

Ranchers should be taking care of predator control problems themselves. This amendment would not prevent ranchers and farmers from doing so. Currently, because of the federal subsidy, ranchers are discouraged from using more effective, humane, less-costly, and non-lethal methods such as guard dogs, electric sound and light devices, or predator exclusion fencing. There is no incentive for ranchers to use these types of control methods because the government is paying to kill the wild animals which attack these farmers' livestock. I don't object to farmers and ranchers protecting their property but I do object to the federal government paying for it.

Again, this program is costly, unnecessary, inhumane, and dangerous. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the DeFazio-Bass-Morella amendment to the Agriculture Appropriations bill.

While I know the Wildlife Services engage in a number of valuable programs to mitigate human-wildlife conflicts, such as the bird control program at Denver International Airport, I am troubled by the reckless and seemingly inhumane procedures undertaken by this agency.

The most disturbing, not to mention dangerous, Wildlife Services endeavor is the Aerial Hunting Campaign. Over the past 10 years, 31 people have been injured, 7 of them fatally, in Wildlife Services aircraft accidents. Low altitude, low speed flying in remote areas is invariably high risk. To me this seems like a hazardous and costly way to go about predator control. As if that was not enough, Aerial Gunning does not help reduce livestock losses because it does not target offending animals, predators that we know are feeding on livestock.

For my colleagues who are not swayed by the disturbing, twisted excesses of the Wildlife Services program, I encourage you to look at the flawed economics behind this program. For every dollar of reported livestock damage, the Wildlife Services spends three dollars in the West to fix the problem.

The DeFazio-Bass amendment offered today is less punitive than amendments offered in previous years. It allows the agency to retain adequate funding, but compels the program to use tax dollars to kill the public's wildlife through a subsidy for private ranchers.

I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon) having assumed the chair, Mr. Nussle, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

# LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4611, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of H.R. 4461 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 538, that no further amendments to the bill shall be in order except, one, pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate; two, the following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes:

The amendments printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and numbered 9, 29, 32, 37, 48, 61 and 68.

Each additional amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in this request, or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed, or a designee, and shall be considered as read. Each additional amendment shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for the purpose of discussion, I want to just clarify, because we have some Members on this side who have brought amendments up just recently and we had not expected those. I wanted to make sure that those Members understood that under this unanimous consent agreement, which I will ultimately support, I do not believe that they would be able to bring their amendments up. I wanted to clarify that.

The only amendments that would be allowed would be those that have already been printed in the RECORD?

Mr. SKEEN. If the gentlewoman will yield, that is correct.

Ms. KAPTUR. And available to the committee?

Mr. SKEEN. That is correct.

Ms. KAPTUR. For example, we have a Member here who may want to be recognized at this point to ascertain whether her amendments would be in order under this unanimous consent agreement. I would not want to preclude the gentlewoman from being at least able to inquire as to whether those amendments would be allowed.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to whether or not the

three amendments that are being referenced are included in this group that is being agreed upon? These are three amendments that we had prepared. We did not realize that there would be perhaps a reduction or closing off of the opportunity to present amendments. I would certainly ask my colleagues to include these three amendments in this group.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I believe these would be the only three amendments on this side that currently are not allowed under the unanimous consent request. They all concern serious issues of civil rights and litigation related to that at the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, could I ask the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) a question under the reservation of objection of the gentlewoman from Ohio? Could I ask whether or not, since it is my understanding that the amendments of the gentlewoman from California are subject to points of order, is it possible under the unanimous consent request that the gentleman is proposing, for those to be handled under the pro forma procedure laid out in the unanimous consent request?

Mr. SKEEN. If the gentlewoman will yield, yes.

Mr. OBEY. So the gentlewoman would be able to offer those amendments, even though they would be subject to a point of order? The gentlewoman cannot get a vote on the amendment, obviously, but we could strike the last word so that she can make the point that she wants on each of the three amendments?

2015

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I will move to strike the last word and then yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) at the appropriate time.

Mr. OBEY. So the gentleman will rise to strike the last word and recognize the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS)?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for that allowance. We realize it is in the nature of an unusual request, but we were unprepared as well until very recently. I also thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

# AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 538 and rule