

Pallone	Rush	Swalwell (CA)
Panetta	Ryan (OH)	Takano
Pascarell	Sánchez	Thompson (CA)
Paulsen	Sanford	Thompson (MS)
Payne	Sarbanes	Titus
Pelosi	Schakowsky	Tonko
Perlmutter	Schiff	Torres
Peters	Schneider	Tsongas
Pingree	Schrader	Upton
Pocan	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Price (NC)	Scott, David	Veasey
Quigley	Serrano	Vela
Raskin	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez
Reichert	Shea-Porter	Visclosky
Rice (NY)	Sherman	Wasserman
Richmond	Sinema	Schultz
Rogers (AL)	Sires	Waters, Maxine
Rooney, Francis	Smith (NJ)	Watson Coleman
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (WA)	Welch
Rosen	Soto	Wilson (FL)
Roybal-Allard	Speler	Yarmuth
Ruiz	Stefanik	
Ruppersberger	Suozi	

NOT VOTING—12

Beyer	Buck	Polis
Blackburn	Clay	Rogers (KY)
Boyle, Brendan	Gohmert	Walz
F.	Labrador	
Brown (MD)	Napolitano	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1829

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments under House Resolution 891, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair 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. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 900 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. 2.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1832

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. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today,

amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 115-679 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. RUSSELL

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GALLAGHER). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 115-679.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 386, line 23, insert “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before “Section”.

Page 387, after line 5, insert the following: (b) EXCLUSION OF ALCOHOL PRODUCTS FROM DEFINITION.—Section 231(a)(5) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1632a(a)(5)) is amended by adding below subparagraph (B) the following:

“The term ‘value-added agricultural product’ does not include beer, wine, distilled spirits, hard cider, or other alcohol product.”

(c) RESCISSION.—Of the funds made available under section 231(b)(7)(A) of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (as in effect before the date of the enactment of this section) to the Secretary of Agriculture to make value-added agricultural product market development grants and unobligated as of such date of enactment, \$8,000,000 is hereby rescinded.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment addresses but redirects; it does not eliminate any funds from the Value Added Producer Grants.

These \$18 million worth of grants are designed to generate new products, expand market opportunities, and assist beginning and socially disadvantaged farmers, family farms, and even veterans entering farming.

Unfortunately, millions of these funds go to fund alcohol products.

While there is nothing inherently wrong with alcohol products, of the government funds that are used for promotion of these products through the program, we also note that the alcohol industry spends \$7.6 million a year in lobbying costs.

Not only do these tax dollars used to fund the promotion of alcohol take away from non-alcohol-based farmers and ranchers, they also compete with the Government itself.

Every year, we spend millions of dollars to curtail the use and abuse of alcohol.

According to the Centers for Disease Control, the impacts and loss of alcohol abuse results in \$249 billion a year in economic, workplace absence, healthcare loss, criminal justice expenses, and vehicle crash costs.

Mr. Chairman, it makes no sense that the Government should spend money to both promote and curtail an industry.

This amendment preserves the Value Added Grants for farmers that have no

\$8-million-a-year industry to lobby for them, and it ends the duplicitous practice of the Government being both for and against something that costs the Nation nearly \$250 billion in annual economic loss.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Russell amendment, which, if enacted, would have a detrimental impact on producers across our Nation, including many of my wine, grape, and hops producers, as well as the beer and wine industry, not only in my State, but around the country.

This amendment proposes to eliminate wine, distilled spirits, beer, and other alcohol products from the Value Added Producer Grant program administered by the USDA.

These industries, in my State and, quite frankly, across the Nation, are a growing segment of our farm economy, providing thousands of jobs.

It is also important to point out the growing significance of wine and hops exports to their industries. Last year, my State exported \$28 million of wine, representing about 5 percent of our total production.

In my home valley of the Yakima Valley in the State of Washington, we account for 75 percent of the U.S. production of hops. With the continued boom of microbreweries and the demand for hops, we must ensure we have available markets.

Our wine grape growers and the wine industry continue to face challenges in export markets, such as the recent tariffs placed on our products by China.

We are in an environment with potential changes in international trade, and farmers are looking for more export markets.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose any efforts to limit our farmers’ ability to find markets for their products.

Mr. Chair, I include these letters of support in the RECORD: one from the Wine Institute, Wine America, Distilled Spirits Council, and the Brewers Association; and one from the Specialty Crop Farm Bill Alliance.

MAY 17, 2018.

Re Oppose Russell Amendment to the Farm Bill.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write on behalf of the nearly 9,000 small, family owned wineries, 6,200 small and independent breweries and approximately 1,700 distilleries spread across rural America to urge you to vote against the Russell Amendment to the Farm Bill.

This amendment would unfairly target a vibrant and growing segment of U.S. agriculture by seeking to block small wineries, breweries and distilleries from participating in USDA’s value-added agriculture marketing grants. Combined, the American

wine, brewing and spirits industries have a direct economic impact of \$287 billion on the United States economy and support more than 5 million jobs nationwide.

Wineries, distilleries and breweries in America represent the very epitome of value-added agriculture, bringing quality jobs and generating much needed tourism to farming communities across the country. This amendment would make it harder for these communities to benefit fully from this opportunity.

We urge you to support these small businesses and their communities buy opposing the Russell Amendment.

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. KOCH,  
*President & CEO,*  
*Wine Institute.*

JAMES TREZISE,  
*President,*  
*WineAmerica.*

ROBERT D. PEASE,  
*President & CEO,*  
*Brewers Association.*

MARK GORMAN,  
*SVP Government Relations,*  
*Distilled Spirits Council.*

SCFBA,

Washington, DC, May 16, 2018.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The Specialty Crop Farm Bill Alliance representing over 120 specialty crop organizations across the United States appreciate Chairman Conaway's efforts on H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act that initiates the formal 2018 Farm Bill process and for his diligent efforts to complete Committee action on the measure and get it to the floor of the House. After a thorough review of the H.R. 2, the Alliance is also pleased to see that the Committee has retained many of the specialty crop provisions that were included in the 2014 Farm Bill. Included in the House version are provisions funding key specialty crop priorities such as:

Specialty Crop Block Grants (\$85 million/year);

Specialty Crop Research Initiative (\$80 million/year);

Trade Programs including MAP (\$200 million/year) and TASC (\$9 Million/year);

Pest and Disease Programs (\$75 million/year) and National Clean Plant Network (\$5 million/year);

Food Insecurity and Nutrition Incentive Program (FINI) (Increased to \$285 million over five years).

These funding commitments demonstrate that the House recognizes the value of these programs and their tremendous importance to the specialty crop industry and the Alliance is grateful for their inclusion in the House legislation. With debate over the next several days on a series of amendments to H.R. 2, we would like to draw your attention to several amendments we interested in. In particular the Specialty Crop Farm Bill Alliance opposes the following amendments:

Amendment 50 by Rep. Russell prohibits USDA value-added grants for wine and other products;

Amendment 71 by Reps. Brat, Blumenauer, and Titus on Checkoff Programs;

Amendment 93 by Rep McClintock on Crop Insurance;

Amendment 97 by Rep. Faso on Plant Pests;

Amendment 100 by Rep. Rogers on multi-vitamin purchases through SNAP.

Finally, we look forward to continuing to work with Chairman Conaway and Members of the House Agriculture Committee on further policy objectives that we believe will strengthen this bill and assist the specialty crop industry to compete in a domestic and

global market place. These priorities are consistent with our requests since last year and in previous Farm Bills which include enhancing nutrition programs, continuing to support Specialty Crop Block Grant programs, combatting invasive pest and diseases, support trade programs, and research funding.

We look forward to the Farm Bill being considered on the House floor this week and that you will strongly consider our views on the amendments mentioned above.

Thank you,

JOHN KEELING,  
*Executive Vice President & CEO,*  
*National Potato Council,*  
*SCFBA Steering Committee Co-Chair.*

MIKE STUART,  
*President & CEO,*  
*Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association,*  
*SCFBA Steering Committee Co-Chair.*

TOM NASSIF,  
*President,*  
*Western Growers Association,*  
*SCFBA Steering Committee Co-Chair.*

ROBERT GUENTHER,  
*Sr. Vice President of Public Policy,*  
*United Fresh Produce Association,*  
*SCFBA Steering Committee Secretariat.*

Attachment: List of Specialty Crop Coalition Members.

SPECIALTY CROP FARM BILL ALLIANCE ORGANIZATION

SPECIALTY CROP FARM BILL ALLIANCE STEERING COMMITTEE

Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, Co-Chair; National Potato Council, Co-Chair; Western Growers Association, Co-Chair; United Fresh Produce Association, Executive Secretariat; American Mushroom Institute; American Mushroom Institute; AmericanHort; America Pistachio Association; Blue Diamond Growers; California Association of Winegrape Growers; California Citrus Mutual; California Fresh Fruit Association; California Table Grape Commission; Florida Tomato Exchange; Georgia Fruit & Vegetable Growers Association.

Idaho Grower Shippers Association; Idaho Potato Commission; National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; National Watermelon Association; National Grape Research Alliance; Northwest Horticultural Council; Produce Marketing Association; Sunkist Growers; Sun-Maid Growers; Texas International Produce Association; U.S. Apple Association; Washington State Potato Commission; Wild Blueberry Commission of Maine.

SPECIALTY CROP FARM BILL ALLIANCE MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS

Alabama Watermelon Association; Arizona Winegrowers Association; Buy California Marketing Agreement; California Association of Nurseries & Garden Centers; California Canning Peach Association; California Dried Plum Board; California Fig Institute; California Fresh Fig Growers Association; California Strawberry Commission; California Walnut Commission; California-Arizona Watermelon Association; Cherry Marketing Institute; Colorado Potato Administrative Committee; Colorado Wine Industry Development Board.

Connecticut Farm Wine Development Council; Connecticut Vineyard & Winery Association; Empire State Potato Growers;

Florida Citrus Mutual; Florida Citrus Packers; Florida Strawberry Growers Association; Florida Sweet Corn Exchange; Florida Watermelon Association; Fruit Growers Marketing Association; Georgia Watermelon Association; Grower-Shipper Association of Central California; Idaho Grape Growers and Wine Producers Commission; Indian River Citrus League; Indiana-Illinois Watermelon Association.

Leafy Greens Council; Maine Potato Board; Maryland-Delaware Watermelon Association; Maryland Wineries Association; Miami-Dade County; Michigan Apple Committee; Minnesota Area II Potato Growers Research and Promotion Council; Minnesota Grape Growers Association; Missouri Wine & Grape Board; National Berry Crop Initiative; National Grape Cooperative Association; National Onion Association; National Peach Council; New England Vegetable and Berry Growers.

New Mexico Wine Growers Association; New York Apple Association; New York Wine & Grape Foundation; North American Blueberry Council; North American Bramble Growers Association; North American Strawberry Growers Association; North Carolina Blueberry Council; North Carolina Grape & Wine Council; North Carolina Potato Association; North Carolina Strawberry Association; North Carolina Watermelon Association; Northern Kentucky Vintners & Grape Growers Association; Northern Plains Potato Growers.

Ocean Spray Cranberries, Inc.; Ohio Wine Producers Association; Oklahoma Grape Growers & Wine Makers Association; Oregon Potato Commission; Oregon Raspberry & Blackberry Commission; Oregon Strawberry Commission; Oregon Wine Advocacy Council; Oregon Winegrowers Association; Peace River Valley Citrus Growers Association; Peerbolt Crop Management; Potato Growers of Idaho; Rocky Mountain Association of Vintners & Viticulturists.

South Carolina Watermelon Association; Tennessee Farm Winegrowers Association; Texas Citrus Mutual; Texas Vegetable Association; Texas Wine & Grape Growers Association; Texas Watermelon Association; Tropical Fruit Growers of South Florida; United Fresh Potato Growers of Idaho; United Potato Growers of America; Virginia Apple Growers Association; Virginia Wineries Association; Washington Association of Wine Grape Growers; Washington Red Raspberry Commission.

Washington State Apple Commission; Welch's; Western Pistachio Association; Western Watermelon Association; Wine Institute; Wine Producers Commission; WineAmerica; Winegrape Growers of America; Winegrowers Association of Georgia; WineMichigan; Wyoming Grape & Wine Association; Yakima Valley Growers-Shippers Association.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, we should not be singling out key agricultural industries under programs like this. We should not be picking winners and losers among our farmers.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to strongly oppose the Russell amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Washington State for yielding me the time and for speaking against this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I am sorry to say to my colleague from the other side of the aisle, we oppose this amendment,

which would remove money from the highly successful Value Added Producer Grant program.

The base text of this farm bill already removes all mandatory funding from VAPG. Now this amendment would make a bad situation worse by rescinding \$8 million from VAPG.

The Value Added Producer Grant is one of the only grant programs that goes directly to farmers.

At a time when the farm economy is hurting, we should be helping farmers find new markets, not taking away opportunities to do so.

USDA's Economic Research Service released a new report earlier this month. Businesses that receive VAPG support are less likely to fail than non-recipient businesses, and businesses that receive VAPG support also employ more workers than nonrecipient businesses.

This amendment would also exclude beer, wine, distilled spirits, and hard cider projects from being eligible for VAPG. It is completely arbitrary and foolish to restrict these products.

In my State of Maine, there has been an explosion of craft breweries, distilleries, and cideries that are contributing to the local economy.

Two years ago, Ricker Hill Orchards in Maine received VAPG money to increase production of hard cider and fruit wine. This provided the farmers with an opportunity to diversify revenue and reach new markets.

This may be a very small program, but it can make a big impact on farmers and rural communities in States like mine and across the country.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, "a bad situation worse"? You want to see a bad situation? How about this: Just in the District of Columbia, \$3.5 billion in 2010 in direct economic costs; \$179 billion of the total cost of alcohol consumption comes from a loss in workplace productivity.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have anything for or against, or want to promote prohibition or anything of the like. The matter is that these crops can stand on their own. They receive \$8 million a year nearly, \$7.67 million from the alcohol industry in lobbying costs. They already have their promoters. These crops can stand on their own. However, of the \$18 million in this Value Added fund, \$8 million of that goes to the alcohol industry.

So when we are talking about picking winners and losers, I think we have already seen who is being picked here, and it is the fleecing of the American people.

What about those that are new farmers, family farms, even veterans that are trying to enter the farming industry but they don't want to grow hops? Maybe they want to grow something that we eat that doesn't have a detrimental \$250 billion a year of an impact.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would argue that I would probably have to be drunk to think that the Government should both promote and curtail something at the same time.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, I believe I have the right to close, so I would reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma has the right to close.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chair, it is my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, I have one speaker. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, how much time does the gentleman have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington State for the opportunity to yield to me to discuss this important issue.

Mr. Chair, this amendment, some in the room might think perhaps will target the Market Access Program, but, in fact, it is the Value Added Producer Grant program.

This is a program that supports and helps producers add value to the products that they raise.

I would tell you my chief concern at this point in time in the way this amendment has been offered is that about \$8 million of the rescissions of this program would come out of current programs that farmers have already applied for. USDA has already scored the applications, it has compiled proposals to make a decision and announcement on grant awards; thus, the amendment wouldn't just adversely affect the small producer-owned wineries, but producers across the board, including those from Oklahoma who have and expect to receive grants.

That is not fair. If you played by the rules, if you have gone through the grant process, if you have qualified, suddenly to have \$8 million taken out to punish a particular industry means that even though you might not be a part of that industry, you lose your opportunity to add value.

Maybe this is an issue that needs to be discussed on a different day in a different way, but I ask my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I have the greatest of respect for my fellow Oklahoman, but on this occasion, let's turn this amendment back.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I certainly have the deepest respect for my colleague from Oklahoma, and he and I

see eye to eye on most issues, but on this one, it makes no sense that we spend nearly 40 percent of the Value Added program—which, by the way, I never addressed Market Access Program, that was never even mentioned—but the Value Added program is not adding value when \$250 billion of economic cost hits the United States; \$27 billion comes from healthcare expenses; \$25 billion to criminal justice; \$12.5 billion to vehicle crashes. We all pay for this.

□ 1845

But why should we both promote and curtail it? We spend millions of dollars in the Federal Government to control and contain abuse and also rehabilitation programs, which are good.

So we need to choose, Mr. Chairman. Are we for something, or are we against something? We may be one, we may be the other, but we cannot be both.

Mr. Chairman, I know these are contentious issues, but it is interesting to watch in the course of our politics over time. This is not a partisan issue; this is an American issue.

I say it is not partisan because if we were holding this debate 30 years ago you would have had a flip-flop, but as we have seen shift in parties in States and regions of the country, we might politically have parties go one direction or the other, but it seems like the special interests remain in the middle.

And if we are really talking about promoting value-added crops and entering new farmers in the workplace, then we don't need to give 40 percent to the alcohol industry when we already see nearly \$8 million given to them by lobbyists.

Mr. Chairman, I ask people to support this amendment. It saves the taxpayer dollars. These crops can stand on their own, and they can do it without the taxpayer subsidization and then our further spending to try to curtail it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 115-679.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 410, after line 13, insert the following:

**SEC. 7113. RESEARCH AND EXTENSION FUNDING EQUITY FOR RECENTLY DESIGNATED 1890 INSTITUTIONS.**

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 1444(b) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3221(b)) is amended, in the matter following paragraph (2)(B), by adding at the end the following: “Beginning with fiscal year 2019, in making the calculation under paragraph (1), any recently designated 1890 Institution shall be deemed to have been designated as an eligible institution on or before September 30, 1978. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a ‘recently designated 1890 Institution’ means an 1890 Institution designated as such on or after September 30, 1999.”.

(b) RESEARCH.—Section 1445 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222) is amended— by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) Beginning with fiscal year 2019, in making the calculation under paragraph (2)(A), any recently designated 1890 Institution (as defined in section 1444(b)) shall be deemed to have been designated as an eligible institution on or before September 30, 1978.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of my amendment to the farm bill.

Mr. Chairman, I had a great conversation today with Secretary of Agriculture Perdue in which he spoke very highly of the students, faculty, and the president of Central State University during his visit to the university. Central State University is in my congressional district, and I want to thank Secretary Perdue for his leadership.

I am committed to working with the Secretary’s office and all of the Historically Black Colleges to find a solution during the appropriations process to stop the disparate funding treatment currently in place. All 1890 land-grant institutions should be treated equally.

My commonsense and revenue-neutral amendment evens the playing field of Federal funding qualifications for all 1890 land-grant Historically Black Colleges, as it is currently written now.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for his support for my work on this amendment. I specifically want to thank JOYCE BEATTY, who supports the amendment and who is the only alumnus from Central State University.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. STEFANIK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 115–679.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Subtitle A of title VIII is amended by adding at the end the following:

**SEC. 8109. INCLUSION OF INVASIVE VEGETATION IN DESIGNATED TREATMENT AREAS.**

Section 602 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 is amended—

- (1) in subsection (a)—  
 (A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, invasive vegetation,” after “insect”; and  
 (B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, invasive vegetation,” after “insects”; and  
 (2) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting “, invasive vegetation,” after “insect”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, our national forests are among our greatest natural resources. Unfortunately, these forests are under constant threat from invasive species and disease. You do not have to search far to find a forest battling invasive pests, disease, or invasive vegetation.

The Healthy Forest Restoration Act was created as a way to help respond to these persistent threats. My amendment before the House would simply add invasive vegetation to the Healthy Forest Restoration Act for the purposes of the designated treatment areas.

Invasive vegetation chokes out our native trees by competing for moisture, sunlight, nutrients, and space. Species like kudzu climb our trees and infrastructure and threaten the health and safety of the areas where it uncontrollably spreads.

When native trees are threatened, it is not just the ecosystem that is damaged. Local economies and sportsmen and those that use our land for other forms of recreation all suffer from degraded forestland.

Adding this designation increases the effectiveness of the Healthy Forest Restoration Act by taking a more encompassing view of the threats facing our forestland.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MS. CHENEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 115–679.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of part III of subtitle C of title VIII, add the following new section:

**SEC. 8334. VACANT GRAZING ALLOTMENTS MADE AVAILABLE TO CERTAIN GRAZING PERMIT HOLDERS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary concerned shall, to the maximum extent practicable, make vacant grazing allotments available to a holder of a grazing permit or lease issued by such Secretary if the lands covered by the permit or lease are unusable because of a natural disaster (including a drought or wildfire), court-issued injunction, or conflict with wildlife, as determined by the Secretary concerned.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The terms and conditions contained in a permit or lease for a vacant grazing allotment made available pursuant to this subsection (a) shall be the terms and conditions of the most recent permit or lease that was applicable to such allotment.

(c) COURT-ISSUED INJUNCTIONS.—A court may not issue any order enjoining the use of any allotment for which a permit or lease has been issued by the Secretary concerned and continues in effect unless the Secretary concerned can make a vacant grazing allotment available to the holder of such permit or lease.

(d) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT UNDER THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT.—Activities carried out by the Secretary concerned pursuant to subsection (a) are a category of actions hereby designated as being categorically excluded from the preparation of an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming.

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

Mr. Chairman, livestock producers in Wyoming and across the West have been battling for years against a Federal Government that has attempted systematically to reduce grazing allotments on public lands.

My amendment would simply make vacant grazing allotments available for our producers should their existing allotments become unavailable due to unforeseen circumstances such as wildfire, drought, other natural disasters, or litigation.

Today, some of our ranch families are facing extreme hardship. They are at risk of losing their livelihood because of factors beyond their control. Frivolous lawsuits have often resulted in a complete loss of grazing rights for some of our producers who have been grazing on public lands for generations.

Mr. Chairman, these circumstances can lead to situations where our ranchers face two options. They either force their livestock to graze in confined conditions that are unsuitable and can’t support the stock, or they have to sell their livestock at fire-sale prices.

We have seen family ranches go out of business and others that are now facing the prospect that their allotments will be lost within the next

year—this, all despite the fact, Mr. Chairman, that the Forest Service has vacant allotments available nearby.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would provide relief and justice for these family ranch operations. It would ensure that Federal agencies honor the terms of these allotments. Best management practices would be maintained, Mr. Chairman, by ensuring that the terms and the conditions of the original allotments are honored on the new ones.

Allowing our ranchers to move their livestock to vacant allotments is plain common sense, and it is the right thing to do, Mr. Chairman, for our livestock industry.

Our hardworking ranch families shouldn't face the potential of economic ruin because of natural disaster or frivolous lawsuits. My amendment will help protect them while we keep them on landscapes they have grazed on for generations.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to provide stability and peace of mind for our ranchers across the West.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of amendment No. 20 offered by my friend Ms. CHENEY, and I am a proud cosponsor, as well, of this amendment.

This amendment would provide resources for ranchers that are facing unforeseeable events, like natural disasters.

In my district, particularly in the northern counties of north-central Washington, where catastrophic wildfires are becoming far too common an occurrence, ranchers can be forced off of their allotments due to wildfires causing their land to be unsuitable for grazing. When these ranchers are forced off of these allotments due to these external factors, they have nowhere to take their livestock.

This amendment will provide a solution to this problem by allowing these ranchers to take their livestock to vacant allotments in the event they face one of these unfortunate but all too common occurrences.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 20, and I thank my colleague Ms. CHENEY for her leadership on this issue.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my cosponsor, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and I would also like to thank Chairman CONAWAY for his work on this important bill overall.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that will just provide justice for our ranch families.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONAWAY. 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. GARRETT) having assumed the chair, Mr. GALLAGHER, Acting Chair 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. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

—————

AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ICELAND—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-127)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith a social security totalization agreement with Iceland, titled "Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland" and the accompanying legally binding administrative arrangement, titled "Administrative Arrangement between the Competent Authorities of the United States of America and Iceland for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland" (collectively the "Agreements"). The Agreements were signed at Reykjavik, Iceland, on September 27, 2016.

The Agreements are similar in objective and content to the social security totalization agreements already in force with other leading economic partners in Europe and elsewhere, including Australia, Canada, Chile, Japan, Norway, the Republic of Korea, and Switzerland. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation and to help prevent the loss of benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The Agreements contain all provisions mandated by section 233 of the Social Security Act and, pursuant to section 233(c)(4), other provisions which I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the estimated number of individuals who will be affected by the Agreements

and the Agreements' estimated cost effect. Also included are a summary of the main provisions of the Agreements and an annotated version of the Agreements with descriptions of each article. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration concluded that these Agreements are in the national interest of the United States.

I commend to the Congress the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland and the Administrative Arrangement between the Competent Authorities of the United States of America and Iceland for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland.

DONALD J. TRUMP,  
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 17, 2018.

□ 1900

—————

HONORING INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LIONS CLUB, MULTIPLE DISTRICT 14

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the International Association of Lions Club, Multiple District 14, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Lions Multiple District 14 will host its 95th annual convention at the Penn Stater Conference Center today through Sunday. They will proudly welcome the Lions Club International president, Dr. Naresh Aggarwal, of Batala, Punjab, India.

Mr. Speaker, this group is near and dear to my heart, as I am a member of my local Lions Club, having served also as a Scoutmaster of that Lions Scout troop.

The Lions are the world's largest service club, with more than 18,900 Lions in Pennsylvania and nearly 1.45 million Lions worldwide.

The Lions focus on five areas of service: diabetes; environment; hunger relief; pediatric cancer; and probably the most well-known area of service, vision. Thanks to the 692 Lions Clubs in Pennsylvania, residents benefit from services like chartering units of the Boy Scouts of America, operating a year-round camp for people with vision challenges, supporting a camp for children with health challenges, and offering scholarships for students.

Mr. Speaker, the Lions do so much for so many in need. I wish them the best of luck as they host their 95th convention and live out their motto: We serve.

—————

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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