

which I am proud to say is the largest peanut producing district in the Nation, I would like to lend my full support and endorsement of language that was included in the bill extending the peanut storage and handling program for an additional year.

During consideration of the 2002 farm bill, the peanut industry, including growers, manufacturers, and processors, asked that the House Agriculture Committee change the Nation's peanut program from a supply management structure to a more market-oriented program.

At the time, I had the pleasure of serving as a member of the Agriculture Committee. The House Ag Committee made these changes, working in co-operation with the peanut industry, and the transition to the new market-oriented program was a part of a very carefully crafted compromise that was developed and approved by the House Agriculture Committee.

□ 1500

The 2002 farm bill provided storage, handling fees and related costs for the peanut program through the 2006 crop year. Our concern centered on the fact that growers would have to absorb the storage costs associated with peanuts placed under loan.

The language included in the committee bill would simply continue the peanut storage and handling fees program through 2007, terminating at the beginning of fiscal year 2008. The language was reviewed by the CBO and will not have a 2007 cost, primarily because the payments will come after the 2007 harvest. There will be a cost of approximately \$77 million in 2008. By all measures, the new peanut program is a true success story.

The storage and handling fees paid on peanuts by this loan program are very limited in scope. And more importantly, the storage and handling segment of the peanut program will actually expire at the end of this fiscal year.

As the chairman will recall, the original intent of this program was to provide an efficient and practical transition from the old supply-management structure to the new market-oriented approach. Without the bridge provided by this program, producers would not have participated in transitioning to the new program.

Every licensed warehouse operator has a structure for storage and handling fees. These fees will be passed on to the peanut producer if they are not paid by the Department of Agriculture. Much of the 2006 peanut crop has already been contracted, and the underlying business decisions associated with these transitions are in large part based on the program provisions that are in effect under current law.

Peanut producers entered this crop year and planned for this farm bill period based on the commitment that Congress made in the 2002 farm bill. Warehouse operators will not absorb

these costs. It will be the producer who will pay if these fees are not paid as designed by the current bill.

Peanuts, unlike many other crops, can't practically be stored on the farm. Specialized handling and storage by knowledgeable warehouse operators is necessary to preserve the value of this semi-perishable commodity. So it is an expense that is absolutely necessary and one that the grower can't avoid by doing it himself.

Without this language, what is now a \$355 per ton marketing loan program will effectively be reduced to a loan program that will not be profitable for the peanut producer.

Mr. Chairman, this language is crucial to the future of the peanut industry and continuation of the program into 2007. It could literally mean the difference between profitability and loss, between success and failure, between farmers surviving or forcing even more family farmers off the land. These farmers are real people, Mr. Chairman, real people whose lives will be profoundly changed if this point of order is upheld by the Chair.

I strongly oppose the point of order and ask the Chairman to retain the language in question which is vital to the American peanut farmer, particularly those in the State of Georgia.

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. HEFLEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Chairman 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. 5384) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITING AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5384, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 5384 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 830, notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except:

Pro forma amendments offered at any point in the reading by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

An amendment by Mr. BLUMENAUER regarding funding limitations for sugar loan rates, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Ms. SLAUGHTER regarding funding for Center For Veterinary Medicine;

An amendment or amendments by Mr. BONILLA regarding funding levels;

An amendment by Mr. LATHAM regarding section 741 of the bill;

An amendment by Mr. HEFLEY regarding an across-the-board reduction;

An amendment by Mr. TIAHRT regarding funding limitation on competitiveness;

An amendment by Mr. PAUL regarding funding limitation on National Animal Identification System;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa regarding submission of a report on the National Animal Identification System and certain pilot projects;

An amendment by Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan regarding emerald ash borer;

An amendment by Mr. SWEENEY regarding a funding limitation on examination, inspection, and processing of horses;

An amendment by Mr. WEINER regarding payments to certain cotton and rice producers;

An amendment by Mr. CARTER regarding funding for program integrity activities in Federal Crop Insurance program;

An amendment by Mr. CHABOT regarding a funding limitation on the MAP program;

An amendment by Mr. LUCAS regarding funding for conservation technical assistance programs;

An amendment by Mr. GUTKNECHT regarding funding limitation on section 720 of this bill;

An amendment by Mr. BACA regarding funding limitation on operational changes to the Food Stamp program;

An amendment by Mr. GERLACH regarding funding limitation on section 728 of the bill;

An amendment by Mr. REICHERT regarding funding limitation on certain milk producer handlers;

An amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey regarding Federal employee attendance at overseas conferences;

An amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey on food stamp program in contravention of the INA;

An amendment by Mr. ENGEL regarding funding limitation on alternative fuel vehicles;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding claims processing on Pigford v. Glickman case;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa regarding the Livestock Identification and Marketing Act;

An amendment by Mr. BOREN regarding funding limitation on the transfer of activities from Oklahoma;

An amendment by Mr. GORDON regarding energy standards for Federal buildings;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on dairy education in Iowa;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on fruit and vegetable market analysis in Arizona and Missouri;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding for Food Marketing Policy Center in Connecticut;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for greenhouse nurseries in Ohio;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for aquaculture in Ohio;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for hydroponic tomato production in Ohio;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for wood utilization in Oregon, Mississippi, North Carolina, Minnesota, Maine, Michigan, Idaho, Tennessee, Arkansas, and West Virginia;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for the National Grape and Wine Initiative in California;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for income enhancement demonstration in Ohio;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for Appalachian Horticulture Research in Mississippi;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for the Competitiveness of Agriculture Products in Washington;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation for Value-Added Product Development for Agriculture resources in Montana.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member named in this request or a designee, or by the Member who caused it to be printed in the RECORD or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate; and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Except as otherwise specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. An amendment shall be considered to fit the description stated in this request if it addresses in whole or in part the object described.

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

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I calculate the time that would be required to dispose of all the amendments made in order by this unanimous consent agreement, it appears to me that it amounts to about 6½ hours just of palaver, without the time consumed by votes; or for that matter, without the time consumed by slippage as we go through the procedures around here.

That means that if every person offers each amendment that is provided for in this unanimous consent request, and if they take the time allotted, we will be here until at least 10:30 or 11 o'clock before we even get to the votes.

Given the fact that there are many amendments, that means, as I see it, that we could be here as late as 2 o'clock tomorrow morning. I would ask Members to keep that in mind when they are determining whether or not they actually want to offer many of these amendments.

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

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with the gentleman more. The gentleman knows that I have tried to work through this bill as expeditiously as possible. I would concur that we try to expedite this process and minimize the speeches that could be associated with these amendments.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 830 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5384.

□ 1512

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5384) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the bill had been read through page 82, line 14.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except those specified in the previous order of the House of today, which is at the desk.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BONILLA

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONILLA:

At the end add:

Sec. _____. The limitation in section 721 shall not apply below a program level of \$1,127,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Hopefully, this will set an example for dealing with the remaining amendments. We have cleared this amendment that deals with putting money back into the EQIP program. We have cleared it with the minority, and I ask for an "aye" vote.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek the time in opposition?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. PAUL:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new sections:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement or administer the National Animal Identification System.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It says none of the funds made available in this act may be used to implement or administer a National Animal Identification System. I think at this time one thing that this country doesn't need is another huge bureaucracy tracing and following every animal in the country.

□ 1515

That is exactly what this new program will do. It means that each animal will be tagged with a radio frequency ID, all cattle, swine, sheep, goats, horses, poultry, bison, deer, elk, llamas and alpacas.

For one, what you own on your farm should be your property, and that information should be private unless there is some type of a subpoena. There is a fourth amendment issue here.

Also, there is the issue of just why this is being done. A lot of people have claimed, and I agree with this, that this is a benefit to the large agribusiness farmers, and it is a great detriment to the small farmers who will be burdened with this great effort to accumulate data which will be of benefit to some private big companies.