

story is read and studied worldwide, and Joyce himself has become an intrinsic part of world culture.

Through a stream of consciousness writing style, and with humor and parody, Joyce has kept literary thinkers and historians engaged with interpreting his words, even 100 years later.

In 265,222 words, Joyce chronicles the simple and even mundane encounters of protagonist Leopold Bloom on one ordinary day in Dublin: Thursday, June 16, 1904. Yet, Joyce does it with such wit, linguistic exuberance, and high regard for the ordinary and often overlooked details that readers remain captivated.

I am one of those readers.

June 16, today, is considered by Joyce fans as Bloomsday, and festivals are taking place in Dublin, here in the States, and around the world.

As such, let me wish all of you a happy Bloomsday.

□ 0915

MEAT AND POULTRY SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR ACT OF 2022

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1170, I call up the bill (H.R. 7606) to establish the Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters within the Department of Agriculture, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-50, modified by the amendment printed in part E of House Report 117-366, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 7606

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Secretary defined.

TITLE I—MEAT AND POULTRY SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR

Sec. 101. Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters.

TITLE II—ADDITIONAL NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE

Sec. 201. Additional nutrient management assistance.

TITLE III—AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SYSTEM SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCE AND CRISIS RESPONSE TASK FORCE

Sec. 301. Agriculture and Food System Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response Task Force.

TITLE IV—BIOFUEL INFRASTRUCTURE AND AGRICULTURE PRODUCT MARKET EXPANSION

Sec. 401. Biofuel infrastructure and agriculture product market expansion.

TITLE V—YEAR-ROUND FUEL CHOICE

Sec. 501. Ethanol waiver.

TITLE VI—PRODUCING RESPONSIBLE ENERGY AND CONSERVATION INCENTIVES AND SOLUTIONS FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (PRECISE)

Sec. 601. Conservation loan and loan guarantee program.

Sec. 602. Assistance to rural entities.

Sec. 603. Environmental Quality Incentives Program.

Sec. 604. Conservation Stewardship Program.

Sec. 605. Delivery of technical assistance.

TITLE VII—BUTCHER BLOCK ACT

Sec. 701. Assistance for new and expanded livestock or poultry processors.

Sec. 702. New and expanding livestock or poultry processing grants.

TITLE VIII—LOWER FOOD AND FUEL COSTS SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022

SEC. 2. SECRETARY DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE I—MEAT AND POULTRY SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR

SEC. 101. OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR FOR COMPETITION MATTERS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 is amended by inserting after section 216 (7 U.S.C. 6916) the following:

“SEC. 217. OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR FOR COMPETITION MATTERS.

“(a) *ESTABLISHMENT.*—There is established in the Department an office, to be known as the ‘Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Office’).

“(b) *SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR FOR COMPETITION MATTERS.*—The Office shall be headed by the Special Investigator for Competition Matters (referred to in this section as the ‘Special Investigator’), who shall be a senior career employee appointed by the Secretary.

“(c) *DUTIES.*—The Special Investigator shall—

“(1) use all available tools, including subpoenas, to investigate and prosecute violations of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) by packers and live poultry dealers with respect to competition and trade practices in the food and agricultural sector;

“(2) serve as a Department liaison to, and act in consultation with, the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission with respect to competition and trade practices in the food and agricultural sector;

“(3) act in consultation with the Department of Homeland Security with respect to national security and critical infrastructure security in the food and agricultural sector;

“(4) maintain a staff of attorneys and other professionals with appropriate expertise; and

“(5) in carrying out the requirements of this subsection, coordinate with the Office of the General Counsel and the Packers and Stockyards Division of the Agricultural Marketing Service.

“(d) *PROSECUTORIAL AUTHORITY.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Notwithstanding title 28, United States Code, the Special Investigator shall have the authority to bring any civil or administrative action authorized under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) against a packer.

“(2) *EFFECT.*—Nothing in this section alters the authority of the Secretary to issue a subpoena pursuant to the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.).

“(3) *NOTIFICATION.*—With respect to any of the actions brought under this subsection in Federal district court, the Special Investigator shall notify the Attorney General.”.

(b) *CONFORMING AMENDMENT.*—Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) The authority of the Secretary to carry out section 217.”.

(c) *TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.*—Subtitle A of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 is amended by redesignating the first section 225 (relating to Food Access Liaison) (7 U.S.C. 6925) as section 224A.

TITLE II—CROP NUTRIENT USE AND PRECISION AGRICULTURE PRACTICE ADOPTION ASSISTANCE

SEC. 201. CROP NUTRIENT USE AND PRECISION AGRICULTURE PRACTICE ADOPTION ASSISTANCE.

(a) *PAYMENTS.*—During the period beginning on the date of enactment of this section and ending on September 30, 2023, the Secretary shall make payments under this section to producers—

(1) to assist in reducing the costs associated with the utilization of crop nutrients; or

(2) to adopt precision agriculture practices to address the utilization of crop nutrients or water availability.

(b) *AMOUNT.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—A payment to a producer under this section shall not exceed 100 percent of the costs of the activity for which the assistance is provided.

(2) *COST SHARE.*—If the Secretary determines that a producer is receiving other Federal funds for the activity for which the assistance is provided, a payment to the producer under this section shall be in an amount that does not, in combination with such other funds, exceed 100 percent of the costs of such activity.

(c) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$500,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2022 and 2023.

SEC. 202. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title shall be construed as a conservation or environmental program within the meaning of section 5(g) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714c(g)).

TITLE III—AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SYSTEM SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCE AND CRISIS RESPONSE TASK FORCE

SEC. 301. AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SYSTEM SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCE AND CRISIS RESPONSE TASK FORCE.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Subtitle B of title II of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6931 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 229. AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SYSTEM SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCE AND CRISIS RESPONSE TASK FORCE.

“(a) *ESTABLISHMENT.*—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish within the

Department of Agriculture and Food System Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response Task Force (in this section referred to as the ‘Task Force’).

“(b) MISSION.—The mission of the Task Force shall be to—

“(1) help to promote the leadership of the United States with respect to the stability of the agriculture and food system supply chain;

“(2) encourage a government-wide approach through partnerships and collaboration with the private sector, labor organizations, the governments of countries that are allies or key international partners of the United States, States or political subdivisions thereof, and Tribal governments in order to—

“(A) promote the resilience of the agriculture and food system supply chain; and

“(B) identify, prepare for, and respond to shocks to the agriculture and food system supply chain;

“(3) monitor the resilience, diversity, security, and strength of the agriculture and food system supply chain;

“(4) support the availability of agriculture and food system supply chain goods for domestic manufacturers, domestic producers, and domestic enterprises in the United States and in countries that are allies or key international partners;

“(5) assist the Federal Government in preparing for and responding to shocks to the agriculture and food system supply chain;

“(6) support the creation of jobs with competitive wages in the United States agriculture and food system sector; and

“(7) coordinate executive branch actions necessary to carry out the functions described in paragraphs (1) through (6).

“(c) SPECIAL ADVISOR ON SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCE AND CRISIS RESPONSE.—The head of the Task Force shall be the Special Advisor on Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response (in this section, referred to as the ‘Special Advisor’) who shall be appointed by the Secretary.

“(d) AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD SYSTEM SUPPLY CHAIN EVALUATION AND REPORT.—

“(1) EVALUATION.—The Special Advisor, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Transportation, shall conduct an evaluation of the stability and reliability of the agriculture and food system supply chain. The evaluation shall focus on the items listed in subsection (b).

“(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Special Advisor shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the evaluation conducted under subsection (a) that includes the following:

“(A) An evaluation of—

“(i) the strengths of the agriculture and food system supply chain;

“(ii) the weaknesses of the agriculture and food system supply chain;

“(iii) current and potential future critical bottlenecks in the agriculture and food system supply chain, including transportation bottlenecks in the distribution of agricultural inputs, processed and unprocessed food and food input products, and consumer-ready food products;

“(iv) workforce challenges and opportunities in the agriculture and food system supply chain; and

“(v) the overall stability and reliability of the agriculture and food system supply chain.

“(B) A discussion of existing Federal legal barriers, if any, that negatively impact the stability and reliability of the agriculture and food system supply chain.

“(C) Specific recommendations to improve the security, safety, and resilience of the agri-

culture and food system supply chain, including recommendations that address challenges identified under paragraph (1) and that also address—

“(i) long-term strategies;

“(ii) industry best practices;

“(iii) risk-mitigation actions to prevent future bottlenecks and vulnerabilities at all levels of the agriculture and food system supply chain; and

“(iv) legislative and regulatory actions that would positively impact the security and resilience of the agriculture and food system supply chain.

“(e) TERMINATION.—The Task Force shall terminate on the earlier of—

“(1) the date on which the report required by subsection (d) is submitted; or

“(2) September 30, 2023.”

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)), as amended by section 101, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) The authority of the Secretary to establish in the Department the Agriculture and Food System Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response Task Force in accordance with section 229.”

TITLE IV—BIOFUEL INFRASTRUCTURE AND AGRICULTURE PRODUCT MARKET EXPANSION

SEC. 401. BIOFUEL INFRASTRUCTURE AND AGRICULTURE PRODUCT MARKET EXPANSION.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts otherwise available, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$200,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2022 and 2023, to remain available until expended, to carry out this section.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall use the amounts made available pursuant to subsection (a) to provide grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities described in subsection (c)—

(1) to install, retrofit, or otherwise upgrade fuel dispensers or pumps and related equipment, storage tank system components, and other infrastructure required at a location to ensure the environmentally safe availability of fuel containing ethanol blends at levels greater than 10 percent (as determined by the Secretary) or fuel containing biodiesel blends at levels greater than 5 percent (as determined by the Secretary); and

(2) to build and retrofit distribution systems for ethanol blends, traditional and pipeline biodiesel terminal operations (including rail lines), and home heating oil distribution centers or equivalent entities—

(A) to blend biodiesel; and

(B) to carry ethanol and biodiesel.

(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—Entities eligible to receive a grant under this section are transportation fueling facilities and distribution facilities, including fueling stations, convenience stores, hypermarket retailer fueling stations, fleet facilities, as well as fuel terminal operations, midstream partners, and heating oil distribution facilities or equivalent entities.

(d) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the total cost of carrying out a project for which a grant is provided under this section shall be not more than 75 percent.

(e) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not limit the amount of funding an eligible entity may receive under this section, except that such funding is subject to the availability of appropriations.

TITLE V—YEAR-ROUND FUEL CHOICE

SEC. 501. ETHANOL WAIVER.

Section 211 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)(4)—

(A) by striking “(4) The Administrator, upon” and inserting the following:

“(4) WAIVER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, on”;

and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) REID VAPOR PRESSURE.—A fuel or fuel additive that has been granted a waiver under subparagraph (A) prior to January 1, 2017, and meets all the conditions of that waiver other than any limitations of the waiver with respect to Reid Vapor Pressure, may be introduced into commerce if the fuel or fuel additive meets all other applicable Reid Vapor Pressure requirements.”; and

(2) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “or more” after “10 percent”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “additional alcohol or”; and

(B) in paragraph (5)(A), by inserting “or more” after “10 percent”.

TITLE VI—PRODUCING RESPONSIBLE ENERGY AND CONSERVATION INCENTIVES AND SOLUTIONS FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (PRECISE)

SEC. 601. CONSERVATION LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM.

Section 304 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1924) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3), by redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (G) and (H), respectively, and inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

“(F) the adoption of precision agriculture practices, and the acquisition of precision agriculture technology;”;

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “and”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) producers who use the loans to adopt precision agriculture practices or acquire precision agriculture technology, including adoption or acquisition for the purpose of participating in the environmental quality incentives program under subchapter A of chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985.”;

(3) in subsection (e), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) 90 percent of the principal amount of the loan in the case of—

“(A) a producer that is a qualified socially disadvantaged farmer or rancher or a beginning farmer or rancher; or

“(B) loans that are used for the purchase of precision agriculture technology.”; and

(4) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY.—The Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) COORDINATION WITH NRCS.—In making or guaranteeing loans under this section, the Secretary shall ensure that there is coordination between the Farm Service Agency and the Natural Resources Conservation Service.”.

SEC. 602. ASSISTANCE TO RURAL ENTITIES.

Section 310B(a)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) expanding precision agriculture practices, including by financing equipment and farm-wide broadband connectivity, in order to promote best-practices, reduce costs, and improve the environment.”.

SEC. 603. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY INCENTIVES PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1240A(6)(B)(v) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa—

1(6)(B)(v)) is amended by inserting “(including the adoption of precision agriculture practices and the acquisition of precision agriculture technology)” after “planning”.

(b) PAYMENTS.—

(1) OTHER PAYMENTS.—Section 1240B(d)(6) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-2(d)(6)) is amended—

(A) by striking “A producer shall” and inserting the following:

“(A) PAYMENTS UNDER THIS SUBTITLE.—A producer shall”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) CONSERVATION LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM PAYMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A producer receiving payments for practices on eligible land under the program may also receive a loan or loan guarantee under section 304 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to cover costs for the same practices on the same land.

“(ii) NOTICE TO PRODUCER.—The Secretary shall inform a producer participating in the program in writing of the availability of a loan or loan guarantee under section 304 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act as it relates to costs of implementing practices under this program.”.

(2) INCREASED PAYMENTS FOR HIGH-PRIORITY PRACTICES.—Section 1240B(d)(7) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-2(d)(7)) is amended, in the subsection heading, by inserting “STATE-DETERMINED” before “HIGH-PRIORITY”.

(3) INCREASED PAYMENTS FOR PRECISION AGRICULTURE.—Section 1240B(d) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-2(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) INCREASED PAYMENTS FOR PRECISION AGRICULTURE.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the Secretary may increase the amount that would otherwise be provided for a practice under this subsection to not more than 90 percent of the costs associated with adopting precision agriculture practices and acquiring precision agriculture technology.”.

(c) CONSERVATION INCENTIVE CONTRACTS.—Section 1240B(j)(2)(A)(i) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-2(j)(3)(A)(i)) is amended by inserting “(which may include the adoption of precision agriculture practices and the acquisition of precision agriculture technology)” after “incentive practices”.

SEC. 604. CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM.

(b) SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS FOR RESOURCE-CONSERVING CROP ROTATIONS AND ADVANCED GRAZING MANAGEMENT.—Section 1240L(d) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-24(d)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “AND ADVANCED GRAZING MANAGEMENT” and inserting “, ADVANCED GRAZING MANAGEMENT, AND PRECISION AGRICULTURE”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) precision agriculture.”; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “or advanced grazing management” and inserting “, advanced grazing management, or precision agriculture”.

SEC. 605. DELIVERY OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 1242(f) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3842(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) SOIL HEALTH PLANNING.—The Secretary shall emphasize the use of third-party providers in providing technical assistance for soil health planning, including planning related to the use of cover crops, precision conservation management, comprehensive nutrient management planning, and other innovative plans.”.

TITLE VII—BUTCHER BLOCK ACT

SEC. 701. ASSISTANCE FOR NEW AND EXPANDED LIVESTOCK OR POULTRY PROCESSORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make or guarantee a loan for the purpose of—

(1) increasing capacity of livestock and poultry processing, facilitating economic opportunity for livestock and poultry producers through processing activities, and diversifying processing ownership;

(2) increasing the customer base or revenue returns of livestock and poultry producers through investment in processing capacity;

(3) improving, developing, or financing livestock and poultry processing capacity or employment including through the financing of working capital; or

(4) promoting the interstate trade and local sales of processed livestock and poultry by financing improvements to meet relevant Federal, State, and local regulatory standards.

(b) ELIGIBILITY; GENERAL LIMITATIONS.—

(1) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—An entity shall be eligible for a loan or guarantee under this section if the entity is—

(A) a public, private, or cooperative organization organized on a for-profit or nonprofit basis;

(B) an Indian tribe on a Federal or State reservation, or any other federally recognized Indian tribal group; or

(C) an individual.

(2) FACILITY LOCATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a facility constructed, expanded, modified, refurbished, or re-equipped with proceeds from a loan made or guaranteed under this section shall be in a rural area.

(B) EXCEPTION.—A facility constructed, expanded, modified, refurbished, or re-equipped with proceeds from a loan made or guaranteed under this section may be in a non-rural area if—

(i) the primary use of the loan involved is for the facility, and the facility will increase the customer base or revenue returns of livestock and poultry producers that are located within 300 miles of the facility;

(ii) the loan involved will be used to increase the capacity in livestock and poultry processing in a region; and

(iii) the principal amount of the loan involved does not exceed \$50,000,000.

(C) RURAL AREA DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “rural area” has the meaning given the term in section 343(a)(13) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1991(a)(13)).

(3) LIMITATIONS.—

(A) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF LOAN INVOLVED.—A loan of more than \$50,000,000 may not be made or guaranteed under this section.

(B) LIMITATION ON ELIGIBILITY.—A loan may not be made or guaranteed under this section to an entity that is owned in partnership or in whole by—

(i) a foreign entity; or

(ii) an entity that currently processes over 5 percent of the daily harvest of any species.

(c) SPECIAL RULES APPLICABLE WITH RESPECT TO COOPERATIVES.—

(1) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF LOAN INVOLVED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (b)(3), a loan of not more than \$100,000,000 may be made or guaranteed for a cooperative organization under this section.

(B) CONDITIONS APPLICABLE IF LOAN INVOLVED IS FOR MORE THAN \$50,000,000.—A loan of more than \$50,000,000 may not be made or guaranteed for a cooperative organization under this section unless the loan is used to carry out a project that significantly increases the livestock and poultry processing in a region, where insufficient processing capacity exists, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) INTANGIBLE ASSETS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In determining whether a cooperative organization is eligible for a loan or guarantee under this section, the Secretary may consider the market value of a properly appraised brand name, patent, or trademark of the cooperative.

(B) ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE.—In the sole discretion of the Secretary, if the Secretary determines that the action would not create or otherwise contribute to an unreasonable risk of default or loss to the Federal Government, the Secretary may take accounts receivable as security for the obligations entered into in connection with a loan made or guaranteed under this section, and a borrower may use accounts receivable as collateral to secure such a loan.

(3) PURCHASE OF COOPERATIVE STOCK.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make or guarantee a loan in accordance with this section to an individual farmer or rancher for the purpose of purchasing capital stock of a farmer or rancher cooperative undertaking an eligible project under this section.

(B) PROCESSING CONTRACTS DURING INITIAL PERIOD.—A cooperative described in subparagraph (A) with respect to which a farmer or rancher receives a guarantee to purchase stock under subparagraph (A) may contract for services to fulfill any eligible purpose under this section, during the 5-year period beginning on the date the cooperative commences operations, in order to provide adequate time for the planning and construction of the processing facility of the cooperative.

(C) FINANCIAL INFORMATION.—A farmer or rancher from whom the Secretary requires financial information as a condition of making or guaranteeing a loan under subparagraph (A) shall provide the information in the manner generally required by commercial agricultural lenders in the geographical area in which the farmer or rancher is located.

(d) CONDITIONS APPLICABLE WITH RESPECT TO USING LOAN INVOLVED FOR REFINANCING.—A borrower may use 25 percent of a loan made or guaranteed under this section to refinance a loan made for a purpose described in subsection (a) if—

(1) the borrower is current and performing with respect to the loan to be refinanced;

(2) the borrower has not defaulted on any payment required to be made with respect to the loan to be refinanced;

(3) none of the collateral for the loan to be refinanced has been converted; and

(4) there is adequate security or full collateral for the loan to be refinanced.

(e) LOAN APPRAISAL.—The Secretary may require that any appraisal made in connection with a loan made or guaranteed under this section be conducted by a specialized appraiser that uses standards that are similar to standards used for similar purposes in the private sector, as determined by the Secretary.

(f) PREFERENCE.—In making or guaranteeing a loan under this section, the Secretary shall give a preference to applicants that have experience in livestock and poultry processing and can quickly scale-up to increase overall processing capacity in the region involved.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts otherwise available, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2025.

SEC. 702. NEW AND EXPANDING LIVESTOCK OR POULTRY PROCESSING GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to—

(1) expand, diversify, and increase capacity in livestock or poultry processing activities;

(2) improve compliance with livestock and poultry processing statutes (including the regulations issued thereunder), such as the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 661) and the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 454);

(3) identify and reduce barriers to entry for new livestock and poultry processors; or

(4) update, expand, or otherwise improve existing facilities.

(b) **ELIGIBLE GRANTEES.**—An entity shall be eligible for a grant under this section if the entity is—

- (1) a governmental entity;
- (2) a public, private, or cooperative organization organized on a for-profit or nonprofit basis; or
- (3) an Indian tribe on a Federal or State reservation or any other federally recognized Indian tribal group.

(c) **USE OF FUNDS.**—An entity to which a grant is made under this section may use the grant funds to establish or support new or expanded livestock or poultry processing activity, or other activity which will increase the customer base or revenue returns of livestock and poultry producers, by undertaking a project, that—

- (1) identifies and analyzes business opportunities, including feasibility studies as required for creditworthiness;
- (2) identifies, trains, and provides technical assistance to existing or prospective rural entrepreneurs and managers or processing facilities;
- (3) provides technical assistance to gain compliance with Federal, State, or local regulations;

(4) conducts regional, community, and local economic development planning and coordination, and leadership development; or

(5) establishes a center for training, technology, and trade that will provide training to livestock or poultry processing employees.

(d) **PREFERENCE.**—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give a preference to applicants that have experience in livestock and poultry processing and can quickly scale-up to increase overall processing capacity in the region involved.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—In addition to amounts otherwise available, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2025.

TITLE VIII—LOWER FOOD AND FUEL COSTS SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes, namely:

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PROCESSING, RESEARCH, AND MARKETING

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Office of the Secretary”, \$200,000,000, to remain available until expended, to carry out title IV Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act: Provided, That the Secretary may use up to 5 percent of amounts made available under this heading in this title for administrative costs, including salaries and expenses, research, data collection, and other associated costs, for carrying out such title IV: Provided further, That amounts made available for administrative costs pursuant to the preceding proviso may be transferred to “Rural Development Programs—Rural Development—Salaries and Expenses” for the purposes specified in such proviso.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 801. In addition to amounts otherwise available, there is appropriated to the Department of Agriculture, \$500,000,000, to remain available until expended, to carry out title II, of which up to 5 percent may be used by the Secretary to provide technical assistance under such title II of the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act.

SEC. 802. Each amount appropriated or made available by this title is in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year involved.

SEC. 803. Unless otherwise provided for by this title, the additional amounts appropriated by this title to appropriations accounts shall be available under the authorities and conditions applicable to such appropriations accounts for fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 804. Each amount provided by this title is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4001(a)(1) and section 4001(b) of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 805. (a) STATUTORY PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this title shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) **SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.**—The budgetary effects of this title shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress).

(c) **CLASSIFICATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105–217 and section 250(c)(7) and (c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects of this title shall be estimated for purposes of section 251 of such Act and as appropriations for discretionary accounts for purposes of the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

This title may be cited as the “Lower Food and Fuel Costs Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2022”.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. **DAVID SCOTT**) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. **THOMPSON**) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. **DAVID SCOTT**).

Mr. **DAVID SCOTT** of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 7606, the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act, and I encourage my colleagues to support this package that is comprised of multiple bills that our House Agriculture Committee has advanced in a strong, bipartisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the last 2 years have led to drastic fluctuations in prices. Whether you look at the ongoing impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic or the global disruptions associated with Putin’s war in Ukraine, American farmers, American ranchers, and consumers are, right now, facing terrible, increasing costs on the farm, at the grocery store, and at the gas station.

Our Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act tackles these price increases head on by increasing competition, options at the pump, and by providing needed support for America’s agriculture sector at every stop of our food supply chain.

Mr. Speaker, our package includes four main pillars.

One: Ensuring robust competition in the meat and poultry sector.

Two: Lowering costs at the grocery store by lowering costs for our farmers and ranchers.

Three: By empowering our farmers to help provide fuel choices and lower prices at our gas stations.

Four: Strengthening the food supply chain.

Going further into each of these pillars, first, this package will establish an Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters in the Agriculture Secretary’s office.

When we held a hearing, Mr. Speaker, it was a very powerful hearing. It was the largest viewing audience for a hearing in the history of our Agriculture Committee.

We heard overwhelming evidence that continuing the status quo when it comes to enforcement will not provide more desperately needed competition and fairness within our meat and poultry industries.

So we believe earnestly that the USDA and their expertise in agriculture issues gives them a strong footing to investigate the competitiveness in our meat and poultry sectors and to enforce existing laws to ensure a fair playing field for our family farmers, ranchers, and consumers.

Mr. Speaker, we were informed at that hearing that right now, we are losing 17,000 ranching farms every year. This has to stop.

Our bill also includes a bipartisan provision that will support the creation and expansion of processing capacity for small- and medium-sized producers to help alleviate this terrible, threatening consolidation just to a handful of four meatpacking companies. This is the core of this legislation.

Our second pillar addresses a key piece in the puzzle of rising prices. At the grocery store, there have been record increases in input costs for agricultural producers, with fertilizer prices for both specialty and row crop producers skyrocketing. This bill will help reduce their input costs so planning decisions are not impacted.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of fertilizer costs, it is very important for the Nation to know that right now, Russia produces and controls 66 percent of the fertilizer in the world. This needs to have serious, serious attention.

Our second pillar of this legislative package is the puzzle of rising prices.

Our third pillar addresses fuel costs, which is something that impacts everyone, whether you are paying more at the gas pump or seeing increasing prices in the grocery store from higher trucking and transportation costs.

This package addresses these concerns in a way that empowers our farmers and provides more choice and lower prices for our consumers at the gas pump and at the grocery store.

Mr. Speaker, our biofuels adoption and investment helps reduce our reliance on foreign oil and the supply shocks facing our gasoline supply, while also bolstering a revenue stream

for our farmers and producers across the country.

Bolstering our use of ethanol from E10 to E15 will not impact the environment, our Environmental Protection Agency confirms this, nor will it slow down the rollout of electric vehicles.

This vital package of bills makes much-needed improvements in our supply chain. A series of shocks to our beef supply chain, combined with a concentrated processing infrastructure, resulted in high prices for meat at our grocery stores and lower prices for our producers, farmers, and ranchers.

Specifically, one provision calls for the formation of an Agricultural and Food System Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response Task Force to examine our food supply chain and report back to us here in Congress on the strengths and the weaknesses that exist.

I am extremely proud of the work of our House Agriculture Committee members, both Democrats and Republicans, who have worked tirelessly to put this strong bipartisan bill together.

We have garnered for this bill extremely important bipartisan participation. This is what our Nation is hungry for; Democrats and Republicans working together to bring down these high costs for our food and our fuel. This bill is a bill that our American people want and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I note that several of the sections in this bill codify or are complementary to ongoing and planned programs that the Department of Agriculture is carrying out or planning to carry out with existing authorities and funding. The intent behind passage of this bill is to be additive to those efforts and is in no way intended to limit or pause those programs and efforts.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 7606 because, simply put, this bill does nothing in the immediate future to lower food and fuel costs.

Long before Russia's invasion of Ukraine, America's farm families and consumers were struggling with fractured supply chains, skyrocketing input costs, and historic levels of inflation, each of which continue to contribute to increased food prices and diminished inventories.

Despite these crises, Democrats have neglected to take serious action to incentivize increased American production. In fact, we are here today to debate a bill that compounds the situation, further limiting American farmers' abilities to meet global food demand and doubling down on the idea that more spending and big government will feed the world.

Adding insult to injury, the White House has been quick to blame the private sector and alleged industry concentration for the current crisis.

Economists across the spectrum—including former Obama and Clinton administration officials—have dismissed

the strategy as misleading, at best, or otherwise, blatantly political.

So it is not surprising that at the behest of the White House, we are debating a package where the anchor piece of legislation perpetuates a tired narrative of blame, duplicates existing authorities, ignores industry and producers, and undermines the Department of Justice.

It is also not surprising the party of defund the police also has become the party of more cops for cows. At every turn, this administration has obsessively pointed the finger at the packing industry, in particular, blaming them almost singlehandedly for rising food costs.

They have done so via blog posts, contrived public events, and press briefings, all without any acknowledgment of the culpability of their own reckless spending and heavy-handed regulatory agenda.

My Democratic colleagues have dutifully played along, executing sensationalized hearings and political theatrics designed to support unvetted and controversial bills.

Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder many of us question the seriousness of the bill before us today. If this were a serious exercise, my Democratic colleagues would not have paired such an egregious example of legislative overreach with several other very thoughtful, very bipartisan bills.

If this were a serious exercise, my Democrat colleagues would not have added two unvetted Democrat amendments that are more about political point-scoring than genuine near-term policy solutions.

If this were a serious exercise, my Democrat colleagues would have worked with Republicans to form a concrete, immediate policy solution with a chance of consideration in the Senate.

Now, I know both parties understand the gravity of these issues. While we may have disagreements on policy, I was confident that we could find common-ground solutions, if given the opportunity.

□ 0930

I am dumbfounded as to why Democratic leadership would choose this moment—when consumers are deciding between gas in their cars or food on their tables—as an attempt to score political points, especially on the heels of a nearly 9 percent increase in consumer prices, the worst this Nation has seen since the Carter administration.

So, Republicans forged ahead, and we developed solutions. Earlier this week, Leader MCCARTHY and I, along with nearly 100 of our Republican colleagues, sent a letter to President Biden outlining administrative actions that he could take immediately to mitigate rising input costs, and strengthen the role that American agriculture plays in global food stability.

And yesterday, I, along with many of those same Members, introduced H.R.

8069, the Reducing Farm Input Costs and Barriers to Domestic Production Act. This bill would reverse many of the more harmful regulatory burdens spearheaded by this administration, address escalating input costs, and provide certainty to farmers, ranchers, agribusinesses, and other entities across the food and agriculture supply chain.

Specifically, the bill provides relief from EPA's unprecedented actions related to pesticides and other vital crop protection tools; offers clarity related to WOTUS regulations; rescinds the SEC's harmful proposed rule on climate-related disclosures; reinstates the 2020 NEPA streamlining; and requires an economic analysis on the costs and the benefits of GIPSA rules. These are all actions which would provide immediate relief to our farm families and households across the globe, and they all were rejected by the Rules Committee majority as amendments to the bill before us.

The letter and this bill stand in stark contrast to what we have seen from the White House and the Democrats in Congress and their efforts to scapegoat private industry for skyrocketing gas prices and sustained supply chain failures.

So, in short, the crises we are facing cannot and will not be mitigated with unfunded mandates, duplicative authorities, politicized agencies, and Big Government, all of which are laced into H.R. 7606.

I remain opposed to this bill and the process which got us here but stand willing to work with my colleagues on commonsense, near-term solutions to provide immediate relief to farmers, ranchers, foresters, and American consumers.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 7606.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER), my good friend.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the opportunity to speak on this important bill, the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act.

American families are struggling. They are continuing to see rising gas prices even as oil and gas companies are making record profits.

Higher prices at the grocery store are making it harder to put food on the table, and a lot of this is because farmers are struggling with increasing fuel prices. Costs and availability of transportation to both domestic and export markets continue to be a challenge for the wheat, cherry, apple, and pear growers in my district.

This is a global problem, but it is a problem that we can take steps to ease right here at home. This bill provides the resources to do just that.

It addresses the cost of fuel by allowing year-round sales of higher ethanol blends, which are consistently less expensive than higher octane gas.

It addresses high food prices by helping farmers and helping our supply chain.

Fertilizer costs are at record highs since most of our fertilizer is typically sourced from Russia. This bill helps farmers spend less on inputs without lowering crop yields.

We are paying skyrocketing prices for meat at the grocery store, but farmers and ranchers don't see any of that additional profit because four companies control 80 percent of U.S. meat processing. That is unfair.

This bill expands the availability and capacity of meat processing and will create new jobs, provide more options for small- and medium-sized ranching operations, and help lower the cost of meat at the grocery store.

Finally, addressing the cost of trucking and transportation will help farmers get their crops to market.

The whole goal here is to make life a little easier for the people we represent, to help you fill up your tank and feed your family. As the only member on the House Agriculture Committee from the Northwest, I will continue to do all that I can to support farmers and lower costs for American families.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the former chairman of the full House Agriculture Committee, who continues to this day to be an incredible advocate for agriculture and a mentor of mine as I have worked my way into this leadership role.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7606 because American farmers and ranchers deserve real assistance, real relief, real policy solutions.

To understand my opposition, you must understand the part of the country that I represent and was raised in. The Third District of Oklahoma was the epicenter of the drought, the Dust Bowl, and the economic depression of the 1930s. This was a time when horrible weather conditions collided with misguided Federal ag and misguided Federal monetary policy to create an environment that profoundly changed the region that my family has called home for over 120 years.

I was raised on these stories, and it was their experiences that shaped my view on what the role of the Federal Government should be. The Federal Government should be passing and enacting policies that help people and businesses, not hinder them. Unfortunately, the Biden administration and House Democrats seem to not hold that same view.

During the past 5 years, American farmers and ranchers have weathered

volatile world markets, devastating natural disasters, prolonged droughts, supply chain disruptions, ever-increasing input costs, and soaring inflation.

Yet, the only thing the Biden administration and House Democrats seem interested in doing is increasing regulatory burdens, limiting access to fuel, and passing spending packages that fuel inflation.

Mr. Speaker, if House Democrats were truly interested in providing relief for American farmers and ranchers, they would join my Republican colleagues and me in calling for the Biden administration to reinstate the Trump-era Waters of the United States rule and rescind the Biden administration's WOTUS rule.

If Democrats were interested in reducing the cost of farm inputs like fertilizer and fuel, they would work with us to restore and expand domestic energy production. They would join us in calling for the Biden administration to rescind the SEC's proposed rule on climate-related disclosure.

This rule is not only a ploy to divert capital away from traditional energy investments, it also requires farmers, regardless of size, to track and report environmental data to public companies with which they work.

Finally, House Democrats are touting this bill as a solution to the issue of consolidation in the meatpacking industry. As we all know, DOJ—yes, the Department of Justice—is in the middle of an ongoing investigation into the meatpacking industry, an investigation that was launched under the Trump administration.

I feel strongly that if there is collusion, manipulation, or other wrongdoing by packers, then the existing law should be enforced under the existing authorities at USDA and DOJ. There are civil and criminal penalties if violations are found. Changing those authorities or laws in the middle of an ongoing investigation only helps to confuse and complicate the eventual DOJ findings.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this messaging bill and join with me in calling for real solutions for American farmers and ranchers.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act.

Across the country, workers are calling out sick because of COVID, truck deliveries and other shipments are facing delays, and people are panic-buying, all leading to product shortages and soaring prices.

Yet, while we know the COVID-19 pandemic has undoubtedly challenged our Nation's supply chain, we also know there are systemic imbalances in our economy. Decreased competition, driven by market concentration, has allowed companies to further drive up costs and their profits at the expense of

hardworking Americans in one of our most vulnerable moments.

In the beef-processing market, for example, four dominant companies control 85 percent of the market. The four largest poultry processing companies made up more than half of the market in 2015, up from 35 percent of the market in 1986.

We have seen this trend all across our economy, as large corporations have squeezed out independent businesses, eliminating competition. As a result, hardworking Americans throughout this country are paying more as food prices skyrocket, particularly for meat.

Provisions included in the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act will help us tackle this very issue and help bring prices down across the board.

The Meat and Poultry Special Investigator Act and the Butcher Block Act, for example, will help strengthen our investigatory and enforcement tools to address market competition issues while also investing in additional meat processing capacity.

The PRECISE Act will improve farming efficiency and help ensure farmers' resiliency to future disruptions in fertilizer supply.

The Renewable Fuel Infrastructure Investment and Market Expansion Act and the Year-Round Fuel Choice Act will help drive down prices at the pump for Americans and increase available fuel supply.

These are just a few of the provisions in this comprehensive package that will help ease the economic burden on American families and help create an economy that works for all of us.

I urge my colleagues to come together to help hardworking Americans by driving down these costs and supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think we should see an extension, a little bigger of that poster that we saw there. That concentration occurred because of exactly what we are seeing today of government and Democrats leveling regulations. It was regulations that caused the concentration within the meatpacking industry. What happened when you put on more regulations, small- and medium-sized processors weren't able to continue to work. They couldn't cope with the compliance costs. They just couldn't handle those increased regulations.

Today, we are seeing not just additional regulations, but a whole new police officer being created under the poison pill within this legislation, special investigator bill.

I would argue that maybe we ought to blow that chart up a little more so we can see and project just how much more concentration occurs when we force more small- and medium-sized processors out of the business. It will result in increased concentration with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN), a

great member of the Agriculture Committee who represents the Big First Congressional District.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 7606.

I support our country's farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers because they are the lifeblood of America. They keep us food and fuel secure and therefore free and self-determining as a Nation.

I cosponsor the Year-Round Fuel Choice Act, which would address limitations on Reid vapor pressure and allow for producers to supply, and consumers to purchase, E15 year-round. I have supported this measure long before my time in Congress, and I will continue to be a strong proponent of year-round E15. A temporary waiver is not enough. We must make this decision permanent and provide certainty to producers. That bill is now part of H.R. 7606.

I cosponsor the Butcher Block Act, which would codify the authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants and loans to expand meat and poultry processing capacity. I support consumer choice. That bill is now part of H.R. 7606.

In the House Agriculture Committee, I voted in favor of four other bills that are now part of H.R. 7606, but today's vote is disappointing because House Democrats ignored an effort made by Mr. DAVIS and others, one I am proud to cosponsor, to include an amendment separating these good pro-agriculture bills from a poison pill. Included in H.R. 7606 is a provision that would create a politically charged special investigator office at the U.S. Department of Agriculture to investigate and prosecute food producers in America.

You heard that right. The original H.R. 7606 and a provision in today's so-called Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act would create a new office at USDA to investigate and prosecute the people who work to feed us. I represent the Big First District of Kansas, which ranks number one in the country for the value of sales of cattle and calves at more than \$9 billion annually. We see the entire beef supply chain in the Big First, from cow-calf producers to cattle feeders and packers. Under the Packers and Stockyards Division at USDA, all of those players, all of them, are already subject to strict inspection. Under H.R. 7606, they would be subject to a type of politically charged scrutiny we expect of no other related business.

Do you think that a Democratic-controlled Congress and USDA would stop there? No. H.R. 7606 would set the horrible precedent for political administrations to inspect and prosecute anything and anyone they disagree with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, today it is packing facilities, tomorrow it is corn-

fields and biofuel facilities, or wheat growers and milling stations. I support farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers in this country, and I am disappointed this poison pill is included.

□ 0945

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to clear up something that the gentleman just said. It is very important. The United States Department of Agriculture is the proper source to deal with this investigation. It needs to be investigated per the will of the American people, and there is no agency better equipped, better qualified, to find out what is going wrong.

According to the USDA, the language is clear on the special investigator being a career employee. It only specifies that the position be appointed by the Secretary and based on the qualifications of the individual.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG), a member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, Americans across the country are justifiably frustrated by the higher prices they are experiencing at the pump, in the grocery store, and across the board.

Right now, working families in every district across this country are crying out for relief. They are tired of political games, and they are tired of partisan attacks. Our constituents don't want Congress in a food fight. They want compromise, and they want solutions.

My friends, today, we have a bipartisan, commonsense solution at our fingertips.

The Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act will lift up our constituents by lowering prices at the grocery store aisle and at the pump and creating a situation where we are seen as acting together.

My provision, the Year-Round Fuel Choice Act, will allow for the year-round sale of homegrown biofuels, which can sell for as much as 40 cents less per gallon than traditional gasoline. Why would we deny that low-cost alternative to working families who are so desperate for savings?

My Strengthening the Agriculture and Food Supply Chain Act will help lower prices at the grocery store by getting products from ships to shelves faster and shoring up our food supply chain for future generations. My friends, why would we deny these critical savings to our constituents who are simply trying to put food on the table?

The American people want action. They are calling for us to use every tool at our disposal to fight inflation and lower costs. We must respond to their call.

I appreciate the support of this package from my Democratic colleagues and many of my Republican colleagues, and I encourage all of you to vote "yes."

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

During the recent packer hearing, Chairman SCOTT mentioned that he used a chart compiled of what really was cherry-picked data with zero context to accuse all four of the major beef packing CEOs of price-fixing and collusion.

The packing executives explained the multitudes of supply and demand dynamics supporting the data, including the cyclical ebbs and flows of cattle production. Each of them denied the chairman's accusation under oath.

Despite their denial, this week at the Rules Committee, the chairman accused the packers of lying under oath. According to the chairman, a price-fixing scheme is the only plausible explanation for increased meat prices. It is no wonder I have serious doubts about this administration's ability to objectively carry out these new authorities.

I agree with the chairman, who is a dear friend. We work well together on well over 99 percent of everything that we engage on, just not this particular poison pill today. USDA is the right place to be the cop on the beat for this. In fact, they already are.

USDA already has an entire Packers and Stockyards Division charged with enforcing the Packers and Stockyard Act that has been in place since the 1930s. Based on the latest available data, they have filed and closed almost 1,900 cases just in 2020 alone. The division already consists of a team of seasoned attorneys, market specialists, and auditors, and it has the option to pursue administrative enforcement through USDA's Office of General Counsel before an administrative law judge or through the Department of Justice in Federal court.

I agree the USDA is the place for oversight of the packing industry, and it is already in place. This duplicative mandate with all the issues it brings is not warranted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), the vice ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I think the American people need to understand two things. One, if you eat, you are involved in agriculture. And, two, food security is national security. So, we keep those things in mind as we have this conversation today. Everyone in this room is involved in agriculture.

Despite that, we have before us today a bill that makes it more difficult for our farmers and ranchers to carry out their primary mission, which is to feed, clothe, and shelter 98 percent of the population that is not engaged in agriculture. Two percent of Americans provide for 100 percent of Americans and the rest of the world. This bill doesn't truly address the challenges that they face every day.

Democrats would rather demonize producers in the private sector instead of taking responsibility for the inflation that is changing the lives of our

constituents every day everywhere in the country. Every day, our world becomes more globalized and our economies become more interconnected. As a result, the need for food security grows.

One day, Russia is weaponizing food in Ukraine, and the next day, China is buying pieces of the American agriculture supply chain.

I have said it before and will say it again: Agriculture security is national security, and we can no longer afford to stand by while our adversaries exploit the supply chain and American food security flounders under continued inflation inflicted by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on H.R. 7606. For those of us who represent rural constituents, this should be the easiest “no” vote you ever make.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me clarify something the ranking member said. Yes, I was able to bring in all four CEOs of our meatpacking companies, and we were very grateful that they accepted our invitation. But our ranking member made a mistake. It wasn’t all four that said in answer to my question about whether or not they agreed or had any agreement on pricing in our meat industry. Three said no; one said, “Not to my knowledge.”

Now, you must understand what we are dealing with here and why just that reply from them requires an investigation. That is what we are here for. That is why we did the hearing, to bring those parties in.

We must act, Mr. Speaker. As I said before, we cannot continue to lose 17,000 ranchers and farmers. Also, so many of them, thousands of them, have not made a profit in 5 years. We have a problem.

In a report, the GAO noted that the USDA’s investigations were planned and conducted primarily by economists, without the formal involvement of attorneys from USDA’s Office of General Counsel, or the OGC. As a result, a legal perspective that focused on assessing potential violations was generally absent when investigations were initiated and conducted. This is precisely why the special investigator bill is so important, because it alleviates an issue that has not had enough scrutiny and ensures that attorneys will be responsible for looking into possible violations.

The GAO also found that the USDA’s Packers and Stockyards Act, PSA, investigations had not modernized to keep up with today’s complex, competition-related concerns, with consolidation at the heart of this issue, nor had it implemented previous recommendations. It also recommended that GIPSA and USDA’s Office of General Counsel work more closely together.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAL-

LONE), the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker from New Jersey, I thank Chairman SCOTT for the time and all he has been doing with his committee to put this excellent bill together.

Today, once again, in my opinion, the House is taking action to fight high gas prices and protect consumers by empowering farmers to provide homegrown fuel choices at the pump, an option that costs consumers 40 cents less per gallon.

At a time when Americans are paying record-high prices for gas, Big Oil continues to exploit market instability caused by Russia’s invasion of Ukraine to rake in record profits.

Big Oil companies collectively made \$41 billion in profits during the first quarter of this year. Some of these were record highs; others were the highest profits in over a decade.

It is abundantly clear that Big Oil companies are more interested in funneling billions in profits to their shareholders and executives than in addressing record-high gas prices for American consumers.

The House has to act, Mr. Speaker, to protect American families from this profiteering. That is why we are here today, to preserve and expand the availability of a cheaper and cleaner fuel option for the driving public.

The Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act combats fuel prices by allowing for the voluntary, year-round sale of gasoline containing 15 percent ethanol, known as E15 or Unleaded 88. Blending more biofuels like ethanol into gasoline displaces demand for petroleum, helping to bring down gas prices for consumers.

Today, drivers are paying, on average, about 40 cents less per gallon to fill up their tanks with E15. This fuel provides significant savings for families during the summer driving season. Let’s ensure it continues to be available at gas stations across the country.

Increasing the availability of E15 protects Americans from volatile global oil markets and eases the grip Big Oil has on American drivers.

By relying more on homegrown biofuels and less on fossil fuels, this legislation insulates American drivers from dramatic global price fluctuations, enhances our national security, creates local jobs, and bolsters true energy independence. It is a win-win across the board. It is one of the most powerful tools in our fight against global price shocks and oil and gas profiteering.

E15 is also a cleaner fuel option that emits less carbon pollution and burns cleaner than regular gasoline. Today’s vote is also part of our broader effort to bring down prices while cutting climate pollution.

I thank Representatives CRAIG and AXNE for their leadership on preserving and expanding access to E15 across the country and Chairman SCOTT, once again, for including these critical E15 provisions in this package.

Mr. Speaker, let’s help bring down gas prices at the pump, strengthen our Nation’s rural communities, and break the grip of Big Oil by passing the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER), a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, listening to the debate this morning reminds me of something President Ronald Reagan once said. He said: Our friends on the other side of the aisle, they know so much that just isn’t so.

How interesting it is that the title of this package is the exact opposite of what this legislation is going to do. It will do nothing to bring down the cost of food and energy. Instead, it is making excuses for the crises caused by the Biden administration’s attacks on American agriculture and energy.

Now, there are a few good pieces of bipartisan legislation in this package, but our friends on the other side of the aisle refuse to allow these bills to receive their individual votes. Instead, they are using the good provisions here as pawns in their political messaging.

□ 1000

One of the really harmful bills in this package, as has been discussed, the Meat and Poultry Special Investigator Act, creates a duplicative office within the USDA that will only add to the regulatory burden of our food processors across the country, and that is going to increase costs.

The investigator would be granted independent litigation authority, allowing for civil suits against packers at the whim of the Secretary without even consulting with the DOJ. It should be noted, the DOJ already launched an investigation into the “Big Four” for anticompetitive practices in May of 2020 and has declined to provide Congress with an update even 2 years into that investigation.

The bottom line is increasing regulation will raise food prices, not make them more affordable. Our farm families need inputs at a fair price. They need diesel prices to come down. They need to be able to produce the food to feed this country and the world without the government making it harder and harder day in and day out. That is why this package must be defeated.

Rather than more regulation, we must unleash the full ability of American production. We must work for our farm families and do what is right and defeat this bill.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER), who is also the chair of our Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of my legislation, H.R. 7606, the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act.

Congress cannot shy away from addressing the urgent economic challenges that face our local communities

and our entire country, and that challenge continues to be inflation. We know how rising prices, consolidation across industries, and supply chain challenges are impacting America's families, businesses, and seniors, and as lawmakers, our job is to listen to the people we represent and then respond with legislation that can help solve those problems.

Indeed, this package, the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act, is just that. It is a compilation of bills put together by lawmakers who are responding to their constituents. I have heard from the other side of the aisle that, in fact, it would have been nice if we came together in a bipartisan way. So I would note that my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle from Iowa, Arkansas, New York, Nebraska, Ohio, Illinois, South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota, Illinois, Illinois, Iowa, Tennessee—it feels like I am practicing State capitals with my fifth grader—Nebraska, Illinois, Kansas, Colorado, Nebraska, South Dakota, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota, Illinois, Nebraska, South Dakota, Iowa, Iowa, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Indiana, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Florida, Wyoming, Virginia, Minnesota, each of these are individual Members of Congress from the Republican side of the aisle who are leading on this issue.

In fact, two of the bills in this package are led by our Republican colleagues, and I am proud that I have joined with Congressman DUSTY JOHNSON in support of the bipartisan Butcher Block Act. I am proud to be his co-lead as he leads that important piece of legislation. It is a commonsense step toward allowing American processors the ability to expand their operations, launch a new business or just make sure they are keeping—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, this is the first step towards lowering meat prices, but in addition to increasing processing capacity for American cattlemen and poultry producers, we need to go after anticompetitive practices in the meat industry.

That is why I am proud that this package also includes the bipartisan Meat and Poultry Special Investigator Act. The bill would establish a special investigator at USDA to investigate violations of our existing antitrust laws that have been on the books for more than 100 years, and I thank Congresswoman MILLER-MEEKS for co-leading this effort.

This bill has broad bipartisan support and bicameral support. So I thank Senator JON TESTER, Senator GRASSLEY, Republican; Senator JOHN THUNE, Republican; Senator HOEVEN, Republican;

and Senator ROUNDS, Republican, for joining with us in pushing this bill forward. It has support from the U.S. Cattlemen's Association, and this bill is responsive to the needs of the people I represent because the Virginia Cattlemen's Association supports this bill, as does the National Farmers Union.

Americans want lower meat prices both now and in the future. They want lower gas prices and to make biofuels accessible to more Americans. We have the opportunity to do that. I urge my colleagues to support this package.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this bill.

To suggest that this bill is a collaborative effort is simply inaccurate. There could be a number of other ways to describe that as well, but it is unfortunate that we are at a place where we could have had an opportunity to advance some good legislation.

I am a supporter of the E15 bill. I have done a lot of work on this, and not just because gas prices are high right now, but because I think that E15 and allowing consumers more choices at the pump would actually engage consumers as it relates to energy policy and energy products.

I do have serious concerns, though, as others have mentioned, about provisions that the Democrats insisted be included in this bill, like the new, very duplicative investigative authority at USDA.

Even more concerning to me is Democrats' continued strategy of seeking to blame others for the situation on energy and the cost of virtually everything in our economy rather than acknowledging that President Biden's economic policies have actually created this mess.

Biden stimulus dollars have driven inflation. Biden's stimulus dollars paid Americans not to return to work, therefore, worsening our supply chain crisis. The President's executive orders canceling new lease options and shutting down the Keystone XL pipeline have certainly contributed to increased gas prices.

Real inflation relief legislation would actually reign in spending, get more Americans back to work, provide broad regulatory relief, and increase domestic energy production. This bill is certainly not it.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor. I commend him and the members of the committee, as we just heard from Congresswoman SPANBERGER, for their very important work recognizing the needs of America's working families with their kitch-

en table issues, recognizing the needs in rural America for us to have legislation that strengthens rural America's hand in the decisions that we make as we go forward.

Mr. Speaker, as we gather here, the war continues in Ukraine. It is an unprovoked, outrageous act of aggression on the part of Putin and Russia invading the territorial borders of Ukraine.

At the same time, doing that has driven up prices here at home, driven up prices at the pump; it is a Putin price at the pump. That is the main reason, in the short period of time following the invasion of Ukraine, the price at the pump went up its highest amount in a very long time.

Russia is also a source of fertilizer, a big source of fertilizer to our country, and of course, diminishing the supply coming in raises the cost of fertilizer and contributes to the cost for our farmers, and of course, then contributes to the price of food at the grocery store. It is an important kitchen table issue.

Putin's price at the pump is exacerbating the skyrocketing costs weighing heavily on our families. Again, since Russia began its saber-rattling against Ukraine, gas prices in many places went up \$2 per gallon.

Meanwhile, the World Bank reports that global food prices in March and April spiked 16 percent over the 2 months prior, and while Putin works to fuel inflation today, the Democratic House—hopefully, in a bipartisan way—takes a strong step to bring down crucial kitchen table costs at the pump and grocery store and across the board.

Our Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act does precisely what the name suggests in three major areas.

First, the bill brings down the costs for farmers in the field. As we know, oil, gasoline is an important factor of production for farmers in order for them to produce. The war in Ukraine has restricted the supply of fertilizer, as I mentioned, and sent the costs through the roof. By taking action to lower the costs on the farm, we lower the costs on the shelf in the grocery store and on the kitchen table.

Second, this bill bolsters competition in the meatpacking industry, and I thank Mr. SCOTT for his leadership. Cracking down on the market power of big conglomerates and increasing competition will ensure ranchers get a fair deal for their livestock while families get a good price for meat and poultry.

Third, this bill will help make cheaper, cleaner homegrown biofuels more widely available. This summer drivers who choose to fill up with Unleaded 88 could save an average of 40 cents a gallon, and by making this fuel more widely available it will unleash the power of America's farmers to help break the grip of foreign autocrats on energy markets; lower gas prices, while keeping our dollars here at home; and reduce pollution because biofuels are cleaner than petroleum.

Today's action to lower food and fuel costs is the latest manifestation of House Democrats' unyielding commitment to fight inflation.

Last month, our majority voted to hold Big Oil accountable for price gouging and war profiteering, which has kept energy prices excessively high.

This week, we passed legislation to crack down on exorbitant ocean shipping fees, leveling the playing field for American businesses and lowering costs for American consumers. Proudly today, President Biden will sign this legislation into law. It is called the Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 2022.

As we speak, the Congress is hard at work on a bold, bipartisan, bicameral competitiveness package to make more goods in America; strengthen our supply chains; diversify our STEM workforce; and reinvigorate research and development. We look forward to sending this strong cost-cutting legislation to the President's desk.

Here is the thing: Inflation springs from higher costs. Higher costs spring from shorter supply. Shorter supply is there because of COVID preventing certain products from coming into our country, so short supply. Short supply of factors of production coming into our country.

That is why the COMPETES Act is so important because it will make us more independent, more self-sufficient on the products we need; for example, chips. Chips are a very important part of that bill. To make a car it takes 1,000 chips; an electric car, 2,000 chips. But we can't do that manufacturing unless we have chips, and if other countries are saving chips for themselves at home or the high fees of transporting them make it just unaffordable to people, we need to make these chips at home, and that is what the COMPETES Act enables us to do.

So lowering costs for our families; when we ran in 2018—just to bring back promises made—we said we were going to lower costs by lowering the costs of prescription drugs, and that is what we are in the midst of doing now. We are going to lower costs in every way for America's working families. That is what this legislation does here.

We are going to have bigger paychecks. And we have had, since President Biden took office, working with the private sector and the nonprofit sector and the public sector, 8 million jobs have been created. Unemployment has been cut in half. Wages have gone up. That also contributes to inflation, which must be addressed, and this legislation is part of doing that.

So this legislation is a strong step in that direction, and I salute the relentless leadership of the Agriculture chair, DAVID SCOTT, and the Energy and Commerce chair, FRANK PALLONE, who is an important part of this, as well as Representatives SPANBERGER, CRAIG, AXNE, and HARDER and the dedicated staff of both committees.

Together, they have assembled a package of popular bipartisan legisla-

tion with a laser focus on fighting inflation.

□ 1015

Make no mistake, a vote against this bill is a vote to keep the cost of gas and groceries high, when we can do just the opposite by voting for it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong "yes" vote.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE), a strong agriculture advocate and a leader in agriculture.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear: just because Democrats named their bill the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act does not mean this bill will achieve that goal.

The only thing it really achieves is a campaign talking point for Democrats responding to constituents frustrated with higher prices at the grocery store and the gas station caused by their reckless spending.

Instead of wasting our valuable time debating this bill that will never become law, we should pass H.R. 8069, the Reducing Farm Input Costs and Barriers to Production Act, introduced by Ranking Member THOMPSON, which includes real, immediate solutions our farmers, ranchers, and producers support.

His bill, which I am proud to support, would reverse the EPA's reckless actions related to crop production tools, reverse the Biden administration's confusing and disastrous changes to the Waters of the United States rule, and would withdraw the SEC's ludicrous ESG rule on climate-related disclosures, an action that has received bipartisan support.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, civilians and soldiers are dying in Ukraine and the American people are feeling it in their pocket, even as they rise up to support democracy. The American people know there is a problem.

As we stand on the floor today, the good news is that Democrats care. That is why we rise today to offer the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act because the American people see it. They see it at the gas station on their way home or to work, they see it at the grocery store when their carts are half empty, and they see it with their hard-earned paychecks that don't meet what they need. Inflation—they know about it.

You know what, they are looking for a fighting team like the Democrats to make something happen, not a whining, complaining, get-nothing-done. In my community, the interest rates are 8.5 percent of the cost of goods in Houston, Texas. I am not going home and telling them that we are out here working. I ask for our colleagues to recognize the importance of lowering costs at the grocery store, ensuring ro-

bust competition, and helping farmers. Let us fight to pass this bill. We care.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7606, the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act, that would shore up the food and agriculture supply chain, assure fair competition in the meat and poultry sectors, and lower food and gasoline costs to the American consumer.

The American people know that there is a problem.

They see it.

They see it at the gas station on their way home from work.

They see it when they leave the grocery store with a half empty cart.

They see it when their hard-earned paychecks stretch less and less.

Inflation rose by 8.6 percent in May, a 40-year high.

The price of all goods in the Houston metro area have jumped by 8.5 percent since April 2021—the highest year-over-year jump since 1981.

My constituents aren't suddenly making 8.5 percent more than they did a year ago, mind you.

No, they are now going without.

The cost of the most basic commodities—electricity, oil, meats, and dairy—have gone up at alarming rates, and our people are disproportionately bearing the burden of inflation.

An income that previously fed and housed a family, provided life-supporting medication, and got people to work and back is now capable of paying only half of those bills.

Our constituents are forced to choose between picking up a prescription or paying for childcare, between keeping the lights on and keeping the pantry full.

These are not choices American families should have to make.

Congress must act to rebalance the financial scales in this country.

This package includes the following bills:

H.R. 7606—"Meat and Poultry Special Investigators Act" which Establishes an Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters in the Agriculture Secretary's Office.

H.R. 7764—"To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to provide additional payments under the Environmental Quality Incentives Program for implementation of nutrient management practices" which would provide additional assistance to specialty and row crop producers who undertake USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service practice standards to use fertilizers more efficiently, do soil testing, or seek out other sources of plant nutrients.

H.R. 2518—"PRECISE Act—Producing Responsible Energy and Conservation Incentives and Solutions for the Environment" which explicitly states precision agriculture eligibility in Environmental Quality Incentive Program (EQIP) and Conservation Stewardship Program, allows a producer who receives payments under EQIP to also receive a conservation loan guarantee, and allows up to a 90 percent cost share for precision agriculture under EQIP.

H.R. 1542—"Renewable Fuel Infrastructure Investment and Market Expansion Act of 2021" which would deploy additional storage and dispensing equipment to ensure that higher ethanol blends and other biofuels are more readily available across the country.

H.R. 4410—"Year-Round Fuel Choice Act of 2021" which would build on a recent Biden Administration action allowing voluntary year-

round sale of gasoline containing 15 percent ethanol, known as E-15 or Unleaded 88.

H.R. 7675—“Strengthening the Agriculture and Food Supply Chain Act” which would create an Agricultural and Food System Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response Task Force at USDA, headed by a Special Advisor on Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response.

H.R. 4140—“Butcher Block Act” which would provide assistance to create new and expand current local and regional livestock and meat processing capacity with direct or guaranteed loans.

From the soil in which our farmers plant their seeds, to the fuel that transports vegetables to our grocers, to the very meat on our tables, this package will enact positive legislation that the American people will be able to see.

The spike in food and energy prices are at the center of inflation.

Beginning at the root, as producers across the country face skyrocketing fertilizer prices, we must help producers reduce their input costs so planting decisions are not impacted.

Expanding access to precision agriculture technology is critical now, as we face climate change and fertilizer costs that have doubled or almost tripled.

Breakdowns and bottlenecks in the food and agriculture supply chain, resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, have been well documented and have caused significant losses and concerns to our agricultural constituents.

Over the last few decades, there has been an influx of domination in the meat packing industry by four large companies resulting in raised prices and reduced options for products.

COVID-19 highlighted the country's dangerous reliance on large beef plants run by the four biggest processors.

The pandemic caused slaughterhouses nationwide to close to contain outbreaks of the virus among workers.

Ranchers were and still are frustrated that cattle prices drop when major plants close, while meat companies still benefit from rising meat prices.

Farmers' share of profits have gone down, while American consumers continue to pay more, with meat prices being the single largest contributor to the rising cost of food people consume at home.

A fair and competitive market is fundamental to a well-functioning U.S. economy.

When firms have to compete for customers, it leads to lower prices, higher quality goods and services, greater variety, and more innovation.

Strengthening enforcement of the Packer and Stockyards Act will lead to greater competition in the meat and poultry processing, fairer access to markets for producers, and more price stability for consumers.

Increased processing capacity will alleviate some supply chain bottlenecks and provide producers with more options to market their cattle and receive a fair price.

The supply chain will be more resilient and competitive long term as a result.

With regard to our energy and fuel crisis, further use of biofuels will reduce prices at the pump for all Americans and increase the supply of fuel available.

Biofuels adoption and investment helps reduce our reliance on foreign oil and the supply

shocks facing our gasoline supply while also bolstering a revenue stream for farmers across the country.

E-10 gasoline, gasoline containing 10 percent ethanol, is currently sold year-round, while the sale of E-15 gasoline, gasoline containing 15 percent ethanol, is dependent on receiving special waivers despite both having very similar emission profiles when it comes to smog formation.

Year-round sale of gasoline containing 15 percent ethanol (E-15) will reduce the price at the pump for American drivers by giving consumers the choice to purchase a fuel that is substantially cheaper than standard gasoline.

The American people need legislative intervention in a market that is increasingly becoming more concentrated and suffering from supply chain disruptions.

This package provides small concrete actions that will invoke change and provide both short-term immediate and long-term continuous relief.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 7606, the Lower Food and Fuel Cost Act.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to a serious issue facing all of rural America: the Biden administration and the radical left's war on agriculture.

Today, the House will vote on H.R. 7606, which will exacerbate fractured supply chains, skyrocketing input costs, and historic levels of inflation, all of which are hammering American consumers.

This bill is the latest attempt to scapegoat private industry rather than address the real needs and concerns of farmers, ranchers, and rural Americans. We know the Biden administration and my colleagues across the aisle see Americans in the oil and gas industry as the enemy, and I truly believe they now see farmers and ranchers as the enemy, too.

Mr. Speaker, I want my constituents back home in Texas to know that this is something I am fighting for every day. I represent the number one ag district in the State of Texas, and farmers and ranchers in my district are experiencing out-of-control input costs for fertilizer, fuel, and basic parts for equipment. I can assure you the legislation we are voting on today will make that worse.

A spending and regulatory agenda that compounds the situation further limits American ag industry's ability to meet global food demands is not the answer.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HARDER), a member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today frustrated, and to be honest, just plain tired.

For months now, my community has been paying over \$6 a gallon for gas and \$5 for a jug of milk. Prices are out of control, and it is crushing us. I talked to a neighbor the other day and she

told me she is going to have to choose between picking her kids up from school and driving herself to work, if gas prices stay this high.

Families in my neighborhood don't have the luxury of sitting around while politicians do nothing. Today, we have a chance to actually help by passing our Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act.

This package includes my bill, which provides funding for farmers to implement nutrient management programs. These programs will help lower the cost of growing food for our farmers, so prices go back to normal at the grocery store.

Helping farmers lower costs while cutting gas prices for our families is common sense. It is beyond time that Congress put politics aside and actually listen to what our communities need. This isn't rocket science. They are asking for the government to do its job and bring these prices back down to Earth.

Mr. Speaker, I hope common sense prevails today, and let's pass this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), a great member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in disbelief at how Washington is trying to run this economy. That is the reason I ran for office because things were so bad, and it was impossible to grow your business.

I am reminded of what we actually did when we had the House, and the Congress, and the White House. We passed the Constitutional Review Act. Through that act, we got no help from the other side, and then we passed some tax reform to give people more money to invest in their businesses.

Let me tell you what happened. For the first time in my life we became energy independent. For the first time we became an energy power. We had more jobs than people looking for jobs. So what happened now? Joe Biden was the Vice-President when I was elected. He is now the President. All those executive orders he signed stopped everything we did to put this country on the right track.

Mr. Speaker, I am tired of this. I demand immediately that we stop this war on American energy that is driving up costs and stop overregulating our ag producers.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman has done a wonderful job as the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and I know that you are working together to bring people together. One of the things that I most admire about Chairman SCOTT is that he wants to have a bipartisan result coming out of his committee, and I think in this bill he has.

Mr. Speaker, every day Americans across the country must contend with

the rising prices caused by inflation. Whenever they pull up to the gas pump, they face the repercussions of Vladimir Putin's criminal invasion of Ukraine, which has made gas prices skyrocket—not just because of the sanctions, not because of Russia's production, but because of the lack of confidence in the future that this war has caused.

Whenever our people go to the grocery store, they suffer the consequences of the havoc that the COVID-19 pandemic has inflicted on global supply chains. Unfortunately, we cannot erase the past crises that led to our current economic situation.

I say to the Members of this Congress that we can take the meaningful steps today to lower prices for consumers and to stimulate America's economy in the weeks and months to come. That is why House Democrats are focusing all week on easing inflation and bringing costs down. I know that is what my Republican colleagues want to do as well.

While this may not be a perfect alternative—there are no perfect alternatives—this is a positive step toward decreasing the costs to our people of things that they must buy: fuel and food. To support that mission, I am proud to bring the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act to the floor today, at Mr. SCOTT's request.

America's farmers and ranchers have long fed our Nation, and indeed, much of the world. Despite their essential work, however, they have often struggled to turn a reliable profit in recent years because of rising expenses, associated particularly with fertilizer—the costs of which have gone up very substantially as a result of the crisis that we confront.

By making fertilizer more affordable and by improving farmers' access to loans for precision agricultural technology, this legislation will help lower these production costs, which burden smaller farmers and contribute to higher consumer food prices.

Additionally, this bill will lower gas prices by increasing biofuel adoption and investment, and by giving consumers greater fuel choices at the pump.

Lack of competition in the meat and poultry processing industries has also jeopardized many of our family farmers and the people they feed. Competition is the essence of a free market. Competition is the essence of establishing prices that are reasonable and fair, both to producers and to consumers.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will help level that playing field for small and independent producers trying to break into the industry, which will both boost our meat processing capacity and stoke healthy competition and innovation, which both sides of the aisle believe is the way we have created this extraordinary economy we know as the American economy: competition and free markets.

Similarly, this bill establishes a dedicated office within the Department of

Agriculture to strengthen enforcement of existing antitrust authorities to consult on trade practices, ensuring a fairer, more competitive industry that works better for consumers.

We know that if just a few producers have a monopoly—and that is one of the problems with oil prices. We have OPEC nations who have constricted supply when demand was up. What inevitably happens in a free market? Prices rise.

This is about free markets. This is about competition. This is about fair pricing for consumers. These reforms will enable our farmers to produce food more efficiently, driving down costs for Americans at the grocery store.

Not only will this legislation help us respond to the ramifications of crises like the pandemic and the war in Ukraine, but they will also make our agricultural sector and our economy more resilient to future shocks.

This legislation is a crucial step toward reducing inflation. I thank Representative SPANBERGER, Representative CRAIG, and Representative AXNE, and my friends on the Republican side who have worked on this, and my friends on the Democratic side who have worked on this.

This is an important piece of legislation for the people—all of them. All of our Members listened closely to the concerns of their constituents and took a collaborative approach to come up with legislation that addresses some of the most pressing needs of the American people.

□ 1030

I thank the ranking member of this committee for his thoughtfulness in approaching this issue.

Today, every Member of this House has an opportunity to do something to ease inflation. Every Member has an opportunity to vote to ease inflation today. We are eager to take that action, which is why we are bringing this to the floor and voting to pass it.

I hope all of our Members will join us so we can show our constituents that their Congress is addressing inflation and working together on their behalf, not on our political behalves, but working together to pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues: vote "yes."

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK), who is another great member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 7606, the higher food and increased fuel costs act.

I just cannot believe that at a time when we Americans all are paying more for everything, from gas, groceries, energy, and beyond, my colleagues on the left want more regulation and more government intervention. They want to blame Putin and

the war in Ukraine, but they don't want to accept responsibility for the very policies that are helping drive these increased costs.

If the last year has taught us anything, Mr. Speaker, it is that Big Government with a one-size-fits-all approach of spending into oblivion does not work. It turns out, shockingly, that taking cues from the Easter Bunny doesn't work.

Look at the facts: fuel, 106 percent up; eggs, 32 percent increase; fresh and frozen chicken, up 19.3 percent; milk, up 15.9 percent; bacon, up 15.6 percent; baby food, up almost 13 percent. Oh, by the way, we can't find it. Let's talk about that.

Right now, our farmers—and I know this for a fact because I come from a rural producing district—have their backs up against a wall. With skyrocketing prices for inputs like fertilizer, fuel, and feed, many of our producers are now reaching a breaking point.

This administration, however, seems hellbent on pushing them over the edge. The regulatory regime at the EPA—and I use that word deliberately—threatens the very livelihood of our producers and the long-term food security of our Nation. Everyone in this room can agree that food security is national security, and it is dangerous policy what the left is doing in taking out our producers.

Now, it seems as if they are more focused on Green New Deal policies, and our districts will never be the same if we continue down this path. Any sort of tax or additional regulation is increasing the costs to produce fuel and produce our food.

This is a time when Americans, keep in mind, are making decisions between gas or groceries, and we are seriously up here talking about increasing costs for fuel and food? Give me a break.

We need to slam the brakes on any policy that empowers more government bureaucrats and impoverishes the people.

We need to ensure that the EPA does not threaten the future of our producers with such ridiculous, out-of-touch policies. I know that many of my colleagues, particularly in leadership, have not filled up a gas tank in probably 40 years, but I have. Two days ago, I paid over \$5 per gallon of gas. That is what Americans are facing. We need to stop empowering these bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, if we adopt my motion to recommit, I will instruct the Committee on Agriculture to add my amendment that would prohibit the EPA from regulating or taxing emission from livestock.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman has the only time remaining. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to replot some of the fields and the comments that have been offered here today. One of my friends on the Agriculture Committee on the other side, Ms. SPANBERGER, claims industry support. She referenced two specific organizations. But it is certainly not widespread support among farmers and ranchers.

I will offer up this fact: Organizations that are constituted by farmers and ranchers, including the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, which is a large cattlemen's association throughout this country made up of men and women in the cattle industry, and the National Pork Producers Council are organizations that oppose this piece of legislation. The National Pork Producers Council is made up of farmers who raise hogs in so many different States in the United States of America. It is a huge industry in terms of agriculture. That organization opposes this bill.

The National Chicken Council—poultry—is huge certainly in the State of Virginia, the State of Pennsylvania, and the State of Georgia. They oppose this piece of legislation that is on the floor today. The same thing with the National Turkey Federation and the North American Meat Institute. All are in opposition to this bill that we are voting on today.

The American Farm Bureau Federation is not opposed publicly to the bill, but they have raised a litany of concerns and unanswered questions.

This bill comes with an additional price tag of \$700 million, not offset, on many of the other provisions. Quite frankly, there are zero dollars for this duplicative poison pill part of this bill, the special investigator for cattle and pork. That leaves me concerned that the existing enforcement resources that I have already made reference to with USDA and the Department of Justice is going to be drained. We are actually probably going to see less effective investigations as a result of this.

We are going to see an increase in consolidation because it is a new layer. If you are a packer of any size, not just the four big ones, but medium and small size, and you have a new cop for cows on the beat, then you are going to have to add compliance staff to be able to prepare when, quite frankly, the Department of Justice and the Packers and Stockyards Division is already doing an incredible job. Active investigations are going on.

I agree with an earlier speaker, I think it was Mr. LUCAS from Okla-

homa, if there is evidence of price-fixing and collusion, we have a regulatory mechanism and a litigation mechanism. People should be held accountable to that.

Although there are some really good parts of this bill, I am also disappointed. We know that the only way we really get legislation through the other side of the Capitol, in the Senate, is where we show cohesion and where we stick together and work together. We have complete consensus on basically all the other aspects of this bill. We did request that this bill be divided and that the special investigator portion come out of the bill.

I think we could be scoring some victories for the American people and for the American farmers. But, quite frankly, I think to be in line with President Biden, because President Biden's approach to everything, all the problems that have been created with his ill-fated policies, is that it is somebody else's fault.

This is blaming the private sector, which works hard to provide us with the food that we need. This is blaming them when, quite frankly, it is a failure to take responsibility for what has happened on day one, starting with President Biden.

We would love to work with President Biden to make sure we can address inflation, but adding this \$700 million today, I have never seen, in my lifetime anyway, or my experience, how you can spend more money and spend your way out of inflation. It just doesn't work that way. The economics do not work that way. The inflation issue, again, I have never seen inflation reduced by spending more money.

I would respectfully encourage, because we can go back to the drawing board and take each of these bills that are really good bills, the bipartisan and strong bills, we ought to take those up individually and give Congress an opportunity to speak on behalf of the American people and affirm that these are good bills. Let the special investigator stand on its own.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage a "no" vote on H.R. 7606, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Each further amendment printed in part F of House Report 117-366 shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. KHANNA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part F of House Report 117-366.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 1, strike "AGRICULTURE AND" and all that follows through "TASK FORCE" on line 4 and insert the following: "AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCY".

Page 7, after line 4, insert the following: "Subtitle A—Agriculture and Food System Supply Chain Resilience and Crisis Response Task Force".

Page 12, after line 4, add the following:

Subtitle B—Addressing Fertilizer Shortages

SEC. 311. ADDRESSING FERTILIZER SHORTAGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall support and incentivize domestic activities through grants, loans, and other forms of assistance, to address fertilizer shortages and deficiencies, diversify fertilizer sources, and reduce dependency on foreign sources for fertilizer, including by—

(1) increasing the availability of innovative fertilizer and fertilizer alternatives, including nitrogen, phosphate, potassium, biological products and technologies, and other nutrients that may assist in the production of agricultural commodities;

(2) increasing materials or tools that reduce the need for fertilizer or support the more efficient use of fertilizer, including nitrogen, phosphate, potassium, biological products and technologies, and other nutrients that may assist in the production of agricultural commodities;

(3) supporting materials and facilities and research and development, that may support the purposes of this section;

(4) supporting sustainable agriculture production through the supporting production of—

(A) sustainable fertilizer produced in, or used in a manner that, reduces the greenhouse gas impact; or

(B) fertilizer produced through the use of renewable energy sources, including incentivizing greater precision in fertilizer use;

(5) supporting activities or other measures that may otherwise address competition-related challenges in the United States fertilizer market and obstacles to producers in obtaining affordable, responsibly manufactured fertilizer as referred to in the notice entitled "Access to Fertilizer: Competition and Supply Chain Concerns" published by the Department of Agriculture in the Federal Register on March 17, 2022 (87 Fed Reg. 15191 et seq.); and

(6) using the facilities and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the authorities under section 1473H of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319k).

(b) PRIORITY APPLICANTS.—In selecting activities to support under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to applications for such support containing proposals that the Secretary determines will most quickly address fertilizer shortages in the near term and mid-term.

(c) STREAMLINED PROCESS.—In providing assistance pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall ensure that such assistance be provided through a streamlined and expedient process (as determined necessary by the Secretary) to quickly address fertilizer shortages.

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDING.—Not more than 3 percent of the funding provided under this section may be used by the Secretary for administrative purposes.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts otherwise available,

there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, my amendment would authorize a new program at the Department of Agriculture to reduce our reliance on foreign sources of fertilizer. It is to make sure that America will be more self-sufficient and that our farmers will be more self-sufficient with our fertilizers and not dependent on Russia or foreign countries.

Everyone knows that retail fertilizer costs are at an all-time high. Putin's invasion of Ukraine is driving severe food shortages and severe fertilizer shortages. This has driven up food prices and hurt American farmers and consumers across the country. In my district, food prices are up and fertilizer prices are up.

The cost of agricultural chemicals has more than doubled since the start of the pandemic, and one of the reasons is Russia is a major exporter of nitrogen, potassium, and phosphorus fertilizers.

We need to be less dependent on countries like Russia, and we need to develop these fertilizers here in the United States. That is why Congress must act on a bipartisan basis.

This amendment is common sense. It would authorize \$100 million for grants, loans, research and development, and other assistance for the Department of Agriculture to support our farmers in developing fertilizer made in the United States.

It will support sustainable and innovative domestic production of fertilizers because our fertilizers are far more sustainable and far more innovative than the fertilizers we get from other parts of the world.

It will invest in practices that reduce the use of fertilizers. One of the best things we can do for food prices and our environment is to reduce the need for fertilizers by having those fertilizers be more innovative.

The amendment also bolsters competition in the fertilizer market.

Most important, it makes us less dependent on the Russians and less dependent on the global supply chain. It will create jobs for domestic producers of fertilizers.

The Department of Agriculture is already supporting American-made fertilizers through the Commodity Credit Corporation. My amendment will expand the Department's authority so they can prioritize solutions that will most quickly address these shortages.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this amendment. I thank Chairman SCOTT for working with me on this amendment. I also thank the Agriculture

Committee staff of Anne Simmons, Lyron Blum-Evitts, Prescott Martin, Josh Lobert, and Luke Theriot for their work, and Kevin Fox on my team.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I express my appreciation to the gentleman for bringing forth a concept that could provide relief, but not for many years.

This is an amendment to a bill that talks about immediate reduction in food prices, but this is kind of a long-term investment. I appreciate that concept, but it is not what this bill says. It really doesn't contribute to immediate relief to American consumers or reducing input costs for our farmers in the immediate or near term.

Working together is how the House Committee on Agriculture solves problems. The committee has been working together with the Department to better understand this amendment, its purpose, and its implications.

Mr. Speaker, the Department and I have agreed that this is not a near-term solution to the high price and limited availability of fertilizer.

As the gentleman knows, this amendment was pulled from consideration by my Democratic colleagues in a recent committee markup.

□ 1045

Unfortunately, we have not learned much since then, which furthers my opposition to it. Growing the size of government by codifying the Biden administration's half-baked initiatives, authorizing \$100 million, specifying further use of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and minimally funded research programs is no way to tackle rising inflation or to address skyrocketing fertilizer costs. In fact, it leaves us in a rather more tenuous situation when it comes to our farmers.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is what we use and what we depend on and rely on when our farmers fall on difficult times. And they are there, these input costs.

Not in all commodities but in most commodities, we see a record price that they are getting for their commodity. But the fact is that agriculture is a business. Farming is a business. Ranching is a business. At the end of the day, it is the margin. It is not what you get paid. You have to consider what you are paying in input costs.

With this inflation, with these types of policies we are talking about today, there will be many commodities that soon will be upside down. They will be more expensive to produce than what they are able to get for price. There are commodities that are already at that point.

Draining the CCC in any year, in 2022, is not only wrong; it is dangerous. We

are not going to have the resources to be able to help our farmers to keep them farming and to use the CCC for what its primary purpose and mission was about.

Even more perplexing is the idea we would want to solidify in law concepts that USDA admittedly has not developed into programming or policy, as the public comment period was just extended yet again.

Now, we would have been better served by considering Republican amendments, all of which would have provided immediate relief through reversing the regulatory assault stifling the innovation and exacerbating strained supply chains.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I respect the ranking member. We have worked together on a number of initiatives.

I would just say that this amendment, by giving the Commodity Credit Corporation resources, is helping make things in America. Whether it is immediate or whether it is over the next few months, we should have a bipartisan consensus that we ought to be making more things in this country and be less dependent on Russia and foreign sources.

While I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, I also hope that we can continue to work with the other side to find common ground over this Congress so that we can get bipartisan support for an effort to build more fertilizer in the United States.

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

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

The gentleman offered an amendment. He is a good friend. We do work together. Another area of jurisdiction on the Agriculture Committee that shocks people, actually, is cryptocurrency because it is a commodity and traded and overseen by CFTC. He has been such a great partner as we have worked together with those solutions.

The whole concept of bipartisan work, it is alive and well in the Agriculture Committee, but just not reflected with this poison pill that is in this particular piece of legislation.

With this amendment, I think, as I said before, yes, we need to be looking long term. But this legislation we are dealing with today, according to the Democrats, is supposed to have an immediate reduction in inflation.

While I believe we do need to do an investment long term and look at other methods of producing fertilizer, this doesn't really fit with reducing prices for American families today. To do it and do it right, we really do need USDA on board. We need to have their input. We need to have their ability to do this through their programming.

This is something I look forward to continuing to work on with the gentleman. I continue to voice my opposition to this amendment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA).

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. SPANBERGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part F of House Report 117-366.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk made in order by the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 1, strike “**AGRICULTURE AND**” and all that follows through “**TASK FORCE**” on line 4 and insert the following: “**AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCY**”.

Page 7, after line 4, insert the following: “**Subtitle A—Agriculture and Food System Supply Chain Resiliency and Crisis Response Task Force**”.

Page 12, after line 4, add the following:

Subtitle B—American Food Supply Chain Resiliency

SEC. 311. SUPPLY CHAIN REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS.

The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“Subtitle H—Food Supply Chain Resiliency
“SEC. 298. SUPPLY CHAIN REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, shall enter into cooperative agreements with eligible entities to establish not fewer than 6 Supply Chain Regional Resource Centers to support small-sized and medium-sized producers of agricultural products and small-sized and medium-sized agricultural businesses through activities, which may include—

“(1) offering coordination, technical assistance, and capacity building support to small-sized and medium-sized producers of agricultural products and agricultural businesses;

“(2) supporting supply chain and value chain coordination—

“(A) in the region in which such producers or businesses are located; and

“(B) with the Department of Agriculture, other Federal, State, and Tribal agencies with relevant resources, regional commissions, and other Supply Chain Regional Resource Centers;

“(3) providing technical assistance to such producers and businesses;

“(4) providing grants or other financial assistance to such producers and businesses looking to expand production or a business or start production or a business in such region; and

“(5) carrying out such other activities as may be specified by the Secretary.

“(b) FOCUS ON TRIBAL SUPPLY CHAIN ISSUES.—At least one Supply Chain Regional Resource Center established pursuant to sub-

section (a) shall provide coordination, assistance, and capacity building support to address supply chain issues faced by Indian tribes and Tribal organizations (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)).

“(c) APPLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity (including an entity representing a partnership) seeking to enter into a cooperative agreement under this section shall submit to the Secretary an application, at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including how the Supply Chain Regional Resource Centers established by such entity will address food and agricultural supply chain issues faced by underserved communities.

“(2) REGIONAL DIVERSITY.—In selecting eligible entities to enter into a cooperative agreement under this section, the Secretary shall ensure the regional diversity of such entities.

“(d) TERM.—The term of a cooperative agreement entered into under this section shall be not less than 4 years.

“(e) COORDINATION.—A Supply Chain Regional Resource Center shall, as a condition on entering into a cooperative agreement under this section, agree to coordinate with other Supply Chain Regional Resource Centers, when appropriate.

“(f) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Beginning not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary 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 on—

“(1) with respect to the activities carried out by the Secretary under this section—

“(A) a description of such activities; and

“(B) the impact of such activities on supply chain issues faced by small-sized and medium-sized producers of agricultural products; and

“(2) with respect to the activities carried out by the Supply Chain Regional Resource Centers under this section—

“(A) a description of such activities;

“(B) the impact of such activities on supply chain issues faced by small-sized and medium-sized producers of agricultural products and agricultural businesses; and

“(C) any grants awarded by Supply Chain Regional Resource Centers to such producers and businesses.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(A) a State government (or a political subdivision thereof), regional authority, or an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization;

“(B) a college or university (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)) (including a land-grant college or university); or

“(C) a nonprofit organization, including a producer network or association, a food council, an economic development corporation, or another organization.

“(2) STATE.—The term ‘State’ has the meaning given such term in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103).

“(h) FUNDING.—In addition to amounts otherwise available, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2026.

“(i) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be interpreted to undermine or narrow the authority of the Secretary to carry out activities described in

subsection (a) under any other authority of the Secretary.”.

SEC. 312. AGRICULTURE INNOVATION CENTERS PROGRAM.

Section 6402(a) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1632b(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) applied research, technical assistance, support services, outreach, and other services to strengthen, maintain, and secure supply chains related to value-added agricultural commodities and products produced in the United States.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, the gentleman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

I rise in support of my amendment to include the American Food Supply Chain Resiliency Act in H.R. 7606, the Lower Food and Fuel Cost Act. I thank Congressman ANTHONY GONZALEZ of Ohio for his partnership on this bipartisan legislation.

Supply chain disruptions are impacting the operations of businesses in Virginia and across the country, leaving shelves empty and driving up prices for consumers. For crop and livestock producers, as well as agribusinesses, the current disruptions are a threat to their livelihoods and their ability to deliver high-quality products at an affordable price while still making ends meet.

Meanwhile, Americans are suffering from rising food prices at grocery stores, dollar stores, and restaurants. Rising inflation makes trips to the grocery store more and more stressful as the price of staple items like meat, eggs, and vegetables rise, sometimes going up monthly, even weekly.

Americans have shared the experience of going to the grocery store—we all have—picking up our favorite food items that we have purchased for years and thinking, well, this is more expensive than last week. My husband and I were just talking about this issue over the weekend as we changed our own shopping list because of it.

Few products are more essential than the foods we eat. Farmers, particularly small- and medium-sized producers, have been left out of investments that are meant to mitigate supply chain challenges, and that has meant it is getting more difficult to get products from the farm to the market and, finally, to the table.

While big companies have the budget to invest in supply chain innovations, research, and experts, small- and medium-sized producers are paying higher prices than ever for fertilizer, fuel, shipping, and other input costs.

When farmers pay more to produce food, all Americans pay more at the

grocery store. That is why we must empower USDA to do more to resolve farmers' and food businesses' supply chain challenges. We must be prepared.

To address these concerns, I was proud to lead the bipartisan American Food Supply Chain Resiliency Act. This legislation would establish supply chain regional resource centers through cooperative agreements with the Agricultural Marketing Service at USDA.

These resource centers would offer locally tailored coordination, technical assistance, and grants to small- and medium-sized producers and agribusinesses, leading to stronger supply chains. This bill would also expand the great work of the Agriculture Innovation Program to include research and support on supply chains.

By establishing supply chain regional resource centers, this bill would provide additional support to family farmers and food businesses trying to deliver their goods at a lower price for consumers. These centers would help local producers get through lean years, obtain the inputs they need, and address challenges related to transportation costs, labor, and high energy prices.

In fact, USDA has already taken similar steps to build collaboration across sectors of local and regional food supply chains through regional centers. Our bipartisan legislation would support and build on these centers, as well as make sure they are a wise, tailored investment with a clear mission and fair reporting requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support our bipartisan bill. Once again, I thank Congressman GONZALEZ for his partnership.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I express my appreciation to the gentlewoman from Virginia for bringing forth an idea, and I do wish the same courtesy had been extended to my Republican colleagues who were denied the opportunity to bring their amendments forward for debate.

Working together is how the House Committee on Agriculture solves problems, and the committee has been working together with the Department to better understand this amendment, its purpose, and its implications.

As the gentlewoman knows, this amendment was pulled from consideration by my Democrat colleagues in a recent committee markup. Unfortunately, we have not learned much since then, which furthers my opposition to it being considered prematurely on the floor today.

I cannot support this amendment as written, an amendment that falls short of its advertised goals, and does not

offer any immediate relief to farmers, ranchers, or consumers, because that is the myth that my Democrat friends are trying to sell with the overall bill today, which will not happen. In fact, I am afraid inflationary costs, more concentration, are going to occur as a result of a specific part of the package.

Growing the size of government by codifying the Biden administration's half-baked initiatives is no way to tackle rising inflation or address rising fuel and fertilizer costs.

Even more perplexing is the idea that we would want to solidify in law concepts that USDA admittedly has not developed into programming or policy.

Now, we would have been better served by considering Republican amendments, all of which would have provided immediate relief through reversing the regulatory assault stifling innovation and exacerbating strained supply chains.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My colleague on the other side of the aisle mentioned that this bill will not provide immediate relief, and I concur. This bill is not meant to provide immediate relief. The amendment before us would plan for the future and would recognize that we face disruptions in our supply chain, and frequently, when we do, it is our farmers and producers who are impacted, particularly smaller and medium-sized producers like those in our districts.

This bill, this amendment to the larger bill, is an issue of planning for the future, recognizing disruptions that may come, and being able to proactively plan for such challenges.

It is unfortunate that the gentleman feels that they were left out of the process, but I am heartened that the scope of concern relates to the process and not the underlying amendment.

This amendment is about long-term planning. It is about ensuring that our smaller and medium-sized producers and agribusinesses have the technical assistance, the support, and the coordination that they will need to weather challenges in supply chain disruptions that may occur today, 10 years, 20 years, 30 years into the future.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, to reiterate, in my comments, I said it was premature, and I do believe it is. I think that this is a concept that the gentlewoman is pursuing that is worthy of consideration, worthy of development and full development so that we can have an appropriate consideration of the text of this particular amendment.

I also think it is out of place with this particular bill because the context, the pretext that my Democratic

friends are presenting here, is a false promise that whatever would pass, and if this would somehow find a pathway through the Senate and be implemented, that it would immediately lower food and fuel costs. That is just not the case.

This is more of a long-term vision. I appreciate that because I think we should be looking long term when it comes to the needs of input costs for our farmers because, quite frankly, when we have inflation, when we have burdensome regulations, when we have an administration that is really out of control from a regulatory perspective, sidelining their scientists at the EPA—which, by the way, actually, part of those are funded under a public-private partnership with agribusinesses to make sure that farmers can have access to crop protection tools, significant crop protection tools that have been sidelined by this administration, when these same scientists have found them to be safe in application in the past.

What I would say is that I look forward to working with the gentlewoman in the future on this concept, but I continue to remain in opposition.

This is not quite ready for prime time, not ready for consideration. We need to be working more. We need more time working in a bipartisan way and, quite frankly, hearing from the administration as well and USDA.

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

□ 1100

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

There is no disagreement that across America's regions and across our commodities, our Nation's farmers and ranchers have gotten the short end of the stick, particularly when it comes to rising input costs as a result of supply chain bottlenecks and inflation.

The Lowering Food and Fuel Costs Act and this amendment take crucial, commonsense steps toward addressing these challenges, both now and into the future, planning for a future where we can be proactive, continually so, and ensure that small and targeted investments from USDA today can have impacts on small- and medium-sized producers' ability to get food to market and improve their bottom lines.

At the same time, these investments should also lead to lower food prices for Americans at the grocery store, convenience stores, and restaurants.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment. I look forward to working with my colleague across the aisle to receive additional, very specific feedback on how we can make some of these provisions stronger, better with that input into the future.

Today, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment in front of us and, ultimately, "yes" on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I continue to offer my opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Cammack of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7606 to the Committee on Agriculture.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. CAMMACK is as follows:

Page 2, after line 3, add the following:

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not promulgate or implement any regulation under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) imposing the collection of a fee, or requiring any source to obtain a permit under title V of the Act (42 U.S.C. 7661 et seq.), for carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, water vapor, or methane emissions resulting from biological processes associated with livestock production.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage. This is a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 206, nays 218, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

YEAS—206

Aderholt Arrington Baird Allen Babin Balderson Amodei Bacon Banks

Barr Bentz Bergman Bice (OK) Biggs Bilirakis Bishop (NC) Boebert Bost Brady Brooks Buchanan Buck Bucshon Budd Burchett Burgess Calvert Cammack Carey Carl Carter (GA) Carter (TX) Cawthorn Chabot Cheney Cline Cloud Clyde Cole Comer Conway Crawford Crenshaw Curtis Davidson Davis, Rodney DesJarlais Diaz-Balart Donalds Duncan Dunn Ellzey Emmer Estes Fallon Feenstra Ferguson Fischbach Fitzgerald Fitzpatrick Fleischmann Foa Franklin, C. Scott Fulcher Gaetz Gallagher Garbarino Gibbs Gimenez Gohmert Gonzales, Tony Gonzalez (OH) Good (VA) Gooden (TX) Barr Granger Graves (LA) Graves (MO) Green (TN) Greene (GA) Griffith Grothman Guest Guthrie Harris Harshbarger Hartzler Hern Herrell Herrera Beutler Hice (GA) Higgins (LA) Hill Hinson Hollingsworth Hudson Huizenga Issa Jackson Jacobs (NY) Johnson (LA) Johnson (OH) Johnson (SD) Jordan Joyce (OH) Joyce (PA) Katko Keller Kelly (MS) Kelly (PA) Kim (CA) Kinzinger Kustoff LaHood LaMalfa Lamborn Latta LaTurner Lesko Letlow Long Loudermilk Lucas Luetkemeyer Mace Malliotakis Mann Massie Mast McCarthy McCaul McClain McClintock McHenry McKinley Meijer Meuser Miller (IL) Miller (WV) Miller-Meeks Gosar Granger Graves (LA) Graves (MO) Green (TN) Greene (GA) Griffith Grothman Guest Guthrie Harris Harshbarger Hartzler Hern Herrell Herrera Beutler Hice (GA) Higgins (LA) Hill Hinson Hollingsworth Hudson Huizenga Issa Jackson Jacobs (NY) Johnson (LA) Johnson (OH) Johnson (SD) Jordan Joyce (OH) Joyce (PA) Katko Keller Kelly (MS) Kelly (PA) Kim (CA) Kinzinger Kustoff LaHood LaMalfa Lamborn Latta LaTurner Lesko Letlow Long Loudermilk Lucas Luetkemeyer Mace Malliotakis Mann Massie Mast McCarthy McCaul McClain McClintock McHenry McKinley Meijer Meuser Miller (IL) Miller (WV) Miller-Meeks Moolenaar Mooney Moore (AL) Moore (UT) Mullin Murphy (NC) Nehls Newhouse Norman Obernolte Owens Palazzo Palmer Pence Perry Pfluger Posey Reschenthaler Rice (SC) Rodgers (WA) Rogers (AL) Rogers (KY) Rose Rosendale Rouzer Roy Rutherford Salazar Scalise Schweikert Scott, Austin Sessions Simpson Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smucker Spartz Stauber Steel Stefanik Steil Steube Stewart Taylor Tenney Thompson (PA) Tiffany Loudermilk Timmons Turner Upton Valadao Van Drew Van Duynne Wagner Walberg Walorski Waltz Weber (TX) Webster (FL) Wenstrup Westerman Williams (TX) Wilson (SC) Wittman Womack

NAYS—218

Adams Castro (TX) Doyle, Michael F. Escobar Eshoo Espallat Evans Fletcher Foster Frankel, Lois Gallego Garamendi Garcia (IL) Garcia (TX) Golden Gomez Gonzalez, Vicente Crow Cuellar Davids (KS) Davis, Danny K. Dean DeFazio DeGette DeLauro DelBene Demings DeSaunier Deutch Dingell Doggett Castro (TX) Cherfilus-McCormick Chu Cicilline Clark (MA) Clarke (NY) Cleaver Clyburn Cohen Connolly Cooper Correa Courtney Craig Crist Crow Cuellar Davids (KS) Davis, Danny K. Dean DeFazio DeGette DeLauro DelBene Demings DeSaunier Deutch Dingell Doggett

Jeffries Johnson (GA) Johnson (TX) Jones Kabele Kaptur Keating Kelly (IL) Khanna Kilde Neal Kilmer Kim (NJ) Kind Kirkpatrick Krishnamoorthi Kuster Lamb Langevin Larsen (WA) Larson (CT) Lawrence Lawson (FL) Lee (CA) Lee (NV) Leger Fernandez Levin (CA) Levin (MI) Lieu Lofgren Lowenthal Luria Lynch Malinowski Maloney, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Manning Matsui McBeth McCollum McEachin McGovern McNeerney Meeks Meng Mfume Moore (WI) Morelle Moulton Mrvan Murphy (FL) Nadler Napolitano Neal Neguse Newman Norcross O'Halleran Ocasio-Cortez Omar Pallone Panetta Pappas Pascrell Payne Pelosi Perlmutter Peters Phillips Pingree Pocan Porter Pressley Price (NC) Quigley Raskin Rice (NY) Ross Roybal-Allard Ruiz Ruppertsberger Rush Ryan Sanchez Sarbanes Scanlon Schakowsky Schiff Schneider Schradler Schrier Scott (VA) Scott, David Sewell Sherman Sherrill Sires Slotkin Smith (WA) Soto Spanberger Speier Stansbury Stanton Stevens Strickland Suozzi Swalwell Takano Thompson (CA) Thompson (MS) Titus Tlaib Tonko Torres (CA) Torres (NY) Trahan Trone Underwood Vargas Veasey Velázquez Wasserman Schultz Waters Watson Coleman Welch Wexton Wild Williams (GA) Wilson (FL) Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Armstrong Casten Costa Garcia (CA) Zeldin

□ 1139

Mses. TLAIB, OMAR, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY, Messrs. THOMPSON of California, LEVIN of California, CLEAVER, Ms. CHU, Mr. PASCARELL, Mses. JACKSON LEE, SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. SCANLON, Messrs. RUSH, SHERMAN, and O'HALLERAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. GRAVES of Louisiana, COLE, and BANKS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei Doggett (Beyer) Lawrence (Balderson) Evans (Beyer) (Stevens) Bergman Garcia (IL) Lawson (FL) (Stauber) (Takano) (Wasserman Schultz) Blunt Rochester Gohmert (Weber) (TX)) Lieu (Beyer) Bonamici (Beyer) Gomez (Huffman) Long Boyle, Brendan Gonzalez (OH) (Fleischmann) F. (Neguse) (Meijer) Loudermilk Brooks (Weber) Guest (Fleischmann) (TX)) Mace (Carter) Brownley Johnson (GA) (GA) (Kuster) (Manning) McEachin Bustos (Mrvan) Johnson (TX) (Beyer) (Jeffries) Moore (WI) (Correa) Kabele (Mrvan) (Beyer) Carter (TX) Katko (Moore) Newman (Beyer) (Weber (TX)) (UT)) Palazzo Crist (Wasserman) Kelly (IL) (Fleischmann) (Neguse) Payne (Pallone) Schultz) Krishnamoorthi Peters (Jeffries) Davids (KS) (Neguse) Pingree (Neguse) Lamb (Neguse) (Wasserman) Davis, Danny K. LaMalfa Schultz (Beyer) (Valadao) Porter (Neguse)

Price (NC) Swallow (Correa) Wagner (McHenry)
 (Manning) (Correa) (McHenry)
 Rice (SC) Taylor (Van Walorski
 (Meijer) Dwyne) (Bucshon)
 Sires (Pallone) Tenney Waters (Takano)
 Stanton (Jackson) Watson Coleman
 (Huffman) Titus (Pallone) (Pallone)
 Suozzi (Beyer) Trahan (Stevens) Welch (Pallone)

Suozzi Torres (NY) Waters
 Swallow Trahan Watson Coleman
 Takano Trone Wexton
 Thompson (CA) Underwood
 Thompson (MS) Vargas
 Titus Veasey
 Tlaib Velázquez
 Tonko Wasserman
 Torres (CA) Schultz

Boyle, Brendan Johnson (TX) Peters (Jeffries)
 F. (Neguse) (Jeffries) Pingree
 Brooks (Weber Kahele (Mrvan) (Wasserman
 (TX) Katko (Moore) Schultz
 (UT))
 Brownley Kelly (IL) Porter (Neguse)
 (Kuster) (Neguse) Price (NC)
 Bustos (Mrvan) Krishnamoorthi (Manning)
 Cárdenas (Correa) (Neguse) Rice (SC)
 (Meijer)
 Carter (TX) Lamb (Neguse) Sires (Pallone)
 (Weber (TX)) LaMalfa Stanton
 (Valadao) (Huffman)
 Crist Lawrence (Stevens) Suozzi (Beyer)
 (Wasserman) Lawton (FL) Swallow
 (Schultz) (Wasserman) (Correa)
 Davids (KS) (Neguse) Taylor (Van
 (Schultz) Dwyne)
 Davis, Danny K. Lieu (Beyer) Tenney
 (Beyer) Long (Jackson)
 Doggett (Beyer) (Fleischmann) Titus (Pallone)
 Evans (Beyer) Loudermilk Trahan (Stevens)
 Garcia (IL) (Fleischmann) Wagner
 (Takano) Mace (Carter) (McHenry)
 Gohmert (Weber) (GA) Walorski
 (TX) McEachin (Bucshon)
 Gomez (Huffman) (Beyer) Waters (Takano)
 Gonzalez (OH) Moore (WI) Watson Coleman
 (Meijer) (Beyer) (Pallone)
 Guest Newman (Beyer) Welch (Pallone)
 (Fleischmann) Palazzo
 Johnson (GA) (Fleischmann)
 (Manning) Payne (Pallone)

Boyle, Brendan Johnson (TX) Peters (Jeffries)
 F. (Neguse) (Jeffries) Pingree
 Brooks (Weber Kahele (Mrvan) (Wasserman
 (TX) Katko (Moore) Schultz
 (UT))
 Brownley Kelly (IL) Porter (Neguse)
 (Kuster) (Neguse) Price (NC)
 Bustos (Mrvan) Krishnamoorthi (Manning)
 Cárdenas (Correa) (Neguse) Rice (SC)
 (Meijer)
 Carter (TX) Lamb (Neguse) Sires (Pallone)
 (Weber (TX)) LaMalfa Stanton
 (Valadao) (Huffman)
 Crist Lawrence (Stevens) Suozzi (Beyer)
 (Wasserman) Lawton (FL) Swallow
 (Schultz) (Wasserman) (Correa)
 Davids (KS) (Neguse) Taylor (Van
 (Schultz) Dwyne)
 Davis, Danny K. Lieu (Beyer) Tenney
 (Beyer) Long (Jackson)
 Doggett (Beyer) (Fleischmann) Titus (Pallone)
 Evans (Beyer) Loudermilk Trahan (Stevens)
 Garcia (IL) (Fleischmann) Wagner
 (Takano) Mace (Carter) (McHenry)
 Gohmert (Weber) (GA) Walorski
 (TX) McEachin (Bucshon)
 Gomez (Huffman) (Beyer) Waters (Takano)
 Gonzalez (OH) Moore (WI) Watson Coleman
 (Meijer) (Beyer) (Pallone)
 Guest Newman (Beyer) Welch (Pallone)
 (Fleischmann) Palazzo
 Johnson (GA) (Fleischmann)
 (Manning) Payne (Pallone)

NAYS—204

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MRVAN). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 204, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

YEAS—221

Adams Feenstra McCollum
 Aguilar Fletcher McEachin
 Allred Foster McGovern
 Auchincloss Frankel, Lois McNeerney
 Axne Gallego Meeks
 Bacon Garamendi Meng
 Barragán Garcia (IL) Mfume
 Bass Garcia (TX) Miller-Meeks
 Beatty Golden Moore (WI)
 Bera Gomez Morelle
 Beyer Gottheimer Mrvan
 Bishop (GA) Green, Al (TX) Murphy (FL)
 Blumenauer Grijalva Nadler
 Blunt Rochester Harder (CA) Napolitano
 Bonamici Hartzler Neal
 Bourdeaux Hayes Neguse
 Bowman Higgins (NY) Newman
 Boyle, Brendan Himes Norcross
 F. Hinson O'Halleran
 Brown (MD) Horsford Ocasio-Cortez
 Brown (OH) Houlihan Omar
 Brownley Hoyer Pallone
 Bush Huffman Panetta
 Bustos Jackson Lee Pappas
 Butterfield Jacobs (CA) Pascrell
 Carbajal Jayapal Payne
 Cárdenas Jeffries Pelosi
 Carson Johnson (GA) Perlmutter
 Carter (LA) Johnson (SD) Peters
 Cartwright Johnson (TX) Phillips
 Case Jones Pingree
 Castor (FL) Kahele Pocan
 Castro (TX) Kaptur Porter
 Cherrifus- Keating Pressley
 McCormick Kelly (IL) Price (NC)
 Chu Khanna Quigley
 Cicilline Kildee Raskin
 Clark (MA) Kilmer Rice (NY)
 Clarke (NY) Kim (NJ) Ross
 Cleaver Kind Roybal-Allard
 Clyburn Kinzinger Ruiz
 Cohen Kirkpatrick Ruppertsberger
 Connolly Krishnamoorthi Rush
 Cooper Kuster Ryan
 Correa Lamb Sánchez
 Costa Langevin Sarbanes
 Courtney Larsen (WA) Scanlon
 Craig Larson (CT) Schakowsky
 Crist Lawrence Schiff
 Crow Lawson (FL) Schneider
 Davids (KS) Lee (CA) Schrader
 Davis, Danny K. Lee (NV) Schrier
 Dean Leger Fernandez Scott (VA)
 DeGette Levin (CA) Scott, David
 DeLauro Levin (MI) Sewell
 DelBene Lieu Sherman
 Demings Lofgren Sherrill
 DeSaulnier Lowenthal Sires
 Deutch Luria Slotkin
 Dingell Lynch Smith (WA)
 Doggett Malinowski Soto
 Doyle, Michael Maloney Spanberger
 F. Carolyn B. Speier
 Escobar Maloney, Sean Stansbury
 Eshoo Manning Stanton
 Espaillat Matsui Stevens
 Evans McBeth Strickland

Aderholt Gimenez Moolenaar
 Allen Gohmert Mooney
 Amodei Gonzales, Tony Moore (AL)
 Arrington Gonzalez (OH) Moore (UT)
 Babin Gonzalez, Vicente Moulton
 Baird Good (VA) Mullin
 Balderson Gooden (TX) Murphy (NC)
 Banks Gosar Nehls
 Barr Newhouse
 Bentz Granger Norman
 Bergman Graves (LA) Obermolete
 Bice (OK) Graves (MO) Owens
 Biggs Green (TN) Palazzo
 Bilirakis Greene (GA) Palmer
 Bishop (NC) Griffith Pence
 Boehert Grothman Perry
 Bost Guest Pfluger
 Brady Guthrie Posey
 Brooks Harris Reschenthaler
 Buchanan Harshbarger Rice (SC)
 Buck Hern Rodgers (WA)
 Bucshon Herrell Rogers (AL)
 Budd Herrera Beutler Rogers (KY)
 Burchett Hice (GA) Rose
 Burgess Higgins (LA) Rosendale
 Calvert Hill Rouzer
 Cammack Hollingsworth Roy
 Carey Hudson Rutherford
 Carl Hudzenga Salazar
 Carter (GA) Issa Scalise
 Carter (TX) Jackson Schweikert
 Cawthorn Jacobs (NY) Scott, Austin
 Chabot Johnson (LA) Sessions
 Cheney Johnson (OH) Simpson
 Cline Jordan Smith (MO)
 Cloud Joyce (OH) Smith (NE)
 Clyde Joyce (PA) Smith (NJ)
 Cole Katko Smucker
 Comer Keller Spartz
 Conway Kelly (MS) Stauber
 Crawford Kelly (PA) Steel
 Crenshaw Kim (CA) Stefanik
 Cuellar Kustoff Steil
 Curtis LaHood Steube
 Davidson LaMalfa Stewart
 Davis, Rodney Lamborn Taylor
 DeFazio Latta Tenney
 DesJarlais LaTurner Thompson (PA)
 Diaz-Balart Lesko Tiffany
 Donalds Letlow Timmons
 Duncan Long Turner
 Dunn Loudermilk Upton
 Ellzey Lucas Valadao
 Emmer Luetkemeyer Van Drew
 Estes Mace Van Dwyne
 Fallon Malliotakis Wagner
 Ferguson Mann Walberg
 Fischbach Massie Walorski
 Fitzgerald Mast Waltz
 Fitzpatrick McCarthy Weber (TX)
 Fleischmann McCaul Webster (FL)
 Foxx McClain Welch
 Franklin, C. McClintock Wenstrup
 Scott McHenry Westerman
 Fulcher McKinley Williams (TX)
 Gaetz Meijer Wilson (SC)
 Gallagher Meuser Wittman
 Garbarino Miller (IL) Womack
 Gibbs Miller (WV)

NOT VOTING—4

Armstrong Garcia (CA)
 Casten Zeldin

□ 1156

So the bill was passed.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS
 Amodei Bergman Blunt Rochester
 (Balderson) (Stauber) (Brown (MD))
 Bonamici (Beyer)

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5828

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 5828.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MRVAN). The gentleman's request is accepted.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1735

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 1735.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request is accepted.

□ 1200

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2374

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) as cosponsor of H.R. 2374, the Peace and Tolerance in Palestinian Education Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend and the House majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, before I start on the colloquy and go through the schedule, I was just talking to the Republican whip, my friend, Mr. SCALISE. We were talking about a friend of ours, his name is John Bresnahan; he is