

as well as Representatives from Washington State, both on and off the committee, for their advice and counsel as we developed this legislation.

H.R. 2088 provides a certainty to American agriculture, and I would urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this bill.

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

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I, too, rise in support of the U.S. Grain Standards Act Reauthorization Act, H.R. 2088.

I would like to, first of all, thank the chairmen of the full committee and of the subcommittee, both of whom provided great leadership, provided the necessary space to get all parties together, and then provided for a final product that meets all of the necessary requirements that you heard the chairman talk about.

I think it is well known that U.S. grain producers produce the highest quality grain in the world. It is the inspections of them, the gold standard of assuring that quality, backed by the Federal Government, that allows us to continue this trade. I think no one here wants to see any interruption to that service. No one here wants to see any lowering of the quality that we have.

So this piece of legislation, I think, in the best tradition of the Agriculture Committee and this House, was a true, bipartisan compromise. It was working to find working solutions that made those things happen, and I would urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

This is how we are supposed to do business. This honors those producers of our grain and makes sure that business and capital flow correctly, and it makes sure that there are standards in place to ensure that our buyers of U.S. grain know that they are getting the world's highest quality product.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this and certainly want to thank the ranking member of the full committee as well and my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, who serves as the ranking member on our subcommittee.

This is a great piece of bipartisan legislation. As has been noted here, this is about 100 years since this has been signed into law, and the grain trade has thrived over that century. GSA has supported its evolution by providing a backbone of stability relied upon by exporters, shippers, farmers, and, of course, consumers.

With the farm economy and so many of our constituents relying on the ability of grain and oilseeds to get to market, it is critical that we act to provide stability for the grain trade, like we are doing here today.

This legislation accomplishes that goal in the following two ways. Many of the provisions in current law are set to expire on September 30 of this year. A lapse in that authorization would disrupt the current grain inspections process; therefore, Congress should not delay in passing its reauthorization. The House is getting its job done well ahead of schedule by considering this bill today, and I hope my colleagues in the Senate will act soon as well.

Secondly, this legislation provides stability by ensuring we can avoid disruptions like that which took place last year in Washington State, which was alluded to earlier by the chairman. Last summer, the Washington State Department of Agriculture discontinued its export inspections amid an ongoing labor dispute. Since labor disputes do happen from time to time, this kind of situation was anticipated by our predecessors, which is why current law provides a mechanism for USDA to step in and provide inspection services in the event of a disruption.

However, the dispute devolved into a political situation in which the Secretary of Agriculture declined to use his discretionary authority to maintain inspections. While inspection services were eventually restored, it is critical we avoid a repeat of that unfortunate decision.

Fortunately, the Agriculture Committee arrived at a bipartisan consensus and found a way to avoid any future disruptions to the grain trade by giving the industry more control of its own destiny.

I urge support from my colleagues for this vital legislation. I thank the committee for all of its hard work to move this bill forward.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, again, I have no further speakers on my side. I can't stress enough my thanks for working this out. It was, at times, a somewhat delicate situation, but leadership from my friends on the Republican side, bringing in folks, all engaged parties in this, helped us find a great compromise.

I, too, would urge our colleagues in the Senate to take up this piece of legislation, move it forward, and give certainty to those producers who feed, clothe, and power the world. I urge our colleagues here, let's just pass this thing and get further work done.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues' comments, both the ranking member as well as the chairman of the subcommittee. We did work in a bipartisan manner. We worked out the differences of the bill, came up with a good work product. It is worthy of the system.

I would like to, again, emphasize, as my colleague from Arkansas did, we are actually getting this done ahead of time. These rules aren't out-of-date yet. And so I would encourage my col-

leagues in the Senate to follow our example and get it done quickly so we can get this to the President's desk. I urge support of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2088, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MANDATORY PRICE REPORTING ACT OF 2015

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2051) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to extend the livestock mandatory price reporting requirements, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2051

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the “Mandatory Price Reporting Act of 2015”.*

##### SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF LIVESTOCK MANDATORY REPORTING.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 260 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1636i) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2020”.

(b) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.—Section 212(12)(C) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635a(12)(C)) is amended by inserting “, including any day on which any Department employee is on shutdown or emergency furlough as a result of a lapse in appropriations” after “conduct business”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 942 of the Livestock Mandatory Reporting Act of 1999 (7 U.S.C. 1635 note; Public Law 106-78) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2020”.

##### SEC. 3. SWINE REPORTING.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 231 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635i) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (9) through (22) as paragraphs (10) through (23), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

“(9) NEGOTIATED FORMULA PURCHASE.—The term ‘negotiated formula purchase’ means a purchase of swine by a packer from a producer under which—

“(A) the pricing mechanism is a formula price for which the formula is determined by negotiation on a lot-by-lot basis; and

“(B) the swine are scheduled for delivery to the packer not later than 14 days after the date on which the formula is negotiated and swine are committed to the packer.”;

(3) in paragraph (12)(A) (as so redesignated), by inserting “negotiated formula purchase,” after “pork market formula purchase;”; and

(4) in paragraph (23) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

“(D) a negotiated formula purchase; and”.

(b) DAILY REPORTING.—Section 232(c) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635j(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(D), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following new clause:

“(ii) PRICE DISTRIBUTIONS.—The information published by the Secretary under clause (i) shall include—

“(I) a distribution of net prices in the range between and including the lowest net price and the highest net price reported;

“(II) a delineation of the number of barrows and gilts at each reported price level or, at the option of the Secretary, the number of barrows and gilts within each of a series of reasonable price bands within the range of prices; and

“(III) the total number and weighted average price of barrows and gilts purchased through negotiated purchases and negotiated formula purchases.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) LATE IN THE DAY REPORT INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall include in the morning report and the afternoon report for the following day any information required to be reported under subparagraph (A) that is obtained after the time of the reporting day specified in such subparagraph.”.

#### SEC. 4. LAMB REPORTING.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall revise section 59.300 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, so that—

(1) the definition of the term “importer”—

(A) includes only those importers that imported an average of 1,000 metric tons of lamb meat products per year during the immediately preceding 4 calendar years; and

(B) may include any person that does not meet the requirement referred to in subparagraph (A), if the Secretary determines that the person should be considered an importer based on their volume of lamb imports; and

(2) the definition of the term “packer”—

(A) applies to any entity with 50 percent or more ownership in a facility;

(B) includes a federally inspected lamb processing plant which slaughtered or processed the equivalent of an average of 35,000 head of lambs per year during the immediately preceding 5 calendar years; and

(C) may include any other lamb processing plant that did not meet the requirement referred to in subparagraph (B), if the Secretary determines that the processing plant should be considered a packer after considering its capacity.

#### SEC. 5. STUDY ON LIVESTOCK MANDATORY REPORTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Agricultural Marketing Service in conjunction with the Office of the Chief Economist and in consultation with cattle, swine, and lamb producers, packers, and other market participants, shall conduct a study on the program of information regarding the marketing of cattle, swine, lambs, and products of such livestock under subtitle B of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635 et seq.). Such study shall—

(1) analyze current marketing practices in the cattle, swine, and lamb markets;

(2) identify legislative or regulatory recommendations made by cattle, swine, and lamb producers, packers, and other market participants to ensure that information provided under such program—

(A) can be readily understood by producers, packers, and other market participants;

(B) reflects current marketing practices; and

(C) is relevant and useful to producers, packers, and other market participants;

(3) analyze the price and supply information reporting services of the Department of Agriculture related to cattle, swine, and lamb; and

(4) address any other issues that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2020, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report containing the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 2051, the Mandatory Price Reporting Act of 2015.

I want to begin by thanking my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee, Ranking Member PETERSON and Congressman ROUZER, for joining me in introducing this legislation. I am especially appreciative of Mr. ROUZER’s work as subcommittee chairman in holding a hearing to foster discussions that led to this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2051 is a bill to reauthorize the Livestock Mandatory Reporting Act of 1999. This bill, like the underlying act and each subsequent reauthorization, has been the result of dialogue and consensus between livestock producers and other industry participants.

I would like to extend my gratitude to our Nation’s livestock producers, capably represented by their trade associations—the National Cattlemen’s Beef Association, the National Pork Producers Council, and the American Sheep Industry Association—for their hard work and dedication on this effort.

We fully understand that government mandates, like price reporting, can be onerous, and that not all industry participants may fully embrace this program.

That said, it is apparent that over the preceding 16 years, mandatory reporting has become an essential tool that allows for greater transparency and price discovery within the livestock industry, especially as the industry continues to evolve.

This reauthorization contains a number of industry-specific modifications proposed by the pork producers and sheep producers. We, likewise, include a provision that responds generally to industry concern regarding USDA’s arbitrary decision to shut this manda-

tory program down for several days during the lapse in appropriations that occurred in 2013, while other mandatory programs were deemed essential.

Following extensive negotiations, the cattlemen have opted to support a simple reauthorization without any statutory modifications. I appreciate their hard work and look forward to continuing to work with them on future improvements that they may choose to pursue.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple, bipartisan reauthorization that represents consensus among industry participants. I urge Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

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

I rise in support of the Mandatory Price Reporting Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I would say let’s hope that what you see is a pattern developing here: smart, bipartisan legislation passed in a timely fashion to make sure this country’s business goes on uninterrupted.

You heard it from the chairman, these programs are important for producers, who rely on access to transparent, accurate, and timely market information. The bill makes an important change to mandatory price reporting by making it an “essential” government program.

As you also heard, the 2013 government shutdown disrupted price reporting. This designation will ensure that, if we ever find ourselves in that situation again, price reporting will continue on. This is the very least we can do for the hard-working folks who are out there. It gives our producers the certainty that it will be there. It is the right thing to do. Again, it is smart; it is bipartisan; it is timely. And I would urge my colleagues not only to support this, but to make this a habit in much of what we do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Foreign Agriculture.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his good and hard work on this important piece of legislation.

As chairman of the Livestock and Foreign Agriculture Subcommittee in which the Mandatory Price Reporting Act originated, I too want to thank the stakeholders for their hard work in coming together on the provisions of this bill.

Mandatory price reporting was developed in response to changing markets, with an increasing number of animals being sold with little information publicly accessible. As these structural changes continued, livestock producers requested that price reporting be made mandatory.

Even today, livestock markets are continuing to evolve, and it was the

goal and intent of the committee to bring all parties together to strike a balance that promotes fairness, transparency, and stability in the market. No one knows how to make this process work better than those directly involved, and I appreciate the willingness of these stakeholders to work together with the committee to craft this legislation.

I also look forward to working with our Senate colleagues to continue the tradition of a healthy dialogue between both Chambers of Congress, producers, and packers on this reauthorization so that we can make sure that the requested modifications are executed as smoothly as possible.

In closing, I would like to again thank Chairman CONAWAY, Ranking Member COLLIN PETERSON, and the committee staff for their tremendous help and guidance.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this legislation to my colleagues, and I appreciate their support.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I too want to thank my colleagues across the aisle as well as colleagues on the committee with me, but I also was remiss earlier in not thanking the dedicated staff of the Ag Committee that worked on the grain standards bill and the group that has worked on this one as well.

We are blessed. Our country is blessed to have dedicated professionals on both sides of the aisle and the committee staff who do a great job working together, trying to avoid the kind of partisanship that sometimes permeates this body.

Again, I rise in support of this mandatory price reporting reauthorization. I will remind my colleagues that this does not expire until September 30 of this year. We are actually ahead of the curve and would commend this process to the House on other important issues like that. I ask my colleagues to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2051, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

#### NATIONAL FOREST FOUNDATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2394) to reauthorize the National Forest Foundation Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2394

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Forest Foundation Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

#### SEC. 2. NATIONAL FOREST FOUNDATION ACT RE-AUTHORIZATION.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE MATCHING FUNDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROJECT EXPENSES.—Section 405(b) of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j-3(b)) is amended by striking “for a period of five years beginning October 1, 1992” and inserting “during fiscal years 2016 through 2018”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 410(b) of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j-8(b)) is amended by striking “during the five-year period” and all that follows through “\$1,000,000 annually” and inserting “there are authorized to be appropriated \$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2018”.

#### (c) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—

(1) AGENT.—Section 404(b) of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j-2(b)) is amended by striking “under this paragraph” and inserting “by subsection (a)(4)”.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 407(b) of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j-5(b)) is amended by striking the comma after “The Foundation shall”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2394, the National Forest Foundation Reauthorization Act of 2015.

The National Forest Foundation has a simple mission: bring people together to restore and enhance our national forests and grasslands. Through the foundation, we are able to leverage private and Federal dollars to support our Nation’s great forests in a variety of ways. These include: planting trees, preserving wildlife habitat, surveying streams, restoring and maintaining trails, and the list goes on.

In recent years, the foundation has leveraged funds at over a four to one ratio and plans to continue on this success to raise at least \$125 million for forest restoration activities.

Since its charter in 1993, the foundation has been essential in helping to meet the challenges the National Forest System faces. Accomplishments in-

clude: over 14,000 miles of trail restored or maintained; nearly 4.4 million trees and shrubs planted; more than 500,000 acres of fuel reduction completed or planned; over 120,000 people volunteered more than 1.5 million hours with an estimated value of \$34 million; over 46,000 youth employed or engaged; approximately 80,000 acres of invasive weeds treated; over 117,000 acres of wildlife habitat restored or maintained; and more than 3,000 miles of streams surveyed or restored.

The foundation has also taken it upon itself to educate and engage the American public on the importance of our national forests as well as the natural resources found within them. It is an integral component in keeping our national forests—such as the Allegheny national forest, in my district, and dozens of other national forests around the country—viable and thriving for years to come.

Simply put, the National Forest Foundation works, and this is a commonsense reauthorization. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for his work on this legislation and also for his work and dedication on the Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee, which we lead together.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. The National Forest Foundation Reauthorization Act will allow the public-private partnership responsible for the stewardship and management of our national forests and grasslands to continue.

This legislation would reauthorize the National Forest Foundation’s matching funds program. This important program brings non-Federal partners and stakeholders together to keep our forests healthy and less prone to fire. In practice, this has generated more than \$4 for our forests for every Federal dollar invested.

I have seen the benefits of this program in my own district. Since 2010, the New Mexico Wilderness Alliance has received grants from the National Forest Foundation to assist the Forest Service in conducting surveys and data collection on the wilderness areas within the New Mexico national forests. This data has helped the Forest Service combat invasive species and improve forest health in the Cibola, Carson, and Santa Fe National Forests.

Our national forests are in dire need of this type of management and restoration in order to maintain valuable ecosystems and prevent devastating and costly wildfires.

New Mexico, like many other States in the Southwest, has been experiencing severe drought; and, as a result, we have had record-breaking fires that have burned hundreds of thousands of acres and have caused millions of dollars in damage.

While we have seen some recent improvements, long-term projections indicate that drought conditions will