
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs.....	27,041,494	35,081,521	35,195,960	35,451,185	35,469,627	+8,428,133
(By transfer).....	(295,322)	(314,193)	(302,183)	(314,193)	(309,647)	(+14,325)
(Loan authorization).....	(3,717,840)	(3,803,253)	(3,818,276)	(3,743,000)	(3,784,652)	(+66,812)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(111,922)	(113,130)	(113,130)	(113,130)	(113,130)	(+1,208)
<b>TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS</b>						
<b>Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment:</b>						
Natural Resources Conservation Service:	735	744	744	744	744	+9
Conservation operations.....	830,661	767,783	773,640	819,561	839,519	+8,858
Watershed surveys and planning.....	7,026	5,141	7,026	5,141	6,083	-943
Watershed and flood prevention operations.....	74,971	---	60,000	60,000	75,000	+29
Watershed rehabilitation program.....	27,280	15,125	47,000	27,313	31,561	+4,281
Resource conservation and development.....	51,228	25,600	51,360	51,228	51,300	+72
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service...	991,166	813,649	939,026	963,243	1,003,463	+12,297
Total, title II, Conservation Programs.....	991,901	814,393	939,770	963,987	1,004,207	+12,306

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION-AND RELATED AGENCIES - FY 2006

H.R. 2744 (H.Rept. 109-255)

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS						
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development...	627	635	627	635	635	+8
Rural Development:						
Rural community advancement program.....	710,321	521,689	657,389	705,106	701,941	-8,380
(Transfer out).....	(-27,776)	---	---	(-28,000)	(-26,000)	(+1,776)
Total, Rural community advancement program..	710,321	521,689	657,389	705,106	701,941	-8,380
RD expenses:						
Salaries and expenses.....	147,264	167,849	152,623	164,773	164,625	+17,361
(Transfer from RHIF).....	(444,755)	(465,886)	(455,242)	(465,886)	(454,809)	(+10,054)
(Transfer from RDLFP).....	(4,281)	(6,656)	(4,719)	(6,656)	(4,793)	(+512)
(Transfer from RETLP).....	(37,971)	(39,933)	(38,907)	(39,933)	(38,784)	(+813)
(Transfer from RTB).....	(3,127)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(-627)
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts..	(490,134)	(514,975)	(501,368)	(514,975)	(500,886)	(+10,752)
Total, RD expenses.....	(637,398)	(682,824)	(653,991)	(679,748)	(665,511)	(+28,113)
Total, Rural Development.....	857,585	689,538	810,012	869,879	866,566	+8,981
Rural Housing Service:						
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Single family direct (sec. 502).....	(1,140,800)	(1,000,000)	(1,140,799)	(1,000,000)	(1,140,799)	(-1)
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	(3,282,823)	(3,681,033)	(3,681,033)	(3,681,033)	(3,681,033)	(+398,210)
Subtotal, Single family.....	(4,423,623)	(4,681,033)	(4,821,832)	(4,681,033)	(4,821,832)	(+398,209)
Housing repair (sec. 504).....	(34,720)	(35,969)	(35,969)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(+280)
Rental housing (sec. 515).....	(99,200)	(27,027)	(100,000)	(90,000)	(100,000)	(+800)
Site loans (sec. 524).....	(5,045)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(-45)
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	(99,200)	(200,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+800)
Multi-family housing credit sales.....	(1,489)	(1,500)	(1,500)	(1,500)	(1,500)	(+11)
Single family housing credit sales.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	---
Self-help housing land develop. (sec. 523)	(10,000)	(5,048)	(5,048)	(5,048)	(5,048)	(-4,952)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(4,683,277)	(4,965,577)	(5,079,349)	(4,927,581)	(5,078,380)	(+395,103)
Loan subsidies:						
Single family direct (sec. 502).....	132,105	113,900	129,937	113,900	129,937	-2,168
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	33,339	40,900	40,900	40,900	40,900	+7,561
Subtotal, Single family.....	165,444	154,800	170,837	154,800	170,837	+5,393
Housing repair (sec. 504).....	10,090	10,521	10,521	10,238	10,238	+148
Rental housing (sec. 515).....	46,713	12,400	45,880	41,292	45,880	-833
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	3,462	10,840	5,420	5,420	5,420	+1,958
Multi-family housing credit sales.....	721	681	681	681	681	-40
Self-help housing land develop. (sec. 523)	---	52	52	52	52	+52
Multi-family housing preservation.....	---	---	---	16,500	9,000	+9,000
Total, Loan subsidies.....	226,430	189,294	233,391	228,983	242,108	+15,678
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RD).	444,755	465,886	455,242	465,886	454,809	+10,054
Rental assistance program:						
(Sec. 521).....	581,411	644,126	644,126	644,126	645,102	+63,691
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D)).....	5,853	5,900	5,900	8,976	8,000	+2,147
Total, Rental assistance program.....	587,264	650,026	650,026	653,102	653,102	+65,838
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund.....	1,258,449	1,305,206	1,338,659	1,347,971	1,350,019	+91,570
(Loan authorization).....	(4,683,277)	(4,965,577)	(5,079,349)	(4,927,581)	(5,078,380)	(+395,103)
Rural housing voucher program.....	---	214,000	---	16,000	16,000	+16,000
Mutual and self-help housing grants.....	33,728	34,000	34,000	34,000	34,000	+272
Rural housing assistance grants.....	43,640	41,000	41,000	43,976	43,976	+336
Farm labor program account.....	33,845	32,728	32,728	29,607	31,168	-2,677
Subtotal, grants and payments.....	111,213	107,728	107,728	107,583	109,144	-2,069
Total, Rural Housing Service.....	1,369,662	1,626,934	1,448,387	1,471,554	1,475,163	+105,501
(Loan authorization).....	(4,683,277)	(4,965,577)	(5,079,349)	(4,927,581)	(5,078,380)	(+395,103)

## AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION-AND RELATED AGENCIES - FY 2006

H.R. 2744 (H.Rept. 109-255)

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
<b>Rural Business-Cooperative Service:</b>						
<b>Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:</b>						
(Loan authorization).....	(33,939)	(34,212)	(34,212)	(34,212)	(34,212)	(+273)
Loan subsidy.....	15,741	14,718	14,718	14,718	14,718	-1,023
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD).....	4,281	6,656	4,719	6,656	4,793	+512
<b>Total, Rural Development Loan Fund.....</b>	<b>20,022</b>	<b>21,374</b>	<b>19,437</b>	<b>21,374</b>	<b>19,511</b>	<b>-511</b>
<b>Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:</b>						
(Loan authorization).....	(24,803)	(25,003)	(25,003)	(25,003)	(25,003)	(+200)
Direct subsidy.....	4,660	4,993	4,993	4,993	4,993	+333
Rural cooperative development grants.....	23,808	21,000	64,000	24,988	29,488	+5,680
Rural empowerment zones and enterprise communities grants.....	12,400	---	10,000	12,400	11,200	-1,200
Renewable energy program.....	22,816	10,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	+184
<b>Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service.....</b>	<b>83,706</b>	<b>57,367</b>	<b>121,430</b>	<b>86,755</b>	<b>88,192</b>	<b>+4,486</b>
(Loan authorization).....	(58,742)	(59,215)	(59,215)	(59,215)	(59,215)	(+473)
<b>Rural Utilities Service:</b>						
<b>Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:</b>						
<b>Loan authorizations:</b>						
<b>Electric:</b>						
Direct, 5%.....	(119,040)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(-19,040)
Direct, Municipal rate.....	(99,200)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+800)
Direct, FFB.....	(2,000,000)	(1,620,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,700,000)	(2,600,000)	(+600,000)
Direct, Treasury rate.....	(1,000,000)	(700,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	---
Guaranteed electric.....	(99,200)	---	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(+800)
Guaranteed underwriting.....	(1,000,000)	---	(1,000,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(+500,000)
<b>Subtotal, Electric.....</b>	<b>(4,317,440)</b>	<b>(2,520,000)</b>	<b>(4,300,000)</b>	<b>(5,500,000)</b>	<b>(5,400,000)</b>	<b>(+1,082,560)</b>
<b>Telecommunications:</b>						
Direct, 5%.....	(145,000)	(145,000)	(145,000)	(145,000)	(145,000)	---
Direct, Treasury rate.....	(248,000)	(425,000)	(424,000)	(425,000)	(424,000)	(+176,000)
Direct, FFB.....	(125,000)	(100,000)	(125,000)	(125,000)	(125,000)	---
<b>Subtotal, Telecommunications.....</b>	<b>(518,000)</b>	<b>(670,000)</b>	<b>(694,000)</b>	<b>(695,000)</b>	<b>(694,000)</b>	<b>(+176,000)</b>
<b>Total, Loan authorizations.....</b>	<b>(4,835,440)</b>	<b>(3,190,000)</b>	<b>(4,994,000)</b>	<b>(6,195,000)</b>	<b>(6,094,000)</b>	<b>(+1,258,560)</b>
<b>Loan subsidies:</b>						
<b>Electric:</b>						
Direct, 5%.....	3,619	920	920	920	920	-2,699
Direct, Municipal rate.....	1,339	5,050	5,050	5,050	5,050	+3,711
Guaranteed electric.....	60	---	90	90	90	+30
Direct, Treasury rate.....	---	70	100	100	100	+100
<b>Subtotal, Electric.....</b>	<b>5,018</b>	<b>6,040</b>	<b>6,160</b>	<b>6,160</b>	<b>6,160</b>	<b>+1,142</b>
<b>Telecommunications:</b>						
Direct, Treasury rate.....	99	212	212	212	212	+113
<b>Subtotal, Telecommunications.....</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>+113</b>
<b>Total, Loan subsidies.....</b>	<b>5,117</b>	<b>6,252</b>	<b>6,372</b>	<b>6,372</b>	<b>6,372</b>	<b>+1,255</b>
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	37,971	39,933	38,907	39,933	38,784	+813
<b>Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account..</b>	<b>43,088</b>	<b>46,185</b>	<b>45,279</b>	<b>46,305</b>	<b>45,156</b>	<b>+2,068</b>
(Loan authorization).....	(4,835,440)	(3,190,000)	(4,994,000)	(6,195,000)	(6,094,000)	(+1,258,560)
<b>Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:</b>						
(Loan authorization).....	(175,000)	---	---	---	---	(-175,000)
RTB administrative expenses (transfer to RD).....	3,127	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	-627
<b>Total, Rural Telephone Bank Program Account.....</b>	<b>3,127</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>-627</b>
High energy costs grants (by transfer).....	(27,776)	---	---	(28,000)	(26,000)	(-1,776)
<b>Distance learning, telemedicine, and broadband program:</b>						
<b>Loan authorizations:</b>						
Distance learning and telemedicine.....	(50,000)	---	(50,000)	---	(25,000)	(-25,000)
Broadband telecommunications.....	(545,600)	(358,875)	(463,860)	(550,000)	(500,000)	(-45,600)
<b>Total, Loan authorizations.....</b>	<b>(595,600)</b>	<b>(358,875)</b>	<b>(513,860)</b>	<b>(550,000)</b>	<b>(525,000)</b>	<b>(-70,600)</b>

## AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION-AND RELATED AGENCIES - FY 2006

H.R. 2744 (H.Rept. 109-255)

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
<b>Loan subsidies:</b>						
Distance learning and telemedicine:						
Direct.....	704	---	750	---	375	-329
Grants.....	34,720	25,000	25,000	35,000	30,000	-4,720
Broadband telecommunications:						
Direct.....	11,621	9,973	9,973	11,825	10,750	-871
Grants.....	8,928	---	9,000	10,000	9,000	+72
Total, Loan subsidies and grants.....	55,973	34,973	44,723	56,825	50,125	-5,848
Total, Rural Utilities Service.....	102,188	83,658	92,502	105,630	97,781	-4,407
(Loan authorization).....	(5,606,040)	(3,548,875)	(5,507,860)	(6,745,000)	(6,619,000)	(+1,012,960)
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs.....	2,413,768	2,458,132	2,470,958	2,534,453	2,528,337	+114,569
(By transfer).....	(517,910)	(514,975)	(501,368)	(542,975)	(526,886)	(+8,976)
(Loan authorization).....	(10,348,059)	(8,573,667)	(10,646,424)	(11,731,796)	(11,756,595)	(+1,408,536)
<b>TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS</b>						
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services.....	590	599	599	599	599	+9
Food and Nutrition Service:						
Child nutrition programs.....	6,629,038	7,304,207	7,224,406	7,224,406	7,473,208	+844,170 M
Transfer from section 32.....	5,152,962	5,111,820	5,187,621	5,187,621	5,187,621	+34,568 M
Team nutrition.....	---	---	---	10,000	---	---
Total, Child nutrition programs.....	11,782,000	12,416,027	12,412,027	12,422,027	12,660,829	+878,829
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC).....	5,235,032	5,510,000	5,257,000	5,257,000	5,257,000	+21,968
Food stamp program:						
Expenses.....	30,499,527	36,034,599	36,034,599	36,044,026	36,045,026	+5,545,499 M
Indian reservations (FPIR).....	---	---	---	4,000	3,000	+3,000
Armed forces provision.....	---	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	+1,000
Reserve.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	---
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico and Samoa	1,515,027	1,535,796	1,535,796	1,522,369	1,522,369	+7,342 M
The emergency food assistance program.....	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	---
Total, Food stamp program.....	35,154,554	40,711,395	40,711,395	40,711,395	40,711,395	+5,556,841
Commodity assistance program.....	177,367	177,935	178,797	179,935	179,366	+1,999
Nutrition programs administration.....	138,818	140,761	140,761	140,761	140,761	+1,943
Total, Food and Nutrition Service.....	52,487,771	58,956,118	58,699,980	58,711,118	58,949,351	+6,461,580
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs.....	52,488,361	58,956,717	58,700,579	58,711,717	58,949,950	+6,461,589
<b>TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS</b>						
Foreign Agricultural Service:						
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation.....	136,719	148,792	148,224	147,868	147,901	+11,182
(Transfer from export loans).....	(3,394)	(3,440)	(3,440)	(3,440)	(3,440)	(+46)
(Transfer from P.L. 480).....	(1,088)	(168)	(168)	(168)	(168)	(-920)
Total, Salaries and expenses program level.....	(141,201)	(152,400)	(151,832)	(151,476)	(151,509)	(+10,308)
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:						
Program account:						
Loan authorization, direct.....	(109,000)	(74,032)	(74,032)	(74,032)	(74,032)	(-34,968)
Loan subsidies.....	93,444	65,040	65,040	65,040	65,040	-28,404
Ocean freight differential grants.....	22,541	11,940	11,940	11,940	11,940	-10,601
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:						
Program level.....	(1,173,041)	(885,000)	(1,107,094)	(1,150,000)	(1,150,000)	(-23,041)
Appropriation.....	1,173,041	885,000	1,107,094	1,150,000	1,150,000	-23,041 150
Salaries and expenses:						
Foreign Agricultural Service (transfer to FAS)	1,088	168	168	168	168	-920
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA).....	2,914	3,217	3,217	3,217	3,217	+303
Subtotal.....	4,002	3,385	3,385	3,385	3,385	-617
Total, Public Law 480:						
Program level.....	(1,173,041)	(885,000)	(1,107,094)	(1,150,000)	(1,150,000)	(-23,041)
Appropriation.....	1,293,028	965,365	1,187,459	1,230,365	1,230,365	-62,663

## AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION-AND RELATED AGENCIES - FY 2006

H.R. 2744 (H.Rept. 109-255)

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
-----						
CCC Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):						
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):						
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS).....	3,394	3,440	3,440	3,440	3,440	+46
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA).....	994	1,839	1,839	1,839	1,839	+845
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account.....	4,388	5,279	5,279	5,279	5,279	+891
McGovern-Dole international food for education and child nutrition program grants.....	86,800	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	+13,200 150
Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs.....	1,520,935	1,219,436	1,440,962	1,483,512	1,483,545	-37,390
(By transfer).....	(4,482)	(3,608)	(3,608)	(3,608)	(3,608)	(-874)
=====						
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION						
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Food and Drug Administration						
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation.....	1,450,098	1,492,726	1,480,978	1,485,009	1,481,617	+31,519
Prescription drug user fee act.....	(284,394)	(305,332)	(305,332)	(305,332)	(305,332)	(+20,938)
Medical device user fee act.....	(33,938)	(40,300)	(40,300)	(40,300)	(40,300)	(+6,362)
Animal drug user fee act.....	(8,354)	(11,318)	(11,318)	(11,318)	(11,318)	(+2,964)
Subtotal.....	(1,776,784)	(1,849,676)	(1,837,928)	(1,841,959)	(1,838,567)	(+61,783)
Mammography clinics user fee (outlay savings)....	(16,919)	(17,173)	(17,173)	(17,173)	(17,173)	(+254)
Export and color certification.....	(6,838)	(7,640)	(7,640)	(7,640)	(7,640)	(+802)
Payments to GSA.....	(129,815)	(134,853)	(134,853)	(134,853)	(134,853)	(+5,038)
Buildings and facilities.....	---	7,000	5,000	7,000	8,000	+8,000
Total, Food and Drug Administration.....	1,450,098	1,499,726	1,485,978	1,492,009	1,489,617	+39,519
=====						
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Commodity Futures Trading Commission.....	93,572	99,386	98,386	98,386	98,386	+4,814
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(42,350)	---	(44,250)	(44,250)	(44,250)	(+1,900)
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration.....	1,543,670	1,599,112	1,584,364	1,590,395	1,588,003	+44,333
=====						
TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Hunger fellowships (sec. 722).....	2,480	---	2,500	2,500	2,500	+20
National Sheep Industry Improvement Center revolving fund (sec. 724).....	992	---	500	2,000	1,250	+258
Citrus canker compensation (sec. 760).....	29,760	---	10,000	---	---	-29,760
Northern Great Plains Regional Authority.....	1,479	---	---	---	---	-1,479
Rural housing assistance grants (rescission).....	-1,000	---	---	---	---	+1,000
Rural housing insurance fund (rescission).....	-3,000	---	---	---	---	+3,000
Denali Commission.....	1,488	---	---	1,500	750	-738
Local TV loan guarantee (rescission).....	-88,000	---	---	---	---	+88,000
Agricultural conservation prog. (rescission).....	-3,500	---	---	---	---	+3,500
Section 32 (rescission).....	-163,000	---	---	---	-37,601	+125,399
P.L. 480 Title I (rescission).....	-191,108	---	---	---	---	+191,108
Milk processing and packaging facilities.....	992	---	---	1,000	650	-342
Alaska private lands wildlife management.....	496	---	---	500	200	-296
Livestock Expo Center (sec. 753).....	992	---	1,000	---	1,000	+8
Virginia Horse Center.....	992	---	---	---	---	-992
Great Plains conservation program, unobligated balances (rescissions).....	-8,000	---	---	---	---	+8,000
Wisconsin Federation of Cooperatives.....	2,232	---	---	2,250	2,250	+18
Florida citrus promotion.....	5,952	---	---	---	---	-5,952
Data mining and data warehousing activities.....	---	3,600	---	---	---	---
WIC contingency reserve (rescission) (sec. 762).....	---	---	-32,000	-32,000	-32,000	-32,000
Specialty crop grants (sec. 766).....	---	---	7,000	---	7,000	+7,000
SFSP Summer food service program.....	---	---	---	1,000	1,000	+1,000
Healthy Forest Reserve.....	---	---	---	5,000	2,500	+2,500
Fruit and Vegetable pilot program.....	---	---	---	2,000	6,000	+6,000
National Agriculture Imagery program.....	---	---	---	1,250	---	---
World food prize.....	---	---	---	700	350	+350
Utah State.....	---	---	---	---	200	+200
University of Nevada.....	---	---	---	---	140	+140



## AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION-AND RELATED AGENCIES - FY 2006

H.R. 2744 (H.Rept. 109-255)

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Ohio State University.....	---	---	---	---	400	+400
Nueces County.....	---	---	---	---	500	+500
IRP Choctaw.....	---	---	---	---	1,000	+1,000
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, title VII, General provisions.....	-409,763	3,600	-11,000	-12,300	-41,911	+367,842
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
OTHER APPROPRIATIONS						
Hurricane Disaster Assistance Act, 2005 (P.L.108-324)						
Farm Assistance Programs: Farm Service Agency:						
Emergency conservation program (emergency).....	100,000	---	---	---	---	-100,000
Conservation Programs: Natural Resources Conservation						
Service: Emerg watershed protection program (emerg)	250,000	---	---	---	---	-250,000
Rural Development Programs:						
Rural community advancement program (emergency)....	68,000	---	---	---	---	-68,000
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:						
Housing repairs (sec. 504):						
Loan authorization (emergency).....	(17,000)	---	---	---	---	(-17,000)
Loan subsidies (emergency).....	5,000	---	---	---	---	-5,000
Rural housing assistance grants (emergency).....	13,000	---	---	---	---	-13,000
Emergency watershed protection program/emergency						
conservation program (emergency).....	50,000	---	---	---	---	-50,000
Section 32 transfer (emergency).....	90,000	---	---	---	---	-90,000
Producer assistance (emergency).....	2,928,500	---	---	---	---	-2,928,500
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, Public Law 108-324 (emergency).....	3,504,500	---	---	---	---	-3,504,500
Emerg. Supplemental Approps. for Defense, The Global						
War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (P.L.109-13)						
Foreign Agricultural Service:						
Public Law 480 Title II Grants (emergency).....	240,000	---	---	---	---	-240,000
Natural Resources Conservation Service:						
Emergency watershed protection program (emergency)...	104,500	---	---	---	---	-104,500
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, Public Law 109-13 (emergency).....	344,500	---	---	---	---	-344,500
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, Other appropriations (emergency).....	3,849,000	---	---	---	---	-3,849,000
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	89,439,376	100,132,911	100,321,593	100,722,949	100,981,758	+11,542,382
Appropriations.....	(86,047,984)	(100,132,911)	(100,353,593)	(100,754,949)	(101,051,359)	(+15,003,375)
Emergency Appropriations.....	3,849,000	---	---	---	---	-3,849,000
Contingent emergency Appropriations.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
(By transfer).....	(817,714)	(832,776)	(807,159)	(860,776)	(840,141)	(+22,427)
(Loan authorization).....	(14,191,899)	(12,450,952)	(14,538,732)	(15,548,828)	(15,615,279)	(+1,423,380)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(154,272)	(113,130)	(157,380)	(157,380)	(157,380)	(+3,108)
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

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

□ 1045

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his statement. I am pleased to join with him today as we complete the work on this year's Agriculture appropriations bill, the first in my capacity as ranking member of the agriculture appropriations subcommittee.

It has been a pleasure to work with Chairman BONILLA and his staff to put together this bill, as well as with Chairman LEWIS and Ranking Member OBEY in an effort to get here today.

I want to say thank you to the subcommittee staffs for their hard work. It truly is yeoman's work. I know that the staffs met for several weeks to iron out the differences between the House and Senate bills. We certainly appreciate all of their hard work.

This has been a privilege. When I chose to sit on this subcommittee 9 years ago, I did so because I have always believed that the issues overseen by this subcommittee speak to the core responsibilities of the Federal Government. This is the only subcommittee where farm policy, rural development, conservation, nutrition programs, food safety, drug regulation and public health all come together.

As such, it is my belief that the bill that we discuss today is more than a list of programs and funding levels. It is a statement of values, principles and priorities. So when we discuss this bill, I believe we think of it in those terms. We should remember that farm programs, international trade promotion and advocacy that help our farmers across the country sell our products may have profound implications on our Nation's overall economy and quality of life. The research programs at USDA are critical to our efforts to protect our agriculture products, our national herd and our public health.

Indeed, there are many aspects of the bill that I am very proud of, particularly in the area of rural development. Whether it is affordable housing, clean drinking water or sewage systems, access to remote educational and medical resources, we know that rural America faces serious economic development challenges. And I believe the President's budget failed to address those challenges, decimating many rural development programs.

And despite our hard work, the overall figure remains below the level of last year's House bill, well below the 2004 level, and I am afraid that the funding shortfall in this bill will lead to long-term problems with rural infrastructure.

But together we made real headway in reversing those cuts. Indeed, I am proud of the work we were able to accomplish with respect to affordable housing in rural America. We were able to keep the House level on section 502

single family direct loans, which help low- and very low-income households obtain homeownership; and 515 loans for multifamily housing projects to provide living units for people with low and moderate incomes in rural areas. The agreement provides \$141 million and \$10 million over the respective Senate levels.

We also agreed to a new \$9 million demonstration program under section 515 to preserve affordable rural multifamily housing. We created a new \$16 million rental housing voucher program to protect tenants residing in section 515 multifamily housing from being threatened by their landlords, as well as preserving a nearly \$3 million low-income multifamily housing preservation revolving fund in the Senate bill.

We made sure to secure language regarding Farm Service Agency office closings. FSA provides that critical link between the farmer and the Federal Government's critical services, delivering assistance to specialty crop producers, disbursement of payments for programs such as the peanut buyout, and the handling of disaster assistance payments. Our language ensures that if FSA closes any field offices, it would require public hearings in the affected areas so that the voices of the community will be heard by USDA before any action is taken, and giving Congress 120 days advance notice.

Of course, this bill's impact on the public health is significant as well, from FDA's responsibilities to feeding programs, which urban areas like my hometown of New Haven rely on for women, infants and children, for schools, and for seniors and the disabled living on the edge of poverty. Ensuring that these programs are both funded and operated efficiently is, in my opinion, among the very serious obligations of government, obligations we are charged in the subcommittee with overseeing.

I am pleased that we agreed to the funding levels in the House and Senate bills for the Women, Infants and Children Program in the conference agreement. We also protected the program's reserve fund in the unlikely case the current estimates in funding prove too low.

I was particularly pleased we were able to secure strong report language directing the Secretary of USDA to tell all agencies to take all necessary steps to keep avian flu out of the U.S., providing a report to us by March of next year on the progress of those efforts. We need to do whatever it takes to aggressively tackle this urgent public health matter, including engaging USDA in that effort. We also added strong report language calling on FDA to develop a response plan on human-to-human transmission of avian influenza.

I thank the chairman for working with me to double the annual funding for review of direct-to-consumer ads by FDA, as well as another \$5 million for

the highest-priority drug safety needs at the FDA. In 2001, the drug industry spent \$2.7 billion on direct-to-consumer advertising, but the FDA office charged with ensuring that those ads are accurate was funded at only \$884,000. Doubling that amount is a small start toward remedying the inequitable advantage, and the \$5 million will be devoted to the most critical aspects of drug safety.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased by many aspects of this bill. I was particularly pleased that after several years we had an opportunity to participate in a conference meeting to resolve several outstanding issues, and to do so in a public capacity. But I was disappointed that same openness and transparency did not carry all the way through to the resolution of all outstanding issues.

And there is much to be done, from food stamps and drug reimportation to reform at FDA and meat labeling. As the agency entrusted with ensuring the safety of our food and drug supply and to protect the public health, we all understand how important it is that we maintain FDA's integrity. But the past year has been particularly difficult, from the flu vaccine shortages caused by inept manufacturing oversight to delayed withdrawal of medicines such as Vioxx that have resulted in thousands of unreported deaths to ongoing safety concerns regarding medical devices.

Restoring integrity to FDA starts with providing better guidelines in the makeup of its advisory committees. What is particularly troubling is the granting of waivers by FDA to scientists and other experts who have potential conflicts of interest. Permitting these experts to serve and vote regardless of conflict is wrong. This must stop. FDA ought to rely on the opinions of unconflicted, fully qualified professional advisers so that the agency can receive the best unbiased advice possible.

The House adopted an amendment 218-210 that would have stopped the granting of such waivers for 1 year for voting members of FDA advisory committees. I believe this was the right approach. Surely we have enough doctors and scientists in this country that we can find unbiased solutions. The Senate adopted language that fails to address the issue by allowing the current practice at FDA to continue. In an effort to break the deadlock on the issue, I offered a compromise amendment at the conference, an amendment that the chairman graciously supported, but the Senate would not accept.

I am disappointed with the language that the majority put into the conference agreement. I think it will both deter people from serving on advisory committees, while failing to stop the FDA from granting conflict of interest waivers to scientists, allowing them to continue on these advisory committees. My hope is in the coming year we can resolve the problem.

Another serious shortcoming in the bill is in the area of country of origin

labeling, giving people the information they need to make an informed choice to protect the safety of their families. Thirty-five other countries we trade with already have a country of origin food labeling system in place, this at a time when food imports are increasing, avian flu poses a serious risk, but the number of inspections of imported meat are decreasing.

And given the fact that we continue to have major recalls of meat products, this effort is also about being able to trace back contaminated product in the event of a recall. Knowing the source of an outbreak is critical to the process so we can quickly take action to prevent people from getting sick.

Unfortunately, this conference report pushes back any action to implement a labeling system until September 2008. It expands the moratorium to include fruits and vegetables, something that was not in the House bill. I regret to say this is a serious failing, a decision on which we had no input. I hope the Congress will revisit this soon.

Perhaps the biggest disappointment in this bill, one so antithetical to the subcommittee's mission that I believe it undermines much of the good work we have done in the past year, is our failure to protect the integrity of the food stamp program, one of the most effective, well-run Federal programs we have.

Twenty-five million citizens receive food stamp benefits, children, seniors, low-income families, many displaced by the recent hurricanes. Despite these immense responsibilities, this bill allows a plan to delegate certification and enrollment of recipients for food stamps to a private firm with no accountability or quality assurances.

But the Texas Food Stamp Privatization Plan would lay off at least 1,200 State workers, closing more than a quarter of State-run eligibility offices around the State, replacing staff at low hourly rates. Major responsibilities would fall to community organizations, which have admitted they do not have the capacity to handle. Clients would be forced to travel long distances or rely on the Internet for services, with serious implications for seniors, low-income families and those with disabilities.

In addition, the plan appears to flout the law, conflicting with Federal statutes governing the food stamp program which require States to obtain a waiver from USDA.

What makes this so unfortunate is that it is so unnecessary. The food stamp program right now is operating with the lowest error rate it has ever had. Texas itself has a very well-operated program. This is not simply about an isolated issue in Texas. Taxpayers all over the country pay half the cost of running the food stamp program. We have an obligation to ensure that the program is run effectively, efficiently and in compliance with the law. Quite simply, the conference report fails to fulfill that obligation, one of our most

serious responsibilities for this subcommittee.

Just let me mention one or two areas of concern that I have. The House and Senate adopted identical language prohibiting the use of Federal funds for the inspection of horses for slaughter for human food. It was a wide margin on roll calls in both Houses. Still there were concerns that the provision would be dropped, and in the final agreement between House and Senate, I was pleased to see the prohibition maintained, even if it was delayed for 120 days.

I am confused by the notion as the bill was ready to be filed that there was included a completely new authorizing legislation on horse slaughter, making it parliamentarily impossible to offer this amendment ever again on the House floor. It seems to me that flies in the face of our democratic process.

Another provision that was not either in the House or Senate bill or discussed in conference which was inserted without debate before the conference report was filed has to do with a series of changes to the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990. Members may be dismayed to know that section 796 of the bill contains language permanently amending the Immigration and Nationality Act. It was adopted by the Senate as part of the bill. I do not know why the sponsor had to have it enacted now without careful consideration and hearing, and why it was included in the agriculture appropriations bill.

As I pointed out, I think we made tremendous progress, and we are going to move forward and adopt this piece of legislation. Despite my concerns, it has been a pleasure working with the chairman on this effort on this important bill. I believe we do have much to be proud of. We can feel a sense of accomplishment about the finished product. My hope is we can address the issues where there still appear to be differences and that we can move forward.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman BONILLA for yielding. He is most gracious to yield to someone who will speak against the conference report and will reluctantly vote against the conference report. It is not every committee chairman that would yield to anyone that would do that, particularly when you are talking about an appropriation bill.

I rise today in opposition reluctantly to this, but I do so primarily because of an issue of process that I have become more and more concerned about in my 11 years in the U.S. Congress.

This conference report was filed last night. The Rules Committee met quickly after that, developing the rule

for consideration of the conference report. The conference report violated rule XXII of the House and violated rule XXVIII of the Senate in that section 798 was included in this conference report which was not a part of the House bill, was not a part of the Senate bill, and specifically changes substantive law.

Yet as is usually the case, the Rules Committee issues a rule waiving all points of order, which actually does raise a question of why does the House need rules, why does the Senate need rules, if we are always waiving those rules and Members never have an opportunity to bring an issue up.

Mr. Speaker, 798 is not about horse slaughter, and we have heard a lot about horse slaughter. I will admit I am one of those in the House that is making an effort to do what we can to stop the slaughter of horses for human consumption in Europe. There are only two companies left in the U.S. that are still doing this. One is owned by a French company, and one is owned by a company in Belgium. But that is not the issue here today.

Section 798 changed section 619 of title 21 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act.

□ 1100

And the substantive change adopted in the conference report without the knowledge of many people in the conference, we have had four different lawyers look at this language, and we have come up with four different answers. And even the attorney for the United States Department of Agriculture sent us an explanation, and they said, We have reviewed section 798 and its intent is not clear. We have had some private lawyers look at it, and they have come up with one conclusion.

So all four lawyers came up with different conclusions, but one thing that they all stated quite specifically was that it is a very vague statute. It is a very vague section. So what we are doing here, it is a section that treats equines, mules, and horses differently than other species of animals, and it is being changed significantly. And all of the attorneys have agreed that it is vague.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, as I stated, does not know its intents; so basically what we are doing is we are including this provision which is legislating on our appropriation bill and the U.S. Department of Agriculture is going to write the regulations, and we are not going to have any control of over it, in my view.

So I come today to simply express my opposition of this process that I find becoming more prevalent. Another example of this was in the omnibus bill last year in which 70 years of policy on protecting wild mustangs was changed without anyone's knowledge. And here today we do not have any agreement on what this language does, and we are going to be voting upon it.

But I would want to, in conclusion, state that I reluctantly am going to

vote against the conference report, but I do want to thank Chairman LEWIS and Chairman BONILLA for allowing me to speak. I appreciate that very much.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), our ranking member, has stated many of the concerns which Members of Congress have with this bill. I would like to state mine, and indicate why I am going to vote against the agriculture appropriations conference report.

Section 797 undermines the organic food industry by changing the definition of organic food without a congressional hearing, without agreement by the National Organic Standards Board, and without consumer consent.

All across America when people go shopping, there are millions of Americans who are looking for the organic label. Why? Because it is considered to be a label that is indicative of greater integrity in food, food which is not likely to be poisoned with pesticides, food which is carefully grown by organic farmers, food which is healthier. People trust that organic label.

But Americans should know that this bill has changed the organic food law and that big food companies have produced Congress to change the organic food law and that this would allow the use of several synthetic ingredients in organic products and potentially weaken the organic dairy standards.

More specifically, the amendments which the industry has helped to put in this bill would leave unresolved whether young dairy cows could be treated with antibiotics and converted to organic within 12 months, which would create a serious new loophole in which organic ingredients could be substituted with nonorganic ingredients, without any consumer notice, based on emergency decrees. Now, consumer confidence in the organic label is absolutely essential to ensure a strong organic market.

I have had the opportunity to meet with organic farmers all across America, and they take great pride in their product and in their produce. And what this bill does is it undermines organic standards. It could permanently allow synthetic processing aids and food contact substances including over 500 food contact substances to be used in organic foods without any type of public review for their safety and compatibility with organic production and processing.

Let me tell the Members what this is reminiscent of. In 1992, the Food and Drug Administration ruled that genetically modified organisms were the functional equivalent of conventional foods. They had no scientific basis to make that decision, but they went ahead and set the stage for the very food that we eat to be altered genetically without any science behind it. Now, if we are what we eat, we should

be careful about how our food is made so we know what we are going to become. And we have taken no concern about that in this Congress because today GMOs are found in hundreds of millions of acres of food in this country, and now we are weakening organic standards with this legislation.

It is time for Congress to take a stand for pure food. It is time for Congress to take a stand for integrity in food. It is time for us to vote against this bill which undermines organic standards.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much for yielding me this time.

I just want to take a minute to thank the chairman for doing such an unbelievably great job through a very difficult year with the allocations; and the ranking member, who has worked so hard on this bill and is a very good friend; and certainly and most importantly, the staff who have done just a fabulous job of putting together this most difficult bill.

Obviously, there are a lot of things we need to do in agriculture with the FDA throughout this entire bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would love to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, one very important priority is the completion of the animal health facility at Ames, Iowa, and this \$58.8 million will complete that \$462 million project. And it is so important for human health, animal health, food safety.

I just want to thank the committee chairman and the ranking member for their support.

I rise in support of this conference report, and encourage the members of the House to do the same, as this is a well-balanced measure. In a climate of tight allocations, the chairman has done an outstanding job of ensuring that sufficient resources are available for the broad range of programs that are funded under this bill.

Congresswoman DELAURO has proved to be an excellent ranking member. And, I want to commend the committee staffs on both sides; once again, they have done a fine job under difficult circumstances.

Like many Members from rural America, I wish we could have applied higher funding levels in this bill. However, given our budget constraints, I am generally pleased with the funding levels provided.

This year, the other body finally saw the light and agreed to final funding for the National Animal Disease Center Modernization Project.

This funding will give the Department of Agriculture a world-class facility, with a broad range of animal disease research capabilities.

For renewable energy—another important sector to our part of the country and to the ag-

riculture economy—the bill provides 23 million dollars.

This program provides small grants that help farmers and small businesses make energy efficiency improvements—ultimately helping farmers hurt by high fuel prices.

The measure funds important agriculture research, for both crops and livestock. Like many of my colleagues we must renew our commitment to agriculture research which holds great promise for the future of American agriculture.

Over the years, we have made great strides through research, in areas such as disease prevention, food safety, crop yields and animal health.

For example, there is again research funding for soybean rust including new treatments for emerging soybean diseases that threaten the economies of our rural communities.

Another important element of the bill is funding under the Hatch Act. These funds sustain critical research at our land grant universities. Without Hatch Act funding we would severely limit the ongoing progress being made by some of our Nation's most talented scientists and educators.

In summary I have noted just a few of the important parts of this FY 06 Agriculture Appropriations Conference Report.

This was a difficult process but we have a good bill that protects our food supply, safeguards the environment and ensures our country continues to benefit from the safest and most reliable pharmaceutical and medical devices in the world.

Again, I urge the members to support this conference report.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, let me just say once again what a pleasure it has been to work with the chairman and his staff, in particular, Maureen Holohan, Leslie Barrack, Jennifer Miller, and Martin Delgado. I appreciate all of their efforts and good work.

As I say to my staff, I was in a staff position before and all of this does not happen by some alchemy. It happens because good people do a lot of good work. I am most appreciative of the assistance from Rob Nabors and Martha Foley and, from my own staff, Ashley Turton and Leticia Mederos.

I will support the conference report.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today, I voted against the conference report on H.R. 2744, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006, primarily because it did not include an extension of the Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC) program. I have fought very hard for the MILC extension and was disappointed that it could not be included. In addition, the conference report is \$199 million over its budget allocation. While I was given assurances that future funding will be cut to offset this discrepancy, this appropriations bill should not have been brought to the floor over its allocation. I will be watching very closely to ensure this funding is offset in future bills.

That said, I support many of the provisions in this conference report. In particular, I was pleased to help secure \$2.25 million for the Wisconsin and Minnesota Health Care Cooperative Purchasing Alliance Demonstrations

Projects. This funding will provide health care coverage to small businesses and family farms in rural areas across the State. The bill also contains \$1.75 million I requested for the State of Wisconsin to combat Chronic Wasting Disease. Despite the many positive aspects of this legislation, on balance—because of the negative factors I mentioned—I believe it was not worthy of my support.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a number of problems with the Fiscal Year 2006 Agriculture Appropriations conference report as it stands now. Its damage to provisions on country-of-origin labeling and organic standards are two alarming reasons to vote against the bill.

But Mr. Speaker, I am most disappointed with this bill's final language regarding conflicts of interest on FDA Advisory Boards.

As you may recall, earlier this year members from both sides of the aisle supported my amendment to shut down bad behavior at the Food and Drug Administration on this issue.

In fact, 217 members of this chamber agreed with me that when the FDA allows scientists with financial conflicts of interest to serve on advisory boards that judge the safety, effectiveness, and viability of various medical treatments, the public health is jeopardized at the expense of inappropriate and personal interests.

These appointments flat-out undermine the objectivity of committee advice and bias recommendations.

And yet, the final language that we are considering today is more like a present to the agency for its bad behavior, instead of the treatment it truly deserves.

This language enables the FDA to keep on allowing conflicted panelists to vote on matters that they have no business judging. While this bill does include new reporting requirements that are intended to help watchdogs keep an eye on how frequently the FDA uses these waivers, I am concerned that the language contains considerable loopholes that will enable the agency to continue to evade its responsibility of protecting the American public in this regard.

In fact, the bill as it stands now is particularly damaging because it would allow the FDA to give the appearance of responsibility while simultaneously continuing dangerous and corrupted practices.

I said it last summer and I'll say it again: if you think that scientists who rely on drug companies for their financial wherewithal are going to recommend that the FDA take action that will harm those companies, then you are living in a fantasy world.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, while I supported the Agriculture Appropriations bill when it was originally considered on the House floor, I was disappointed in the conference committee's failure to maintain some essential programs and I voted against the conference report.

The agreement further delays mandatory country-of-origin labeling for meat or meat products. Congress recognized the importance of this program in ensuring food safety when it passed the 2002 Farm Bill and the need is even more apparent now. It is perplexing why, in a time of mad cow outbreaks and the threat of bioterrorism, we would cut funding for this important program.

I was also disappointed to see a change to the organic standard, that was not performed in a transparent manner. I am hopeful that in

the future Congress can work together more productively to pass an agriculture bill that reflects the values of Americans and properly funds the programs that are important to them.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the 2006 Agriculture Appropriations Conference Committee because it funds programs important to Maine and the Nation. However, I oppose Sec. 797 because it amends the definition of organic food without a Congressional hearing or agreement by the National Organic Standards Board.

On January 26, 2005, the First Circuit Court of Appeals issued a ruling in *Harvey v. Veneman*, a lawsuit brought by Arthur Harvey, an organic blueberry farmer from Maine with operations in Hartford and Buckfield, against the Secretary of Agriculture. Harvey claimed that several provisions of the USDA's National Organic Regulations were in conflict with the Organic Foods Production Act. The U.S. District Court for the District of Maine issued its Consent Final Judgment and Order on June 9, 2005. The court ruled in Harvey's favor on three counts.

Specifically, the court found that existing regulations allowing the use of synthetic substances in the handling and processing of products labeled with the USDA "Organic" label and seal are contrary to the intent and language of the OFPA. This final judgment requires USDA to develop new rules within one year. It also allows producers, handlers, and processors to operate and sell products under the old rules until June 2007.

Regulatory changes are a viable means to resolve the inconsistencies between the law (OFPA) and the National Organic Program regulations. The organic farming community opposes the broadening of the definition of organic to include synthetic ingredients. Changes in this area should have been made in an open manner under regular order and not inserted as a rider to the Agricultural Appropriations bill.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this conference report for H.R. 2744, the "Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, Appropriations Act of 2006."

While the amounts in the bill are not adequate to fully meet the needs of rural Colorado—and I'm disappointed that there isn't more—the fact is that the Federal Government is being forced to do more with less in a time of record budget deficits.

The conference report does include some important improvements over the House passed bill. This is particularly true as regards funding for conservation programs and rural development.

The bill also provides support for research programs that are important to Colorado State University, including work on infectious disease and ultraviolet radiation monitoring.

However, I am particularly disappointed with the conference committee's decision to continue to delay for another two years implementation of a mandatory country of origin labeling (COOL) for products such as meat and produce. The shortsightedness of the conference committee denies Colorado ranchers and farmers a wonderful resource to market their products and provide consumers a clear choice in the products they purchase.

I also am disappointed by the lack of consultation, consensus and public discourse that marked the process of developing the legisla-

tive changes the conference report makes to the National Organics Program. Such legislative changes should be done in the most transparent manner possible and I am disappointed this was not the case.

As this issue will certainly be revisited, I am hopeful the consumers, producers, manufacturers and supporters of organic agriculture can work together to advance this important part of agriculture in Colorado and around the country.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of the conference report on H.R. 2744, the Agriculture Appropriations Act for FY 2006 because of the Conferee's decision to further delay mandatory country-of-origin labeling until September 30, 2008.

Country-of-origin labeling allows the consumer to make informed decisions about what to buy and allows the consumer to support specific farmers or producers at their discretion. Quite simply, American consumers should, and need to have the right to know where their food comes from. Imported meat is currently sold under the guise of a U.S. product and there is no way for consumers to differentiate the origin of their meat. This policy is an unfair and unnecessary risk to the American consumer.

Congress passed mandatory country-of-origin labeling in the 2002 Farm Bill to be implemented on September 30, 2004. This bill will now further delay labeling four years from when it was originally scheduled to take effect. America wanted this provision in the last Farm Bill and Congress has again delayed its implementation.

Unfortunately over 40 of our trading partners have country-of-origin labeling programs already in place, and despite all of our resources and technology, the U.S. has not been able to determine a method of implementation that provides our consumer with the same information. Without this program in place, we are putting at risk two of our three largest beef export markets, Japan and Korea.

For these reasons I cannot vote for this conference report today, and it is my hope that Congress will finally take seriously what is best for this country and the consumer.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). 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, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the conference report on H.R. 2744 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on adoption of H. Res. 523.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 318, nays 63, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 555]

YEAS—318

Abercrombie	Allen	Bartlett (MD)
Ackerman	Bachus	Barton (TX)
Aderholt	Baird	Beauprez
Akin	Baldwin	Berkley
Alexander	Barrow	Berry

Bishop (GA) Harman  
 Bishop (NY) Hart  
 Bishop (UT) Hastings (FL)  
 Boehmer Hastings (WA)  
 Bonilla Hayes  
 Bonner Herger  
 Boozman Higgins  
 Boren Hinchey  
 Boucher Hinojosa  
 Boustany Hobson  
 Boyd Hoekstra  
 Brady (PA) Holden  
 Brady (TX) Holt  
 Brown (OH) Hooley  
 Brown (SC) Hoyer  
 Brown, Corrine Hulshof  
 Burgess Hunter  
 Burton (IN) Hyde  
 Butterfield Inglis (SC)  
 Buyer Issa  
 Camp Istook  
 Cannon Jackson (IL)  
 Cantor Jenkins  
 Capito Jindal  
 Capps Johnson (CT)  
 Cardin Johnson (IL)  
 Cardoza Johnson, E. B.  
 Carnahan Johnson, Sam  
 Carson Jones (OH)  
 Carter Kanjorski  
 Case Kaptur  
 Castle Keller  
 Chabot Kelly  
 Chandler Kennedy (MN)  
 Clay Kennedy (RI)  
 Cleaver Kildee  
 Coble Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Cole (OK) King (IA)  
 Conaway King (NY)  
 Costa Kline  
 Costello Knollenberg  
 Cramer Kolbe  
 Crenshaw Kuhl (NY)  
 Crowley LaHood  
 Cubin Langevin  
 Cuellar Lantos  
 Culberson Larsen (WA)  
 Cummings Larson (CT)  
 Cunningham Latham  
 Davis (AL) Leach  
 Davis (CA) Levin  
 Davis (IL) Lewis (CA)  
 Davis (KY) Lewis (KY)  
 Davis (TN) Lipinski  
 Deal (GA) LoBiondo  
 DeGette Lofgren, Zoe  
 Delahunt Lowey  
 DeLauro Lucas  
 DeLay Lungren, Daniel  
 Dent E.  
 Dicks Mack  
 Dingell Maloney  
 Doggett Manzullo  
 Doolittle Markey  
 Doyle Marshall  
 Dreier Matheson  
 Edwards Matsui  
 Ehlers McCarthy  
 Emanuel McCaul (TX)  
 Emerson McCotter  
 English (PA) McCreery  
 Etheridge McGovern  
 Evans McHenry  
 Everett McHugh  
 Farr McIntyre  
 Fattah McKinney  
 Filner McMorris  
 Fitzpatrick (PA) McNulty  
 Forbes Meehan  
 Fortenberry Meeks (NY)  
 Foxx Melancon  
 Frank (MA) Menendez  
 Frelinghuysen Mica  
 Gerlach Michaud  
 Gilchrest Millender  
 Gillmor McDonald  
 Gingrey Miller (FL)  
 Gohmert Miller (MI)  
 Gonzalez Miller (NC)  
 Goode Miller, George  
 Goodlatte Mollohan  
 Gordon Moore (KS)  
 Granger Moore (WI)  
 Graves Moran (KS)  
 Green, Al Moran (VA)  
 Green, Gene Murphy  
 Grijalva Murtha  
 Gutknecht Musgrave  
 Hall Myrick

Neal (MA) Neugebauer  
 Weldon (PA) Weller  
 Wicker  
 Wilson (NM) Wilson (NM)  
 Andrews  
 Barrett (SC)  
 Bass  
 Bean  
 Biggert  
 Bilirakis  
 Blackburn  
 Blumenauer  
 Bono  
 Bradley (NH)  
 Capuano  
 Chocola  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Davis, Tom  
 DeFazio  
 Duncan  
 Engel  
 Feeney  
 Ferguson  
 Flake  
 Fossella  
 Baca  
 Baker  
 Becerra  
 Berman  
 Blunt  
 Boehlert  
 Boswell  
 Brown-Waite,  
 Ginny  
 Calvert  
 Clyburn  
 Davis (FL)  
 Davis, Jo Ann  
 Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Drake  
 Eshoo  
 Foley  
 Reynolds  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Ruppersberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Ryun (KS)  
 Sabo  
 Salazar  
 Sanchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sanders  
 Saxton  
 Schiff  
 Schmidt  
 Schwartz (PA)  
 Schwarz (MI)  
 Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Sherman  
 Sherwood  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Skelton  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Sodrel  
 Solis  
 Souder  
 Spratt  
 Strickland  
 Stupak  
 Sullivan  
 Tanner  
 Taylor (MS)  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Terry  
 Thomas  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tierney  
 Turner  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Upton  
 Van Hollen  
 Visclosky  
 Walden (OR)  
 Walsh  
 Wamp  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watson  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Weldon (FL)

Wilson (SC)  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wynn

Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

## NAYS—63

Franks (AZ)  
 Garrett (NJ)  
 Gibbons  
 Green (WI)  
 Hayworth  
 Hefley  
 Hensarling  
 Herseth  
 Honda  
 Hostettler  
 Inslee  
 Israel  
 Jackson-Lee  
 (TX)  
 Kirk  
 Kucinich  
 Lee  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Marchant  
 McCollum (MN)  
 Nadler  
 Otter  
 Owens  
 Paul  
 Payne  
 Pence  
 Petri  
 Pitts  
 Price (GA)  
 Ramstad  
 Rehberg  
 Rohrabacher  
 Royce  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Schakowsky  
 Shays  
 Simmons  
 Stearns  
 Sweeney  
 Tancred  
 Wexler  
 Whitfield

## NOT VOTING—52

Ford  
 Gallegly  
 Gutierrez  
 Harris  
 Jefferson  
 Jones (NC)  
 Kind  
 Kingston  
 LaTourette  
 Linder  
 Lynch  
 McDermott  
 McKeon  
 Meek (FL)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Napolitano  
 Ney  
 Nunes  
 Obey  
 Ortiz  
 Pelosi  
 Reyes  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Shadegg  
 Shaw  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (TX)  
 Stark  
 Tauscher  
 Tiahrt  
 Towns  
 Velazquez  
 Westmoreland  
 Wu

□ 1134

Messrs. PAYNE, OTTER, and BARRETT of South Carolina, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. LEE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. SULLIVAN, GOODLATTE, JOHNSON of Illinois, HERGER, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ANNOUNCING DEATH OF FORMER MEMBER JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the death of a distinguished former Member of this body, a colleague of ours and a friend of many of us here, the Honorable John Lesinski, Jr., who passed away on Friday, October 21, 2005. He served in this Congress with great distinction, and he served his Nation in time of war in the Navy with great distinction. He received the Purple Heart and the Navy and the Marine Corps medal, in addition to serving from 1950 to 1964.

We will pray for the repose of his soul and ask that the good Lord give com-

fort and strength and peace to his family.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the death of the Honorable John Lesinski, Jr.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of a former member of this great institution, John Lesinski, Jr., who passed away on Friday, October 21, 2005.

Congressman Lesinski was born in Detroit, MI on December 28, 1914. Like his father, Congressman Lesinski served in the U.S. House of Representatives, representing the 16th District of Michigan from 1951 to 1965.

He also bravely fought for our Nation, enlisting in the Navy at the age of 18, and had his first tour of duty from 1933–1937.

He returned to the Navy after Pearl Harbor was attacked and served the duration of the war leaving the service in 1945, having received both a Purple Heart and a Navy and Marine Corps Medal.

I knew Congressman Lesinski personally, and as a fellow Polish American, he taught me much about what it takes to be an effective member of Congress. I served with Congressman Lesinski as a colleague and faced him as a primary opponent; I know that he served the people of the 16th District with great purpose and conviction.

I salute the long and full life Congressman Lesinski led and his service in this House—he was a good and able public servant who will be much missed.

I also want to express my condolences to his family, particularly his son Gary who is continuing the Lesinski family tradition of service as an aide to our colleague from North Carolina, Mr. MILLER.

John now joins his dear wife Margaret. He is survived by his sons John W., Ron, Richard, Gary and James, and his daughter Patricia Hinton, as well as his five grandchildren Jodi, Jennifer, Jonathan, Jessica and Justin, and one great-grandchild Noah.

This House has lost a distinguished alum, a member who was dedicated to his district, this institution and this Nation. May the Lord keep him and his beloved wife Margaret in peace.

Survived by: Sons, John W., Ron, Richard, Gary, James; Daughter, Patricia Hinton; Grandchildren, Jodi, Jennifer, Jonathan, Jessica, Justin, and Great Grandchild, Noah.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

## CONDEMNING IRANIAN PRESIDENT MAHMOUD AHMADINEJAD'S THREATS AGAINST ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 523 on which the yeas and nays are ordered.