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REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE ON ACTIVITIES DURING THE 106TH CONGRESS

JANUARY 2, 2001.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. COMBEST, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

REPORT

In accordance with rule XI, clause 1(d), of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Agriculture reports herewith on its activities during the 106th Congress.

I. SUMMARY OF ORGANIZATION, JURISDICTION, AND OVERSIGHT PLAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

A. ORGANIZATION

With the passage of House Resolution 6 and House Resolution 7 on January 6, 1999, the House of Representatives established the total authorized membership of the Committee on Agriculture for the 106th Congress at 51, with a party division of 27 Republicans and 24 Democrats. Among the committee members were 11 Representatives who were serving their first terms (Calvert, Riley, Walden, Simpson, Ose, Hayes, Fletcher, Boswell, Phelps, Lucas of Kentucky, Thompson of California, and Hill).

The committee organized on January 20, 1999, and committee rules were adopted without subcommittee jurisdictions or ratios. However, on February 10, 1999, the committee met and organized into four subcommittees, three of which were assigned jurisdiction over major agricultural commodities and one of which dealt with various related agricultural operations. The four subcommittees were constituted as follows:
SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

(Ratio includes ex officio members. Larry Combest, chairman, and Charles W. Stenholm, ranking minority member, were ex officio members of all subcommittees)

COMMODITY SUBCOMMITTEES

GENERAL FARM COMMODITIES, RESOURCE CONSERVATION, AND CREDIT (RATIO 11–10)

BILL BARRETT, Nebraska, Chairman

JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio, Vice Chairman
NICK SMITH, Michigan
FRANK D. LUCAS, Oklahoma
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia
JERRY MORAN, Kansas
JOHN R. THUNE, South Dakota
WILLIAM L. JENKINS, Tennessee
DOUG OSE, California
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina

DAVID MINGE, MN, Ranking Minority Member
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
DAVID D. PHELPS, Illinois
BARON P. HILL, Indiana
EVA M. CLAYTON, North Carolina
EARL POMEROY, North Dakota
TIM HOLDEN, Pennsylvania
SANFORD D. BISHOP, Jr., Georgia
JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI, Maine

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK AND HORTICULTURE (RATIO 12–11)

RICHARD W. POMBO, California, Chairman

JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio, Vice Chairman
BOB GOODLATTE, Virginia
TERRY EVERETT, Alabama
FRANK D. LUCAS, Oklahoma
HELEN CHENOWETH-HAGE, Idaho
JOHN N. HOSTETTLER, Indiana
BOB SCHAEFFER, Colorado
KEN CALVERT, California
GIL GUTKNECHT, Minnesota
BOB RILEY, Alabama

COLLIN C. PETERSON, Minnesota, Ranking Minority Member
TIM HOLDEN, California
GARY A. CONDIT, Pennsylvania
CALVIN M. DOOLEY, California
MARION BERRY, Arkansas
MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina
DEBBIE STABENOW, Michigan
BOB ETHERIDGE, North Carolina
KEN LUCAS, Kentucky

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RISK MANAGEMENT, RESEARCH, AND SPECIALTY CROPS (RATIO 18–16)

THOMAS W. EWING, Illinois, Chairman

BILL BARRETT, Nebraska, Vice Chairman
NICK SMITH, Michigan
TERRY EVERETT, Alabama
FRANK D. LUCAS, Oklahoma
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia
RAY LAHOOD, Illinois
JERRY MORAN, Kansas
JOHN R. THUNE, South Dakota
WILLIAM L. JENKINS, Tennessee
GIL GUTKNECHT, Minnesota
BOB RILEY, Alabama
GREG WALDEN, Oregon
DOUG OSE, California
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
ERNIE FLETCHER, Kentucky

GARY A. CONDIT, California, Ranking Minority Member
CALVIN M. DOOLEY, California
EARL F. HILLIARD, Alabama
EARL POMEROY, North Dakota
SANFORD D. BISHOP, Jr., Georgia
JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI, Maine
DEBBIE STABENOW, Michigan
BOB ETHERIDGE, North Carolina
CHRISTOPHER JOHN, Louisiana
LEONARD L. BOSWELL, Iowa
KEN LUCAS, Kentucky
LEONARD L. BOSWELL, Iowa
MIKE THOMPSON, California
JOE BACA, California
OPERATIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS, OVERSIGHT, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY (RATIO 11–10)

BOB GOODLATTE, Virginia, Chairman
THOMAS W. EWING, Illinois, Vice Chairman
RICHARD W. POMBO, California
CHARLES T. CANADY, Florida
JOHN N. HOSTETTLER, Indiana
SAXBY CHAMBLESS, Georgia
RAY LAHOOD, Illinois
JERRY MORAN, Kansas
JOHN COOKSEY, Louisiana
GREG WALDEN, Oregon
EVA M. CLAYTON, North Carolina, Ranking Minority Member
MARION BERRY, Arkansas
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
DAVID D. PHELPS, Illinois
BARON P. HILL, Indiana
MIKE THOMPSON, California
DAVID MINGE, Minnesota
JOE BACA, California

B. COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

Under rules adopted by the House of Representatives for the 106th Congress, the Committee on Agriculture's (hereinafter also referred to as committee) jurisdiction (See rule X, clause 1 of the Rules of the House of Representatives) extended to—

1. Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.
2. Agriculture generally.
3. Agricultural and industrial chemistry.
4. Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.
5. Agricultural economics and research.
6. Agricultural education extension services.
7. Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products, and commodities (not including distribution outside of the United States).
8. Animal industry and diseases of animals.
10. Crop insurance and soil conservation.
11. Dairy industry.
12. Entomology and plant quarantine.
13. Extension of farm credit and farm security.
15. Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.
16. Human nutrition and home economics.
17. Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.
18. Rural electrification.
19. Rural development.
20. Water conservation related to activities of the Department of Agriculture.

The revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the 106th Congress (House Document No. 105–358) provides the following concerning the Committee on Agriculture:1

1References are to the volume and section of Hinds’ (volumes I–V, e.g., IV, 500) and Cannon’s (volumes VI–VIII, e.g., VI, 400) Precedents of the House of Representatives, and to the Congressional Record by date and page (e.g., January 3, 1953, p. 500).
mates of and to report appropriations (IV, 4149). However, on July 1, 1920, authority to report appropriations for the U.S. Department of Agriculture was transferred to the Committee on Appropriations (VII, 1860).

The basic form of the present jurisdictional statement was made effective January 2, 1947, as a part of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 812). Subparagraph (7) was altered by the 93d Congress, effective January 3, 1975, to include jurisdiction over agricultural commodities (including the Commodity Credit Corporation) while transferring jurisdiction over foreign distribution and nondomestic production of commodities to the Committee on International Relations (House Resolution 988, 93d Congress, October 8, 1974, p. 34470). Nevertheless, the committee has retained a limited jurisdiction over measures to release CCC stocks for such foreign distribution (September 14, 1989, p. 20428). Previously unstated jurisdictions over commodities exchanges and rural development were codified effective January 3, 1975.

The 104th Congress consolidated the committee’s jurisdiction over inspection of livestock and meat products to include inspection of poultry, seafood, and seafood products, and added subparagraph (20) relating to water conservation (section. 202(a), House Resolution 6, January 4, 1995, p.464). Clerical and stylistic changes were effected when the House recodified its rules in the 106th Congress (House Resolution 5, January 6, 1999, p. 111).

The committee has had jurisdiction of bills for establishing and regulating the Department of Agriculture (IV, 4150), for inspection of livestock and meat products, regulation of animal industry, diseases of animals (IV, 4154; VII, 1862), adulteration of seeds, insect pests, protection of birds and animals in forest reserves (IV, 4157; VII, 1870), the improvement of the breed of horses, even with the cavalry service in view (IV, 4158; VII, 1865).

The committee, having charge of the general subject of forestry, has reported bills relating to timber, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain (IV, 4160). It has also exercised jurisdiction of bills relating to agricultural colleges and experiment stations (IV, 4152), incorporation of agricultural societies (IV, 4159), and establishment of a highway commission (IV, 4153), to discourage fictitious and gambling transactions in farm products (IV, 4161; VII, 1861), to regulate the transportation, sale and handling of dogs and cats intended for use in research and the licensing of animal research facilities (July 29, 1965, p. 18691); and to designate an agricultural research center (May 14, 1995, p. 111). The committee shares with the Committee on the Judiciary jurisdiction over a bill comprehensively amending the Immigration and Nationality Act and including food stamp eligibility requirements for aliens (September 19, 1995, p.111).

The House referred the President’s message dealing with the refinancing of farm-mortgage indebtedness to the committee, thus conferring jurisdiction (April 4, 1933, p. 1209).
The committee has jurisdiction over a bill relating solely to executive level position in the Department of Agriculture (March 2, 1976, p. 4958) and has jurisdiction over bills to develop land and water conservation programs on private and non-Federal lands (June 7, 1976, p. 16768).

Some of the specific areas in which the Committee on Agriculture exercises its jurisdiction or that have been created for the committee by historical reference include:

1. Public Law 480, 83d Congress, the restoration, expansion, and development of foreign markets for U.S. agricultural products; and the effect of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (and the North American Free Trade Agreement), bilateral free trade agreements, the European Community, and other regional economic agreements and commodity marketing and pricing systems on United States agriculture.

2. All matters relating to the establishment and development of an effective Foreign Agricultural Service.

3. Matters relating to rural development, including rural telephone companies, farm credit banks, farm rural housing loans, rural water supply, rural flood control and water pollution control programs, and loans for rural firehouses, community facilities, and businesses.

4. Production and use of energy from agricultural and forestry resources.

5. Matters relating to the development, use, and administration of the National Forests, including, but not limited to, development of a sound program for general public use of the National Forests consistent with watershed protection and sustained-yield timber management, study of the forest fire prevention and control policies and activities of the Forest Service and their relation to coordinated activities of other Federal, State, and private agencies; Forest Service land exchanges; and wilderness and similar use designations applied to National Forest land.

6. Price spreads of agricultural commodities between producers and consumers.

7. The formulation and development of improved programs for agricultural commodities; matters relating to the inspection, grading, and marketing of such commodities, including seafood; and food safety generally.

8. Matters relating to trading in futures contracts for all commodities and similar instruments, including commodity options and commodity leverage contracts.

9. The administration and operation of agricultural programs through State and county committees and the administrative policies and procedures relating to the selection, election, and operation of such committees.

10. The administration and development of small watershed programs under Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended, and the development of resource conservation and development programs for rural areas.

11. Programs of food assistance or distribution supported in whole or in part by funds of the Department of Agriculture, including but not limited to the Food Stamp Program and the Commodity Distribution Program.
(12) Aquaculture programs of the Department of Agriculture.
(13) Sugar legislation, including import control programs that stabilize domestic prices.
(14) All matters relating to pesticides, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, the Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act of 1972, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act Amendments of 1988, and the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996, including, but not limited to, the registration, marketing, and safe use of pesticides, groundwater contamination, and the coordination of the pesticide program under FIFRA with food safety programs.
(15) Agricultural research programs, including, but not limited to, the authorization of specific research projects and agricultural biotechnology development efforts.
(16) All matters relating to the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act.
(17) Legislation relating to the control of the entry into the United States of temporary, nonresident aliens for employment in agricultural production.
(18) Legislation relating to the general operations and the Organic Act of the Department of Agriculture, the Commodity Credit Corporation, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Farm Credit Administration, Farm Credit System, Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation, and Commodity Futures Trading Commission.
(19) Producer-funded research, promotion, and consumer and industry information programs for agricultural commodities.
(20) Legislation regarding reclamation water projects where the pricing of water delivered by such projects is affected by whether the water will be used in the production of a crop for which an acreage reduction programs is in effect.
(21) Legislation regarding reclamation water projects for which the Secretary of Agriculture is required to make a determination regarding commodity availability prior to the determination of the price to be charged for the delivery of such project water.
(22) Legislation establishing the level of fees charged by the Federal Government for the grazing of livestock on Federal lands.
(23) Legislation governing the Federal regulation of transactions involving swaps contracts, hybrid financial instruments, and derivative securities and financial products.
(24) Legislation regarding the Federal Reserve Board with respect to its authority to regulate the establishment of appropriate levels of margin on stock index futures contracts.

The committee also reviews and studies, on a continuing basis, the current and prospective application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the committee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof. In addition, the committee, along with other standing committees of the House, has the function of reviewing and studying on a continuing basis the effect or probable effect of tax and other fiscal and monetary policies affecting subjects within their jurisdiction.
C. OVERSIGHT PLAN


The following outline was prepared in consultation with the ranking minority member and approved by the full committee which was forwarded to the Committee on Government Reform and the Committee on House Administration on February 15, 1999:

OVERSIGHT PLAN, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
FOR THE 106TH CONGRESS

The committee expects to exercise appropriate oversight activity of the following issues. While committee and subcommittee leadership will be coordinating this oversight activity to make the best possible use of committee resources, they are listed under the auspices of the full committee.

1996 FARM BILL AND CURRENT ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) implementation of the Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform (FAIR) Act of 1996, as well as current U.S. agricultural economic conditions, including:

• Hearing on the current U.S. farm economy;
• Hearing on current livestock prices;
• The implementation of crop and market loss payments made available under the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for fiscal year 1999.
• USDA’s implementation of the Nonrecourse Marketing Assistance Loans and Loan Deficiency Payments provisions;
• The impact of funding shortfalls under the Special Marketing Provisions for Upland Cotton;
• The impact of the termination of the Milk Price Support Program on U.S. dairy producers;
• Hearings relative to USDA’s ongoing efforts to consolidate and reform Federal Milk Marketing Orders;
• The impact of the possible extension of the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact as well as the possibility of other regional compacts, on the U.S. dairy industry;
• The operation of specialty crop programs;
• The progress of the Commission on 21st Century Production Agriculture; and
• Ways to improve the FAIR Act to strengthen the safety net for U.S. agricultural producers.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

• The Federal Crop Insurance Program, including implementation of crop insurance provisions contained in the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998, as well as relevant General Accounting Office (GAO) reports recently completed or now in progress; and
• Activities of USDA carried out pursuant to section 192 of the FAIR Act. Section 192 requires the Secretary of Agriculture to work with the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) in the implementation of producer risk management education programs.

AGRICULTURAL TRADE

• Hearings on U.S. agricultural trade and the role of the Federal Government in promoting exports and securing a more favorable export environment through the reduction of trade barriers;
• The administration’s agricultural export promotion strategy, USDA’s export programs (including the Export Enhancement Program, the Market Access Program, General Sales Manager credits, and Foreign Market Development), as well as food assistance programs (including the Food Security Commodity Reserve and U.S. commitments under international agreements);
• The administration’s plans for new trade agreements and expansion of existing trade agreements affecting U.S. agriculture, including the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agricultural Agreement, the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), and accession of countries, such as China, to the WTO;
• USDA’s implementation of trade agreements and related issues to ensure compliance of other countries’ trade obligations, including:
  • The Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), including dispute settlement provisions, European Union (EU) issues such as the EU meat hormone ban, tariff rate quotas, EU crop subsidies, biotechnology, and state trading enterprises;
  • Issues relating to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), including Canada’s use of high tariffs for dairy, poultry, eggs, barley, and margarine products; tomato and avocado imports from Mexico; and Canadian exports of wheat, barley, and other agricultural commodities into the United States; and
  • Harmonization of sanitary and phytosanitary standards (SPS), including those provided by international organizations setting such standards; the administration’s position regarding the use of international standards versus U.S. standards; and incorporation of new technologies and products into SPS standards.
• Implementation of the trade title of the 1996 FAIR Act;
• Implementation of changes made under the FAIR Act to Public Law 480, including third country monetization, maximum administrative funding levels, the Farmer-to-Farmer Program, and expanded authority for sales on credit;
• Food assistance programs to ensure that program goals are being met in the most recent uses of the program;
• Extension of fast track trade negotiating authority;
• The impact of sanctions on U.S. agricultural exports;
• Current labeling requirements and other technical barriers to trade the United States faces as an exporter of meat, perishables, and other agricultural products to major export destinations;
• Examination of which markets offer the greatest opportunity to increase sales of U.S. agricultural product, such as Asia or Latin America, and what forums are best suited to open those markets, such as the FTAA, APEC, or the WTO; and
• The potential impact of trade proposals such as the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI) parity and the Africa Trade Opportunity Act on U.S. agriculture.

THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT
• Hearings on the reauthorization of the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA). The current authorization expires at the end of fiscal year 2000 and the congressionally-imposed moratorium on Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) rulemaking in the area of over-the-counter derivatives expires on April 1, 1999; and
• CFTC budget and annual performance plan, as well as the commission’s compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND PROMOTION
• USDA’s implementation of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998, including provisions relative to competitive and special grants and precision agriculture;
• The U.S. regulatory process governing biotechnology relevant to production agriculture, as well as the Federal agencies responsible for such regulation, including the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and the EPA;
• Agricultural marketing and promotion programs; and
• Federal efforts to facilitate research and development of aquacultural enterprises, specifically focusing on the activities of the Joint Committee on Aquaculture, chaired by the Secretary of Agriculture and including the Secretaries of Interior and Commerce.

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT
• Budget and program activities of USDA’s Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS);
• The regulatory activities of the NRCS and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) relative to concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFO’s) (including safe harbor agreements) and their impact on the livestock industry and other agricultural producers;
• USDA’s 18th Conservation Reserve Program sign-up;
• The potential impacts of the EPA’s National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone and particulate matter on agricultural producers;
• The potential consequences for production agriculture in the United States should the mandates contained in the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations’ Framework Convention on Climate Change be implemented by treaty, law, or regulation;
• The status of Public Law 566, the Small Watershed Program;
• The impact of regulatory activities carried out pursuant to the Endangered Species Act (ESA), or any proposed legislative changes to such Act, on agricultural producers;
• The impact of laws or regulations relative to the rights of agricultural producers to use legally acquired property, ranging from actual Federal acquisition to regulatory actions that restrict or prohibit lawful activities that affect the value of private property;
• USDA Forest Service’s management of public lands under its jurisdiction, including a review of agency policy governing grazing and other uses of these lands which require users to secure a permit;
• Federal efforts to reduce threats to human, animal, and plant health due to predatory and invasive species;
• The impact of EPA’s regulatory activity relative to methyl bromide on production agriculture in the United States;
• EPA’s implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA);
• The NRCS’ regulatory activity relative to the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP);
• USDA Forest Service’s management of the National Forest System, including the Agency’s fiscal and financial accountability, strategic planning and performance measurement under the Government Performance and Results Act, efforts to address the Nation’s declining forest health, and Federal laws and regulations affecting the management of private forest lands; and
• The Secretary of Interior’s activities pursuant to section 390 of the FAIR Act, a provision authorizing $200 million toward the restoration of the Everglades ecosystem in south Florida.

FARM CREDIT, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, AND THE RURAL ECONOMY

• Farm Service Agency (FSA) credit issues, including the status of the Preferred Lender Program, efforts to streamline the application process, agency loan funding shortfalls, and efficacy of direct versus guaranteed lending;
• The effectiveness of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation (FarmerMac) in providing liquidity to rural financial institutions;
• The Farm Credit Administration’s regulatory responsibilities relative to the Farm Credit System, as well as their individual and collective efforts to ensure the System’s financial soundness;
• The availability of credit to agricultural producers in view of low commodity prices;
• The status of the Rural Business-Cooperative Service’s Business and Industry loan program; and
• The potential impact of electrical industry deregulation on agricultural producers and rural residents.

WELFARE REFORM AND FOOD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

Hearings on the effect of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act on the Food Stamp Program and the efficient and effective management of the program. USDA’s Food and Nutrition
Service is responsible for overseeing the implementation of this reform by the States. The committee will review and evaluate the following issues:

- Revision of the simplified Food Stamp Program to ensure that States have the necessary flexibility to simplify the program;
- Harmonization of welfare and food stamp programs by States;
- Implementation of work requirement for able-bodied individuals and use of waivers by States to allow able-bodied persons aged 18 to 50 to receive benefits;
- The timetable for nationwide implementation of the State’s use of electronic benefits transfer (EBT) systems to improve the distribution of food benefits;
- Effectiveness of provisions designed to curb trafficking and fraud, particularly implementation of laws terminating food stamp benefits for prisoners and deceased individuals;
- Adequacy of USDA data collection to support comprehensive evaluation of the impact of food stamp reforms; and
- Consolidation of food distribution programs to improve distribution and delivery of food;

FOOD SAFETY, ADMINISTRATIVE AND REGULATORY ISSUES

- Aggressive oversight, reviews, and investigations relative to the Food Safety Inspection Service’s administration of the meat and poultry inspection laws, the Food and Drug Administration’s food inspection activities, including seafood and seafood products to ensure that policies and resources are focused on developing scientifically sound systems for food safety assurance;
- USDA’s efforts to educate consumers regarding safe food handling practices, the development of pre-exposure and post-exposure interventions to reduce the frequency and severity of food borne illnesses, expanded research and development of pathogen reduction technologies, as well as streamlined, science-based policies relative to assessment and approval of food safety technologies;
- USDA’s implementation of new protocols for meat, poultry, eggs, or seafood safety inspection, including the implementation of Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) for medium- and small-sized plants;
- USDA’s Civil Rights settlement, which is pending Court approval on March 2, 1999;
- The issue of new drug development, approval, and availability for animal agriculture as well as the implementation of the Animal Drug Availability Act;
- USDA’s proposed rule on organic standards;
- The effectiveness of the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) in monitoring the potential for market manipulation in the livestock industry;
- Hearing on the issue of concentration of agribusiness in and the potential impact on agricultural producers;
The Grain Inspection Act in anticipation of the act’s reauthorization in 2000, including any administration proposal;
• The adequacy of agricultural labor and the agricultural guest worker program, H2A;
• USDA operations, including agency operations, reorganization efforts, administrative convergence, management improvements, compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act, and the impact on client services;
• USDA’s Year 2000 readiness.

II. COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES DURING THE 106TH CONGRESS

A. MAIN LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Agriculture reported or otherwise considered a variety of bills in the 106th Congress covering many of the diverse areas within its jurisdictional interest. A considerable portion of the committee’s work in the first session of the 106th Congress was devoted to developing the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (H.R. 2559) which was signed into Public Law 106–224 on June 20, 2000.

With abundant world supplies and declining export demand, the committee also spent a considerable amount of time during the first and second sessions of the 106th Congress developing legislation to supplement farm income and expand overseas markets. This lead to the enactment of funding packages to supplement fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 farm income and again to legislation to expand crop insurance coverage and increase Federal premium subsidies.

In addition to legislative activity, the committee began the process of making permanent improvements to the current farm bill, which expires in 2002, by holding 10 field hearings across the country and five in Washington to hear from farmers and policy experts on the proper role of the Government for the future of U.S. agriculture.

Other major activities of the committee during the 106th Congress included the following:

Crop Insurance

The committee completed nearly a year of work that began in the first session of the 106th Congress by enacting H.R. 2559 (Public Law 106–224), the “Agricultural Risk Protection Act.” This legislation builds on the premium discounts provided by Congress for the 1999 and 2000 crop years. The chart below provides a comparison of the premium assistance offered at each coverage level (percentage of yield insured) under old law and under Public Law 106–224. For example, if a producer elects the 75 percent coverage level, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC) would pay 24 percent of total premium under old law and 55 percent of total premium under Public Law 106–224.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COVERAGE LEVEL</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Law .................</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The act requires that the percentage of total premium FCIC must pay toward the purchase of each coverage level, above, applies to traditional Multi-Peril Corp Insurance (MPCI) policies that cover production losses as well as to revenue insurance policies, such as Crop Revenue Coverage (CRC), that cover production and price losses.

The act protects Actual Production History (APH) from the effects of multiple year disasters so insurable yields better reflect what farmers have proven they can grow. New law allows producers that record a yield of less than 60 percent of the long-term county average to exclude that low yield and use 60 percent of that county average yield in the calculation of their APH.

The act requires the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC) to review the premium rates charged for insurance coverage and lower any premiums that are too high.

The act eliminates the unworkable “area loss” trigger of Non-insured Crop Disaster Assistance Program (NAP) so producers of crops that are not now insurable can receive assistance for losses on their individual farms regardless of whether the loss was widespread throughout the area.

The act cracks down on fraud, waste and abuse perpetrated by agents, loss adjusters, companies, farmers, or any other person through stiff penalties, including fines equal to the amount improperly gained by the violator or $10,000, whichever is greater, and debarment from all farm programs.

The act expedites the research and development of new and innovative policies to meet the unique needs of producers of all crops from all regions and empowers the real experts—farmers, farmer-owned cooperatives, producer trade associations, colleges and universities, and others—to conduct new policy research and development with the help of reimbursements and contracts so producers receive the quality coverage they need.

**Economic Assistance**

The committee held three oversight hearings to review the agricultural economy and saw enacted into law several bills in response to the severe economic conditions in rural America, providing a total $15.8 billion in supplemental agricultural assistance for 1999 and 2000.

In 1999, with agriculture prices continuing to remain depressed, Congress provided a total of $8.7 billion to producers by making an additional 100 percent Agricultural Market Transition Act (AMTA) payment (referred to as Market Loss Assistance) totaling $5.465 billion, $475 million in oilseed assistance, $200 million for livestock assistance, $122 million for dairy, $328 million for tobacco and $1.2 billion in single year disaster assistance.

In 2000, as part of H.R. 2559, Congress provided $7.1 billion in additional agricultural economic assistance to help producers cope with the continuation of low commodity prices.
Mandatory Price Reporting

As a result of the House Committee on Agriculture’s February 10, 1999 hearing on livestock prices, a bipartisan call went out from the committee for packers and producers to enter into good faith discussions toward a productive compromise on mandatory price reporting.

After many months of complex and, at times, contentious work, the two sides were able to craft a proposal that balanced the needs of interested parties against the potential pitfalls of market disruption.

The legislation, passed in October, 2000 as part of the fiscal year 2000 Agriculture appropriations bill (Public Law 106–78), would require hog processing plants that slaughter an average of 100,000 hogs or more annually to submit purchases daily to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Cattle plants that slaughter 125,000 head or more a year would also be required to submit purchases daily to the USDA. These thresholds effectively capture 94 percent of these livestock markets by requiring 10 percent of all plants to report.

The primary goal of a mandatory price reporting requirement is to provide producers with more accurate and timely information to allow the market transparency they seek for efficient price discovery. At the same time, care had to be taken to ensure that mandatory price reporting did not inadvertently cause packers to reveal proprietary data to their competitors.

Final rulemaking is virtually complete; USDA will be implementing the law in the very near future.

Biomass Research

The Biomass Research and Development Act of 2000 was included in title III of the conference report to the Agricultural Risk Protection Act (Public Law 106–224). Title III of the act authorizes research to promote the conversion of biomass into biobased industrial products.

The development of the biomass industry will benefit the agriculture community. Biomass products can be derived from plants, crop residues, wastes, and other organic sources. Organic waste products once deemed worthless have the potential of becoming valuable commodities such as plastics and fuel. Byproducts such as corn cobs, sugarcane stalks, and rice hulls could create power and cleaner air.

Plant Protection

The Plant Protection Act of 2000 (PPA), was included as part of the conference report on H.R. 2559, the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000, and was developed in recognition of the new challenges facing the Plant Protection and Quarantine program of USDA’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service under the developing global market in agricultural commodities.

The PPA addresses the three main goals of the Plant Protection and Quarantine program:

(1) Safeguard America’s abundant plant resources from invasive plant pests;

(2) Expeditiously secure admission of an increasing volume of goods and passengers into the United States; and
(3) Facilitate agricultural trade in compliance with international obligations and standards.

PPA consolidates 11 previous plant quarantine laws that date back to 1913 and which comprised a patchwork of sometimes confusing and inadequate authorities. PPA law is intended to eliminate duplication, inconsistencies, and confusion regarding the appropriate application of provisions.

In addition to consolidation and streamlining of existing statutory authorities, the law would grant several new authorities to the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. Included among these provisions, the Department is granted authority to issue administrative subpoenas when involved in an investigation of suspected violations of the act.

Dairy

The 1996 farm bill required the Secretary of Agriculture to reform the Federal milk marketing order system, which USDA administers, and to consolidate the 31 existing orders into between 10 and 14 new orders. Due to controversy that developed as a result of the Secretary's proposed pricing formulas under the revised system, the Congress modified the final order of the Secretary through passage of H.R. 1402 on September 22, 1999. H.R. 1402 was subsequently reintroduced as H.R. 3428 and incorporated into the fiscal year 2000 omnibus appropriations (Public Law 106–113).

This legislation required the Secretary to implement the “Option 1-A” location based differentials for class I (fluid) milk when implementing the final rule to consolidate Federal milk marketing orders.

Required the Secretary to enter into formal rulemaking procedures to evaluate and revise the pricing formulas for class III (cheese) and class IV (powder) adopted as part of USDA's final rule. This rulemaking would be required to be completed by January 1, 2001.

Required the Secretary to implement a 5-year pilot program of price-forward contracting for milk used for manufactured dairy products (i.e., all products except fluid milk) in federally regulated milk orders to allow producers and cooperatives to voluntarily contract with handlers.

Decoupled consent for the Northeastern Interstate Dairy Compact with market order consolidation in order to extend congressional consent through September 30, 2001.

Trade

Twenty-five percent of U.S. farm income is derived from agricultural trade. Therefore, with exports being vital to the prosperity and success of U.S. farmers and ranchers, the committee worked and saw enacted legislation that will help enhance U.S. trade policies. For instance, H.R. 4444, which was signed into Public Law 106–286, will grant permanent normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China. The law will not only improve China's prospects for entry into the World Trade Organization, but most importantly will present a significant opportunity for U.S. farmers and ranchers to take advantage of China's lucrative export market.

Other provisions affecting agricultural trade were also contained in H.R. 17, the Selective Agricultural Embargoes Act of 1999,
which laid out congressional procedures for the approval or disapproval of future embargos on agricultural products that are not a part of an embargo on all products to a country. Amendments nearly identical to H.R. 17 passed both the House and Senate in the fiscal year 2001 agriculture appropriations measures that exempted food and medical products from current and future U.S. unilateral economic sanctions. Such products could be sold to buyers in five currently sanctioned countries (Cuba, Iran, Libya, North Korea, and Sudan).

H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, which was signed into Public Law 106–200. Provisions in the law allow for a rotation in the types of products targeted for trade retaliation (“carousel retaliation”), which requires the USTR to periodically revise the list of goods subject to retaliation when a foreign country fails to comply with a WTO ruling.

Grain Standards

The reauthorization of the U.S. Grain Standards Act will provide the Grain Inspection Packers and Stockyards Administration with the essential authority to continue the inspection of grain, both domestically and internationally. Also included in this legislation was a rewrite of the U.S. Warehouse Act which authorizes electronic warehouse receipts for commodities other than cotton.

Commodity Futures Modernization

The committee labored over the passage of H.R. 4541, the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000, which was reported by all three committees of jurisdiction and passed by the House on October 19, 2000 by a vote of 377 yeas to 4 nays. This measure revamped U.S. futures laws to make them more conductive to the modern finance industry; make our domestic exchanges more competitive in the changing international markets; and provided legal certainty for risk management tools that have become so important to financial institutions worldwide.

On December 14, 2000, H.R. 5660 was introduced that contained major provisions of the House passed version of H.R. 4541. These provisions were included as part of the conference report (H. Rept. 106–1033) that accompanied H.R. 4577, the Consolidated Appropriations Act. (Note.—For further action see Public Law 106–111, under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law.”)

B. STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

(1) Statistics on bills referred to the Committee on Agriculture

Number of bills referred:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Bill</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House bills</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate bills</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House joint resolutions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House concurrent resolutions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate concurrent resolutions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House resolutions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disposition of bills containing items under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Bill</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bills enacted into law</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bills acted on by the committee included in other bills that became law .......... 7
Bills vetoed ............................................................................................................. 0
Bills acted on by both Houses, but not enacted ............................................... 1
Bills passed by the House but not considered by the Senate ............................ 9
Concurrent resolutions passed .............................................................................. 0
Bills reported to the House but not considered .................................................... 3
Bills defeated in the House ................................................................................... 2

(2) Statistics on hearings and markups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Open business meeting</th>
<th>Washington hearings</th>
<th>Field hearings</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Farm Commodities, Resource Conservation, and Credit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock and Horticulture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management, Research, and Specialty Crops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. DIGEST OF BILLS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON WHICH SOME ACTION HAS BEEN TAKEN

1. Bills enacted into law

   Public Law 106–2 (H.R. 882)

   To nullify any reservation of funds during fiscal year 1999 for guaranteed loans under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act for qualified beginning farmers or ranchers, and for other purposes (approved March 15, 1999).

   This act provided that funds reserved until April 1, 1999 for guaranteeing loans to beginning farmers and ranchers under the Beginning Farmers and Ranchers provisions of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act be made available for purposes of guaranteeing loans to producers. The act also provided that beginning farmers and ranchers be given priority to the extent practicable by the Secretary for any funds made available for purposes of guaranteeing farm loans pursuant to a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1999.

   Public Law 106–7 (H.R. 1212, S. 756)

   To protect producers of agricultural commodities who applied for a Crop Revenue Coverage PLUS supplemental endorsement for the 1999 crop year (approved April 1, 1999).

   This act required the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to extend the sales closing date for crop insurance for a 14-day period beginning on the date of enactment of the bill, but no later than April 12, 1999, for producers who applied for Crop Revenue Coverage PLUS (CRCPLUS) for the 1999 crop year. During this time period, such producers could obtain new insurance at equivalent or lesser coverage levels for crops subject to CRCPLUS, and such producers could transfer other policies with the insurer to whom they applied for CRCPLUS to another approved insurance provider.
Public Law 106–41 (S. 604, H.R. 1135)
To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to complete a land exchange with Georgia Power Company (approved August 5, 1999).
This act directs the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Georgia Power Company about 1,275 acres of Federal land located in Lake Oconee, GA, and a cash payment of about $23,250. In exchange, the company would convey to the Secretary about 1,175 acres of land in and near the Chattahoochee and Oconee National Forests in the State of Georgia. This exchange, which was an agreement between the Forest Service and the Company will, result in consolidation and more efficient management of national forests, increased protection of wildlife and habitats and improved recreational access for citizens.

Public Law 106–47 (S. 1543)
To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to release and protect the release of tobacco production and marketing information (approved August 13, 1999).
This act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to provide to State government producer tobacco marketing information. Furthermore, the information provided to States shall only be used for purposes of calculating and dispersing tobacco settlement money to tobacco producers.

Public Law 106–96 (H.R. 609)
To amend the Export Apple and Pear Act to limit the applicability of the act to apples (approved November 12, 1999).
The Export Apple and Pear Act, enacted on June 10, 1933, required that apples and pears meet certain standards prior to export in order to ensure only high quality U.S. fruit moves in foreign commerce. U.S. pear producers and shippers recommended that pears should be dropped from the act so that they can increase the volume of pear exports.
This act eliminated pears from the act, thereby allowing U.S. exporters greater flexibility in the changing international marketplace and the opportunity to increase exports.

Public Law 106–102 (S. 900, H.R. 10)
To enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, and other financial service providers, and for other purposes (approved November 12, 1999).
The Committee on Agriculture was appointed as conferees to title V, “Privacy” of H.R. 10/S.900. H.R. 10 was introduced in the House on January 6, 1999 and was referred to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and the Committee on Commerce. On July 1, 1999 the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union adopted an amendment to H.R. 10 dealing with the regulation of disclosure of non-public information of financial institution customers. The House passed H.R. 10, with the privacy amendment, on July 1, 1999.
The privacy title had not previously been considered or debated in any committee of the House. Consequently, the Committee on Agriculture was not permitted to review those provisions of title V, which affected entities within the jurisdiction of the committee. By
letter to the Speaker, the chairman requested that the committee be appointed conferees to the conference on S. 900 in order to address those provisions of title V concerning the jurisdiction of the committee.

Title V prohibited the disclosure of certain customer information by financial institutions. Falling within the ambit of the definition of “financial institution” were the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation and certain entities chartered and operating under the Farm Credit Act, and certain entities regulated by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission pursuant to the Commodity Exchange Act. Title V did not provide any means by which the Farm Credit Administration nor the Commodity Futures Trading Commission would be authorized to take part in rule making proceedings affecting their respective regulatees.

The Committee on Agriculture requested that the definition of “financial institution” exclude any person or entity with respect to any financial activity that is subject to the jurisdiction of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission under the Commodity Exchange Act and does not include the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation or any entity chartered and operating under the Farm Credit Act of 1971. Such exclusion was agreed to by the Conference and appears in sections 509(3)(B) and (C) and 527(4)(D) of the act.

Public Law 106–156 (H.R. 2632, S. 1843)

To designate certain Federal lands in the Talladega National Forest in the State of Alabama as the Dugger Mountain Wilderness (approved December 9, 1999).

This act designated as wilderness approximately 9,200 acres of Federal land in the Talladega National Forest in the State of Alabama. According to the Forest Service, the land was currently being managed as a wilderness study area. Therefore, designating the land as wilderness will have little impact on how the land is currently being administered.

Public Law 106–171 (S. 1733, H.R. 2709)

To amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to provide for a national standard of interoperability and portability applicable to electronic food stamp benefit transactions (approved February 11, 2000).

This act provides for a national standard of interoperability and portability for the food stamp program. Requires the U.S. Department of Agriculture to set specific standards for States with electronic benefit transfer (EBT) systems so that food stamp participants can redeem their benefits in neighboring States. Under the food stamp coupon system, participants can redeem benefits in any retail food store. EBT portability is simply allowing recipients of benefits under the food stamp program to redeem those benefits without regard to State borders at the stores they choose. (Note.— See also discussion under “D. Oversight. 2. Legislative hearings. June 17, 1999: Review of H.R. 852.”)

Public Law 106–222 (S. 777, H.R. 852)

To require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable farmers and other persons to file paperwork electronically with selected agencies of the Depart-
ment of Agriculture and to access public information regarding the programs administered by these agencies (approved June 20, 2000).

This act requires the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a user-friendly electronic filing and retrieval system, which would allow farmers to download forms from the Internet and submit completed and modified forms. Within 2 years, the completed system must be fully operational, allowing farmers to retrieve and file all relevant forms with USDA. (Note.— See also discussion under “D. Oversight. 2. Legislative hearings. August 5, 1999, Review of the Food Stamp Program and H.R. 2709.”)

Public Law 106–224 (H.R. 2559, S. 225)

To amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to strengthen the safety net for agricultural producers by providing greater access to more affordable risk management tools and improved protection from production and income loss, to improve the efficiency and integrity of the Federal crop insurance program (approved June 20, 2000).

Title I—Crop Insurance provisions of Public Law 106–224 build on the 30 percent premium discount provided to producers for the 1999 crop year. Producers participating in the Federal Crop Insurance Program will receive additional premium assistance at all levels of buy-up coverage—encouraging producers to purchase better coverage for less premium. The act also affords producers greater flexibility in buying coverage that best fits their farm. Producers with good insurance or production experience may receive a performance-based discount on premiums.

Producers choosing innovative plans of insurance, such as revenue or cost of production insurance, would receive an equal percentage of premium assistance that producers choosing traditional Multi-Peril Crop Insurance would receive “making these plans of insurance that protect price as well as production risk more affordable to producers.

The act continues the standard catastrophic risk protection (CAT) coverage (insuring 50 percent of yield at 55 percent of price) at a fee of $100. The act also allows producers to select an alternative CAT coverage based on area yields and losses that provides a higher combination of yield and price protection than the standard CAT coverage.

Producers are currently penalized with lower insurable yields that do not reflect their productive capability and coverage needs as a result of multiple-year disasters. The conference report ensures that farmers can better insure the yields they have proven they can produce by allowing producers that record a yield of less than 60 percent of the long-term county average to exclude that low yield and use 60 percent of that county average yield in the calculation of their Actual Production History (APH).

The act requires the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC) to review the premium rates charged for insurance coverage and lower any premiums that are too high.

The act establishes new procedures for insuring multiple crops on the same land, with provisions for traditional double-cropping areas. Producers also have more flexibility with regard to prevented planting coverage.
The act changes the unworkable area loss requirements of the Non-insured Assistance Program (NAP) and replaces it with an individual loss trigger allowing producers of crops for which there is not an insurance policy to have risk protection similar to CAT coverage, with an equal fee.

The act enhances provisions concerning fraud, waste and abuse to build a stronger crop insurance program and lower producer costs. The act directs the Secretary to develop and implement a coordinated plan for the FCIC and the Farm Service Agency (FSA) to reconcile producer information annually. The FSA will also assist the FCIC with investigating claims of waste, fraud or abuse and FSA State committees will review insurance policies for program vulnerabilities to reduce waste and abuse. The act also directs the FCIC to establish methods to identify producers, agents and loss adjusters who may be abusing the program. The act provides for tougher penalties and program disqualification for producers, agents, loss adjusters and others who defraud the crop insurance program.

The act makes a substantial investment in research and development by allowing experts to research and develop new policies, rather than the FCIC. This provision will increase the quality and quantity of insurance available to producers and make insurance policies available more quickly. The FCIC would have the authority to enter into contracts for research and development for underserved States and commodities, including specialty crops.

The act provides for expanded pilot authorities, including coverage for livestock and also for a pilot program on premium rate reduction.

The act provides for the Secretary of Agriculture to establish competitive grants to educate producers in underserved areas about the full range of risk management options and expands the dairy options pilot program to 300 counties.

The act adds one additional farmer to the Board of Directors of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation so that four active farmers would serve on the board. This provision would also require that at least one member of the board be a specialty crop producer.

The FCIC will make crop insurance information available electronically and will develop methods to allow producers and insurance providers to submit information electronically.

Title II of Public Law 106-224 provides producers with current Agricultural Market Transition Act (AMTA) contracts a payment to mitigate economic losses. Delivering the payment through the AMTA structure ensures USDA makes payments to the greatest number of producers quickly and efficiently, prior to the end of fiscal year 2000. The payments under this provision will total $5.466 billion nationwide.

Title II provides oilseed producers with direct payments to mitigate losses due to continued low prices. Producers growing oilseeds eligible to obtain a marketing assistance loan in the 2000 crop year will be eligible to receive payments estimated at 15 cents per bushel. To compensate for depressed cotton seed prices, producers and cotton seed handlers will be eligible for a payment for the 2000 crop. At a payment rate of approximately $20 per ton, these payments total $100 million nationally.
The act provides for infrastructure improvements for growers of specialty crops. Specifically, the section provides $59.45 million for the Perishable Agricultural Commodity Act, 1930 (PACA) reserve fund and the inspection service reserve fund to maintain the cost of licensing and inspection fees at the current level. The section also provides $11.55 million to make improvements to the system used for inspecting fruits and vegetables. This section also provides $200 million to be used by the Secretary to purchase specialty crops that experienced low prices in the 1998 and 1999 crop years. This section also provides $25 million to compensate growers for losses resulting from plum pox virus, Pierce's disease and citrus canker. This section also provides loans, up to 3 years in term, for apple producers that are suffering economic losses resulting from low prices.

Title II provides a payment to peanut producers for the 2000 peanut crop. In total, peanut producers would receive $47 million in economic assistance, which equates to $30.50 per ton for quota peanuts and $16 for additional peanuts. Title II provides $340 million in total payments to tobacco farmers to compensate for economic losses. Due to continued depressed wool and mohair prices, producers will receive a direct payment of 20 cents per pound of wool and 40 cents per pound of mohair produced for the 1999 marketing year—totaling $11 million. To mitigate the economic situation for honey producers, a recourse loan will be established.

Title II provides a payment to producers of wheat, oats, and barley who elect to graze their crop rather than harvest it mechanically. Payment will be made for the 2001 crop only.

However, producers of AMTA contract crops produced on a farm that does not have an AMTA contract are made eligible for a loan deficiency payments for 2000 crop year crops.

Title II provides $10 million for farmland preservation and $40 million to provide cost-share assistance for special 1-year conservation contracts.

Title II directs the Secretary to use $15 million to award competitive grants to producers to facilitate greater participation in markets for value-added agricultural commodities.

Title II provides $7 million for psuedorabies vaccination costs incurred by pork producers and $6 million for bovine tuberculosis control and eradication efforts.

Title II provides USDA with authority to make 18-month no-interest loans to producers of 1999 crop grass, forage, vegetable and sorghum seed that have not received payments from AgriBiotech (ABT) as a result of bankruptcy proceedings involving ABT.

Title III—Biomass Research and Development Act of 2000, incorporated text of S. 935, which authorizes competitive grants, contracts and other financial incentives to promote the use of biobased industrial products.

Title IV—Plant Protection, includes a revised version of the Plant Protection Act (H.R. 1504), which consolidates and enhances the authority of the Secretary to regulate in interstate and foreign commerce, the movement of any plant, plant product, biological control organism, or noxious weed if the Secretary determines the action is necessary to prevent the introduction or dissemination of a plant pest or noxious weed.
Title V—Inspection Animals, provides for civil penalties of up to $10,000 for causing harm to or interfering with a Department of Agriculture inspection animal. (Note.—See also discussion under “D. Oversight. 2. Legislative hearings. October 19, 1999. Review of H.R. 2827.”)

Public Law 106–330 (H.R. 4285)

To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain administrative sites for National Forest System lands in the State of Texas, to convey certain National Forest System land to the New Waverly Gulf Coast Trades Center, and for other purposes (approved October 19, 2000).

This act gives authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain Forest Service administrative sites in the Davy Crockett, Sabine, and Angelina National Forests in Texas at fair market value, and to authorize the conveyance of approximately 57 acres of National Forest land, at fair market value, to the Waverly Gulf Coast Trades Center.

Public Law 106–393 (H.R. 2389, S.1608)

To restore stability and predictability to the annual payments made to States and counties containing National Forest System lands and public domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management for use by the counties for the benefit of public schools, roads, and other purposes (approved October 30, 2000).

The act provides each county an election to either receive current revenue sharing payments (25 percent payment for Forest Service counties and 50 percent payment for Bureau of Land Management counties) or to receive a guaranteed safety net payment. Safety-net payments amount to a county’s share of the State’s high 3-year average between 1986 and 1999, indexed annually for inflation. Counties receiving the safety-net payment may use between 80 percent and 85 percent of the total payment for roads and schools. For counties receiving all safety net payments (less than $100,000) they may elect to use the total payment amount for road and schools. The act also authorizes the use of project funds reserved for projects on Federal or private land that benefit Federal land and resources. Furthermore, the act establishes resource advisory committees representing a broad cross-section of interest to approve project proposals prior to their submission to the Secretary. The act requires the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior to ensure that proposed projects comply with Federal laws, regulations, and policies, comply with applicable resources management plans, and be approved by local advisory committees. There is also established a pilot program authorizing separate contracts for the removal and sale of merchantable material for a fixed percentage of projects involving merchantable material. The act authorizes the use of project funds for county projects for search and rescue on Federal land, community service work camps, recreation and conservation easements, forest-related after school program, fire prevention programs and planning and community forestry. (Note.—See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Legislative hearings. July 15, 1999 Review of H.R. 2389.”)
Public Law 106–399 (H.R. 4828)

To designate wilderness areas and a cooperative management and protection area in the vicinity of Steens Mountain in Harney County, Oregon, and for other purposes (approved October 30, 2000).

This act designates the Steens Mountain Wilderness Area to maintain the cultural, economic, ecological, and social health of the Steens Mountain area in Harney County, Oregon. (Note.—H.R. 4828 was introduced on July 12, 2000 and referred to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. However, on October 2, 2000, the Committee on Agriculture waived further consideration by letter to the Chairman of the Committee on Resources in the interest of expediting the passage of the legislation.)

Public Law 106–472 (H.R. 4788, S. 3001)

To amend the United States Grain Standards Act to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to collect fees to cover the cost of services performed under that act, extend the authorization of appropriations for that act, and improve the administration of that act, to reenact the United States Warehouse Act to require the licensing and inspection of warehouses used to store agricultural products and provide for the issuance of receipts, including electronic receipts, for agricultural products stored or handled in licensed warehouses, and for other purposes (approved November 9, 2000.)

This act reauthorizes the U.S. Grain Standards Act and provides authority for the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) and the Federal Grain Inspection Service (FGIS). The act also provides new legal authority for FGIS to collect fees to cover administrative and supervisory expenses associated with grain inspection as well as fees for the testing of equipment utilized in performing official inspection, official weighing or supervision of weighing of grain.

The act also makes several revisions to the Warehouse Act by authorizing and standardizing electronic documents and allowing their transfer from buyer to seller across State and international boundaries. The act authorizes warehouse operators to enter into contracts or agreements with depositors to allocate available storage space and protect the integrity of State warehouse laws and regulations from Federal preemption.

Other provisions included in the act:

H.R. 728, the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Amendments of 1999, which helps small communities raise financial resources to repair dams by providing grants and cost-share assistance;

H.R. 4965, which extends the filing deadline for producers to make claims arising from a false inspection certificate issued at the Hunts Point Terminal Market; and

H.R. 5224, the International Food Relief Partnership Act, which authorizes grants to private, non-profit organizations for stockpiling and rapid transportation, delivery, and distribution of shelf-stable prepackaged foods to needy individuals in foreign countries. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “2. Bills Acted on By the Committee Included in Other Laws Enacted, H.R. 728, H.R. 4965, and H.R. 5224,” and the discussion under “5. Bills Acted
on By the House But Not By the Senate, H.R. 728, H.R. 4965 and H.R. 5224.

Public Law 106–471 (H.R. 4646, S. 2865)
To designate certain National Forest System lands within the boundaries of the State of Virginia as wilderness areas, and for other purposes (approved November 9, 2000).
The act designates approximately 6,500 acres in the George Washington National Forest as the “Priest Wilderness Area,” and another area of approximately 4,800 acres as the “Three Ridges Wilderness Area.” (Note.—See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Legislative hearings. September 19, 2000. Review of H.R. 4646.”)

Public Law 106–506 (H.R. 3388, S. 1925)
To promote environmental restoration around the Lake Tahoe basin (approved November 13, 2000.)
This act enables the Forest Service to plan and implement significant new environmental restoration activities and forest management activities to address degradation of the Lake Tahoe ecosystem, including sedimentation, dead and dying trees, loss of water clarity, groundwater contamination and increased risk of catastrophic forest fires. (Note.—H.R. 3388 was introduced and referred to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure. However, on August 15, 2000, the Committee on Agriculture waived further consideration by letter to the Chairman of the Committee on Resources in the interest of expediting the passage of the legislation.)

Public Law 106–526 (S. 1936)
To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange all or part of certain administrative sites and other National Forest System land in the State of Oregon and use the proceeds derived from the sale or exchange for National Forest System purposes (approved November 22, 2000).
This act will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange specified National Forest System Land and improvements in Oregon. In addition, the act will give the right of first refusal to purchase the Bend Pine Nursery to the Bend Metro Park and Recreation District while requiring proceeds to be deposited in the fund established under the Sisk Act. Furthermore, it will allow proceeds to be used for the acquisition, construction, or improvements of the Deschutes National Forest, and acquisition of land in the State of Oregon. (Note.—On September 6, 2000, S. 1936 was referred to the Committee on Resources. On October 5, 2000, the Committee on Resources reported S. 1936 after an exchange of letters with the Committee on Agriculture wherein it did seek a sequential referral in the interest of expediting the passage of the legislation.)

Public Law 106–532 (S. 2773)
To amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to enhance dairy markets through dairy product mandatory reporting, and for other purposes (approved November 22, 2000.)
The act establishes a mandatory program of price and sales volume reporting of products used by the USDA to establish the minimum monthly prices under the Federal Milk Order system. While a voluntary program had previously been administered by the USDA, concerns had been raised over the accuracy and timeliness of some reports. In addition to codifying the existing program, the legislation provides authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to enforce reporting mandates.

Other laws

Several bills acted on by other authorizing committees, but not acted on by the Committee on Agriculture, were enacted with provisions relating to matters within the committee’s jurisdiction. Following are abbreviated summaries of these bills, including some of the relevant provisions:

Legislative matters

**Public Law 106–5 (H.R. 808)**
To extend for 6 additional months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code is reenacted (approved March 30, 1999).

Chapter 12 is a specialized form of bankruptcy relief available only to a family farmer with regular annual income. It permits eligible family farmers to reorganize their debts pursuant to a repayment plan. Last Congress chapter 12 was extended until April 1, 1999 as part of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act. This act reenacted chapter 12 for the period beginning on April 1, 1999 and ending on October 1, 1999. It also specifies that all cases commenced or pending under chapter 12 shall be conducted and determined under such chapter as if such chapter were continued in effect after October 1, 1999.

**Public Law 106–53 (S. 507, H.R. 1480)**
To provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the United States Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes (approved August 17, 1999).

This act authorizes $6.3 billion for projects and programs of the Army Corps of Engineers civil works program. The act responds to pressing water infrastructure priorities, policy initiatives to update existing water resources programs, and programs to restore, protect, and enhance the aquatic environment. The act also authorizes 114 new water resources projects including 45 major Corps projects, modifies 75 existing authorized projects, and authorizes the Corps to conduct 60 studies to address a variety of water resources problems and opportunities.

Specifically of interest is the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) small watershed program and the authorization of the Secretary of the Army to complete the NRCS’s flood control program at Llagas Creek, California.
Public Law 106–70 (H.R. 1606)

To extend for 9 additional months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code is reenacted (approved October 9, 1999).

This act extends Public Law 106–6 for an additional 9 months for which family farmers can reorganize their debts. (Note.—See the description of “Public Law 106–5 under 1. Bills Enacted Into Law; Other Laws.”)

Public Law 106–181 (H.R. 1000)

To amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes (approved April 5, 2000).

This act authorizes approximately $40 billion over 3 years through fiscal year 2003 for the airport improvement program (AIP), air traffic control facilities and equipment, and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) operations. Included in this Act was a provision to ensure that airlines will continue to be able to carry animals while information is collected to determine whether there is a problem that warrants stronger legislative remedies. Toward this end, scheduled U.S. airlines will be required to provide monthly report to the Department of Transportation (DOT) describing any incidents involving animals that they carry. DOT and the Department of Agriculture must enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to determine that the Department of Agriculture receives this information. DOT must publish data on incidents and complaints involving animals in its monthly consumer reports or other similar publications.

Public Law 106–200 (H.R. 434)

To authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa, expand trade benefits to the countries in the Caribbean Basin, renew the generalized system of preferences, and reauthorize the trade adjustment assistance programs (approved May 18, 2000).

This act contains a provision of H.R. 2991 included in section 407 of H.R. 434. It amends the Trade Act of 1974 to create a “carousel” effect for products on a World Trade Organization (WTO) sanctioned retaliation list.

If the United States issues a retaliation list because a country fails to implement a WTO decision, the act requires the United States Trade Representative (USTR) to review the list of retaliatory goods every 6 months. The act further directs the USTR to change the goods that are on the list by changing the whole list within specific parameters.

Public Law 106–286 (H.R. 4444)

To authorize extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the People’s Republic of China, and to establish a framework for relations between the United States and the People’s Republic of China (approved October 10, 2000).

This act grants the President the authority to exempt the People’s Republic of China from title IV of the Trade Act by submitting to the Congress a report outlining the terms and conditions for the People’s Republic of China’s accession into the WTO, which must
be a least equivalent to those agreed to in the November 15, 1999, bilateral agreement. The act also enforces the product-specific safeguard established under the U.S-China Bilateral Trade Agreement and establishes clear standards for Presidential implementation of the provisions to provide relief to injured U.S. industries and workers. However, for U.S. farmers and ranchers, with permanent Normal Trade Relations status, agricultural trade is expected to increase by as much as $2 billion annually by 2005.

**Appropriations**

*Public Law 106–31 (H.R. 1141, S.544)*

Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for the Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes (approved May 21, 1999).

This act provided funds for emergency farm credit needs and Farm Service Agency (FSA) operations, while also addressing immediate shortfalls in the current year’s USDA budget by providing $109.6 million to replenish USDA loan accounts; $42.75 million to cover Farm Service Agency salaries and expenses; $70 million for additional Livestock Disaster Assistance payments; $28 million to fund Conservation Reserve Program technical assistance to farmers and ranchers for the remainder of fiscal year 1999 and $35 million for fiscal year 2000; and $145 million in emergency assistance available to agricultural producers.

*Public Law 106–78 (H.R. 1906, S. 1233)*

Making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (approved October 22, 1999).

This act provided $8.7 billion in emergency farm aid for income and disaster assistance and is designed to expedite delivery of funds to producers, including $1.2 billion for natural disasters, $5.5 billion for market loss payments, including $125 million for dairy producers and $200 million livestock losses; $650 million for crop insurance premium subsidy and for crop insurance associated costs; and $475 million in direct payments to oilseed producers. The act also provided full funding for the Cotton Step 2 marketing assistance throughout the current farm bill; eased the limit on Loan Deficiency Payment (LDP) and Marketing Loan Gains from $75,000 to $150,000 to better reflect their farm income as that of a small business, and included Mandatory Livestock Pricing Reporting language.

*Public Law 106–113 (H.R. 3194)*

Making consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (approved November 29, 1999).

This act which was a compromise final appropriation bill included an additional $576 million in emergency disaster assistance for agriculture and implementation of the dairy reform known as Option 1-A. Also included was an extension for 2 years for the Northeast Dairy Compact. (Note.— See also the discussion under
Public Law 106–246 (H.R. 4425)

Making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (approved July 13, 2000).

This act provided emergency supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture by providing $210.4 million for farm and conservation programs, including $81 million for marketing loan forgiveness and $77.56 million for Farm Service Agency expenses.

The act also requires the Environmental Protection Agency to contract with the National Academy of Science for a review of the science used to develop and implement Total Maximum Daily Loans (TMDL) and to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the costs associated with the development and implementation of TMDL's that shall include, (1) the potential State resources that will be required, (2) the projected annual costs to the regulated community in both the private and public sectors, (3) analysis, responding to concerns raised by the Comptroller General, and (5) the projected costs to small businesses.

Public Law 106–291 (H.R. 4578)

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (approved October 11, 2000).

This act appropriated $18.8 billion in new fiscal year 2001 budget authority. Approximately half of the funding, $8.4 billion, finances Interior Department programs to manage and study the Nation's animal, plant, and mineral resources and support Indian programs. The balance of the measure's funds support other, non-Interior agencies such as the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture. Furthermore, the act provided instructions for the use of $1.8 billion for wildfire suppression, rehabilitation and prevention and requires the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to engage State and local government as joint decision-making partners in the use of these appropriations.

The act also establishes a national advisory committee to develop recommendations for long-term policy ensuring that counties adjacent to Federal forest lands receive sufficient funding for the benefit of public education and other public purposes.

Public Law 106–377 (H.R. 4635)

Making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (approved October 27, 2000).

This act appropriates $23.6 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Energy, Army Corps of Engineers, and related programs. Included in this Act, is a provision that directs the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to contract expeditiously the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) for a review of the
of the quality of science used to develop and implement Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) that directs that the final report be submitted to Congress by June 1, 2001. The provision further directed EPA to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the potential State resources which will be required for the development and implementation of TMDLs and to present the results of the study to Congress within 120 days of enactment. (Note.—See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. 1. Oversight hearings. May 22, 2000: Review of the impact of the proposed Total Maximum Daily Loan (TMDL) regulations on agriculture and silviculture” and “June 19, 2000: Review of the Environmental Protection Agency’s Total Maximum Daily Loan Program and the impacted on agricultural and silviculture industries.”)

Public Law 106–387 (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 (approved October 28, 2000).

This act provided $3.5 billion in emergency disaster funds, including a provision that lifts limits to $150,000 this crop year on Loan Deficiency Payment (LDP) and provided legislation that lifts the ban on food and medicine exports to Cuba, Iran, Libya, North Korea and Sudan. Also included is the Hunger Relief Act, a $1.6 billion program (over 5 years, $66 million in fiscal year 2001). This legislation conforms the vehicle allowance in the Food Stamp program to the higher levels set in the TANF program, and increases the housing deduction from $280 to $340.

Public Law 106–554 (H.R. 4577)

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (approved December 21, 2000).

This act referred to as the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001, included H.R. 5660, the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000. This bill contained major provisions of H.R. 4541 as passed by the House. These provisions are in titles I and II of the act and provide regulatory relief for the domestic futures exchanges, legal certainty for over-the-counter derivatives, and allow trading of single stock futures.

The agreement (H.R. 5660) added two new titles not included in the House passed bill. Title III, Legal Certainty for Swap Agreements, provides the guidelines for the SEC’s role in regulating equity based swaps.

Title IV, the “Legal Certainty for Bank Products Act of 2000” excludes banking products from the Commodity Exchange Act and provides guidelines to determine the regulator for new products if regulators disagree on who should regulate the product. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion of H.R. 4541, under “5. Bills acted on by the House but not the Senate.”)

Public Law 106–553 (H.R. 4942)

Making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against
the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (approved December 21, 2000).

This act contains Commerce, Justice, and State appropriations, as well as a compromise between the competing House and Senate versions of rural satellite legislation (H.R. 3615) that, among other things, included a change in the composition of the Board to include members from the Federal Reserve Board and from the Departments of Treasury, Commerce, and Agriculture. The compromise (title X of H.R. 5548) further requires full collateral on loans, that the loan program be technologically neutral, and provides that Internet and Weather Service Signals are additional considerations under the act. (Note: For further action see the discussion of H.R. 3615, under “5. Bills Acted on By the House By Not the Senate.”)

2. Bills acted on by the committee included in other laws enacted

H.R. 3615 included in Public Law 106–553 (H.R. 4577)

See the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–553” and the discussion under “5. Bills Acted on by the House But Not the Senate, H.R. 3615.”

H.R. 728 included in Public Law 106–472 (H.R. 4788)

See the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–472” and the discussion under “5. Bills Acted on by the House But Not the Senate, H.R. 728.”

H.R. 1402 included in Public Law 106–113 (H.R. 3194)

See the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted into Law, Public Law 106–113” and under “5. Bills Acted on By the House But Not the Senate, H.R. 1402.”

H.R. 2827 included in Public Law 106–224 (H.R. 2559)

See the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted into Law, Public Law 106–224.”

The Subcommittee on Risk Management, Research, and Specialty Crops held a hearing on the National Sustainable Fuels and Chemicals Act on October 19, 1999. See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. 2. Legislative Oversight, October 19, 1999: Review of H.R. 2827.”

On February 29, 2000, the companion bill S. 935, passed the Senate, amended, and was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and in addition to the Committee on Science.

H.R. 4965 included in Public Law 106–472 (H.R. 4788)

See the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–472” and the discussion under “5. Bills Acted on By the House But Not the Senate, H.R. 4965.”

H.R. 5224 included in Public Law 106–472 (H.R. 4788)

See the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–472” and the discussion under “5. Bills Acted on By the House But Not the Senate, H.R. 5224.”
3. Vetoed bills

There were three bills vetoed by the President during the 106th Congress that contained tax cuts, which would have benefited U.S. farmers and ranchers. While none of the bills were referred to the Committee on Agriculture, following is an abbreviated summary of the bills, including the relevant provisions:

**H.R. 8, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phase-out the estate and gift taxes over a 10-year period (vetoed on August 31, 2000).**

H.R. 8, known as the “Death Tax Elimination Act of 2000” was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means (H. Rept. 106–651), amended, and passed by the House of Representatives on June 9, 2000 by a vote of 279 yeas to 136 nays. On July 14, 2000, the Senate passed the measure by a vote 59 yeas to 39 nays. The President vetoed H.R. 8 on August 31, 2000 and the House unsuccessfully voted to override the veto on September 7, 2000 by a vote of 274 yeas to 157 nays (two-thirds required for passage).

Currently family owned businesses (composed of 50 percent or more of business or farm assets) are exempt from taxes on estates valued up to 1.3 million. The act repealed the step-up in basis, applying a carry-over basis instead to estates of more than $1.3 million.

The act reduced rates and repealed the Federal estate, gift, and generation-skipping transfer taxes over a 10-year period, beginning with a reduction of the tax immediately and eliminating it completely in 2010. The plan would also simplify portions of the generation skipping transfer tax rules prior to repeal and would expand the ability of farmers and ranchers to use conservation easements in their estate planning.

**H.R. 2488, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to sections 105 and 211 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 (vetoed on September 23, 1999).**

H.R. 2488, known as the “Taxpayer Refund Act of 1999” was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means (H. Rept. 106–238), amended, and passed by the House of Representatives on July 22, 1999 by a vote of 223 yeas to 208 nays. On July 30, 1999, the Senate struck all the language after the enacting clause and substituted the language of S.1429, as amended, and passed the bill by unanimous consent. The Conference Report (H. Rept. 106–289) was filed and passed by the House on August 5, 1999 by a vote of 221 yeas to 206 nays. That same day the Senate passed the Conference Report by a vote of 50 yeas to 49 nays. The President vetoed the bill on September 23, 1999.

A provision of the act was designed to help farmers and ranchers through tough economic times by providing them with a tax benefit during the good times by allowing them to make contributions to an account under the Fish, Farm and Ranch Risk Management Act (FFARRM). Contributions to FFARRM accounts are tax deductible and limited to 20 percent of the taxable income that is attributable to eligible businesses. Amounts deposited in a FFARRM account could remain for up to 5 years and must be distributed after that period of time.
H.R. 4810, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 (vetoed August 5, 2000).

H.R. 4810, known as the “Marriage Tax Relief Reconciliation Act” was introduced on July 10, 2000 and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. The bill passed the House of Representatives on July 12, 2000. On July 18, 2000, the Senate struck all the language after the enacting clause and substitute the language of S. 2839, as amended, and passed the bill by a vote of 61 yeas to 38 nays. The Conference Report (H. Rept. 106–765) was filed and passed by the House on July 20, 2000 by a vote of 271 yeas to 156 nays. The next day the Senate passed the measure by a vote of 60 yeas to 34 nays. The President vetoed the bill on July August 5, 2000.

According to the Joint Committee on Taxation of the Congress, under current law, a married couple with two children making $50,000 would pay $3,425 in Federal taxes; by eliminating the marriage penalty that couple would pay $3,185, saving $240. That amounts to a 7 percent reduction in their taxes. The same couple earning $75,000 would have their taxes reduced by 13 percent. At an annual income of $200,000, the couple would receive a 3.9 percent reduction.

4. Bills acted on by both houses but not enacted

None.

5. Bills acted on by the House but not by the Senate

H.R. 17, to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to require the President to report to Congress on any selective embargo on agricultural commodities, to provide a termination date for the embargo, to provide greater assurances for contract sanctity, and for other purposes

H.R. 17 was introduced on January 6, 1999 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and in addition to the Committee on International Relations. The Committee on Agriculture reported H.R. 17, without amendments, on May 20, 1999 (H. Rept. 106–154, part 1). The Committee on International Relations reported H.R. 17, without amendments, on June 14, 1999 (H. Rept. 106–154, part 2). The bill then passed the House of Representatives on June 15, 1999 under suspension of the rules by a voice vote.

H.R. 17 was similar in intent and construction to the prior provisions of the Export Administration Act of 1979 that expired on August 20, 1994. The Export Administration Act of 1979 required that “If the President imposes export controls on any agricultural commodity in order to carry out the policy set forth in [this Act], the President shall immediately transmit a report on such action to the Congress, setting forth the reasons for the controls in detail and specifying the period of time, which may not exceed 1 year, that the controls are proposed to be in effect.”

H.R. 17 required that if the President acts to implement an embargo of any agricultural commodity to any country, the President must submit a report to Congress within 5 days of imposing the embargo that described the reasons for the embargo and the period of time the embargo would in effect. The bill also provided that if
within 100 days of receiving the President's report, a joint resolution must be enacted that approves the embargo, the embargo will end on the date determined by the President or 1 year after the date of enactment of the joint resolution, whichever is earlier. If a joint resolution disapproving the embargo is enacted during that 100-day period, the embargo would terminate at the end of that 100-day period.

The bill also granted an exception providing that an embargo may take effect during any period in which there is a state of war declared by Congress or a national emergency declared by the President.

The bill also clarified that “plant nutrient materials” are included in the category of agricultural commodities in the section of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, regarding contract sanctity. Therefore the protection afforded agricultural commodities in regard to suspension of trade and contract sanctity would apply to plant nutrient materials.

Furthermore, plant nutrient materials under export sales contracts would be protected from suspension of trade, as long as the contract is entered into before the suspension of trade is announced and the contract terms require delivery within 270 days after suspension of trade is imposed.

**H.R. 169, to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to expand the pilot investigation for the collection of information regarding prices paid for the procurement of cattle and sheep for slaughter and of muscle cuts of beef and lamb to include swine and muscle cuts of swine.**

H.R. 169 was introduced and referred to the Committee on Agriculture on January 6, 1999 and passed by the House of Representatives, amended, under suspension of the rules on February 9, 1999. The bill would have simply added hogs and pork products to the pilot investigation on beef and lamb prices that was authorized during the 105th Congress as part of (Public Law 105–277) the Omnibus Appropriations package. During the 105th Congress, when the Omnibus bill was being crafted, the pork producers declined to be included in the USDA pilot investigation. However, with drastic declines in live hog prices, the pork producers reconsidered and ultimately reversed its decision.

*(Note.—For further action see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law. Public Law 106–78” and the discussion under “A. Main Legislative Activities. Mandatory Price Reporting.”)*

**H.R. 701, to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, and for other purposes.**

The Committee on Resources reported H.R. 701, as amended, on February 16, 2000 (H. Rept. 106–499, part 1). The bill was then sequentially referred to the Committee on Agriculture until March
H.R. 701 established a new program that provided Outer Continental Shelf Impact assistance to State and local governments and amended several other statutes to create a fund for the purchase of land for parks, renovation of historic properties, creation of new wildlife habitat and areas and incentives to assist in the recovery of threatened and endangered species. The Conservation and Reinvestment Fund (CARA) would receive revenues from leased oil and gas tracts within defined areas of the Outer Continental Shelf. The Fund would then allocate the funds to State and local governments in accordance with the various titles of the bill.

Title VII of H.R. 701 which falls within the Committee on Agriculture’s jurisdiction, provided $150 million for annual funding dedicated to conservation easement and other landowner incentives to assist in the recovery of threatened and endangered species. The Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Resources worked diligently on compromise language to address this committee’s concerns regarding the implementation of that title.

Therefore, in an exchange of letters between the respective chairmen of the committees, the Committee on Agriculture waived its further consideration of the bill on March 17, 2000, and the bill with the compromise language passed the House on May 11, 2000, by a vote of 315 yeas to 102 nays.

H.R. 728, to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide cost share assistance for the rehabilitation of structural measures constructed as part of water resource projects previously funded by the Secretary under such Act or related laws.

H.R. 728 was introduced on February 11, 1999 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reported the measure, amended, on November 18, 1999 (H. Rept. 106–484 part 1) and the Committee on Agriculture reported the measure on April 4, 2000 (H. Rept. 106–484 part 2).

On July 17, 2000, a compromise passed the House of Representatives, amended, under suspension of the rules, by a voice vote, that would have given the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to provide financial assistance to local organizations for up to 65 percent of the total costs for those dams built under the Small Watershed Program. The measure authorized a total of $90 million over the next 5 years beginning in 2001, to help rehabilitate the Nation’s watershed projects. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion of Public Law 106–472 under “1. Bill Enacted Into Law,” and the discussion under “2. Bills Acted on By the Committee Included in Other Laws Enacted, H.R. 728” and “D. Oversight. 2. Oversight hearings. April 15, 1999: Review of Bexar-Medina-Atascosa Counties Small Watershed Project and H.R. 728, The Small Watershed Rehabilitation Amendments of 1999.”)
H.R. 1402, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to implement the class I milk price structure known as Option 1-A as part of the implementation of the final rule to consolidate Federal milk marketing orders.

H.R. 1402 was introduced on April 14, 1999 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. The Committee on Agriculture reported H.R. 1402, amended, on July 19, 1999 (H. Rept. 106–239) and it was passed by the House of Representatives on September 22, 1999 by a vote of 285 yeas to 140 nays.

H.R. 1402 required the Secretary of Agriculture to implement the class I “Option 1-A” milk price structure when implementing the final rule to consolidate Federal milk marketing orders. Option 1-A reflects the status-quo pricing structure in which milk marketing orders require milk processors to pay a certain minimum price for farm milk based on how the milk is used.

The bill also requires the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into formal rulemaking, on an emergency basis, to develop pricing formulas for class III and IV milk within 10 months, and prohibits the Secretary of Agriculture from collecting assessments from milk producers or handlers to administer the Federal milk market order program if the final rule regarding class III and class IV pricing formulas is delayed.

The bill reduces the processors’ manufacturing allowance for cheese from 17.02 cents per pound of cheese to 14.7 cents per pound as an interim while developing regulations regarding class III and class IV pricing formulas.

The bill extended for 1 year the dairy price support program at its current level while delaying implementation of the Recourse Loan Program for the same period of time.

Finally, the act required the Secretary to establish a forward pricing program so that producers and cooperatives may enter into contracts with handlers on a voluntary basis in order to manage risk and reduce the negative impacts of price volatility.

(Note.—For further action on this provision, see the discussion of Public Law 106–113 under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law” and “2. Bill Acted on the Committee Included in Other Laws Enacted.”)

H.R. 3615, to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to ensure improved access to the signals of local television stations by multichannel video providers to all households which desire such service in unserved and underserved rural areas by December 31, 2006.

H.R. 3615 was introduced on February 10, 2000 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and the Judiciary. On March 1, 2000, the Committee on Agriculture reported H.R. 3615, amended (H. Rept. 106–508 part 1), and the Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration on March 31, 2000. On April 6, 2000, the Committee on Commerce reported the bill, amended (H. Rept. 106–508 part 2). The bill then passed the House of Representatives, as amended, under a rule, by a vote of 375 yeas to 37 nays on April 13, 2000.

H.R. 3615 amended the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 in order to provide local television networks to rural satellite customers and authorized the Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service (RUS)
to provide loan guarantees to rural communities for building or improving satellite, cable television and multi-channel video distribution infrastructures to ensure improved access of local television signals into unserved or underserved rural areas by December 31, 2006.

(Note.—For further action on this provision, see the discussion of Public Law 106–553, under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law,” the discussion of H.R. 3615 under “2. Bills Acted on by the Committee Included in Other Laws Enacted,” and the discussion “D. Oversight. 2. Legislative Oversight. February 9, 2000: Review of proposed legislation to establish a loan guarantee program to promote the delivery of direct-to-home satellite services to rural America.”)

H.R. 4541, to reauthorize and amend the Commodity Exchange Act to promote legal certainty, enhance competition, and reduce systemic risk in markets for futures and over-the-counter derivatives, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4541 was introduced on May 25, 2000, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, and Commerce. On June 29, 2000, the Committee on Agriculture reported the bill, amended, (H. Rept. 106–711 part 1), and on September 6, 2000, both the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and the Committee on Commerce reported the bill, amended, (H. Rept. 106–711 part 2, and part 3). On October 19, 2000, the bill passed the House of Representatives, amended, under suspension of rules by a vote of 377 yeas to 4 nays.

The bill as passed contained provisions from the three reported committee bills (Agriculture, Banking and Financial Services, and Commerce), including a compromise concerning the Commodity Exchange Act (CEAct): legal certainty for over-the-counter derivatives and swap transactions and regulatory relief for Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) regulated futures and option markets. Transactions in foreign currencies, government securities and other described financial instruments that are excluded under current law by the so-called “Treasury Amendment” may continue to trade exclusive of CFTC jurisdiction. This provision would allow banks and other regulated financial institutions to offer these products to their customers while leaving the CFTC with the authorities to bring enforcement actions against fraudulent bucket shops selling foreign currency futures and options illegally.

The bill gave no jurisdiction to CFTC over transactions in excluded commodities (non-agricultural) if they are traded between defined eligible contract participants and are not conducted on a trading facility that generally is described as a facility where bids and offers may be executed between multiple participants. Transactions in excluded commodities may be conducted on electronic trading facilities if the transactions are on a bilateral basis between eligible contract participants. Securities or depository instruments with futures or option components (hybrid instruments) that meet a predominance test will not be subject to CFTC jurisdiction.

The bill did, however, give the CFTC defined and limited jurisdiction over certain exempt commodities (energy products and metal) that are traded among eligible contract participants and are not traded on a trading facility. With the exception of the com-
modity options, eligible commercial entities were not subject to the Commodity Exchange Act’s fraud provisions. Eligible commercial entities may conduct principal-to-principal trades on electronic trading facilities, and the CFTC may enforce its anti-fraud and anti-manipulation status and regulations as described in the bill.

Swap transactions on commodities other than agricultural commodities are excluded specifically from CFTC jurisdiction, as long as they are traded among qualified participants.

The measure allowed designated contract markets within boards of trade to establish and enforce its own rules to ensure fair and equitable markets with limited CFTC oversight so long as the contract market maintained trading standards and adhered to the 18 core principles. Futures and future options on agricultural commodities enumerated in the CEAct must be conducted on a registered contract market.

A board of trade operating contract markets may elect to operate as a registered derivatives transaction execution facility (DTEF) under conditions that set out the commodities that may be traded and persons that may trade on the DTEF. Because only sophisticated parties may trade or private individuals may trade only through a registered futures broker, they may trade in this less-regulated environment where they must adhere to nine core principals. DTEF’s may trade excluded and exempt commodities.

The measure required for all clearinghouses, systems or organizations to be regulated by a Federal regulator. Derivatives clearing organizations, clearing transactions excluded from the CEAct may register with the CFTC and meet certain core principles. Federal banking regulators will be the default regulator for any clearing system otherwise not regulated.

Also included was a compromise of the Shad-Johnson reforms dealing with the trading of single stock futures and futures based on narrow-based stock indexes. The tax treatment of single stock transactions in security futures and security option contracts also has required reconciliation to ensure that neither the options or futures market has a competitive trading advantage. Reconciliation of tax treatment between security futures and security option contracts will be left to the Department of the Treasury to resolve by regulation. Major disagreements resolved were margin levels and margin setting, the definition of a narrow-based index that may contain one or two heavily-weighted stocks, commencement of stock futures trading and overall SEC authorities to intervene in stock futures trading.

(Note.—For further action, see the discussion of Public Law 106–554, under “1. Bills Enacted Law” and for further discussion “A. Main Legislative Activities. Commodity Futures Modernization” and also the discussion under “D. Oversight. 1. Oversight hearings. May 18, May 19, May 20, and June 8, 1999: Review of the reauthorization of the Commodity Futures Trade Commission” and “D. Oversight 2. Legislative Oversight. June 14, 2000: Review of H.R. 4541, the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000.”)
H.R. 4965, To amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, to extend the time period during which persons may file a complaint alleging the preparation of false inspection certificates at Hunts Point Terminal Market, Bronx, New York.

H.R. 4965 was introduced on July 26, 2000 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On October 17, 2000, H.R. 4965 passed the House of Representatives under suspension of rules by a voice vote.

The act amends the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 by adding at the end the following: “Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, a person that desires to file a complaint under this section involving the allegation of false inspection certificates prepared by graders of the Department of Agriculture at Hunts Point Terminal Market, Bronx, New York, prior to October 27, 1999, may file the complaint until January 1, 2001.”

(Note.—For further action on this provision, see the discussion of Public Law 106–472, under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law,” the discussion of H.R. 4965 under “2. Bills Acted on by the Committee Included in Other Laws Enacted,” and the discussion under “D. Oversight. 1. Oversight hearings. July 27, 2000: Reviewing illegal activities at the Hunts Point Marketing Terminal.”)

H.R. 5224, to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to authorize assistance for the stockpiling and rapid transportation, delivery, and distribution of shelf stable prepackaged foods to needy individuals in foreign countries.

H.R. 5224 was introduced on September 20, 2000, and referred to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On September 21, 2000, the Committee on International Relations ordered reported, the bill, amended. On September 25, 2000, the measure passed the House of Representatives, amended, under suspension of the rules, by a voice vote, after the Committee on Agriculture discharged itself from further consideration by letter to the Chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

The bill promotes public-private partnerships to leverage the donation of nutritious foods by volunteers to needy families throughout the world in times of famine, disaster, or other critical need. The bill authorizes the Agency for International Development (AID) to make matching grants to American non-profit institutions that are engaged in the processing and delivery of donated food for consumption by the less fortunate throughout the world in times of great need. The bill also authorizes AID to stockpile long shelf life food for rapid delivery to other places in the globe in times of crises, famine, or other need. Additionally, the bill encourages AID to make grants to non-profit organizations that provide matching or in-kind contributions and thereby serve to strengthen the international food relief effort carried out by non-profits and authorizes the AID to pre-position commodities overseas in anticipation of critical needs and to expedite the delivery of emergency food relief.

(Note.—For further action on this provision, see the discussion of Public Law 106–472, under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law.”)
6. Concurrent resolutions approved
None.

7. Bills reported to the House but not considered

_H.R. 1523_, to establish mandatory procedures to be followed by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management in advance of the permanent closure of any forest road so as to ensure local public participation in the decisionmaking process.

_H.R. 1523_, known as the Forest Roads-Community Right-To-Know Act, was introduced on April 22, 1999 and referred to the Committee on Resources and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture.

The Committee on Resources reported _H.R. 1523_, as amended, on May 3, 2000 (H. Rept. 106–604, part 1). In the report filed by the Committee on Resources is a copy of an exchange of letters between the respective chairmen of the committees (Agriculture and Resources) explaining the reasons expediting this legislation. Therefore, on May 3, 2000, the Committee on Agriculture was discharged from further consideration.

_H.R. 1523_ provided that permanent road closures, including road decommissioning, would no longer be done by the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management without adequate public notice and local government and public involvement. It specifically allows short-term closures that the agencies may deem necessary. However, the bill does not affect valid and existing rights.

_H.R. 1524_, to authorize the continued use on public lands of the expedited processes successfully used for windstorm-damaged national forests and grasslands in Texas.

_H.R. 1524_ was introduced on April 22, 1999 and referred to the Committee on Resources. On October 31, 2000, the Committee on Resources reported the bill, without amendment, (H. Rept. 106–1021), and the Committee on Agriculture did not seek a sequential referral by an exchange of letters between the respective Committee Chairmen.

_H.R. 1524_ would require the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior to request from the appropriate officials in the executive branch the authority to remove in an expedited manner dead or damaged trees on about 247,000 acres of Federal land. The bill would require the officials considering the Secretaries’ requests to consider them promptly and either approve or disapprove them. The measure would also require the officials to report to the Congress on the reasons for their decision within 90 days of receiving a request from the Secretaries.

_H.R. 3661_, to help ensure general aviation aircraft access to Federal land and to the airspace over that land.

_H.R. 3661_ was introduced on February 15, 2000 and referred to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Transportation, and Infrastructure. On September 12, 2000, the Committee on Resources reported the bill, amended, (H. Rept. 106–841, part 1), and the Committee on Agriculture was
H.R. 3661 would establish new requirements related to aircraft landing strips on Federal lands managed by the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior. It would prohibit the secretaries from closing certain aircraft landing strips for more than 180 days a year without the approval of the head of the aviation department of the State in which the landing strip is located. The bill also would require the secretaries to maintain those landing strips in consultation with State aviation departments and other interested parties and would authorize them to enter into cooperative agreements for that purpose. Finally, the bill would direct the secretaries to develop a national policy for managing certain landing strips under their jurisdiction.

**S. 1288, to provide incentives for collaborative forest restoration projects on National Forest System and other public lands in New Mexico, and for other purposes.**

S. 1288, known as the “Community Forest Restoration Act” passed the Senate on November 19, 1999, and referred to the Committee on Resources on January 27, 2000. On October 6, 2000, the Committee on Resources reported the bill, without amendment, and the bill was then sequentially referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On October 13, 2000, the Committee on Agriculture was discharged from further consideration of the bill.

S. 1288 would direct the Forest Service to establish a cooperative program for forest restoration in New Mexico to provide grants for experimental forest restoration projects. The bill also would authorize appropriations of $5 million a year for that program and would specify the eligibility requirements for projects to receive funding under the program and would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convene an advisory committee to recommend projects that meet those criteria.

**8. Bills defeated in the House**

*House Concurrent Resolution 296, Expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the necessity to expedite the settlement process for discrimination claims against the Department of Agriculture brought by African-American farmers.*

House Concurrent Resolution 296 was introduced on March 30, 2000 and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture.


The resolution called for whatever resources necessary to be committed to expediting the settlement process concerning claims of racism perpetrated on African-American farmers by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, so that the claims could be resolved as quickly as possible.

Furthermore, the resolution expressed the sense of Congress that the Attorney General and Secretary of Agriculture should strictly follow the consent decree issued in the discrimination case.
H.R. 3085, to provide for discretionary spending offsets for fiscal year 2000.

_H.R. 3085 was introduced on October 14, 1999 and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, Resources, Commerce, Education and the Workforce, and the Budget._

On October 19, 1999, H.R. 3085 failed passage under suspension of the rules by a vote of 0 yeas to 419 nays with 5 present (two-thirds majority vote required for passage).

H.R. 3085 included $19.2 billion in discretionary spending offsets with tax increases as well as new and increased user fees that were outlined in the President’s fiscal year 2000 budget.

Included were provisions that established new user fees on the poultry and egg industries to cover the cost of plant inspections.

9. Other bills acted on by the committee

_H.R. 1275, to amend the Animal Welfare Act to prohibit the interstate movement of live birds for the purpose of having the birds participate in animal fighting._

H.R. 1275 was introduced on March 24, 1999 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On April 13, 2000, the Subcommittee on Livestock and Horticulture held a business meeting and ordered reported the bill, amended, to the full committee by a voice vote. On September 13, 2000, the full committee held a hearing to review the legislation and received testimony from representatives from the law enforcement, the Humane Society of the United States, the United Gamefowl Breeders Association, the American Poultry Association, and the American Animal Husbandry Coalition.

The bill amended the Animal Welfare Act to prohibit the interstate movement of live birds with the intent of having the birds participate in fighting ventures.

_(Note._—For further action, see the discussion of H.R. 1275 under “D. Oversight. 2. Legislative hearings. September 13, 2000: Review of H.R. 1275, Prohibition of Interstate Movement of Live Birds.”)

_H.R. 2962, to provide for the issuance of a promotion, research, and information order applicable to certain handlers of Hass avocados._

H.R. 2962 was introduced on September 28, 1999 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On April 13, 2000, the Subcommittee on Livestock and Horticulture held a hearing and business meeting and ordered reported H.R. 2962, amended, to the full committee.

“The Hass Avocado Promotion, Research and Information Act of 2000” was a self-help national checkoff program that allowed avocado growers to fund and operate a coordinated marketing effort to expand the domestic market. The avocado promotion program was to be operated at a no net cost to the Nation’s taxpayer and would have been funded by the U.S. avocado growers and avocado importers.
D. OVERSIGHT

1. Oversight hearings

The Committee on Agriculture and its subcommittees were active in their oversight functions, holding a number of oversight hearings both in the field and in Washington, DC, during the course of the 106th Congress. The hearings related to the application, administration, and effectiveness of laws that lie within the committee's jurisdiction as well as the organization and operation of the Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies having responsibility for the administration of such laws. The hearings often resulted in recommendations for improvements in the administration of the laws, regulations and policies in effect in the executive branch as they related to the committee's jurisdiction. Information gathered at these hearings was later useful in preparing legislation for consideration in the House of Representatives.

As part of its hearings, the committee and its subcommittees reviewed the way the particular Federal agency or department (usually the Department of Agriculture) administered existing laws related to the subject matter of the legislation before, or to be considered by, the committee. In some cases, legislation favorably reported to the House carries a termination date (a "sunset") to ensure that in the future Congress will again review the effectiveness and the methods with which the executive branch of Government has carried out the letter and the spirit of that statute.

In keeping with the objective of the Oversight Plan as submitted to the Committee on Government Reform, the committee and its subcommittees conducted the following chronological oversight hearings during the 106th Congress:

Oversight hearings, 106th Congress—chronological listing

  - The full committee began its work in the 106th Congress with a hearing on the causes of low prices currently facing the livestock industry. Six witnesses testified before the committee which included industry groups, and the Chief Economist from the Department of Agriculture. The issues of price reporting, country of origin labeling and the changing structure of the livestock industry were among the topics addressed. (Note.—For further action relating to this hearing, see the discussion under "1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–78, "A. Main Legislative Activities. Mandatory Price Reporting," and "5. Bills Acted on By the House But Not By the Senate. H.R. 169.")

  - The purpose of this hearing was to review the state of the farm economy and to focus on the impact of the ongoing structural consolidation of the agricultural community. Testimony was received from four witnesses who underscored the complex nature of agribusiness consolidation. While some witnesses encouraged aggres-
sive government oversight of consolidation, others cautioned the committee about the pitfalls of interventionist policies.


The subcommittee heard testimony from five witnesses representing the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Farm Credit Administration, the American Bankers Association, the Farm Credit Council, and the Independent Bankers Association of America regarding the dire situation of farmers facing the lowest commodity prices in years and its effect on the availability of farm credit.


This was a field hearing held in Grand Island, NE to review the state of the agriculture economy. Fourteen witnesses appeared before the committee representing the Department of Agriculture (State and Federal), producers, agribusiness, and commodity organizations.


The purpose of this hearing was to review Forest Service forest health risk maps with emphasis on how to restore and sustain the long-term health and productivity of U.S. forests, how to restore financial and performance accountability to the Forest Service, both for how it spends taxpayer dollars and for what it accomplishes, and how to examine the role of the Forest Service with regard to private forestland management. Ten witnesses appeared before the subcommittee representing the Forest Service (Federal and State), universities, associations, and forestry constituent groups.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the status of biotechnology in U.S. agriculture, its future potential for farmers and ranchers, and its impact on exports of U.S. agricultural commodities and products. Eleven witnesses appeared before the subcommittee representing the Farm and Foreign Agriculture Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Agricultural Affairs Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, farmers’ organizations, agribusinesses, and commodity organizations.


This was the first of several hearings reviewing the staffing, budget, and workload requirements of the Loan Deficiency Payments Program with emphasis placed on the adequate delivery of services from USDA. Testimony was received from the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the National Legislative Chairman of the National Association of Farm Service Agency County Office Employees.

After three forums held in Georgia and North Carolina in February, 1999 on crop insurance, a series of hearings were held to identify potential reforms to the Federal crop insurance program. The subcommittee review brought together USDA Risk Management Agency Administrator Ken Ackerman as well as a dozen representatives from farmer organizations, commodity groups, the insurance industry and lenders.

(Note.—For further action relating to the hearing, see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law. Public Law 106–224 and the discussion under “A. Main Legislative Activities, Crop Insurance.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to review the Forest Service's funding request in the fiscal year 2000 budget. In doing so, the subcommittee questioned the Agency's performance and whether Congress should give the Forest Service more money as requested. The subcommittee also questioned what the Agency's priorities should be assuming current funding levels. Appearing before the subcommittee were eleven witnesses representing the General Accounting Office, the U.S. Forest Service, State Foresters, forestry supported organizations and Members of Congress.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the USDA's implementation of disaster assistance and the operation of other programs that were a part of the omnibus appropriations bill passed by Congress in 1998 that provided $5.9 billion in additional agriculture spending, including $2.5 billion in disaster assistance. Appearing before the committee were officials from USDA, including the Secretary of Agriculture, Dan Glickman. Chairman Combest questioned the Secretary about the delays that continued to plague implementation of the disaster program and also questioned the administration's commitment to certain programs that had received no funding in the President's budget.


This was a joint hearing which brought together representatives from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), industry groups, and the scientific community to review the potential effects and costs of implementing a controversial new pesticide rule regulating the use of plants' natural defenses against pests. During the hearing, it was requested that EPA consider re-proposing the rule and provide for a new comment period to address issues raised at the hearing including replacing the term “plant-pesticide” and “plant expressed protectant, expanding the proposed exemptions, and performing a thorough cost-benefit analysis of the new rule.

This was a field hearing held in Stockton, California that was designed as a broad overview of agricultural issues concerning livestock and horticulture in a State whose farmers and ranchers lead the Nation in the production of over 75 commodities. Fourteen witnesses appeared before the subcommittee testifying of the challenges, obstacles and opportunities on such varied and diverse issues as livestock, poultry, dairy, fruits, vegetables, water usage and the farm labor supply.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the Forest Service’s implementation of a law enacted in the 105th Congress that would improve the Forest Inventory and Analysis Program. Five witnesses appeared before the subcommittee representing the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, State Foresters, universities, and industry representatives.


Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities, Resource Conservation, and Credit. Hearing Serial No. 106–14.

The purpose of this hearing was to review a proposal to improve a watershed project in Texas and to consider legislation responding to the maintenance and improvement involving a large number of similar projects originally funded by the Federal Government. Under Public Law 83–566, the Natural Resources Conservation Service of USDA in the 105th Congress submitted to the House Committee on Agriculture the watershed plan-environmental impact statement for improvements in the Bexar-Medina-Atascosa Counties Water Control and Improvement District No. 1, the Medina Valley Soil and Water Conservation District and the Alamo Soil and Water Conservation District in south central Texas. Four witnesses appeared before the subcommittee representing the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the USDA, local conservation districts and Members of Congress. (Note.—For further action regarding this hearing, see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, P.L. 106–472,” “2. Bills Acted on By the Committee Included in Other Laws Enacted, H.R. 728,” “5. Bills Acted on By the House But Not the Senate, H.R. 728,” and the discussion under “E. Watershed Projects.”)

April 22, 1999: Review of the implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act. Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry. Hearing Serial No. 106–16

The purpose of the hearing was to review the implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) and to hold the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) accountable for its actions in the implementation process. Bipartisan concerns were expressed about how the law would be implemented and whether a consistent, science based framework would be employed. The importance of the process by which the FQPA amendments are implemented was stressed by the subcommittee because of the potential of bringing major changes to the system of food production, disease control and other public health programs. Ten witnesses testified including
Representative Doc Hastings and representatives from the USDA, EPA, and several commodity organizations.


The purpose of this hearing was to examine the issue of country-of-origin labeling for meat and produce. Although the subcommittee has been gathering information on this subject for some time, this hearing gave a broad overview of the philosophies, the costs, the benefits, and the alternatives to mandated country-of-origin labeling. Fourteen witnesses appeared before the subcommittee representing the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the General Accounting Office, producer organizations, and Members of Congress.


The purpose of this hearing was to examine the issue of mandatory price reporting for livestock and its possible implications and benefits for both producers and packers. Appearing before the subcommittee were eight witnesses, representing agribusiness and industry organizations. (Note—For further action relating to this hearing, see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–78,” “A. Main Legislative Activities. Mandatory Price Reporting,” and “5. Bills Acted on By the House But Not By the Senate. H.R. 169.”)


This was a field hearing in Lexington, KY to review the Federal Crop Insurance Program. This is a continuation of the series of field hearings the subcommittee held around the country to gather information and ideas to make crop insurance more effective for producers. Five witnesses appeared before the subcommittee representing agribusiness and industry groups. (Note—For further action relating to the hearing, see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law. Public Law 106–224” and the discussion under “A. Main Legislative Activities, Crop Insurance.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to review the USDA’s final decision on the reform of Federal Milk Marketing Orders. The hearing was designed for the subcommittee to continue to exercise its oversight responsibilities with regard to the ongoing reform of America’s dairy industry as outlined and mandated under the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, also known as the farm bill. The subcommittee heard from 18 witnesses, including several House representatives, U.S. Department of Agriculture officials representing the Agriculture Marketing Service, the Chief Economist, agribusiness and industry groups.

Testimony received during this oversight hearing of USDA’s regulatory effort to reform the system of Federal Milk Marketing Orders led to legislative activity resulting in modifications to the final regulation promulgated by the USDA. (Note: For further action, see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law

The purpose of the hearings was to debate the reauthorization of the Commodity Futures Trade Commission (CFTC). The subcommittee identified some guidelines for a successful reauthorization process: (1) create and maintain a cooperative process through open dialog; (2) focus on maintaining and fostering the competitiveness of U.S. markets; (3) encourage regulatory efficiency; and (4) maintain market integrity. Subcommittee members heard testimony from a total of 28 witnesses during the series of hearings. Witnesses represented the CFTC, trade boards, market exchanges, commodity groups, banks, and exchange and securities organizations.

Testimony received during these oversight hearings led to the introduction of H.R. 4541, the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “5. Bills Acted on By The House But Not the Senate. H.R. 4541” and the discussion under “A. Main Legislative Activities, Commodity Futures Modernization.”)


The purpose of the hearing was to review a proposal put forth by a grass roots movement called the National Forest Counties and Schools Coalition to resolve the continuing problems facing rural communities under the “25 percent county payment” system. The system worked on the premise that in counties where the Forest Service was the dominant landowner, the Government would share 25 percent of the revenue derived from the forest with the impacted communities to finance schools and local road infrastructure. After timber sales plummeted 75 percent from historic averages, the Government defaulted on its obligations under the contract, and the affected communities suffered. The subcommittee heard testimony from seven first time congressional witnesses representing the National Forest Counties and Schools Coalition. The coalition, which represents nearly 400 organizations in over 30 States, presented its set of principles for addressing the 25 percent payment problem.

This hearing led to the introduction of H.R. 2389, the County Schools Funding Revitalization Act. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–393.”)

May 26, 1999: Review of the effects of electric deregulation on rural areas and an examination of legislative proposals. Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities, Resource Conservation, and Credit. Hearing Serial No. 106–21.

The purpose of the hearing was to review the possible side effects of a federally-mandated deregulation of the Nation’s electric power generation, transmission, and distribution system on rural areas. Rural areas face significant difficulties in competing for electricity and other utilities due to low populations, absence of economies of
scale, and a smaller percentage of individual customers which all lead to greater costs associated with providing service to these areas. The subcommittee discussed the proposed introduced by the administration and expressed concern as to whether deregulation was actually being achieved by this legislation (H.R. 1828). Seven witnesses appeared before the subcommittee including representatives from the USDA and the Department of Energy, university economists, and industry experts.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the effect of sanctions on United States agriculture, focusing on how it affects the prosperity of farmers and ranchers. Members urged the Clinton administration to move quickly on its policy of removing agricultural products from unilateral sanctions and to expand this policy to allow credit guarantees and other export assistance. The committee heard from nine witnesses. The administration was represented by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Under Secretary of State for Economics, Business, and Agricultural Affairs. One Member of Congress and several agribusiness and industry organization representatives appeared.

Several bills were introduced in the 106th Congress addressing unilateral sanctions on food and medicine. However, the fiscal year 2001 Agriculture appropriations included a provision eliminating unilateral food (including agriculture products such as cotton) and medicine sanctions on Libya, Iran, North Korea, Sudan, and Cuba. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–387.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to examine the proposed change to a national, uniform LDP rate. The committee received testimony from the chief proponent of the change, the Honorable Dan Glickman, Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture. The committee expressed concern over the ability of the proposed uniform LDP rate to create a more equitable market for farmers.

June 21, 1999: To review the implementation of the Northwest Forest Plan. Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry. Hearing Serial 106–23.

The subcommittee held a hearing in Medford, Oregon, to review the implementation of the Northwest Forest Plan. The plan called for 80 percent of the forests in the Pacific Northwest to be placed in reserves and 20 percent to be available for harvest in order to achieve sustainable forestry. The committee expressed concern over whether the implementation of the Plan was actually helping to achieve this goal. Eleven witnesses testified before the committee, including representatives from the United States Department of Agriculture, Department of Interior, Department of Commerce, and several State and local forest organizations. The committee urged the Federal agencies to work with each other and the affected parties to ensure that the Plan is carried out to meet its objectives.

The purpose of the hearing was to review the administration’s preparation for the 1999 World Trade Organization (WTO) Ministerial. After hearing testimony from the Secretary of Agriculture, Committee members criticized the administration for categorizing supplemental Agricultural Marketing Transition (AMTA) Payments as trade distorting payments, and the committee requested the Secretary to change the classification of the payments for WTO purposes. A new round of multilateral trade negotiations will begin at the WTO ministerial meeting in November, 1999. These negotiations will provide a unique opportunity for United States agriculture to further reduce tariffs, open new markets, and address unfair trade practices around the world. The committee also heard testimony from 12 other witnesses including the United States Trade Representative and representatives from numerous commodity organizations.

After the WTO meeting in Seattle, WA, several bills were introduced and ultimately enacted that greatly affect producers. For example, H.R. 4444, the Permanent Normal Trade Relations for China, was signed by the President into Public Law 106–286. This measure will lower trade barriers to provide U.S. farmers better access to a market of 1.2 billion people. The Trade and Development Act of 2000, was signed by the President into Public Law 106–200. This measure included a provision for periodic revision of WTO approved retaliation lists, better known as the carousel law. Another provision of the Trade and Development Act is the Caribbean Basin Initiative, which removes duties and quotas on certain Caribbean apparel exports made from U.S. textile components. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–200; Public Law 106–286 and Public Law 106–387” and the discussion under “A. Main Legislative Activities, Trade.”)


This hearing was third in the series held to review the USDA’s and EPA’s implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act and resultant impacts on public health. The subcommittee heard testimony from 11 witnesses representing the USDA, EPA, National Cotton Council, Bayer Corporation, American Crop Protection Organization, Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association, Harvard School of Public Health, Mississippi Department of Health, Mosquito Control Association, National Pest Control Association, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment, and American Farm Bureau Federation Young Farmer and Rancher Committee.


The subcommittee heard testimony from four Commodity Futures Trading Commissioners (CFTC) and representatives from the Chicago Board of Trade, Chicago Mercantile Exchange, and New

The subcommittee held this field hearing in Lodi, California to review the status and prospects of American wine production. Ten witnesses testified to the economic contributions of the wine industry and the need for policy changes to ensure its future growth.


In the first of a series of two hearings held to review the farm financial crises, representatives from 10 various farmer, commodity, and lending organizations gathered to present testimony before the full committee. In addition, 10 Members of Congress submitted statements for the record. These testimonies served to witness the dire state of the U.S. agricultural economy and offered suggestions on how Congress could help alleviate the situation.

The committee concluded its review of the farm financial crises with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Dan Glickman, who testified to some of the possible causes of the financial crises, as well as to the administration's focus on what direction should be taken by Congress to help farmers weather these difficult times. Written testimony was also submitted by five Members of Congress and by the National Association of Conservation Districts.


The full committee held this field hearing in Hutchison, KS, to review the negative impacts suffered by the State due to the current financial crises facing agriculture. U.S. Department of Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman and USDA Chief Economist Keith Collins gave testimony. They were joined by several Kansas farmers and representatives of Kansas farmer organizations. These witnesses impressed upon the committee the difficulties faced by farmers in the State and in the rest of the Nation. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “1 Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–31, Public Law 106–78, Public Law 106–113, Public Law 106–224 and Public Law 106–387,” and the discussion under “A. Main Legislative Activities. Economic Assistance.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to review the United States Department of Agriculture's Russian Food Aid Program. USDA Secretary Dan Glickman and USDA Inspector General Roger C. Viadero gave testimony. Also among those who testified were the Honorable Marcy Kaptur and representatives from several commodity organizations. The hearing was held shortly after Russia's
official request to the U.S. Government for additional food aid in fiscal year 2000.


This hearing was held for the purpose of reviewing USDA's civil rights programs and responsibilities. The committee heard testimony from six witnesses. Ms. Rosalind D. Gray, Director, Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Agriculture, testified that the Department had made incredible strides in implementing new civil rights reforms and implored the committee to enact certain legislation that would enable the Department to continue in this endeavor. However, many representatives of black farmer organizations and otherwise socially disadvantaged groups testified that the USDA had committed horrible crimes against their constituencies in the past, and that these inequities were continuing today. Among these witnesses were Mr. Stephon (sic) J. Bowens, executive director, Land Loss Prevention Project, and Mr. John W. Boyd, Jr., president, National Black Farmers Association.

House Concurrent Resolution 296, a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the necessity to expedite the settlement process for discrimination claims against the Department of Agriculture brought on by African-American farmers, was introduced on March 30, 2000, and considered by the House under suspension of the rules on May 8, 2000. (Note.—For further action on H. Con. Res. 296, see the discussion under “8. Bills Defeated in the House, H. Con. Res. 296.”)


Chairman Combest pledged close consultation between the committee and the U.S. Trade Representative and the Department of Agriculture during the course of WTO negotiations. This hearing provided Members of the committee the opportunity to question USTR Ambassador Charlene Barshefsky and USDA Secretary Dan Glickman about the Government’s planning for the upcoming Seattle negotiations. Chairman Combest stressed the importance that throughout this process, it is essential that these worldwide trade negotiations proceed under the close scrutiny of the farm sector represented by the Committee on Agriculture because world trade can provide greater opportunities for the success of our farmers and ranchers when the terms are fair to all concerned. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “1 Bill Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–200; Public Law 106–286 and Public Law 106–387” and the discussion under “A. Main Legislative Activities, Trade.”)


The purpose of this hearing was intended to be a broad review of several new rules and guidelines that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has promulgated that would have a terribly negative impact on farmers, ranchers, and timber workers. Chairman Goodlatte criticized EPA for its disregard of existing laws passed by Congress to protect the environment and the use of unscientific
methods in promulgating new regulations. Among the witnesses that addressed the concerns of the subcommittee were Mr. J. Charles Fox, EPA, Ms. Glenda Humiston, USDA, Mr. John Barrett, EPA's TMDL Federal Advisory Committee, Mr. Robert J. Olszewski, The Timber Company, Mr. Ron Jones, Texas Institute for Applied Environmental Research, and Mr. Arthur Nash, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality.


This was a field hearing held in Lake Alfred, Florida to review issues concerning invasive, harmful, and non-native species facing the United States. Florida, being one of several States that stands on the front lines in the fight against invasive and harmful species, has more than it shares of problems. Invasive species are dealt with under a patchwork of Federal and State laws and regulations administered by a wide variety of Federal agencies. This hearing brought together various agencies of Federal, State, and local governments, growers, farm bureaus, and retailers to ensure that all is being done to protect our States from harmful species.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the findings of the President's Working Group contained in a Committee-requested report on over-the-counter derivatives and the Commodity Exchange Act. Testimony was received from representatives of the Working Group, U.S. futures exchanges, over-the-counter markets, and securities and option exchanges. *(Note.—For further action, see the discussion under "5. Bills Acted on By The House But Not the Senate, H.R. 4541" and the discussion under "A. Main Legislative Activities, Commodity Futures Modernization.")*


This was a field hearing held in Rutherford, CA, to review the effects concerning the recent and severe outbreak of Pierce's Disease on winegrapes. Nearly 90 percent of America's wine is produced in California and it generates about 112,000 jobs annually with an additional 40 to 50 thousand during harvest time. Pierce's Disease represents a serious and substantial threat to this thriving agricultural sector; however, it also places citrus, stone fruits and almonds at risk. The subcommittee received testimony from 11 witnesses representing the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the California Department of Food and Agriculture, California Farm Bureau, universities, growers and producers.

*March 6, 17, 18, 27, 29; April 1, 3, 12; May 1, 2, 12, 13, July 12, 19 and 26 2000:* Review of Federal Farm Policy. Full committee. Hearing Serial No. 106-50 part I and II.

For 3 months, as producers prepared for another challenging year of poor commodity prices and uneven yields, Members of the House Committee on Agriculture traveled to 10 cities throughout rural America, convening field hearings on farm policy that were heard over the committee's Internet site as they occurred. Allowing
for the broadest discussion possible, the committee encouraged testimony beyond the effect of the current farm bill, to seek producer specifics on what is working—and what can work better—in all areas of Federal farm policy. Producers were strongly supportive of the flexibility of the “Freedom to Farm” concept, and in agreement with Committee Members critique of the Federal Government’s failure to pursue other promised elements of the market-oriented legislation: tax relief, reducing regulatory burdens, and the opening of more world markets for American agricultural products.

Under the leadership and initiative of Chairman Combest, and the support of Ranking Minority Member Stenholm, these farm policy field hearings enjoyed high attendance—totaling more than 2,500 present in the audiences, 181 witnesses, and a high degree of participation by Members of the committee. While producers were unable to agree on specifics for new policy initiatives, the personal involvement of Committee on Agriculture Members traveling thousands of miles to listen to local farmers and ranchers in their communities contributed to expressions of producer confidence in Members’ willingness to continue to work for consensus.

The committee concluded this comprehensive review with a series of hearings in Washington, DC, and heard from leaders of national farm organizations, national commodity organizations and producer groups that face many issues distinct to their industries.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the fiscal year 2001 budget of the Forest Service. While it was recognized that the Forest Service was making efforts to become more financial and performance accountable, the subcommittee stressed concern over a $380 million budget increase request. Witnesses consisted of officials from the administration.


The purpose of this hearing was to discuss the reauthorization of certain authorities of the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, specifically the Federal Grain Inspection Service. Testimony was received from administration officials and industry representatives.

This hearing led to the introduction of H.R. 4788, the United States Grain Standards Reauthorization Act of 2000. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–472.”)


This was a field hearing held in Mankato, MN, to review the Conservation Reserve Program, Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, and other conservation matters affecting U.S. agriculture. Testimony was received from 12 witnesses representing the Department of the Army, the Department of Agriculture (both
State and Federal), conservation districts, agribusinesses and producers.


This was a field hearing held in Lexington, KY, to review the challenges that producers and growers of tobacco face today. Testimony was received from eight witnesses, all of whom expressed concern over the anti-tobacco sentiments.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the administration’s proposal for permanent trade relations with China. Ten witnesses testified before the committee, that included the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, the U.S. Trade Representative, and various members from commodity groups. During the hearing, the witnesses and the Members expressed overwhelming support for Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–286” and the discussion under “A. Main Legislative Activities, Trade.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to review the impact of the proposed Total Maximum Daily Load regulations on agriculture and silviculture. Fourteen witnesses testified before the committee that included a representative from the USDA, EPA, various forestry representatives, and affected producers. Members questioned the witnesses about a hand-written letter from the EPA to the USDA about things “getting out of hand.” Members expressed their frustrations and concerns about the TMDL rules to the USDA and EPA. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion, under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–377.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to review the EPA’s Total Maximum Daily Load Program and the impacts on agriculture and silviculture industries. Ten witnesses testified before the subcommittee that included a representative from the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, the EPA Water Quality Protection Division, and various aquaculture, tree farmer, and livestock producers. Members expressed their frustrations and concerns about the proposed TMDL rules and urged the EPA to withdraw the new regulations. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion, under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–377.”)

The purpose of this hearing was to review the administration’s export and market promotion programs. The Secretary of Agriculture was the only witness that testified before the committee. The Secretary was questioned about various USDA export programs such as the Export Enhancement Program (EEP) and the Dairy Export Incentive Program (DEIP) and the extent to which they are used to assist U.S. farmers and ranchers. The hearing also provided a venue to compare expenditures on U.S. programs to those of other countries.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the factors affecting domestic and international agricultural input prices. Two panels, consisting of nine witnesses, testified before the committee. Witnesses included representatives from the General Accounting Office, National Center for Food and Agricultural Policy, and various seed trade groups.


The purpose of this hearing was to exercise the subcommittee’s oversight responsibility with regard to the implications American fruit and vegetable production would have should methyl bromide be banned from use. Also discussed was the availability of possible transition products and the economic consequences of a pending ban. The subcommittee heard testimony from 10 witnesses representing producers and growers, agribusinesses, and representatives of the scientific community.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the illegal activity that occurred at Hunts Point Terminal Market, located in the Bronx, NY, where 21 people, including eight USDA inspectors, were charged with bribery and fraud. Witnesses included the Inspector General of USDA, the Administrator of Agricultural Marketing Service of USDA, and various groups representing producers and growers.

Legislation to extend the time period during which persons may file a complaint alleging the preparation of false inspection certificates at Hunts Point Terminal Market was introduced on July 26, 2000, and passed by the House of Representatives on October 17, 2000, under suspension of the rules. *(Note.—For further action regarding that legislation, see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law. Public Law 106–472,” and the discussion under “5. Bills Acted on by the House But Not By the Senate, H.R. 4965.”)*


The purpose of this hearing was to receive testimony and written statements reviewing the Inspector General report on the Urban Resources Partnership Program of the Office of the Under Sec-
retary for Natural Resources and Environment. Among other items discussed, the audit revealed funds originally appropriated for agricultural conservation measures that were diverted to questionable uses without congressional approval. Officials from the Department of Agriculture testified.


Early in 1999, the Committee on Agriculture began working with farmers of all crops from every region of the country to strengthen the crop-loss side of the farm safety net. The result of this effort was the enactment of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act (Public Law 106–224), the most sweeping improvement to the Federal Crop Insurance Program in its 62-year history. The committee received testimony from the Secretary of Agriculture and representatives from the crop insurance industry regarding the implementation of that act.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the causes of this year’s (2000) catastrophic western wildfires and to examine a new plan designed by the Western Governors Association that was included in House-passed Interior appropriations bill to prevent future disasters. Governor Kempthorne of Idaho was the only witness; however, a panel of witnesses were also available to answer technical questions.

The Interior appropriations bill (H.R. 4578) was signed into Public Law 106–291 on October 11, 2000. (Note.—For further discussion on this provision, see Public Law 106–291 under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law.”)

2. Legislative hearings


The purpose of the hearing was to review H.R. 852, the Freedom to E-file Act, a bill requiring the United States Department of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system, enabling farmers to file all required paperwork with the USDA and to access public information on farm programs, quarterly trade, production reports, and other similar information through the Internet. The subcommittee heard testimony from five witnesses representing the USDA, Women Involved in Farm Economics, the National Association of County Office Employees, American Farm Bureau, and Fiserv, Inc. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–222.”)

June 24, 1999: Review of H.R. 1402, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to implement the class I milk price structure known as Option 1-A as part of the implementation of the final rule to consolidate Federal milk marketing orders. Subcommittee on Livestock and Horticulture. Hearing Serial No. 106–25.

The purpose of this hearing was to review and discuss this bill, which would require the Secretary of Agriculture to implement the class I milk price structure known as option 1-A as part of the implementation of the reform of Federal milk marketing orders. This
hearing was another step in the ongoing process of reforming America's dairy industry as outlined and mandated under the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, commonly known as the farm bill. The subcommittee heard from 19 witnesses, including Members of Congress, industry groups, dairy farmers and Minnesota Governor Jesse Ventura to help gauge how deep, rational, reasonable, and how far-sighted the support was for H.R. 1402. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–113,” “5. Bills Acted on By the House But Not the Senate, H.R. 1402,” and the discussion under “A. Main Legislative Activities, Dairy.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to discuss H.R. 2389, the County Schools Funding Revitalization Act of 1999. The focus of the discussion was how to best ensure the restoration and maintenance of the well-being of rural school children. The subcommittee received testimony from 10 witnesses including Members of Congress, rural school district administrators, county officials, a National Forest Counties and Schools Coalition representative, a representative of the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Association, and James R. Lyons, Under Secretary, Natural Resources and Environment, U.S. Department of Agriculture. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–393.”)


The subcommittee heard testimony from seven witnesses representing the U.S. Department of Agriculture and several conservation and wildlife groups in an attempt to review the USDA's administration of the Conservation Reserve Program. H.R. 408 was also introduced to expand the current acreage limitation of 36.4 million acres to 40 million acres.


The purpose of this hearing was to review many aspects of the Food Stamp Program with special emphasis on State flexibility within the program, EBT interoperability, and caseload reduction. Another issue for the subcommittee's review was the Electronic Benefit Transfer Interoperability and Portability Act of 1999 that would afford food stamp beneficiaries the ability to redeem their benefits in any eligible store regardless of location. Testimony from eleven witnesses was heard. Among them were Shirley R. Watkins, USDA Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, representatives from various State and Federal agencies, and representatives of lending organizations. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–171.”)

Eight witnesses gave testimony before the subcommittee to emphasize possible benefits to be realized through the incentives provided in H.R. 2827 to fund bio-energy research. Among the witnesses were Rep. Mark Udall, Colorado, the Honorable I. M. Gonzales, Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics, U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Honorable Dan W. Reicher, Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, U.S. Department of Energy, and several representatives from industry, commodity, and research groups. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “1 Bills Enacted Into Law, P.L. 106–224,” and the discussion under “2. Bills Acted on By the Committee Included in Other Laws Enacted.”)

February 9, 2000: Review of proposed legislation to establish a loan guarantee program to promote the delivery of direct-to-home satellite services to rural America. Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry. Hearing Serial No. 106–41.

The purpose of this hearing was to review proposed legislation to establish a loan guarantee program to promote the delivery of direct-to-home satellite services in rural America. The predominate issue discussed was how the legislation would allow satellite providers to become more effective competitors with cable operators. Furthermore, the subcommittee examined the prospects of enabling rural America to benefit from local news coverage, weather reports, information related to natural disasters or community emergencies, local sports, politics, and other information that is vital to the integrity of communities across the country. Testimony was taken from Members of Congress, the administration, and various television station and trade association representatives.

On February 10, 2000, H.R. 3615 was introduced and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and the Judiciary. Two of the three Committee reported the bill and the measure passed the House of Representatives on April 13, 2000. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “5. Bill Acted on By the House But Not the Senate.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to review legislation introduced by subcommittee Chairman Goodlatte that would increase available funds for the Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP). Six witnesses presented testimony before the subcommittee on how H.R. 3453 simply would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to spend up to $25 million of unused Employment and Training money on TEFAP commodity purchases.


The purpose of this hearing was to review legislation that would allow avocado growers to fund and operate a coordinated marketing effort to expand domestic and foreign markets. Testimony was received from the Chairman of the California Avocado Commission, and the U.S. General Counsel of the Chilean Exporters Association and Chilean Fresh Fruit Association. (Note.—For further discussion, see “9. Other Bills Acted on by the Committee.”)

The purpose of this hearing was to review H.R. 4541, the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000. One panel consisting of four witnesses testified before the subcommittee. Witnesses included C. Robert Paul, General Counsel of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; Lewis Sachs, Assistant Secretary for Financial Markets at the U.S. Department of Treasury; Patrick Parkinson, Associate Director of the Federal Reserve System; and Annette Nazareth, Director, Division of Market Regulations at the Securities and Exchange Commission. (Note.—For further action see the discussion “A. Main Legislative Activities, Commodity Futures Modernization” and the discussion under “5. Bills Acted on by the House But Not the Senate, H.R. 4541.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to review H.R. 4502, a bill to improve the implementation of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act by preventing the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) from overriding congressional intent and State authority by imposing new rules regulating TMDL’s from non-point pollution sources.

Seven witnesses appeared before the committee that represented the Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the General Accounting Office. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion, under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–377.”)


Prior to this hearing the Subcommittee on Livestock and Horticulture held a business meeting and reported, H.R. 1275, as amended, on April 13, 2000. However, because H.R. 1275 generated a considerable degree of interest, both favorably and unfavorably, the full committee held a hearing that included witnesses representing the Human Society of the United States, the United Gamefowl Breeders Association, the American Poultry Association, the American Animal Husbandry Coalition, and representatives from law enforcement. Witnesses testified both for and against the bill explaining the principle behind the need for the legislation for Federal action and the possible unintended consequences of the legislation. (Note.—For further discussion, see “9. Other Bills Acted on by the Committee.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to review H.R. 4013, a bill to establish a cooperative effort of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior to reduce sediment and nutrient loss in the Upper Mississippi River Basin. Six witnesses testified before the committee including Members of Congress, officials from
Departments of Agriculture and the Interior, and the Upper Mississippi River Basin Association.

September 19, 2000: Review of H.R. 4646, a bill to designate certain National Forest System lands within the boundaries of the State of Virginia as wilderness areas, and for other purposes. Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, and Forestry. Hearing Serial No. 106–61.

The purpose of this hearing was to receive testimony and written statements in review of H.R. 4646, and the current status of National Forest System lands within the State of Virginia. Five witnesses appeared before the subcommittee representing the Forest Service, the Southern Environmental Law Center, the Central and Southwest Appalachian Trail Conference, the Wildlife Center of Virginia, and the Montebello Volunteer Fire Department and Rescue Squad. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law, Public Law 106–471.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to receive testimony and written statements in review of H.R. 1144, a bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that all meat and meat food products, whether domestic or imported, bear a label notifying the ultimate purchaser of meat and meat food products of the country-of-origin, of the livestock that is the source of the meat. This hearing was another step in the ongoing study of country-of-origin labeling that had been conducted by the subcommittee, USDA, as well as the GAO. The subcommittee heard from 12 witnesses representing producers, agribusinesses, and U.S. Department of Agriculture officials.

E. WATERSHED PROJECTS—HEARINGS AND ACTION TAKEN

On November 12, 1998, the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), in concurrence with the Office of Management and Budget, submitted to the committee the Watershed Plan Environmental Impact Statement for the works of improvement in the Bexar-Medina-Atascosa Counties’ water conservation area in Texas.

On February 11, 1999, the Bexar-Medina-Atascosa Counties Water Conservation Plan and Environmental Impact Statement of Texas, was referred to the Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities, Resource Conservation, and Credit.

On April 15, 1999, the Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities, Resource Conservation, and Credit held a hearing to review the status of aging small watershed projects, as well as the Bexar-Medina-Atascosa Counties Small Watershed Project under P.L. 83–566.

On June 30, 1999, the full committee met in an open business meeting and approved the project by a voice vote. (Note.—For further discussion see “D. Oversight 1. Oversight hearings, April 15, 1999: Review of the Bexar-Medina-Atascosa Counties Small Watershed Project.”)
F. PRINTED HEARINGS (BY SUBJECT)


FARM POLICY, REVIEW OF FEDERAL. Full committee. March 6 (Lubbock, TX); March 17 (Memphis, TN); March 18 (Auburn, AL); March 27 (Raleigh, NC); March 29; April 1 (West Chester, OH); April 3 (Kutztown, PA); April 12, 2000. Serial No. 106–50, Part 1.

FARM POLICY, REVIEW OF FEDERAL. Full committee. May 1, (Woodland, CA); May 2, (Sioux Falls, SD); May 12, (Boise, ID); May 13, (Peoria, IL); July 12, 19, 26, 2000. Serial No. 106–50 Part 2 (Final).

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE PROGRAM, REVIEW OF THE. Subcommittee on Risk Management, Research, and Specialty Crops. Field hearings. February 16 (Perry, GA), February 16 (Douglas, GA), and February 18 (Laurinburg, NC), 1999. Serial No. 106–3.


PRINTED HEARINGS (BY SERIAL NO.)

106–3 REVIEW OF THE FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE PROGRAM. Subcommittee on Risk Management, Research, and Specialty Crops. Field hearings. February 16 (Perry, GA), February 16 (Douglas, GA), and February 18 (Laurinburg, NC), 1999.


106–21 THE EFFECTS OF ELECTRIC Deregulation ON RURAL AREAS AND AN EXAMINATION OF LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS. Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities, Resource Conservation, and Credit. May 26, 1999.


106–36 USDA’S RUSSIAN FOOD AID PROGRAM (Secretary Dan Glickman). Full committee. October 6, 1999.
106–41 LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM TO PROMOTE THE DELIVERY OF DIRECT-TO-HOME SATELLITE SERVICES TO RURAL AMERICA. Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry. February 9, 2000.
106–50, Part 1 REVIEW OF FEDERAL FARM POLICY. Full committee. March 6 (Lubbock, TX); March 17 (Memphis, TN); March 18 (Auburn, AL); March 27 (Raleigh, NC); March 29; April 1 (West Chester, OH); April 3 (Kutztown, PA); April 12, 2000.
106–50 Part 2 (Final) REVIEW OF FEDERAL FARM POLICY. Full committee. May 1, (Woodland, CA); May 2, (Sioux Falls, SD); May 12, (Boise, ID); May 13, (Peoria, IL); July 12, 19, 26, 2000.
106–52 THE ADMINISTRATION’S PROPOSAL FOR PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH CHINA (Secretary Dan Glickman). Full committee. May 17, 2000.


G. MEETINGS NOT PRINTED


Full committee. Open business meeting. Approved by voice vote budget views and estimates letter for fiscal year 2000 to be forwarded to Committee on the Budget. February 25, 1999.


Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities, Resource Conservation, and Credit: Ordered reported to full committee by voice vote H.R. 728, the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Amendments of 1999. July 20, 1999.


III. APPENDIX

A. EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS


750—February 25, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk in the Nebraska-Western Iowa Marketing Area; Suspension of Certain Provisions of the Order [DA-98-10] Received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1302—April 12, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Table Grapes (European or Vinifera Type); Grade Standards [Docket Number FV-98-302] Received March 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1762—April 28, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Handling Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches [Docket No. FV99-916-2 FR] Received April 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1763—April 28, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Almonds Grown in California; Revision of Reporting Requirements [Docket No. FV99-981-1 FR] Received April 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1902—May 6, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Olives Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV99-932-1 FR] Received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1903—May 6, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk in the New England and Other Mar-
Marketing Areas; Decision on Proposed Amendments to Marketing Agreements and to Orders [DA-97-12] Received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


2051—May 12, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department Of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Melons Grown in South Texas; Change in Container Regulation [Docket No. FV99-979-1 IFR] Received May 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


2415—June 7, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Milk in the Iowa Marketing Area; Revision [DA-99-02] Received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


2571—June 10, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Peanut Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Procedures [Docket No. FV-98-703-FR] Received April 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


2754—June 25, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the


3384—August 3, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of southeastern California and Imported Table Grapes; Revision in Minimum Grade, Container, and Pack Requirements [Docket No. FV98-925-3 FIR] Received July 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3649—August 5, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Melons Grown in South Texas; Change in Container Regulation [Docket No. FV99-979-1 FIR] Received August 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3650—August 5, 1999; letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmit-


3652—August 5, 1999; letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Almonds Grown in California; Revisions to Requirements Regarding Credit for Promotion and Advertising Activities [Docket No. FV99-981-2 FR] Received August 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4023—September 13, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk in the New England and Other Marketing Areas; Order Amending the Orders [DA-97-12] Received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4267—September 21, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Fiscal Period Change [Docket No. FV99-955-1 IFR] Received September 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4350—September 22, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Fresh Prunes Grown in Designated Counties in Washington and Umatilla County, Oregon; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV99-924-1 FR] Received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4352—September 22, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV99-948-1 FR] Received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4389—September 23, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Change in Pack Requirements [Docket No. FV99-923-1 FIR] Received September 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4390—September 23, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, California, and in All Counties in Oregon, Except Malheur County; Temporary Suspension of Handling Regulations and Establishment of Reporting Requirements [Docket No. FV99-947-1 FIR] Received September 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4475—September 27, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk in the Central Arizona Marketing Area; Suspension of Certain Provisions of the Order [DA-99-05] Received September 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4476—September 27, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Revision of the Sampling Techniques for Whole Block and Partial Block Diversions and Increasing the Number of Partial Block Diversions Per Season for Tart Cherries [Dock-


4575—September 30, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV99-993-3 FR] Received September 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4714—October 12, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Avocados Grown in South Florida and Imported Avocados; Revision of the Maturity Requirements for Fresh Avocados [Docket No. FV99-915-2FR] Received October 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4815—October 19, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Milk in the New England and Other Marketing Areas; Delay of Effective Date [DA-97-12] Received October 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4816—October 19, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Change in Pack Requirements [Docket No. FV99-923-1 IFRC] Received October 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4999—October 28, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV99-966-1 IFR] Received October 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
5038—November 1, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Domestically Produced and Imported Peanuts; Change in the Maximum Percentage of Foreign Material Allowed Under Quality Requirements [Docket Nos. FV99-997-2 IFR, FV99-998-1 IFR, and FV99-999-1 IFR] Received October 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5040—November 1, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Walnuts Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV99-984-3 IFR] Received October 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5041—November 1, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Refrigeration Requirements for Shell Eggs [Docket No. PY-99-002] Received October 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5439—November 18, 1999; letter from the Associate Administrator, Dairy Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service’s final rule—Milk in the New England and Other Marketing Areas; Exemption of Handlers Operating Plants in Clark County, Nevada, From Order Requirements [Docket No. DA-00-01] Received November 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5478—November 22, 1999; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Limiting the Volume of Small Red Seedless Grapefruit [Docket No. FV99-905-3-FIR] Received November 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5479—November 22, 1999; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Almonds Grown in California; Revisions to Requirements to Regarding Credit For Promotion and Advertising Activities [Docket No. FV99-981-4 IFR] Received November 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5480—November 22, 1999; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida and Imported Grapefruit; Relaxation of the Minimum Size Requirement for Red Seedless Grapefruit [Docket No. FV99-905-6 IFR] Received November 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5483—November 22, 1999; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Papayas Grown in Hawaii; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV99-928-1 FR] Received November 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5484—November 22, 1999; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Walnuts Grown in California; Reporting Walnuts Grown Outside of the United States and Received by California Handlers [Docket No. FV99-984-2 FR] Received November 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5572—January 27, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Tobacco Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tobacco Inspection; Subpart B-Regulations [Docket No. TB-99-10] (RIN: 0581-AB65) Received December 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5574—January 27, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Avocados Grown in South Florida; Relaxation of Container and Pack Requirements [Docket No. FV00-915-1 IFR] Received December 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5586—January 27, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Changing the Term of Office and Nomination Deadlines [Docket No. FV00-955-2 IFR] Received January 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5587—January 27, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Fiscal Period Change [Docket No. FV99-955-1 FIR] Received January 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
6017—February 7, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-932-1 IFR] Received January 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6018—February 7, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Hazelnuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Establishment of Interim and Final Free and Restricted Percentages for the 1999–2000 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV00-982-1 IFR] Received January 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6019—February 7, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV99-966-1 FIR] Received January 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6020—February 7, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Onions Grown in South Texas; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-959-1 FR] Received January 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6249—February 29, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Walnuts Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV99-984-3 FIR] Received January 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6544—March 13, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Reporting Requirements [Docket No. FV99-916-3FR] Received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6545—March 13, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2000–2001 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV00-985-1 FR] Received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6592—March 15, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Onions Grown in South Texas; Change in Container Requirements [Docket No. FV00-959-2 IFR] Received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
6620—March 16, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Dairy Programs, Department of Agricultural, transmitting the Department's final rule—Milk in the Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri Marketing Area; Suspension of Certain Provisions of the Order [DA-00-02] Received January 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6622—March 16, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Livestock and Seed Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Soybean Promotion and Research: The Procedures To Request a Referendum Correction [No. LS-99-17] Received January 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6695—March 21, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Domestically Produced and Imported Peanuts; Change in the Maximum Percentage of Foreign Material Allowed Under Quality Requirements [Docket Nos. FV99-997-2 FIR, FV99-998-1FIR, and FV99-999-1 FIR] Received January 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6714—March 22, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California; Changes in Producer District Boundaries [Docket No. FV00-993-1-FIR] Received March 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6863—March 30, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Olives Grown in California; Changes in Producer District Boundaries [Docket No. FV99-932-3 FR] Received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6715—March 22, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Changing the Term of Office and Nomination Deadlines [Docket No. FV00-955 2 FIR] Received March 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6742—March 23, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-955-1 FR] Received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
6743—March 23, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida and Imported Grapefruit; Relaxation of the Minimum Size Requirement for Red Seedless Grapefruit [Docket No. FV99-905-6 FIR] Received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7002—April 10, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 1999–2000 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV00-985-3 IFR] Received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7004—April 10, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Partial Exemption From the Handling Regulation for Producer Field-Packed Tomatoes [Docket No. FV98-966-2 FIR] Received February 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


7154—May 2, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Handling Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches [Docket No. FV00-916-1 IFR] Received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7157—May 2, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 1999–2000 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV00-985-3 IFR] Received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7158—May 2, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Services, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Avacados Grown in South Florida; Relaxation of Container and Pack Requirements [Docket No. FV00-915-1 FIR] Received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
May 2, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Fruits and Vegetables, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Blueberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Referendum Procedures [FV-99-702-FR] Received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

May 2, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Melons Grown in South Texas; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-979-1 FR] Received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

May 2, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Livestock and Seed Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Pork Promotion and Research [No. LS-98-007] Received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

May 15, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FVOO-985-4 IFR] Received April 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

May 17, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Final Free and Reserve Percentages for 1999–2000 Crop Natural (Sun-Dried) Seedless and Zante Currant Raisins [Docket No. FV00-989-4 IFR] Received April 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

May 17, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-932-1 FIR] Received April 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

June 13, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Almonds Grown in California; Release of the Reserve Established for the 1999–2000 Crop Year [Docket No. FV00-981-1 IFR] Received May 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

June 15, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Tobacco Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tobacco Inspection; Subpart B—Regulations [Docket No. TB-99-07] (RIN: 0581-AB75) Received May 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

June 15, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of Administrative Rules and Regulations Governing Issuance of Additional Allotment Base to New Producers [Docket No. FV-00-985-2 FR] Received May 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
8182—June 19, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Changes in Reporting Requirements [Docket No. FV00-989-1 FR] Received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8242—June 20, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Dairy, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk in the New England and Other Marketing Areas; Order Amending the Orders; Correction [Docket No. DA-97-12] Received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8243—June 20, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced on the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 1999–2000 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV00-985-3 FIR] Received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8300—June 22, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Onions Grown in South Texas; Change in Container Requirements [Docket No. FV00-959-2 FIR] Received May 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8301—June 22, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Fruit & Vegetable Programs, PACA Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Amendments to Rules of Practice Under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act (PACA); Correction [Docket No. FV00-363] Received May 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8302—June 22, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California; Undersized Regulation for the 2000–2001 Crop Year [Docket No. FV00-993-2 FR] Received May 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8323—June 23, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, PACA Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act: Recognizing Limited Liability Companies [Docket No. FV99-361] Received May 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8325—June 23, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Increase in Compensation Rate for Handlers’ Services Performed Regarding Reserve Raisins [Docket No. FV00-989-2 FR] Received May 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8342—June 26, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Certain Designated Counties in Idaho, and Malheur County, Oregon; Modification of Handling Reg-
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Color Grade [Docket No. CN-00-001] (RIN: 0581-AB67) Received June 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8909—July 19, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Avocados Grown in South Florida; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-915-2 FR] Received June 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8912—July 19, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Walnuts Grown in California; Report Regarding Interhandler Transfers of Walnuts [Docket No. FV00-984-1 FR] Received June 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8913—July 19, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Almonds Grown in California; Release of the Reserve Established for the 1999-2000 Crop Year [Docket No. FV00-981-1 FIR] Received June 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8914—July 19, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fresh Bartlett Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-931-1 IFR] Received July 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8915—July 19, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, California, and in all Counties in Oregon, except Malheur County; Suspension of Handling, Reporting, and Assessment Collection Regulations [Docket No. FV00-947-1 IFR] Received July 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9054—July 20, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Dairy Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Final Rule for Dairy Forward Pricing Pilot Program [Docket No. DA-00-06] Received July 18, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9055—July 20, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final
rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Increase in Desirable Carryout Used to Compute Trade Demand [Docket No. FV00-989-3 FR] Received July 18, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9057—July 20, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, AMS, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-985-4 FR] Received July 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9058—July 20, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, AMS, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced from Grapes Grown in California; Final Free and Reserve Percentages for 1999-2000 Crop Natural (Sun-Dried) Seedless and Zante Current Raisins [Docket No. FV00-989-4 FR] Received July 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9059—July 20, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, AMS, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Hazelnuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Establishment of Interim and Final Free and Restricted Percentages for the 1999–2000 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV00-982-1 FR] Received July 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9060—July 20, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, AMS, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Onions Grown in Certain Designated Counties in Idaho, and Malheur County, OR; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-958-1 FR] Received July 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9181—July 24, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Blueberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order [FV-99-701 FR] (RIN: 0581-AB78) Received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9489—September 6, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Hazelnuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-982-2 FR] Received August 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9492—September 6, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, USDA, Fruits and Vegetables, Research and Promotion Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Honey Research, Promotion, and Consumer Information Order; Revision of Subpart C—Referendum Procedures [FV-00-702 FR] Received August 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9493—September 6, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s
final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Handling Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches [Docket No. FV00-916-1 FIR] Received August 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9494—September 6, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Kiwifruit Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-920-3 IFR] Received August 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9495—September 6, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown on Certain Designated Counties in Idaho, and Malheur County, Oregon; Modification of Handling Regulations [Docket No. FV00-945-1 FIR] Received August 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9496—September 6, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tart Cherries in the States of Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin, Decreased Assessment Rates [Docket No. FV00-930-3 FR] Received August 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9497—September 6, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cranberries Grown in the States of Massachusetts, et al.; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-929-4 IFR] Received August 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9498—September 6, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Winter Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Establishment of Quality Requirements for the Beurre D'Anjou Variety of Pears [Docket No. FV00-927-1 FR] Received August 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9511—September 6, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-905-1 FR] Received August 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10053—September 18, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Winter Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Establishment of Quality Requirements for the Beurre D'Anjou Variety of Pears; Correction [Docket No. FV00-927-1 FRC] Received September 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10054—September 18, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Kiwifruit Grown in California and Imported Kiwifruit; Relaxation of the Minimum Maturity Requirement [Doc No. FV00-920-2- FR] Received September 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
10188—September 21, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Limiting the Volume of Small Red Seedless Grapefruit [Docket No. FV00-905-4 IFR] Received September 18, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10189—September 21, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Cranberries Grown in the States of Massachusetts, et al., Temporary Suspensions of Provisions in the Rules and Regulations [Docket No. FV00-929-6 IFR] Received September 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10333—September 28, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Increase in the Minimum Size Requirements for Dancy, Robinson, and Sunburst Tangerines [Docket No. FV00-905-3 FR] Received September 26, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10375—September 29, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Increase in Fees and Charges for Egg, Poultry, and Rabbit Grading [Docket No. PY-00-002] (RIN: 0581-AB89) Received September 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10397—October 2, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-989-5 IFR] Received September 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10663—October 23, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Sweet Onions Grown in the Walla Walla Valley of southeast Washington and northeast Oregon; Revision of Administrative Rules and Regulations [Docket No. FV00-956-1 IFR] Received October 18, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10693—October 24, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Olives Grown in California; Modification to Handler Membership on the California Olive Committee [Docket No. FV00-932-3-FR] Received October 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10729—October 26, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Livestock and Seed Program, Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Soybean Promotion and Research: Amend the Order To Adjust Representation on the United Soybean Board [No. LS-00-04] Received October 26, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10814—October 31, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s
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final rule—Kiwifruit Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-920-3 FIR] Received October 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10866—November 2, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fresh Bartlett Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-931-1 FIR] Received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10867—November 2, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Livestock and Seed Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pork Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Program: Amendment to Procedures for the Conduct of Referendum [No. LS-00-10] Received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10869—November 2, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Science and Technology Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Changes in Fees for Science and Technology (S&T) Laboratory Service [Docket No. S&T-99-008] (RIN: 0581-AB91) Received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10938—November 14, 2000; letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, California, and in all Counties in Oregon, Except Malheur County; Suspension of Handling, Reporting, and Assessment Collection Regulations [Docket No. FV00-947-1 FIR] Received November 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


115—February 2, 1999; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—


2858—July 12, 1999; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Imported
Fire Ant; Quarantined Areas and Treatment [Docket No. 98-125-1] Received May 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3728—August 5, 1999; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Texan (Splenetic) Fever in Cattle; Incorporation by Reference [Docket No. 96-067-2] Received August 2, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4021—September 13, 1999; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Horses From Morocco; Change in Disease Status [Docket No. 98-055-2] Received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4265—September 21, 1999; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final


4863—October 21, 1999; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition to Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 99-033-2] Received October 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4894—October 25, 1999; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State Designations [Docket No. 99-008-1] Received October 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4961—October 27, 1999; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Depart-
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ment of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Animal Welfare; Perimeter Fence Requirements [Docket No. 95-029-2] Received October 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5100—November 2, 1999; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Aeration of Imported Logs, Lumber, and Other Unmanufactured Wood Articles That Have Been Fumigated [Docket No. 99-057-1] Received October 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5195—November 5, 1999; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Imported Fire Ants; Quarantined Areas and Treatment Dosage [Docket No. 99-078-1] Received November 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5391—November 17, 1999; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area [Docket No. 98-083-7] Received November 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5392—November 17, 1999; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—User Fees; Agricultural Quarantine and Inspection Services [Docket No. 98-073-2] (RIN: 0579-AB05) Received November 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5577—January 27, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Veterinary Services User Fees; Biosecurity Level Three Laboratory Inspection Fee [Docket No. 98-052-2] Received December 2, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5579—January 27, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Im-


6117—February 10, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition to Quaratined Areas [Docket No. 00-004-1] Received February 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6150—February 14, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Horses From Qatar; Change in Disease Status [Docket No. 97-131-3] Received January 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6197—February 15, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition to Quaratined Areas [Docket No. 00-004-1] Received February 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6744—March 23, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Field Study; Definition, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6950—April 5, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pink Bollworm Regulated Areas [Docket No. 00-009-1] Received February 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


7156—May 2, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Veterinary Services User Fees; Export Certificate Endorsements [APHIS Docket No. 98-003-02] Received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7159—May 2, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Importation and Interstate Movement of Certain Land Tortoises [Docket No. 00-016-1] Received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
7456—May 4, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Arkansas [Docket No. 97-108-2] Received March 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


7716—May 19, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Importation of Wood Chips From Chile [Docket No. 96-031-2] (RIN: 0579-AA82) Received April 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7737—May 22, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of the Republic of South Africa Because of Foot-and-Mouth Disease and Rinderpest [Docket No. 98-029-2] Received April 19, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8034—June 7, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Imported Fire Ant; Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 00-007-1] Received May 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8324—June 23, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition to Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 00-004-2] Received May 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8465—July 11, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Plum Pox
[Docket No. 00-034-1] Received June 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8521—July 13, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Pork and Pork Products from Mexico Transiting the United States [Docket No. 98-095-3]—Received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8618—July 17, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Veterinary Services User Fees; Pet Food Facility Inspection and Approval Fees [Docket No. 98-045-2] Received June 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8910—July 19, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State and Zone Designations [Docket No. 00-055-1] Received June 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8911—July 19, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Importa-
tion of Bovine Parts from Argentina [Docket No. 00-038-1] Received June 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8918—July 19, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change in Disease Status of Japan Because of Rinderpest and Foot-and-Mouth Disease [Docket No. 00-031-2] Received July 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9490—September 6, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Louisiana [Docket No. 99-052-1] Received July 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9503—September 6, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—

9504—September 6, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oriental Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area [Docket No. 99-044-3] Received August 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9505—September 6, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Mexican Fruit Fly Regulations; Removal of Regulated Area [Docket No. 98-082-6] Received August 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9508—September 6, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Imported Fire Ant; Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 00-007-2] Received August 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9509—September 6, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Changes in Disease Status in Denmark Because of BSE [Docket No. 00-030-2] Received August 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9513—September 6, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Plum Pox [Docket No. 00-034-2] Received August 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9514—September 6, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Cit-
rus Canker; Addition to Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 00-036-1] Received August 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9909—September 11, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Quarantined Areas, Regulated Articles, Treatments [Docket No. 97-056-18] Received September 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9989—September 13, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Pink Bollworm Regulated Areas [Docket No. 00-009-2] Received September 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10052—September 18, 2000; letter from the Chief, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Plum Pox Compensation [Docket No. 00-035-1] (RIN: 0579-AB19) Received September 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


10191—September 21, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of East Anglia Because of Hog Cholera [Docket No. 00-080-1] Received September 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10263—September 25, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Citrus Canker; Addition to Quarantined Areas; Correction [Docket No. 00-036-2] Received September 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


10637—October 19, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Citrus Canker; Payments for Commercial Citrus Tree Replacement [Docket No. 00-037-1] (RIN: 0579-AB15) Received October 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10731—October 26, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tuberculosis in Cattle, Bison, and Captive Cervids; State and Zone Designations [Docket No. 99-038-5] Received October 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10817—October 31, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Depart-
ment of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—
Commuted Traveltime Periods: Overtime Services Relating to Im-
ports and Exports [Docket No. 00-049-1] Received October 30, 2000,

10818—October 31, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review
Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health
Inspection Service, transmitting the Department’s final rule—
Change in Disease Status of KwaZulu-Natal Province in the Re-
public of South Africa Because of Rinderpest and Foot-and-Mouth
Disease [Docket No. 00-104-1] Received October 31, 2000, pursuant

10868—November 2, 2000; letter from the Congressional Review
Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Depart-
ment of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Im-
ported Fire Ant; Addition to Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 00-
076-1] Received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.
801(a)(1)(A).

10934—November 14, 2000; letter from the Congressional Re-
view Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant
Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Department’s final
rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Lou-
isiana [Docket No. 99-052-2] Received November 14, 2000, pursuant

10935—November 14, 2000; letter from the Congressional Re-
view Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant
Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Department’s final
rule—Importation of Horses, Ruminants, Swine, and Dogs; Inspe-
cion and Treatment for Screwworm [Docket No. 00-028-1] Received

10936—November 14, 2000; letter from the Congressional Re-
view Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant
Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Department’s final
rule—Spanish Pure Breed Horses from Spain [Docket No. 00-109-
1] Received November 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6520—March 9, 2000; letter from the Under Secretary, Research
Education, and Economics, Department of Agriculture, transmit-
ing the Department’s final rule—Stakeholder Input Requirements
for Recipients of Agricultural Research, Education, and Extension
Formula Funds (RIN: 0584-AA23) Received February 24, 2000,

30—January 19, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm and
Foreign Agricultural Services, Department of Agriculture, transmit-
ing the Department’s final rule—Disaster Set-Aside Program—
Second Installment Set-Aside (RIN: 0560-AF65) Received January

540—February 23, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm
Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the De-
partment’s final rule—Implementation of Preferred Lender Pro-
gram and Streamlining of Guaranteed Regulations (RIN: 0560-
AF38) Received January 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.
801(a)(1)(A).

543—February 23, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm
Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the De-
partment’s final rule—Tobacco—Importer Assessments (RIN: 0560-
AF 52) Received February 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
752—February 25, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Small Hog Operation Payment Program (RIN: 0560-AF70) Received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
975—March 11, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Implementation of Preferred Lender Program and Streamlining of Guaranteed Loan Regulations (RIN: 0560-AF38) Received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
1246—March 24, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Recourse Loan Regulations for Mohair (RIN: 0560-AF63) Received March 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
1498—April 14, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Dairy Indemnity Payment Program (RIN: 0560-AF66) Received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
1499—April 14, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—End-Use Certificate Program (RIN: 0560-AF64) Received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
1761—April 28, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Recourse Loan Regulations for Honey (RIN: 0560-AF62) Received March 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
1848—May 5, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—1998 Marketing Quotas and Price Support Levels for Fire-Cured (type 21), Fire-Cured (types 22-23), Maryland (type 32), Dark Air-Cured (types 35-36), Virginia Sun-Cured (type 37), Cigar-Filler (type 41), Cigar-Filler and Binder (types 42-44 and 53-55), and Cigar Binder (types 51-52) Tobaccos (RIN: 0560-AF 20) Received April 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
1981—May 11, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Suspension of Collection of Recapture Amount for Borrowers with Certain Shared Appreciation Agreements (RIN: 0560-AF80) Received April 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
2049—May 12, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Dairy Market Loss Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AF67) Received May 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
2253—May 20, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AF46) Received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
2294—May 24, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—1998 Single-Year and Multi-Year Crop Loss Disaster Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AF75) Received May 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3233—July 27, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Implementation of Preferred Lender Program and Streamlining of Guaranteed Farm Loan Programs Loan Regulations; Correction (RIN: 0560-AF38) Received July 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4020—September 13, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Flood Compensation Program (RIN: 0560-AF57) Received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4022—September 13, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Small Hog Operation Payment Program (RIN: 0560-AF70) Received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4266—September 21, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—1998-Crop Peanuts, National Poundage Quota, National Average Price Support Level For Quota and Additional Peanuts, and Minimum Commodity Credit Corporation Export Edible Sales Price for Additional Peanuts (RIN: 0560-AF81) Received September 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4922—October 26, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Amendments to the Regulations for Cotton Warehouses—Electronic Warehouse Receipts and Other Provisions (RIN: 0560-AE60) Received October 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5193—November 5, 1999; letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Streamlining of Regulations for Real Estate and Chattel Appraisals (RIN: 0560-AF69) Received November 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5194—November 5, 1999; letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—1999 Livestock Indemnity Program; 1998 Single-Year and Multi-Year Crop Loss Disaster Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AF82) Received November 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5390—November 17, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Providing Notice to Delinquent Farm Loan Program Borrowers of the Potential for Cross-Servicing (RIN: 0560-AF89) Received November 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5477—November 22, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Dairy Indemnity Payment Program (RIN: 0560-AG10) Received November 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
5482—November 22, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Debarment and Suspension (RIN: 0560-AF47) Received November 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5569—January 27, 2000; letter from the Administrator and Executive, Farm Service Agency, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—1999 Marketing Quota and Price Support for Flue-Cured Tobacco (RIN: 0560-AF49) Received December 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6716—March 22, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Streamlining of Regulations for Real Estate and Chattel Appraisals; Correction (RIN: 0560-AF69) Received March 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6949—April 5, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendments to Regulations Governing the Peanut Quota and Price Support Programs (RIN: 0560-AF61) Received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7164—May 2, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—1999 Crop Peanuts National Poundage Quota (RIN: 0560-AF48) Received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8155—June 15, 2000; letter from the Administrator, FSA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Disaster Set-Aside Program—Second Installment Set-Aside (RIN: 0560-AF91) Received May 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8299—June 22, 2000; letter from the Administrator, FSA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Farm Storage Facility Loan Program (RIN: 0560-AG00) Received May 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8464—July 11, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Agricultural Disaster and Market Assistance (RIN: 0560-AG14) Received June 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8908—July 19, 2000; letter from the Administrator, FSA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Lamb Meat Adjustment Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AG17) Received June 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8919—July 19, 2000; letter from the Administrator & Executive VP, CCC, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Commodity Credit Corporation (RIN: 0560-AF51) Received June 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9499—September 6, 2000; letter from the Administrator, FSA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Handling Payments from the Farm Service Agency (FSA) to
Delinquent FSA Farm Loan Program Borrowers (RIN: 0560-AG24) Received August 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9532—September 6, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Farm Loan Programs Account Servicing Policies—Servicing Shared Appreciation Agreements (RIN: 0560-AF78) Received August 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9910—September 11, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Streamlining of the Emergency Farm Loan Program Loan Regulations (RIN: 0560-AF72) Received September 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10728—October 26, 2000; letter from the Administrator and Executive Vice President, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—2000 Marketing Quotas and Price Support Levels for Fire-Cured (Type 21), Fire-Cured (Types 22-23), Dark Air-Cured (Types 35-36), Virginia Sun-Cured (Type 37), and Cigar-Filler and Binder (Types 42-44 and 53-55) tobaccos (RIN: 0560-AF86) Received October 26, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10730—October 26, 2000; letter from the Executive Vice President, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency, Tobacco and Peanuts Division, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Amendments to Regulations Governing the Peanut Poundage Quota and Price Support Programs (RIN: 0560-AF61) Received October 26, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10746—October 27, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Amendments to the Regulations for Cotton Warehouses Regarding the Delivery of Stored Cotton (RIN: 0560-AF13) Received October 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10815—October 31, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Farm Reconstitutions and Market Assistance for Cottonseed, Tobacco, and Wool and Mohair (RIN: 0560-AG19) Received October 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10816—October 31, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—2000 Crop Agricultural Disaster and Market Assistance (RIN: 0560-AG18) Received October 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10937—November 14, 2000; letter from the Executive Vice President, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, Warehouse and Inventory Division, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Bioenergy Program (RIN: 0560-AG16) Received November 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

360—February 8, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS: FDP/HO—Oklahoma Waiver Authority (RIN: 0584-AB56) Received January 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
2725—June 24, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Food and Consumer Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Stamp Program: Retailer Integrity, Fraud Reduction and Penalties (RIN: 0584-AC46) Received May 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4794—October 18, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—School Nutrition Service: Nondiscretionary Technical Amendments (RIN: 0584-AC01) Received October 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6649—March 20, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations: Disqualification Penalties for Intentional Program Violations (RIN: 0584-AC65) Received January 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9298—July 25, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Services, USDA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Stamp Program: Electronic Benefit Transfer Benefit Adjustments (RIN:0584-AC61) Received July 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9375—July 26, 2000; letter from the Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Stamp Program: Recipient Claim Establishment and Collection Standards (RIN 0584-AB88) Received July 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
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9515—September 6, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations: Income Deductions and Miscellaneous Provisions (RIN: 0584-AC81) Received August 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9988—September 13, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Stamp Program: Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) Systems Interoperability and Portability (RIN:0584-AC91) Received September 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


2863—July 12, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Use of Soy Protein Concentrate, Modified Food Starch, and Carrageenan as Binders in Certain Meat Products [Docket No. 94-015DF] (RIN: 0583-AB82) Received June 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3730—August 5, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fee Increase for Inspection Services [Docket No. 98-052F] (RIN: 0583-AC54) Received August 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4263—September 21, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, trans-

4652—October 5, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Food and Safety Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Addition of Mexico to the List of Countries Eligible to Export Poultry Products into the United States [Docket No. 97-006F] (RIN: 0583-AC33) Received September 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4712—October 12, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Scale Requirements for Accurate Weights, Repairs, Adjustments, and Replacement After Inspection—Received October 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5099—November 2, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Sanitation of Requirements for Official Meat and Poultry Establishments [Docket No. 96-037F] Received October 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5581—January 27, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Ingredients and Sources of Radiation Listed or Approved for Use in the Production of Meat and Poultry Products [Docket No. 88-026F] (RIN: 0583-AB02) Received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5877—January 31, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Sanitation Requirements for


7163—May 2, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Labeling; Nutrient Content Claims, Definition of Term: Healthy [Docket No. 99-050IF] (RIN: 0583-AC65) Received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8829—July 18, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Elimination of Requirements for Partial Quality Control Programs [Docket No. 97-001F] (RIN: 0583-AC35) Received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9491—September 6, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fee Increase for Egg Products Inspection—Year 2000 [Docket No. 99-012F] (RIN: 0583-AC71) Received August 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10745—October 27, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Termination of Designation of the State of North Dakota with Respect to the Inspection of Meat and Meat Food Products [Docket No. 00-038F] Received October 26, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

792—March 2, 1999; letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Sugar to be Imported and Re-exported in Refined Form or in Sugar Containing Products, or Used for the Production of Polyhydric Alcohol (RIN: 0551-AA39) Received February 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5000—October 28, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Programs to Help Develop Foreign Markets for Agriculture Commodities (Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program) (RIN: 0551-AA26) Received October 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6771—March 27, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Dairy Tariff-Rate Import Quota Licensing (RIN 0551-AA58) Received January 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7439—May 2, 2000; letter from the General Sales Manager and Vice President, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Ag-
riculture, transmitting a report on sales and barter of commodities

8623—July 17, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agri-

29—January 19, 1999; letter from the Deputy Under Secretary

1206—March 23, 1999; letter from the Chief, Forest Service, De-

2254—May 20, 1999; letter from the Acting Associate Chief, For-

3375—August 2, 1999; letter from the Secretary of Agriculture,

5324—November 15, 1999; letter from the Deputy Under Sec-

8486—July 11, 2000; letter from the Assistant Secretary for Pol-

10288—September 26, 2000; letter from the Under Secretary, Na-

113
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Community Forestry Assistance Program—Received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10902—November 13, 2000; letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—National Forest System Land and Resource Management Planning (RIN: 0596-AB20) Received November 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

116—February 2, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tolerances for Moisture Meters (RIN: 0580-AA60) Received January 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

751—February 25, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Fees for Rice Inspection (RIN: 0580-AA67) Received February 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1847; May 5, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Official Testing Service for Corn Oil, Protein, and Starch (RIN: 0580-AA62) Received April 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7153 May 2, 2000; letter from the Regulatory Liaison, Grain Inspection, Packers, and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, USDA (RIN: 0580-AA70) Received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7574 May 15, 2000; letter from the Regulatory Liaison, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Regulations Issued under the Packers and Stockyards Act (RIN: 0580-AA64) Received April 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

122—February 2, 1999; letter from the Chief, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Conservation Farm Option (RIN: 0578-AA20) Received January 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1497—April 14, 1999; letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assist crop producers who were adversely affected by an insurance company’s sale of a private insurance policy called CRCPLUS.

1594—April 20, 1999; letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for livestock price reporting.

2546—June 9, 1999; letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to establish a trust for the benefit of the cash seller of livestock until the cash seller receives payment in full for the livestock.
2547—June 9, 1999; letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Agricultural Fair Practices Act to authorize administrative enforcement by the Secretary of Agriculture.


3647—August 5, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Office of the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Adjustment of Appendices to the Dairy Tariff-Rate Import Quota Licensing Regulation for the 1999 Tariff-Rate Quota Year—Received July 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3735—August 5, 1999; letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide educational assistance, technical assistance, and research services to nonagricultural cooperatives of rural residents.

4383—September 22, 1999; letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish the basis for reimbursement for services provided by Working Capital Fund activities for USDA and other Federal entities, and for the recovery of all costs for service provided to any entity; to ensure adequate capitalization of the Fund; and to establish appropriate levels of operating reserves for the Fund.

4386—September 22, 1999; letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to restore food stamp eligibility to certain elderly aliens residing in the United States on August 22, 1996.

4862 October 20, 1999; letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the administration and enforcement of voluntary commodity inspection and grading programs, the tobacco inspection program, and marketing agreements and orders.

5394—November 17, 1999; letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reform the State inspection of meat and poultry in the United States.

7073—April 12, 2000; letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft bill, “To amend the United States Grain Standards Act to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to collect fees, to extend the authorization of appropriations for such Act, and to improve the administration of such Act.”

8237—June 19, 2000; letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report entitled, “Preparing For Drought In The 21st Century.”

8326—June 23, 2000; letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft bill, “to provide a safety net to protect agricultural producers from short-term market and production fluctuations, to encourage conservation practices, and for other purposes.”

9433—July 27, 2000; letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft bill, “To expand eligibility for emergency farm loans.”

9481—September 6, 2000; letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual animal welfare enforcement report for fiscal year 1999, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2155.

10218—September 21, 2000; letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft bill entitled, “Conversion of Non-Federal Farm Service Agency County Committee Employees to Federal Civil Service Status.”


4713—October 12, 1999; letter from the Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—General Administrative Regulations; Interpretations of Statutory and Regulatory Provisions (RIN: 0563-AB74) Received October 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6591—March 15, 2000; letter from the Administrator, RMA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Potato Crop Insurance Certified Seed Endorsement—Received January 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7003—April 10, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—General Administrative Regulations; Reinsurance Agreement-Standards for Approval; Regulations for the 1997 and Subsequent Reinsurance Years—Received February 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7005—April 10, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Forage Production Crop Provisions; and Forage Seeding Crop Provisions—Received February 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8628—July 17, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the De-
department’s “Major” rule—Catastrophic Risk Protection Endorsement; Regulations for the 1999 and Subsequent Reinsurance Years; Group Risk Plan of Insurance Regulations for the 2000 and Succeeding Crop Years, and the Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Basic Provisions (RIN: 0563-AB81) Received July 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9482—September 6, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, the Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Fig, Pear, Walnut, Almond, Prune, Table Grape, Peach, Plum, Apple and Stonefruit Crop Insurance Provisions—Received August 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10374—September 29, 2000; letter from the Administrator, RMA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Rice Crop Insurance Provisions—Received September 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6089—February 9, 2000; letter from the Under Secretary of Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Rural Business Opportunity Grants (RIN: 0570-AA05) Received December 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10747—October 27, 2000; letter from the Under Secretary, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Business and Industry Guaranteed Loan Program—Domestic Lamb Industry Adjustment Assistance Program Set Aside (RIN: 0570-AA31) Received October 26, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2820—July 1, 1999; letter from the Under Secretary, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Community Programs Guaranteed Loans (RIN: 0575-AC17) Received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2984—July 13, 1999; letter from the Under Secretary, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Community Facilities Grant Program (RIN: 0575-AC10) Received June 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

113—February 2, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Electric Overhead Distribution Lines; Specifications and Drawings for 24.9—14.4 kV Line Construction—Received January 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

120—February 2, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—RUS Fidelity and Insurance Requirements for Electric and Telecommunications Borrowers (RIN: 0572-AA86) Received January 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1904—May 6, 1999; letter from the Administrator, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Distance Learning and Telemedicine Loan and Grant Program (RIN: 0572-AB31) Received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7524—May 10, 2000; letter from the Acting Administrator, Rural Utilities Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the De-
department's final rule—Load Forecasts (RIN: 0572-AB05) Received March 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7525—May 10, 2000; letter from the Acting Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Post-Loan Policies and Procedures for Insured Electric Loans—Received March 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8620—July 17, 2000; letter from the Acting Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Specifications and Drawings for Underground Electric Distribution—Received May 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9180—July 24, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—General Policies, Types of Loans, Loan Requirements—Telecommunications Program (RIN: 0572-AB53) Received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10289—September 26, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Reduction in Minimum TIER Requirements (RIN: 0572-AB51) Received September 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10290—September 26, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—General Policies, Types of Loans, Loan Requirements—Telecommunications Program (RIN: 0572-AB56) Received September 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10312—October 11, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—RUS Form 397, Special Equipment Contract (Including Installation) (RIN: 0572-AB35) Received September 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1—January 6, 1999; letter from the Deputy Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Trading Hours Received January 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


422—February 9, 1999; letter from the Deputy Executive Director, U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Temporary Licenses for Associated Persons, Floor Brokers, Floor Traders and Guaranteed Introducing
Brokers Received January 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


618—June 16, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Legislative & Intergovernmental Affairs, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Fees for Applications for Contract Market Designation, Audits of Leverage Transaction Merchants, and Reviews of the Rule Enforcement Programs of Contract Markets and Registered Futures Associations Received May 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2722—June 24, 1999; letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Performance of Certain Functions by National Futures Association With Respect to Those Foreign Firms Acting in the Capacity of a Futures Commission Merchant. Received June 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2723—June 24, 1999; letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Rules of Practice; Final Rules; Correction Received June 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2724—June 24, 1999; letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Fees for Applications for Contract Market Designation Received June 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2817—July 1, 1999; letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Recordkeeping Received June 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2818—July 1, 1999; letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Economic and Public Interest Requirements for Contract Market Designation Received June 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2819—July 1, 1999; letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Representations and Disclosures Required by Certain IBs, CPOs and CTAs Received June 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3481—August 4, 1999; letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Performance of Certain Functions by the National Futures Association with Respect to Regulation 9.11. Received July 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
3646—August 4, 1999; letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, Chairperson, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the report of the President’s Working Group on Financial Markets on Hedge Funds, Leverage, and the Lessons of Long-Term Capital Management (LTCM).

4231—September 17, 1999; letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Review of Exchange Disciplinary, Access Denial or Other Adverse Actions Review of NFA Decisions Corrections Received September 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5176—November 4, 1999; letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Order Granting the London Clearing House’s Petition for an Exemption Pursuant to section 4(c) of the Commodity Exchange Act Received November 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5177—November 4, 1999; letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Foreign Futures and Options Transactions Received November 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5469—November 18, 1999; letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Secretary of Treasury, Chairman of the Board of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the President’s Working Group on Financial Markets entitled “Over-the-Counter Derivatives Markets and the Commodity Exchange Act.”


7150—May 2, 2000; letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Use of Electronic Signatures by Customers, Participants and Clients of Registrants Received March 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7151—May 2, 2000; letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Exemption from Registration as a Commodity Trading Advisor (RIN: 3038-AB48) Received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7736—May 22, 2000

Letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Minimum Financial Requirements for Futures Commission Merchants and Introducing Brokers (RIN: 3038-AB51) Received April 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7807—May 24, 2000; letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Commodity Pool Operators; Exclusion for Certain Otherwise Regulated Persons from the Definition of the Term
“Commodity Pool Operator” (RIN: 3038-AB34) Received April 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9483—September 6, 2000; letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Exemption From Registration for Certain Foreign FCMS and IBs (RIN: 3038-AB46) Received August 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9484—September 6, 2000; letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Exemption from Certain Part 4 Requirements for Commodity Pool Operators With Respect to Offerings to Qualified Eligible Persons and for Commodity Trading Advisors With Respect to Advising Qualified Eligible Persons (RIN: 3038-AB37) Received August 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


10460—October 5, 2000; letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Profile Documents for Commodity Pools (RIN: 3038-AB60) Received October 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4—January 6, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Dicamba (3,6-dichloro-o-anisic acid); Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300767; FRL–6049–2] (RIN: 2070-


363—February 8, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Lambda-cyhalothrin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300780;
123


1061—March 16, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Phase 2 Emission Standards for New Nonroad Spark-Ignition Nonhandheld Engines At or Below 19 Kilowatts (RIN: 2060-AE29) Received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1062—March 16, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Propiconazole; Estab-


1303—April 12, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Cinnamaldehyde; Exemption from the requirement of a Tolerance; Correction [OPP–300769A; FRL–6069–2] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received March 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1306—April 12, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Norflurazon; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300803; FRL–
126


1712—April 26, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Potato Leaf Roll Virus Resistance Gene (also known as orf1 orf2 gene); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP–300530A; FRL–6052–3] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received March 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1794—May 3, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions; Correction [OPP-300771A; FRL-6071-6] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1796—May 3, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Tebufenozide; Benzoic Acid, 3,5-dimethyl-1-(1,1-dimethylethyl)-2-(4-ethylbenzoyl) hyrazide; Pesticide Tolerances [OPP-300839; FRL-6073-9] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received April 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1982—May 11, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Beauveria bassiana (ATCC #74040); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance
128


2256—May 20, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Dimethyl phosphate


2864—July 12, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Difenoconazole; Pesticide Tolerance; Technical Amendment [OPP–300863A; FRL–


3390—August 3, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Tebufenozide; Benzoic Acid, 3, 5-dimethyl–1-(1,1-dimethylethyl)–2-(4-ethylbenzoyl) hydrazide; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300896; FRL–6092–1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received July 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3391—August 3, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Tebufenozide; Benzoic Acid, 3, 5-dimethyl–1-(1,1-dimethylethyl)–2-(4-ethylbenzoyl) hydrazide; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300886; FRL–6092–8] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received July 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3869—September 8, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Pyriproxyfen; Re-es-


4391—September 23, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—2,6-Disopropynapthalene; Temporary Exemption from the Require-


4395—September 23, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Tebufenozide; Benzoic Acid, 3,5-dimethyl–1-(1,1-dimethylethyl)–2-(4-ethylbenzolyl) hydrazide; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300914; FRL–6380–1] (RIN: 2070-AB) Received September 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4665—October 6, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Imazapic-Ammo-


4819—October 19, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Tebufenozide; Benzoic Acid, 3, 5-dimethyl–1-(1,1-dimethylethyl)–2-(4-ethylbenzoyl) hydrazide; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300928; FRL–6382–6] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received October 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5101—November 2, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Propargite; Partial Stay of Order Revoking Certain Tolerances [OPP–300891A; FRL–
138


5588—January 27, 2000; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—2, 4-dichlorophenoxyacetic Acid; Re-establishment of Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300952; FRL–6396–3] (RIN: 2070-
Received December 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5591—January 27, 2000; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Tetraconazole [(+)-2-(2,4-dichloropheny)-3-(1H-1, 2, 4-triazol-1-yl) propyl 1,1,2,2-tetrafluoroethyl ether]; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300931; FRL–6384–1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received December 1, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6864—March 30, 2000; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bifenthrin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300963; FRL–6485–2]


7009—April 10, 2000; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Dimethyl Silicone Polymer With Silica; Silane, Dichloromethyl-, Reaction Product With Silica; Hexamethyldisilizane, Reaction Product With Silica; Tolerance Exemptions [OPP–300972; FRL–6490–9] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


7169—May 2, 2000; letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the annual report on conditional registration of pesticides during Fiscal Year 1999, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 136w–4.


7875—June 6, 2000; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency,


8183—June 19, 2000; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Tebufenozide; Benzoic Acid, 3,5-dimethyl–1-(1,1-dimethylethyl)–2-(4-ethylbenzoyl) hydrazide; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300999; FRL–6555–1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received May 19, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8632—July 17, 2000; letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Azoxystrobin or Methyl (E)–2-[2-[6-(cyanophenoxy)pyrimidin–4-yloxy]phenyl]–3;


8898—July 18, 2000; letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting proposed bills, with section-by-section summaries, to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA).


9516—September 6, 2000; letter from the Small Business Advocacy Chair, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Avermectin; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301027; FRL–6598–8] (RIN: 2070-AB) Received August 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9517—September 6, 2000; letter from the Small Business Advocacy Chair, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Carfentrazone-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–301025; FRL–6597–7] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received August 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9518—September 6, 2000; letter from the Small Business Advocacy Chair, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Diflubenzuron; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–301019; FRL–6596–3] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received August 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9519—September 6, 2000; letter from the Small Business Advocacy Chair, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Fenpropatrin; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301024; FRL–6597–9] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received August 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9520—September 6, 2000; letter from the Small Business Advocacy Chair, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Pymetrozine; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–301033; FRL–6599–2] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received August 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9521—September 6, 2000; letter from the Small Business Advocacy Chair, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Imidacloprid; Extension of Tolerances for

9522—September 6, 2000; letter from the Small Business Advocacy Chair, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Sodium Chlorate; Extension of Exemption from Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301031; FRL–6599–3] (RIN: 2070-AB) Received August 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9524—September 6, 2000; letter from the Small Business Advocacy Chair, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Propiconazole; Extension of Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301036; FRL–6737–1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received August 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9531—September 6, 2000; letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Buprofezin (2-Tert-butylimonp–3-isopropyl –5-phenyl–1, 3, 5-thiadiazinan–4-one); Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerances [OPP–301040; FRL–6740–1] (RIN: 2070-AB) Received August 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


10293—September 26, 2000; letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Methacrylic Acid-Methyl Methacrylate-Polyethylen Glycol Methyl Ether Methacrylate Copolymer; and Maleic Anhydride-ox-Methylstylene Copolymer Sodium Salt; Tolerance Exemption [OPP–301059; FRL–6745–2] Received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


10295—September 26, 2000; letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the

10296—September 26, 2000; letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Ethametsulfuron-methyl; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301048; FRL–6744–1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10313—September 27, 2000; letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Dimethyl silicone polymer with silica; silane, dichloromethyl-reaction product with silica; hexamethyldisilizane, reaction product with silica; Tolerance Exemption [OPP–301055; FRL–6745–1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


10315—September 27, 2000; letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–301069; FRL–6749–1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received September 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10334—September 28, 2000; letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Dimethomorph, (E,Z) 4-(3-(4-chlorophenyl)-3-(3, 4-dimethoxyphenyl)-1-oxo-2-propeny morpholine; Pesticide Tolerances [OPP–301062; FRL–6747–9] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received September 26, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


10337—September 28, 2000; letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Propamocarb hydrochloride; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–301057; FRL–6745–8] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received September 26, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10376—September 29, 2000; letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Triallate, (S–2,3,3-trichloroallyl disopropylthiocarbamate); Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–301063; FRL–6744–8] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received September 26, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10515—October 10, 2000; letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the


10593—October 17, 2000; letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Zinc phosphide; Extension of Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301065; FRL–6748–1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received October 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


10903—November 13, 2000; letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Sulfentrazone; Pesticide Tolerances for Emer-


126—February 2, 1999; letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the annual report of the Farm Credit Administration for fiscal year 1998, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 2252(a)(3).

1307—April 12, 1999; letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting notification of the 1999 compensation program adjustments, including the Agency’s current salary range structure and the performance-based merit pay matrix.

1458—April 12, 1999; letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the proposed fiscal year 2000 budget.

1470—April 13, 1999; letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Organization; Disclosure to Shareholders; FCS Board Compensation Limits (RIN: 3052-AB79) Received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2530—June 8, 1999; letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Funding Operations; Investment Management (RIN: 3052-AB76) Received May 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3393—August 3, 1999; letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Loan Policies and Operations Leasing; General Provisions; Accounting and Reporting Requirements (RIN: 3052-AB63) Received June 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3734—August 5, 1999; letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Standards of Conduct; Loan Policies and Operations; General Provisions; Regulatory Burden (RIN: 3052-AB85) Received August 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4271—September 21, 1999; letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Funding and Fiscal, Loan Policies and Operations; FCB Assistance to Associations (RIN: 3052-AB80) Received September 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7775—May 23, 2000; letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Loan Policies and Operations; Participations
8529—July 13, 2000; letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Standards of Conduct (RIN: 3052-AB95) Received June 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.801(a)(1)(A).  
127—February 2, 1999; letter from the United States Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the Court.

2352—May 25, 1999; letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation which would provide a more competitive electric power industry.

2855—July 1, 1999; letter from the Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Voluntary Seafood Inspection Performance Based Organization Act of 1999."

2857—July 1, 1999; letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation which would implement proposals in the President's fiscal year 2000 budget to offset discretionary spending.

3727—August 5, 1999; letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's March 1999 "Treasury Bulletin," pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 9602(a).

5470—November 18, 1999; letter from the Acting, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a legislative proposal entitled, "Southeast Europe Trade Preference Act."

8077—June 9, 2000; letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft legislation entitled, "Consumer Financial Privacy Act."

10662—October 19, 2000; letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled the "Supplemental Subsistence Benefit for Certain Members of the Armed Forces."

B. PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

5 February 9, 1999; Communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report entitled the "1999 National Drug Control Strategy."

32 June 15, 1999; Communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 714(k).

C. PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATIONS, AND OTHER DOCUMENTS OF INTEREST


Executive order, President's Commission on Improving Economic Opportunity in Communities Dependent on Tobacco Production


D. STATUTORY REPORTS

USDA: Letter regarding compliance on providing advice and assistance to the U.S. dairy industry, consistent with the obligation of the United States as a member of the World Trade Organization, required by section 150 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996. Submitted by USDA, January 11, 1999.


USDA: Commodity Estimates Book—fiscal year 2000 President’s Budget, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, February 1, 1999.


USDA: Letter notifying change in the allocation of the rate of price support for milk as reflected in the purchase prices of nonfat dry milk and butter, required by section 141(d)(1) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996. Submitted by USDA, February 11, 1999.


General Accounting Office: Preliminary papers on issues related to the exchange-traded and over-the-counter (OTC) derivatives
markets, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, February 19, 1999.


GAO: Letter confirming Terms of the Work for assessment of the adequacy of the Department of Health and Human Service’s methodology to determine the funds for common administrative costs attributable to the Food Stamp Program that were included in the States’ Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grants, required by the Agriculture, Research, Extension and Education Reform Act of 1998, Public Law 105–185. Submitted by GAO, March 4, 1999.

USDA: Farm Service Agency Conservation Reserve Program 18th Signup, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, March 4, 1999.

USDA: Office of the Chief Financial Officer Federal Managers’ Financial Integrity Act Report, Fiscal Year 1998, required by the


Risk Management Agency: Notice of intent to establish Risk Management Advisory Committee; request for nominations and comments, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, March 25, 1999.


Farm Credit Administration: Final Rule amending FCA regulations on Farm Credit System bank director compensation, required by section 5.17(c)(1) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended. Submitted by FCA, March 30, 1999.

USDA: Federal Milk Marketing Order Reform New England, et al., Final Decision, required by section 143 of the Federal Agri-


Farm Service Agency: Stewardship Incentive Program, From Inception of Program through 1998 Fiscal Year, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, March, 1999.


USDA: President’s Council on Food Safety Assessment of the NAS Report, Ensuring Safe Food from Production to Consumption, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, April 1, 1999.


USDA: Draft bill, the Department of Agriculture Livestock Price Reporting Act of 1999, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, April 7, 1999.


USDA: Draft bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to establish a trust for the benefit of the cash seller of livestock until the cash seller receives payment in full for the livestock, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, April 22, 1999.


Food Safety: The Agricultural Use of Antibiotics and Its Implications for Human Health (GAO/RCED–99–74), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, April, 1999.

Congressional Budget Office: Maintaining Budgetary Discipline: Spending and Revenue Options, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by CBO, April, 1999.


Food Stamp Program: Relatively Few Improper Benefits Provided to Individuals in Long-Term Care Facilities (GAO/RCED–99–151), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, June 4, 1999.


USDA: Draft bill to replace the current method of calculating payments to States based on Forest Service receipts to provide for greater stability and predictability of such payments, and for other purposes, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, June 7, 1999.

USDA: Draft bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to take administrative actions against live poultry dealers who violate section 202 of the Act, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, June 8, 1999.


USDA: 65th Anniversary issue of Rural Cooperatives, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, June 16, 1999.


Farm Credit Administration: Final Rule clarifying existing regulations and providing Farm Credit System institutions with more regulatory guidance about leasing activities, required by section
5.17(c) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended. Submitted by FCA, June 18, 1999.


Freedom to Farm: The Record and Outlook, Prepared for Coalition for a Competitive Food and Agriculture System by Sparks Companies, Inc., pursuant to request. Submitted by Sparks, June, 1999.


USDA: Draft bill to improve and reform the administration of Department of Agriculture programs, and for other purposes, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, July 9, 1999.

Food and Nutrition Service: Characteristics of Food Stamp Households, Fiscal Year 1998 (Advance Report), pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, July 12, 1999.


Farm Credit Administration: Final rule that amends FCA regulations on the release of information under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), required by section 5.17(c)(1) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended. Submitted by FCA, July 27, 1999.

USDA: Draft bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide educational assistance, technical assistance, and research services to nonagricultural cooperatives of rural residents, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, July 28, 1999.


Farm Credit Administration: Final rule reducing the regulatory burden on the Farm Credit System, required by section 5.17(c) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended. Submitted by FCA, August 2, 1999.


Forest Service: Livestock Grazing on the Kiowa National Grassland in Union County, NM, Environmental Assessment, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, August 9, 1999.


U.S. State Department: Final rule to permit the export of agricultural commodities that were previously banned under U.S. economic sanctions, pursuant to request. Submitted by U.S. State Department, August 16, 1999.


USDA: Draft legislation to establish the basis for reimbursement for services provided by Working Capital Fund activities for USDA and other Federal entities, and for recovery of all costs for service provided to any entity; to ensure adequate capitalization of the Fund; and to establish appropriate levels of operating reserves for the Fund, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, August 23, 1999.


Food and Nutrition Service: Food Stamp Participants' Food Security and Nutrition Availability, July 1999; Customer Service in the Food Stamp Program, July 1999; and Food Stamp Participants' Access to Food Retailers, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, September 2, 1999.


Farm Credit Administration: Final rule to remove the requirement that banks obtain prior approval before making certain transfers of capital to associations, required by section 5.17(c)(1) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971. Submitted by FCA, September 8, 1999.

USDA: Draft legislation to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for persons who harm animals used for official inspection by the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, September 8, 1999.


USDA: Draft legislation to facilitate the administration and enforcement of voluntary commodity inspection and grading programs, the tobacco inspection program, and marketing agreements and orders, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, October 5, 1999.


Foreign Assistance: North Korea Restricts Food Aid Monitoring (GAO/NSIAD–00–35), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, October 8, 1999.


Forest Service: Annual Report for USDA Forest Service Southern Research Station, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, October 22, 1999.


General Accounting Office: USDA’s use of liquidating and financing accounts for farm credit programs (direct loans and loan guarantees) to cover the cost of administrative settlements of alleged discriminatory treatment of African-American farmers (B-280396.2). Submitted by GAO, October 28, 1999.

USDA: Draft bill to reform the State inspection of meat and poultry in the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, November 2, 1999.


Budget Surpluses: Experiences of Other Nations and Implications for the United States (GAO/AIMD-00-23), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, November 2, 1999.


Food and Nutrition Service: A Report to Congress on Options for a National Database to Track Participation in Federal Means-Tested Public Assistance Program, required by section 2(a) of Public Law 105-379. Submitted by USDA, November 12, 1999.


Long-Term Capital Management: Regulators Need to Focus Greater Attention on Systemic Risk (GAO/GGD–00–3), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, November 22, 1999.


U.S. Office of Special Counsel: Comments on report from USDA reviewing disclosures of information allegedly evidencing a violation of law, rule, or regulation and an abuse of authority by officials of USDA Farmers Home Administration, now Rural and Economic Community Development, Albuquerque, NM, required by section 1213, Public Law 101–12, the Labor and Employment, Federal Employees, Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989. Submitted by OSC, November 24, 1999.

Food Assistance: Efforts to Control Fraud and Abuse in the Child and Adult Care Food Program Should Be Strengthened (GAO/RCED–00–12), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, November 29, 1999.


U.S. Office of Special Counsel: Comments on report from USDA reviewing disclosures of information allegedly evidencing a viola-

Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City: Equity for Rural America from Wall Street to Main Street, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by Federal Reserve Bank, November, 1999.


Farm Credit Administration: Proposed rule to allow Farm Credit System service corporations to sell stock to non-System entities and System institutions to adopt bylaws permitting the State on unlimited amounts of certain classes of equities, required by Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, Public Law 94–588, as amended. Submitted by FCA, December 10, 1999.


Charter: Establishment of Fixed Anchors in Wilderness Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee, required by Public Law


Food and Consumer Service: USDA’s progress in planning for the implementation of death match requirements in the Food Stamp Program, required by Public Law 105–379, Denial of Food Stamps for Deceased Individuals. Submitted by USDA, January 18, 2000.


The White House: Letter in support on permanent Normal Trade Relations (NTR) with China, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by The White House, January 24, 2000.


USDA: Draft legislation to amend the United States Grain Standards Act to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to collect fees, to extend the authorization of appropriations for such Act, and to improve the administration of such Act, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, February 4, 2000.


The White House: Letter supporting passage of Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status to China, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by The White House, February 16, 2000.


Financial Regulatory Coordination: The Role and Functioning of the President’s Working Group (GAO/GGD–00–46), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, February, 2000.

School Meal Programs: Few Outbreaks of Foodborne Illness Reported (GAO/RCED–00–53), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, February, 2000.


U.S. Office of Special Counsel: Comments on report from USDA reviewing disclosures of information allegedly evidencing violations of law, rule, or regulation, a substantial and specific danger to public health of safety, and an abuse of authority by official of the USDA FSIS, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, required by section 1213, Public Law 101–12, the Labor and Employment, Federal Employees, Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989. Submitted by OSC, March 13, 2000.


Food Safety: FDA's Use of Faster Tests to Assess the Safety of Imported Foods (GAO/RCED-00-65), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, March, 2000.


CFTC and SEC: Issues Related to the Shad-Johnson Jurisdictional Accord (GAO/GGD-00-89), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, April 6, 2000.

Farm Credit Administration: Semiannual Report on the operations and financial condition of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation (Farmer Mac), pursuant to request. Submitted by FCA, April 14, 2000.

USDA: Proposed land purchases in Mark Twain National Forest, Missouri; Cedar Creek PU, Missouri; Chippewa National Forest, Minnesota; and Hoosier National Forest, Indiana, required by section 17(b) of the National Forest Management Act of 1976, Public Law 94-558, as amended. Submitted by USDA, April 17, 2000.

Food and Nutrition Service: Characteristics of Food Stamp Households, Fiscal Year 1998, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, April 20, 2000.


Food Stamp Program: Better Use of Electronic Data Could Result in Disqualifying More Recipients Who Traffic Benefits (GAO/RCED-00-61), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, April, 2000.

Foreign Assistance: Donation of U.S. Planting Seed to Russia in 1999 Had Weaknesses (GAO/NSIAD-00-91), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, April, 2000.

Pesticides: Improvements Needed to Ensure the Safety of Farmworkers and Their Children (GAO/RCED-00-40), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, April, 2000.

Agricultural Marketing Service: Notice of request under Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) for a list of almond growers in the State of California covered by a Federal marketing order for almonds, required by section 1663 of the Food Security Act of 1985, amending

USDA: Draft bill to provide a safety net to protect agricultural producers from short-term market and production fluctuations, to encourage conservation practices, and for other purposes, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, May 3, 2000.


General Accounting Office: Terms of work on study of USDA State Office Collocation, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, May 12, 2000.


USDA-USDOI: Draft bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to establish permanent recreational fee authority, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA and USDOI, May 30, 2000.


USDA: Commitment to Progress—Civil Rights at the United States Department of Agriculture, April 2000, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, May, 2000.


Sugar Program: Supporting Sugar Prices Has Increased Users’ Costs While Benefiting Producers (GAO/RCED±00±126), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, June 9, 2000.


Risk Management Agency: Report on the operation of the Cotton Harvest Incentive (CHI) Pilot Insurance Program, required by sec-


Office of Inspector General: Executive summaries to audit reports issued by USDA, OIG, during the month of May 2000, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, June 30, 2000.


USDA: Draft bill to expand eligibility for emergency farm loans, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, July 13, 2000.


USDA: Draft bill Conversion of Non-Federal Farm Service Agency County Committee Employees to Federal Civil Service Status, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, July 26, 2000.


USDA: Proposed land purchase in Daniel Boone National Forest, Kentucky, required by section 17(b) of the National Forest Manage-


Invasive Species: Federal and Selected State Funding to Address Harmful, Nonnative Species (GAO/RCED–00–219), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, August 24, 2000.


Department of Defense: Draft legislation to provide a supplemental subsistence benefit to certain members of the Armed Forces of the United States, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by DOD, September 28, 2000.

Program Evaluation: Studies Helped Agencies Measure or Explain Program Performance (GAO/GGD–00–204), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, September 29, 2000.


Foreign Assistance: U.S. Food Aid Program to Russia Had Weak Internal Controls (GAO/NSIAD/AIMD–00–329), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, September, 2000.

Economic Development: Multiple Federal Programs Fund Similar Economic Development Activities (GAO/RCED/GGD–00–220), pur-


Food Safety: Controls Can Be Strengthened to Reduce the Risk of Disease Linked to Unsafe Animal Feed (GAO/RCED-00-255), pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, October, 2000.


USDA: Chart for the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, October, 2000.


E. MEMORIALS

27—April 29, 1999; Memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 104 memorializing that they support the passage of the Imported Meat Labeling Act of 1999; by the First Session of the 106th Congress.

40—April 29, 1999; Memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 101 memorializing that they strongly support aggressive, immediate and continued management activities on all acres of Douglas fir bark beetle infested lands on all Idaho national forests, and specifically on the Idaho Panhandle National Forests.

60—May 10, 1999; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 5017 urging Congress to direct the EPA to immediately initiate appropriate administrative rulemaking to ensure that the policies and standards it intends to apply in evaluating pesticide tolerances are
subject to thorough public notice and comment prior to final tolerance determinations being made by the Agency.

90—June 7, 1999; Memorial of the Senate of the State of Kansas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1616 memorializing Congress to remove or restrict the use of trade sanctions as they apply to agricultural products and that Congress ensure that the use of trade sanctions will result in meaningful results.

124—June 29, 1999; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of New Hampshire, relative to House Resolution No. 9 memorializing the Federal Government to make full funding of the Land and Resource Management Plan its highest priority regarding its ownership and management of the White Mountain National Forest.

141—June 29, 1999; Memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 132 S.D. 1 memorializing the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to implement the 1996 Food Quality Protection Act using sound science and real-world data from the data call-in process for realistic risk assessments.

143—June 29, 1999; Memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 56 H.D. 1 memorializing the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to implement the 1996 Food Quality Protection Act using sound science and real-world data from the data call-in process for realistic risk assessments.

147—June 29, 1999; Memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 28 memorializing support for the efforts of the U.S. Department of Justice to accomplish the much needed program coordination through the creation of the National Domestic Preparedness Office.

173—July 30, 1999; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 1022 memorializing Congress and the Department of Justice to closely monitor any large corporation that controls the production, processing and marketing of agriculture’s food and fiber.

178—August 2, 1999; Memorial of the legislature of the State of Montana, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 26 memorializing the current Federal Government policies on national forest road closures and obliteration be suspended and that Congress reaffirm its directives that forest lands be managed in accordance with forest plans that provide for multiple-use management.

179—August 3, 1999; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 99–1043 memorializing Congress to pass legislation requiring labels that disclose the country of origin on meats, poultry, and fresh produce.

180—August 3, 1999; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 12 memorializing Congress and the Department of Agriculture to re-examine our national agricultural policy and give due attention and action to remedy the current agricultural economic dilemma.

181—August 3, 1999; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of New Hampshire, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 7 memorializing support for the continued management of the White Mountain National Forest for multiple uses as a part of the National Forest System.
202—August 3, 1999; Memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 5 memorializing support for the stabilization of payments of the U.S. Forest Service to county governments through the State Treasurer.

205—August 4, 1999; Memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 60 memorializing Congress to restore National Resource Conservation Service’s budget in order that it can continue to serve the conservation and environmental needs of Louisiana.

212—August 4, 1999; Memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 51 memorializing Congress to adopt legislation which would allow the sale of food and other humanitarian aid to the people of Cuba.

213—August 4, 1999; Memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 124 memorializing Congress to provide funding for the construction of the Big Creek Recreation Access Project.

214—August 4, 1999; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 27 and House Resolution No. 51 memorializing Congress to investigate the issue of apple juice concentrate from other countries being sold in the American Market at prices below cost.

215—August 6, 1999; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 1015 memorializing Congress to enact legislation relating to a national country-of-origin labeling law.

216—August 6, 1999; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 1014 memorializing Congress to take certain actions regarding the Export Enhancement Program.

217—August 6, 1999; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 1019 memorializing Congress to enact legislation to restore the “safety net” for family farmers so that these farmers and the rural communities of which they are a part can remain productive.

218—August 6, 1999; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 1020 memorializing Congress to enact legislation that requires packers to report all prices given and received for livestock.

221—August 6, 1999; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 1022 memorializing Congress, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Agriculture to take certain actions relating to large corporations.

285—November 18, 1999; Memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 68 to memorialize the Congress of the United States to end tobacco subsidies and to redirect this support to food-processing agricultural activities.

303—March 30, 2000; Memorial of the Senate of the State of West Virginia, relative to Senate Resolution No. 4 memorializing the U.S. Congress to adopt legislation establishing loan guarantee programs or other mechanisms for the delivery of local television satellite signals to markets not receiving local television satellite signals.
317—June 6, 2000; Memorial of the legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 5050 urging Congress to pass legislation allowing State-inspected meat and meat products to be shipped interstate and to pass legislation increasing the number of poultry to be slaughtered at home and offered for sale to the consumer.

318—June 6, 2000; Memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to 1999; Senate Joint Resolution 13 memorializing Congress to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to allow for the interstate shipment of State-inspected meat.

336—June 7, 2000; Memorial of the legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 1 memorializing the U.S. Congress to provide funds sufficient to relieve Utahns of the devastating economic impact of the State’s cricket and grasshopper infestation.

340—June 7, 2000; Memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 106 memorializing the Senate and the House of Representatives to request the U.S. Forest Service not move forward with the final rule based on the October 5, 1999 proposal.

348—June 8, 2000; Memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 105 memorializing the U.S. Forest Service to extend the deadline to submit comments on the NOI by 120 days.

349—June 12, 2000; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 288 memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide funding for increased Bovine Tuberculosis Testing and Research in Michigan and for Federal Indemnification and Financial Assistance for the Federally Required Destruction of Michigan Cattle.

360—June 29, 2000; Memorial of the legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 37 memorializing the 20th legislature of the State of Hawaii for the responsible use of agricultural biotechnology for the benefit of Hawaii’s people.

361—June 29, 2000; Memorial of the legislature of the State of Georgia, relative to Senate Resolution No. 478 memorializing the Congress of the United States to address potential Federal monetary assessments that could be placed on southeastern peanut growers, including Georgia peanut growers, when the 2000 peanut crop is harvested; and for other purposes.

386—July 10, 2000; Memorial of the legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 42 memorializing the U.S. Congress to financially assist in the implementation of a dairy waste management program in Louisiana.

400—July 10, 2000; Memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 8 petitioning the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled, and to the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States to quickly harmonize and equalize laboratory testing of potatoes so that there is mutual acceptance of each country’s respective test results.

401—July 10, 2000; Memorial of the legislature of the State of Iowa, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 9 memorializing Con-
gress and the Canadian Parliament concerning issues of communication, production data, animal health regulations, and the Pacific Cattle Project.

448—July 26, 2000; Memorial of the legislature of the State of New Hampshire, relative to House Joint Resolution memorializing Congress to pass legislation ensuring improved access to local television for households in unserved and underserved rural areas.

449—July 27, 2000; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 553 memorializing the U.S. Congress to acknowledge the differences between the hallucinogenic drug known as marijuana and the agricultural crop known as hemp; and to assist United States’ producers by clearly authorizing the commercial production of industrial hemp.

486—October 31, 2000; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Resolution No. 104 memorializing the United States Forest Service Chief and the Pennsylvania congressional delegation support proper timber harvesting as a management tool to ensure better forest health in Pennsylvania.

F. PETITIONS

70—November 18, 1999; Petition of the Town Board of Southampton, relative to Resolution No. 1199 petitioning the Federal Government to permit the Suffolk County Department of Health to have access to and participate in monitoring health related activity at the Plum Island Disease Center.


88—June 6, 2000; Petition of Downers Grove Board of Park Commissioners, relative to Resolution No. 00–3 urging Congress to pass H.R. 701 and S. 2123 the Conservation Reinvestment Act (CARA) during its session in 2000.

95—July 10, 2000; Petition of the People of Chefornak, AK, relative to Resolution H.R. 701 petitioning the Congress to vote on and pass the Conservation and Reinvestment Act.

96—July 10, 2000; Petition of Lan-Oak Park District Board of Commissioners, Lansing, IL, relative to a resolution urging Congress to pass legislation to provide full and permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to pass H.R. 701 and S. 2123, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA) during its session in 2000.

97—July 10, 2000; Petition of City Council of Trenton, MI, relative to Resolution 2000–19 petitioning the 106th Congress to support the Conservation and Reinvestment Act by advancing CARA H.R. 701.

102—July 26, 2000; Petition of city of Kaktovik, Office of the Mayor, relative to Resolution No. 00–04 petitioning the U.S. Congress to support the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999: H.R. 701 and S.2123.

103—July 27, 2000; Petition of Essex County Board of Supervisors, clerk, Essex, NY, relative to Resolution No. 101 petitioning
the House of Representatives to amend the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999 to include a provision stating that if any county, town, city or village has more than 20 percent publicly owned land, the governing body of such municipality must approve of the acquisition of any property or property rights with such municipality through the use of CARA funds in whole or in part.