

annual or even quarterly basis for certain imports.

Under this provision, importers who wish to import sugar into the United States outside of the narrow time period specified in the bill would be required to pay the over-quota tariff rate rather than the in-quota tariff rate to which they would otherwise be entitled. Thus, this provision would increase the tariff rate on these imports from 1.46 cents per kilogram to 33.87 cents per kilogram: an increase in the tariff rate of over 2,000 percent.

In effect, this bill changes the tariff classification of these imports because it changes the tariff to which these imports are subject based on when they are imported into the United States. As a result, this language would affect the amount of tariff revenue collected, thus triggering clause 5(a) of rule 21.

Completely egregious in its own right on the merits, the inclusion of this provision also flies smack in the face of the rules of the House and should not be included in the bill today. But, sadly today we are precluded from raising a point of order against this provision as a result of this rule.

Mr. Speaker the rule also contains a self-executing tax increase that will put the squeeze on investment in the U.S. and cost America jobs. Also not considered by the Committee on Ways and Means, this provision, masquerading as a way to keep jobs here, will in fact send jobs overseas.

The practical effect of this amendment is that employers like BASF in Evans City, Pennsylvania will be at a direct disadvantage simply because they have chosen to locate a manufacturing plant in the U.S.—and employ U.S. workers—but have a parent company based in Germany. Similarly, companies throughout my district would be indirectly affected as a result of some of their customers—companies like Honda and Sony among others—being disadvantaged by this provision. In addition, this provision completely disregards obligations made under international tax treaties.

Mr. Speaker, American workers deserve better, American employers deserve better, and our treaty partners deserve better.

I urge a “no” vote on this most misguided rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 574 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 202, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 746]

YEAS—222

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner

NAYS—202

Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter

Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruybersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Townes
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn

Clarke
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann

Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Graves
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula

NOT VOTING—8

Hunter
LaHood
Rogers (AL)
Waters
Young (AK)

□ 1937

Mr. SESSIONS changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

COMMUNICATION FROM CONGRESSIONAL AIDE OF THE HON. MARK UDALL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from John Bristol, Congressional Aide, Office of the Honorable MARK UDALL, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 12, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the Westminster, Colorado Municipal Court, for testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

JOHN BRISTOL,
Congressional Aide.

COMMUNICATION FROM CONGRESSIONAL AIDE OF THE HON. MARK UDALL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Carter Ellison, Congressional Aide, Office of the Honorable MARK UDALL, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, July 12, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the Westminster, Colorado Municipal Court, for testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

CARTER ELLISON,
Congressional Aide.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2419.

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

There was no objection.

FARM, NUTRITION, AND
BIOENERGY ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 574 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2419.

□ 1942

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2419) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes, with Mrs. TAUSCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, today we have a bill before us that is known as the farm bill, but this bill is much more than about farms. It is about the food we eat, the clothes we wear, and, increasingly, the fuel that we will use.

The farm bill assures that we will have a safe, strong food supply now and for years to come. It funds nutrition programs and ensures that working families have enough to eat. It provides conservation programs to protect the environment. It funds rural development programs in support of our rural communities nationwide. You can see that this farm bill is certainly about more than just farms.

In addition to these important priorities, this farm bill also provides the safety net that allows our Nation's farmers and ranchers to continue to provide the food, fiber, and fuel that meet the needs of Americans and people around the world.

America is still the world's breadbasket, and that is something we should be proud of. Over the past year, my colleagues and I have traveled across the country from New York to Alabama, to my neck of the woods in Minnesota, and all the way to California. We heard from folks who are out there every day working the land, producing a diverse range of agriculture products.

The farm bill is a product of agreements that we have reached by consulting everyone interested in this process. In addition to hearings across the country, we have worked with nutrition advocates, conservation and environmental organizations, renewable energy groups, and representatives from all parts of the fruit and vegetable industry, in addition to the farm groups traditionally involved in the farm bill.

At the end of that process, we now have more than 100 organizations representing conservation, nutrition, rural development, renewable energy, labor and farm groups that have signed on in support of this bill. I think that this unprecedented support is a direct result of our efforts to be inclusive in this farm bill process.

There are very few issues that the National Farmers Union and the American Farm Bureau Federation can agree on, but at the end of the day, they both support this bill.

The members of these groups who support our farm bill are the real experts on farm policy because it is a reality that they live each day of their lives. They are the ones on the land planting the crops, managing the livestock and taking the risk inherent in

the industry of farming. They are the ones who represent the people using the farm bill's nutrition programs. They are the ones working to implement good conservation practices in the communities across this country. If they support our bill, then I know that we're doing the right thing.

This farm bill also includes significant reforms. Of course, some people think we went too far. Others think we didn't go far enough. But everybody seems to agree that they never thought that we could get an agreement that went as far as it has. That is what this farm bill is about. We got the different groups into the room and produced an agreement that everyone feels like they've been part of the process, even if they didn't get exactly what they wanted.

This bill does make significant changes, including a hard cap on subsidies for the first time ever. We've taken the \$2.5 million adjusted gross income cap down to \$500,000. And we have put a hard cap on of \$1 million so that anybody over \$1 million of adjusted gross income will not receive farm payments after this bill passes.

We have also cut the soft cap that I mentioned on adjusted gross income to \$500,000. We also, in this bill, required direct attribution for the first time of farm program payments so that people won't be able to get around the payment limits by receiving payments through different business entities. These are not insignificant by any means, and these changes will affect thousands of farmers nationwide.

In the area of conservation, too, we have made significant changes as well as new investments. One thing we've done, we have included the same kind of payment limits on conservation programs that we have had for farm programs. That way, there's more money available to more farmers to participate in these popular programs.

The bill also includes \$3.8 billion in new spending for conservation programs over the next 5 years. These programs help farmers protect the environment with programs that reduce erosion, enhance water supply, improve water quality, increase wildlife habitat, and reduce damage caused by floods and other natural disasters.

This farm bill provides new resources to protect and preserve the Chesapeake Bay and other high-priority areas, and it encourages private land owners to provide public access for hunting, fishing and other recreational activities.

In the area of renewable energy, this farm bill invests in programs that will help encourage the development of cellulosic ethanol in this country. In my opinion, this represents the future for American agriculture. Once we can establish the first facilities that can make ethanol from agricultural waste and other biomass products, we will take a huge step in a new direction for agriculture and for rural America.