AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

106TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 106–619

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

MAY 16, 2000.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. SKEEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 4461]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for fiscal year 2001.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

	FY 2000 appropriation [1]	FY 2001 estimates	FY 2001 recommendation	FY 2001 recommendation compared with	
				FY 2000 appropriation	FY 2001 estimates
Title I—Agricultural Programs	$35,436,305,000	$34,740,299,000	$34,483,976,000	−$952,329,000	−$256,323,000
Title II—Conservation Programs	804,158,000	878,010,000	812,811,000	+8,653,000	−65,199,000
Title III—Rural Economic and Community Development Programs	2,187,507,000	2,587,610,000	2,407,744,000	+220,237,000	−179,866,000
Title IV—Domestic Food Programs	35,044,106,000	36,264,658,000	35,230,359,000	+186,253,000	−1,034,299,000
Title V—Foreign Assistance and Related Programs	1,055,669,000	1,090,765,000	1,049,364,000	−6,305,000	−41,401,000
Title VI—FDA and Related Agencies	1,112,011,000	1,283,255,000	1,171,255,000	+59,244,000	−112,000,000
Title VII—General Provisions	2,250,000	0	119,000,000	+116,750,000	+119,000,000

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS—Continued

	FY 2000 appropriation [1]	FY 2001 estimates	FY 2001 recommendation	FY 2001 recommendation compared with	
				FY 2000 appropriation	FY 2001 estimates
Title VIII	8,670,540,000	0	0	−8,670,540,000	0
Total	84,312,546,000	76,844,597,000	75,274,509,000	−9,038,037,000	−1,570,088,000

[1] Includes impact of 0.38 percent reduction pursuant to P.L. 106–113.

For discretionary programs the Committee provides $14,491,000,000, which is $545,910,000 more than the amount available in fiscal year 2000 and $1,026,071,000 less than the budget request.

In this report, all references to enacted fiscal year 2000 appropriations levels represent the amounts enacted in Public Law 106–78, as reduced by 0.38 percent pursuant to Public Law 106–113.

The Committee's recommendations for fiscal year 2001 assume enactment of fiscal year 2000 supplemental funding for Agriculture programs and activities, as contained in House action on the bill H.R. 3908 as passed the House of Representatives on March 30, 2000.

INTRODUCTION

The programs funded in this legislation improve the lives of every American, every day. The Department of Agriculture administers nutrition and feeding programs for millions of Americans. USDA is also responsible for the safety of our meat and poultry supply.

This bill provides funding for research to strengthen our Nation's food supply, to make American exports competitive in world markets, to improve human nutrition, and to help ensure food safety. Funds in this bill make it possible for less than two percent of the population to provide a wide variety of safe, nutritious, and affordable food for nearly 275 million Americans and many more people overseas.

Food safety remains one of the Committee's highest priorities. The bill provides funding for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, the Food and Drug Administration, the Office of the Chief Economist, the Economic Research Service, the Food and Nutrition Service, the Agricultural Research Service and the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service for food safety related activities.

The rural development programs funded in this bill provide basic housing, safe water, and opportunities for economic growth in rural America. Conservation and environmental programs preserve lands and watersheds for use by future generations.

In addition, this bill provides funding for the Food and Drug Administration which oversees the safety of an enormous range of food, drugs, and medical devices and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission which regulates an increasingly complex market in commodity trading.

To establish priorities for funding for so many diverse and critical activities is never easy and the task will be more difficult as the effort to preserve the budget surplus continues. There are very

few program increases in this bill. Many of the accounts are at current levels of spending or decreased from the previous fiscal year.

In setting program levels the Committee was constrained by allocations for budget authority and outlays in comparison with fiscal year 2000. The Committee's recommended program levels are based upon appropriated funds as well as limitations on mandatory programs.

Program Priorities/Loan Targeting.—The Committee will expect the Department to focus exclusively on economic need when attempting to target increased lending under various farm loan and rural housing loan and assistance programs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

Clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives states that:

> Each report of a committee on a bill or joint resolution of a public character, shall include a statement citing the specific powers granted to the Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution.

The Committee on Appropriations bases its authority to report this legislation from Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America which states:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of Appropriations made by law * * *

Appropriations contained in this Act are made pursuant to this specific power granted by the Constitution.

TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

2000 appropriation [1]	$2,835,000
2001 budget estimate	2,914,000
Provided in the bill	2,836,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+1,000
2001 budget estimate	−78,000

[1] Excludes $12,600,000 for development and implementation of a common computing environment which is shown under "Common Computing Environment".

The Secretary of Agriculture, assisted by the Deputy Secretary, Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries, Chief Information Officer, Chief Financial Officer, and members of their immediate staffs, directs and coordinates the work of the Department. This includes developing policy, maintaining relationships with agricultural organizations and others in the development of farm programs, and maintaining liaison with the Executive Office of the President and Members of Congress on all matters pertaining to agricultural policy.

The general authority of the Secretary to supervise and control the work of the Department is contained in the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2201–2202). The delegation of regulatory functions to Department employees and authorization of appropriations to carry out these functions is contained in 7 U.S.C. 450c–450g.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Secretary, the Committee provides an appropriation of $2,836,000, an increase of $1,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $78,000 below the budget request.

Administrative Provision.—The Committee is concerned that the Department continues to establish programs that are not requested in the budget or described in any communication to Congress. Programs described as "outreach" and "community food security" have been established with no explanation to the Committees on Appropriations. Of further concern is the use of the salaries and expenses accounts of the Farm Service Agency, the Natural Resources and Conservation Service and the Rural Development missions to fund these programs with no request or notice of reprogramming to the Committees.

In addition, the Committee has received reports from USDA employees that personnel on the Department payroll are being temporarily assigned outside the Department to duties that do not support USDA missions. Questions on these issues that were submitted to the Department on February 16 have gone unanswered.

In most cases, the Committee has not provided the requested increases in salary and expense accounts. This is due mainly to a very tight budget situation. However, the Committee will not be able to support any increases in salary and expense accounts until the Department answers the questions submitted by the Committee and addresses the Committee's concerns about diversion of funds from core mission areas.

State Office Colocation.—The Committee considers any reallocation of resources related to the colocation of state offices scheduled for 2001 to be subject to the Committee's reprogramming procedures.

Trade Adjustment Package for Lamb.—On January 13, 2000, the Administration announced a trade adjustment package for lamb. The Committee directs the Secretary to report on the progress of implementing the provisions of this trade adjustment package not later than January 13, 2001, which will be one year from the date the package was announced.

The Committee directs the Secretary to work with other agencies of the Federal Government, including the Departments of Defense, Interior, Energy, and Transportation, the Environmental Protection Agency and the General Services Administration to maximize the use of ethanol, biodiesel and other agricultural-based fuels.

The Committee expects the Department to integrate various agency research, food safety, and regulatory functions to develop a unified effort to respond to consumer safety and environmental concerns while providing sufficient information that would allow consumers to make informed choices about the production and consumption of bioengineered foods. Any regulatory decision should be based on sound, verifiable science. The Committee also expects the Department to coordinate its activities with those of the Food and Drug Administration to provide a unified approach across agency jurisdictions.

The Committee has received several requests for some of the programs that were highlighted in the President's farm safety net proposal including the farmland protection program, wildlife habitat incentives program, environmental quality incentives program, and the wetlands reserve program. The administration did not submit any legislative proposal to reauthorize these programs until May 3, 2000. The Committee will be in a better position to deal with these requests for funds when the authorizing committee has had an opportunity to act on the administration's proposed farm safety net program.

The Committee is concerned about the number of ongoing business process reengineering projects currently underway and projected to be started in fiscal year 2001. The Committee notes that the Department is spending more than $20,000,000 on such projects. The Committee encourages the Department to focus their efforts on projects that show the most value to the county-based agencies.

The Committee is concerned about rising numbers of criminal acts targeting animal and plant research facilities. The Secretary is directed to report to the Committee on the extent of animal and plant terrorism incidents at USDA funded facilities, the consequence of these activities on research, recommendations for im-

proving security at federally funded facilities, and guidance on the appropriate federal role in response to such criminal activities. This report shall be submitted to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Agriculture of both the House and Senate by March 31, 2001.

The Committee shares the concern expressed by African-American producers that programs of research, extension, marketing, rural development, and international trade have not adequately responded to the unique needs of these producers. Recognizing that there are many opportunities to link African-American farmers with other farmers in Africa, and to establish long-term cooperative relationships in addition to project specific research activities between the 1890 Colleges and Tuskegee Institute with their counterparts in Africa, the Committee directs the Secretary to develop a comprehensive report to be submitted to the Committee no later than February 1, 2001, detailing outreach efforts by the agencies of the Department to these two producer groups, and describing what additional resources may be necessary to develop and maintain such cooperative programs. This report shall also detail whatever opportunities may exist for the provision of assistance to these cooperative programs through the monetization of necessary food assistance provided to the people of Africa through governments or Private Voluntary Organizations, as appropriate.

The Committee is aware of interest in providing programs similar to the school lunch program and the WIC program in needy areas around the world. The Committee applauds the efforts of the Department, in the use of Section 416(b) and Food for Progress, and its partners, including the U.N. World Food Program in providing such assistance where appropriate. The Committee directs the Department to develop a report detailing where such efforts currently occur, the level of assistance provided at each location by the United States (either through the Department or the Agency for International Development) and other donors, and on the feasibility of conducting pilot projects in those countries which might be able to sustain such a program after a reasonable period of support from the United States and other donors. This report should indicate what level of assistance would be needed in addition to other demands for Section 416(b) and PL 480 Title II commodities.

The Committee is concerned that extensive use of contracting outside the Department for administrative and core mission activities may not yield the best cost benefit or the best customer benefit in terms of dealing with experienced career federal personnel. Customers of federal programs such as those administered by the Rural Development Services and the Farm Service Agency often have needs and circumstances that are not dealt with in the private sector. The Committee directs the Department to make cost comparisons of the use of private contractors with federal employee performance and to employ the most efficient organization process as described in OMB Circular A–76. The Committee also directs the Department to solicit input from federal employees in agencies affected by contracting out in order to ensure the expertise of those employees is a part of any decision made by management. The Committee also directs the Department to report on its contracting

out policies, including the agency budgets for contracting out, with its annual budget submission for fiscal year 2002.

EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

Executive Operations was established as a result of the reorganization of the Department to provide a support team for USDA policy officials and selected department-wide services. Activities under Executive Operations include the Office of the Chief Economist, the National Appeals Division, and the Office of Budget and Program Analysis.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ECONOMIST

2000 appropriation	$6,408,000
2001 budget estimate	8,612,000
Provided in the bill	6,408,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−2,204,000

The Office of the Chief Economist advises the Secretary of Agriculture on the economic implications of Department policies and programs. The Office serves as the single focal point for the Nation's economic intelligence and analysis, risk assessment, energy and new uses, and cost-benefit analysis related to domestic and international food and agriculture, and is responsible for coordination and review of all commodity and aggregate agricultural and food-related data used to develop outlook and situation material within the Department.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Chief Economist, the Committee provides an appropriation of $6,408,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $2,204,000 below the budget request.

NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

2000 appropriation	$11,707,000
2001 budget estimate	12,610,000
Provided in the bill	11,718,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+11,000
2001 budget estimate	−892,000

The National Appeals Division conducts administrative hearings and reviews adverse program decisions made by the Rural Development mission area, the Farm Service Agency, the Risk Management Agency, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the National Appeals Division, the Committee provides an appropriation of $11,718,000, an increase of $11,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $892,000 below the budget request.

The Committee is very concerned by the disproportionate share of regional hearing officer decisions favoring producers that are overturned by the Director of the National Appeals Division (NAD).

Recent evidence suggests that Director Review Determinations that support the Department position far outpace those that support the producer position. The Committee is further concerned by media reports that the Department may have resisted efforts to bring this information to light and make it available to the public. The actions of the NAD have called into question the integrity of the appeals process and raised concerns about the possibility of bias against producers. Therefore, the Committee directs NAD to track and make available to the public information about Director Review Determinations. The information should indicate whether the request for Director Review was submitted by the appellant or the head of an agency, and should indicate the number of Director Review Determinations that are made in favor of the Department and the number that are made in favor of the producer. The Committee directs the USDA to submit a report of this information to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate no later than February 1, 2001.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

2000 appropriation	$6,581,000
2001 budget estimate	6,765,000
Provided in the bill	6,581,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−184,000

The Office of Budget and Program Analysis provides direction and administration of the Department's budgetary functions including development, presentation, and execution of the budget; reviews program and legislative proposals for program, budget, and related implications; analyzes program and resource issues and alternatives, and prepares summaries of pertinent data to aid the Secretary and departmental policy officials and agency program managers in the decision-making process; and provides department-wide coordination for and participation in the presentation of budget related matters to the Committees of the Congress, the media, and interested public. The Office also provides department-wide coordination of the preparation and processing of regulations and legislative programs and reports.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, the Committee provides an appropriation of $6,581,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $184,000 below the budget request.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

2000 appropriation	$6,046,000
2001 budget estimate	14,680,000
Provided in the bill	10,051,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+4,005,000
2001 budget estimate	−4,629,000

Section 808 of P.L. 104–208 required the establishment of a Chief Information Officer for major Federal agencies. Pursuant to this Act, the Office of the Chief Information Officer was established

in August 1996, to provide policy guidance, leadership, coordination, and direction to the Department's information management and information technology investment activities in support of USDA program delivery. The Office provides long-range planning guidance, implements measures to ensure that technology investments are economical and effective, coordinates interagency Information Resources Management projects, and implements standards to promote information exchange and technical interoperability. The Office also provides telecommunications and ADP services to USDA agencies through the National Information Technology Center with locations in Ft. Collins, Colorado and Kansas City, Missouri. Direct ADP operational services are also provided to the Office of the Secretary, Office of the General Counsel, Office of Communications, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer and Executive Operations.

Additionally, the Office of the Chief Information Officer is responsible for certain activities under the Department's Working Capital Fund (7 U.S.C. 2235).

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Chief Information Officer, the Committee provides an appropriation of $10,051,000, an increase of $4,005,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $4,629,000 below the budget request.cc

The Committee is concerned that USDA's computer systems could be vulnerable to computer hackers that could expose farmers, ranchers, and/or homeowners who interact with USDA electronically or whose personal/business information is contained in an electronic USDA database as well as the more than 400,000 federal employees who are part of USDA's payroll system to become victims of computer crime. As a result, the Committee has provided an increase of $4,005,000 to alleviate some of those concerns.

The Committee supports USDA's request of $1,392,000 for a central cyber-security program as well as $1,280,000 to strengthen the information risk management program. The balance of the increase, $1,333,000, is to fund an information and telecommunications security architecture to ensure the protection of USDA's vast information resources. The Committee directs the Chief Information Officer to keep the Committee updated, on a routine basis, as these programs are implemented.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

2000 appropriation	$4,783,000
2001 budget estimate	6,465,000
Provided in the bill	4,783,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−1,682,000

Under the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, the Chief Financial Officer is responsible for the continued direction and oversight of the Department's financial management operations and systems. The Office supports the Chief Financial Officer in carrying out the dual roles of the Chief Financial Management Policy Officer and the Chief Financial Management Advisor to the Secretary and mis-

sion area heads. The Office provides leadership, expertise, coordination, and evaluation in the development of Department and agency programs for financial management, accounting, travel, Federal assistance, and performance measurements. It is also responsible for the management and operation of the National Finance Center. The Office also provides budget, accounting, and fiscal services to the Office of the Secretary, departmental staff offices, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Office of Communications, and Executive Operations.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, the Committee provides an appropriation of $4,783,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $1,682,000 below the budget request.

The Committee has included bill language that directs the Chief Financial Officer to actively market the cross-servicing activities of the National Finance Center.

The Committee recommends language that allows the Secretary to transfer funds provided in this Act and other available unobligated balances of the Department of Agriculture, with the approval of the agency administrator, to the Working Capital Fund for the acquisition of plant and capital equipment necessary for the delivery of financial, administrative, and information technology services of the National Finance Center in New Orleans, LA, and the National Information Technology Center in Kansas City, MO and Ft. Collins, CO.

COMMON COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT

2000 appropriation [1]	$12,600,000
2001 budget estimate	75,000,000
Provided in the bill	25,000,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+12,400,000
2001 budget estimate	−50,000,000

[1] In FY 2000, funding for the Common Computing Environment was included in the "Office of the Secretary".

The Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 requires the Secretary of Agriculture to procure and use computer systems in a manner that enhances efficiency, productivity, and client services, and that promotes computer information sharing among agencies of the Department. Section 808 of P.L. 104–208 requires USDA to maximize the value of information technology acquisitions to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of USDA programs. Since its beginning in 1996, the USDA Service Center Modernization initiative has been working to restructure county field offices, modernize and integrate business approaches and replace the current, aging information systems with a modern Common Computing Environment that optimizes information sharing, customer service, and staff efficiencies.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Common Computing Environment, the Committee provides an appropriation of $25,000,000, an increase of $12,400,000

above the amount available in fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $50,000,000 below the budget request.

The Committee directs the Department to report to the Committee on Appropriations on a quarterly basis on the implementation of the Common Computing Environment beginning in January 2001.

The CCE plan for fiscal year 2000 included $3,000,000 to address Farm Service Agency connectivity issues. The Committee notes that the House-passed fiscal year 2000 supplemental appropriations bill included $38,500,000 to address Farm Service Agency computer problems including funds to address the connectivity issue. The Committee directs the Department to ensure that any funds obligated out of the CCE account for FSA connectivity should be reimbursed.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

2000 appropriation	$613,000
2001 budget estimate	629,000
Provided in the bill	613,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−16,000

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration directs and coordinates the work of the departmental staff in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress relating to real and personal property management, ethics, personnel management, equal opportunity and civil rights programs, and other general administrative functions. Additionally, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration is responsible for certain activities financed under the Department's Working Capital Fund (7 U.S.C. 2235).

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration, the Committee provides an appropriation of $613,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $16,000 below the budget request.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

2000 appropriation	$140,343,000
2001 budget estimate	182,747,000
Provided in the bill	150,343,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+10,000,000
2001 budget estimate	−32,404,000

Rental Payments.—Annual appropriations are made to agencies of the Federal government so that they can pay the General Services Administration (GSA) fees for rental of space and for related services.

The requirement that GSA charge commercial rent rates to agencies occupying GAS-controlled space was established by the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972. The methods used to establish commercial rent rates in GSA space follow commercial real estate appraisal practices. Appeal and rate review procedures are in place to assure that agencies have an opportunity to contest rates they

feel are incorrect. The cost of newly leased space reflects current private sector market rates. The leases are competitively acquired in close coordination with USDA and other customer agencies.

Building Operations and Maintenance.—On October 1, 1984, GSA delegated the operations and maintenance functions for the buildings in the D.C. complex to the Department. This activity provides departmental staff and support services to operate, maintain, and repair the buildings in the D.C. complex. Since 1989, when the GSA delegation expired, USDA has been responsible for managing, operating, maintaining, repairing, and improving the headquarters complex, which encompasses 14.1 acres of ground and four buildings containing approximately three million square feet of space occupied by approximately 8,000 employees. In fiscal year 1998, USDA began operations of the Beltsville Office Facility.

Strategic Space Plan.—The Department's headquarters staff is presently housed in a four-building government-owned complex in downtown Washington, D.C. and in leased buildings in the metropolitan Washington area. In 1995, USDA initiated a plan to improve the delivery of USDA programs to the American people, including streamlining the USDA organization. A high priority goal in the Secretary's plan is to improve the operation and effectiveness of the USDA headquarters in Washington. To implement this goal, a strategy for efficient re-allocation of space to house the restructured headquarters agencies in modern and safe facilities has been proposed. This USDA Strategic Space Plan will correct serious problems USDA has faced in its facility program, including the inefficiencies of operating out of scattered leased facilities and serious safety hazards which exist in the huge Agriculture South Building. During FY 1998, the Beltsville Office Facility was completed. This facility was constructed with funds appropriated to the Department and is located on Government-owned land in Beltsville, Maryland. Occupancy of the George Washington Carver Center in Beltsville, Maryland, was substantially completed during 1999. By summer 2000, the center will be fully occupied, housing about 1,200 employees.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments to GSA, the Committee provides an appropriation of $150,343,000, an increase of $10,000,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $32,404,000 below the budget request.

Included in this amount is $125,542,000 for rental payments to GSA. The Committee includes language permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer not more than five percent of this appropriation to or from another agency's appropriation. The Committee expects that such a transfer will be proposed only when a move into GSA space is vacated in favor of commercial space. This flexibility is provided to allow for incremental changes in the amount of GSA space and is not intended merely to finance changes in GSA billing.

The following table represents the Committee's specific recommendations for this account:

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	2000 estimate	*2001 budget request*	*Committee recommendation*
Rental Payments	$115,542	$125,542	$125,542
Building Operations	24,801	31,205	24,801
Strategic Space Plan	.....	26,000	.....
Total	140,343	182,747	150,343

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

2000 appropriation	$15,700,000
2001 budget estimate	30,073,000
Provided in the bill	15,700,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−14,373,000

Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the Department has the responsibility to meet the same standards regarding the storage and disposition of hazardous materials as private businesses. The Department is required to contain, clean up, monitor, and inspect for hazardous materials in areas covered by the Department or within departmental jurisdiction.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Hazardous Materials Management, the Committee provides an appropriation of $15,700,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $14,373,000 below the budget request.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

2000 appropriation	$34,708,000
2001 budget estimate	40,740,000
Provided in the bill	34,708,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−6,032,000

Departmental Administration is comprised of activities that provide staff support to top policy officials and overall direction and coordination of the Department. These activities include department-wide programs for human resource management, management improvement, occupational safety and health management, real and personal property management, procurement, contracting, motor vehicle and aircraft management, supply management, civil rights, equal opportunity and ethics, participation of small and disadvantaged businesses and socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers in the Department's program activities, emergency preparedness, and the regulatory hearing and administrative proceedings conducted by the Administrative Law Judges, Judicial Officer, and Board of Contract Appeals.

Departmental Administration is also responsible for representing USDA in the development of government-wide policies and initiatives; analyzing the impact of government-wide trends and devel-

oping appropriate USDA principles, policies, and standards. In addition, Departmental Administration engages in strategic planning and evaluating programs to ensure Department-wide compliance with applicable laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to administrative matters for the Secretary and general officers of the Department.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Departmental Administration, the Committee provides an appropriation of $34,708,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $6,032,000 below the budget request.

OUTREACH FOR SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS

2000 appropriation	$3,000,000
2001 budget estimate	10,000,000
Provided in the bill	3,000,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−7,000,000

This program is authorized under section 2501 of title XXV of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990. Grants are made to eligible community-based organizations with demonstrated experience in providing education or other agriculturally related services to socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers in their area of influence. Also eligible are the 1890 land-grant colleges, Tuskegee University, Indian tribal community colleges, and Hispanic serving post-secondary education facilities.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Outreach for Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program, the Committee provides an appropriation of $3,000,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $7,000,000 below the budget request.

The Committee notes that in fiscal year 2000, the Department provided $5,200,000 from the Fund for Rural America for the Outreach for Socially Disadvantaged Farmers program. The Department has informed the Committee that funds have been obligated in prior years from the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the Rural Development mission area and the Farm Service Agency for outreach activities such as those conducted by this program. The Department has also informed the Committee that the Department has authority to make further obligations from these agencies for outreach activities.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

2000 appropriation	$3,568,000
2001 budget estimate	3,778,000
Provided in the bill	3,568,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−210,000

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations maintains liaison with the Congress and White House on legislative matters. It also provides for overall direction and coordination in the development and implementation of policies and procedures applicable to the Department's intra and inter-governmental relations.

The following table represents the Committee's specific recommendations for this account:

CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

	2000 enacted	2001 estimate	Committee provision
Headquarters Activities	$857	$983	$857
Intergovernmental Affairs	470	483	470
Subtotal	1,327	1,466	1,327
Agricultural Marketing Service	176	181	176
Agricultural Research Service	129	133	129
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	101	104	101
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service	120	124	120
Farm Service Agency	355	366	355
Food and Nutrition Service	270	279	270
Food Safety and Inspection Service	309	319	309
Foreign Agricultural Service	183	189	183
Natural Resources Conservation Service	148	153	148
Risk Management Agency	109	112	109
Rural Business-Cooperative Service	52	54	52
Rural Housing Service	147	152	147
Rural Utilities Service	142	146	142
Subtotal	2,241	2,312	2,241
Total	3,568	3,778	3,568

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, the Committee provides an appropriation of $3,568,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $210,000 below the budget request. The Committee includes language allowing the transfer of not less than $2,241,000 to agencies funded in this Act to maintain personnel at the agency level.

OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS

2000 appropriation	$8,138,000
2001 budget estimate	9,031,000
Provided in the bill	8,138,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−893,000

The Office of Communications provides direction, leadership, and coordination in the development and delivery of useful information through all media to the public on USDA programs. The Office serves as the liaison between the Department and the many associations and organizations representing America's food, fiber, and environmental interests.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of Communications, the Committee provides an appropriation of $8,138,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $893,000 below the budget request.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

2000 appropriation	$65,097,000
2001 budget estimate	70,214,000
Provided in the bill	65,097,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−5,117,000

The Office of the Inspector General was established October 12, 1978, by the Inspector General Act of 1978. This reaffirmed and expanded the Office established by Secretary's Memorandum No. 1915, dated March 23, 1977.

The Office is administered by an Inspector General who reports directly to the Secretary of Agriculture. Functions and responsibilities of this Office include direction and control of audit and investigative activities within the Department, formulation of audit and investigative policies and procedures regarding Department programs and operations, analysis and coordination of program-related audit and investigation activities performed by other Department agencies, and review of existing and proposed legislation and regulations regarding the impact such initiatives will have on the economy and efficiency of the Department's programs and operations and the prevention and detection of fraud and abuse in such programs. The activities of this Office are designed to assure compliance with existing laws, policies, regulations, and programs of the Department's agencies, and to provide appropriate officials with the means for prompt corrective action where deviations have occurred. The scope of audit and investigative activities is large and includes administrative, program, and criminal matters. These activities are coordinated, when appropriate, with various audit and investigative agencies of the executive and legislative branches of the government.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Inspector General, the Committee provides an appropriation of $65,097,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000, and a decrease of $5,117,000 below the budget request.

The Inspector General is directed to undertake an investigation of the adequacy of Food Safety and Inspection Service financial management and project management, as well as the adequacy of management controls in those areas. The Committee directs the Inspector General to provide a preliminary report no later than March 1, 2001. The investigation should ascertain what deficiencies resulted in recent inspector shortages and why Anti-Deficiency Act violations occurred over the last two years.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

2000 appropriation	$29,194,000
2001 budget estimate	32,881,000
Provided in the bill	29,194,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−3,687,000

The Office of the General Counsel, originally known as the Office of the Solicitor, was established in 1910 as the law office of the Department of Agriculture, and manages all of the legal work arising from the activities of the Department. The General Counsel represents the Department on administrative proceedings for the promulgation of rules and regulations having the force and effect of law; in quasi-judicial hearings held in connection with the administration of various programs and acts; and in proceedings involving freight rates and practices relating to farm commodities. Counsel serves as General Counsel for the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and reviews criminal cases arising under the programs of the Department for referral to the Department of Justice.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the General Counsel, the Committee provides an appropriation of $29,194,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000, and a decrease of $3,687,000 below the budget request.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS

2000 appropriation	$540,000
2001 budget estimate	1,356,000
Provided in the bill	540,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−816,000

The Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress for food and agricultural research, education, extension, and economic and statistical information. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Agricultural Research Service; Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service; Economic Research Service; and National Agricultural Statistics Service. The Under Secretary serves as chair of the Biobased Products and Bioenergy Coordinating Council of the Department, which is responsible for developing a list of biobased products to be considered for environmental preferability.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics, the Committee provides an appropriation of $540,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $816,000 below the budget request.

The Committee does not recommend providing funds for developing a list of biobased products.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

2000 appropriation [1]	$65,363,000
2001 budget estimate	55,424,000
Provided in the bill	66,419,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+1,056,000
2001 budget estimate	+10,995,000

[1] Does not reflect the transfer of $1 million to FPA in the Food and Nutrition Service.

The Economic Research Service (ERS) provides economic and other social science information and analysis for public and private decisions on agriculture, food, natural resources, and rural America. ERS produces such information for use by the general public and to help the executive and legislative branches develop, administer, and evaluate agricultural and rural policies and programs.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Economic Research Service, the Committee provides an appropriation of $66,419,000, an increase of $1,056,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and an increase of $10,995,000 above the budget request. The Committee has provided $12,195,000 for studies and evaluations work under the Food and Nutrition Service. Included in this total is $5,700,000 for food stamp, $3,000,000 for child nutrition, and $3,495,000 for WIC studies and evaluations. This work is to be carried out within the Food and Consumer Economics Division which conducts research and analysis on food programs and food policy issues. The Committee expects ERS to consult and work with the staff at the Food and Nutrition Service as well as other agencies to assure that all studies and evaluations are meeting the needs of the Department.

The Committee has provided $1,056,000 to address structural changes and concentration in food and agriculture and to improve the efficiency of the agriculture sector. The Committee has maintained Estimating the Benefits of Increased Food Safety at the fiscal year 2000 level.

In House Report 106–157, the Committee expressed concern over the rise in the cost of infant formula since the WIC rebate program began, and in the decline in the number of infant formula suppliers. The Committee directs the Economic Research Service to provide a report by April 15, 2001, on the number of suppliers of infant formula in each state, and to compare the cost of formula that is included in the WIC rebate program versus the cost of formula that is not in the WIC rebate program.

The Committee supports efforts of the Economic Research Service to study the economic impact of market concentration. The Committee encourages the Service to work with the Anti-Trust Division at the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission as they conduct pre-merger reviews and antitrust investigations into agribusiness mergers. ERS should share its knowledge and expertise on agribusiness and the effects of concentration on small farms and rural communities.

The Committee strongly encourages the Department to conduct a study of the need for more substantial physician education in breast-feeding techniques in order to increase the incidence of breast-feeding, particularly within the WIC population.

The Committee directs the Department to conduct a study of plate waste in the school nutrition programs and the factors associated with it, including "offer v. serve" in both elementary and secondary schools, scheduling of lunch hours (are they too short, are there competing activities that interfere with lunch time e.g. recreation time after a meal versus before a meal) quality and condition of food.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

2000 appropriation	$99,333,000
2001 budget estimate	100,615,000
Provided in the bill	100,851,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+1,518,000
2001 budget estimate	+236,000

The National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) administers the Department's program of collecting and publishing current national, state, and county agricultural statistics, which are essential for making effective policy, production, and marketing decisions. These statistics provide accurate and timely estimates of current agricultural production and measures of the economic and environmental welfare of the agricultural sector. NASS also provides statistical services to other USDA and Federal agencies in support of their missions, and provides consulting, technical assistance, and training to developing countries.

Beginning with the fiscal year 1997 appropriation, funding has been provided to NASS for the Census of Agriculture which has been transferred from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Agriculture to consolidate the activities of the two agricultural statistics programs. The Census of Agriculture is taken every five years and provides comprehensive data on the agricultural economy including: data on the number of farms, land use, production expenses, farm product values, value of land and buildings, farm size, and characteristics of farm operators. It provides national, state, and county data as well as selected data for Puerto Rico, Guam, and the United States Virgin Islands.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the National Agricultural Statistics Service, the Committee provides an appropriation of $100,851,000, an increase of $1,518,000 above the amount available in fiscal year 2000 and 236,000 above the budget request. Included in this amount is $15,000,000 for the Census of Agriculture. The Census of Agriculture collects and provides comprehensive data every five years on all aspects of the agricultural economy.

Information security is vital to maintain the credibility of NASS given the market sensitivity of agency reports released to the public, as well as the confidential nature of the data collected by NASS from farmers, ranchers, and agribusinesses. The Committee recommends a $1,400,000 increase that was included in the budget request that will allow the agency to establish a computer security architecture that will simultaneously address the technical, managerial, and administrative issues associated with NASS information security.

The Committee includes an increase of $800,000 for pesticide use surveys to address existing data gaps to more accurately assess the impact of chemical use as required by the Food Quality Protection Act.

The Committee recommends an increase of $572,000 for a monthly hog survey required by Livestock Mandatory Reporting. The monthly survey responds to the industry's need for more timely information on hog supplies. Prior to the passage of the Livestock Mandatory Reporting amendment, NASS reported a hog survey on a quarterly basis.

The Committee has provided $236,000 to develop and implement a weekly cream or milkfat price survey by surveying the major buyers or end-users of milkfat. The weekly publication of this information will benefit all segments of the dairy industry by making publicly available an accurate measure of the value of milkfat.

The Committee assumes all savings included in the budget request under NASS.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

2000 appropriation	$830,384,000
2001 budget estimate	894,258,000
Provided in the bill	850,384,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+20,000,000
2001 budget estimate	−43,874,000

The Agricultural Research Service (ARS) was established by the Secretary of Agriculture on November 2, 1953, under the authority of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 133z–15), Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, and other authorities. Pursuant to the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6912), ARS includes functions previously performed by the Human Nutrition Information Service and the National Agricultural Library. ARS conducts basic and applied research in the fields of animal sciences, plant sciences, entomology, soil, water and air sciences, agricultural engineering, utilization and development, human nutrition and consumer use, marketing, development of integrated farming systems, and development of methods to eradicate narcotic-producing plants.

ARS also directs research beneficial to the United States which can be advantageously conducted in foreign countries through agreements with foreign research institutions and universities, using foreign currencies for such purposes. This program is carried out under the authority of sections 104(b) (1) and (3) of Public Law 480, and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

Salaries and expenses.—For salaries and expenses of the Agricultural Research Service, the Committee provides an appropriation of $850,384,000, an increase of $20,000,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $43,874,000 below the budget request.

Continuing Programs.—The Committee recognizes the importance of ongoing research projects in addressing increasing prob-

lems faced by the Nation's food and fiber producers. In this regard, the Committee directs the Agricultural Research Service to continue to fund the following areas of research in fiscal year 2001 at the same funding level provided in fiscal year 2000: Comparative Textural Analysis of Fresh and Fresh-Cut Fruits and Vegetables; Ecologically-Based Technologies for Controlling Ixodes Scapularis and Reducing Lyme Disease; Physiology of Strawberry, Blueberry, and Other Small Fruit Crops in Sustainable Production Systems; Improving Quality of Fresh and Fresh-Cut Produce by Preventing Deterioration in Cold Storage; National Turfgrass Evaluation Program; Alternative Crops Research; Lyme Disease at Yale University; Floriculture and Nursery Crop Research; Fish Diseases; Developing Integrated Weed Management Systems for Efficient and Sustainable Sugarcane Production; Disease and Insect Control Mechanisms for the Enhancement of Sugarcane Germplasm Resistance; Formosan Subterranean Termite Control and Research Demonstration Program; Improving Sugarcane Productivity by Conventional and Molecular Approaches to Genetic Development; Small Fruit Cultural and Genetic Research in the Mid-South; Small Fruits Research; Development of Value-Added Products from Seed Proteins; Biotechnology Research and Development Corp. (BRDC); New Crops for Industrial Products; Thermomechanical Processing of Natural Polymers; Animal Health Consortium; Soybean Diseases; Genetics of Host Resistance to Pathogens in Cereal Crops; Risk Assessment for BT Crops Research; Postharvest Handling and Mechanization to Minimize Damage for Fruits; Germplasm Evaluation and Genetic Improvement of Oats and Wild Rice; Wild Rice Breeding and Germplasm Improvement; Plant Genetics Research; Mid-West/Mid-South Irrigation Research; Watershed Research; Development of Soybean Germplasm and Production Systems for High Yield and Drought Prone Environments; New England Plant, Soil, and Water Research; Golden Nematode Research; Grape Rootstock Research; Animal Vaccines Research; Aquaculture Systems (Rainbow Trout) Research; Biological Control of Yellow Starthistle and Other Non-indigenous Plant Pests in the Western US; Sustainable Vineyard Practices Research; Irrigation Water and Crop Management to Sustain Productivity and Protect Water Quality; Greenhouse Lettuce Germplasm; Lettuce Genetics/Breeding Research; Organic Minor Crop Research; Post-Harvest and Controlled Atmosphere Chamber (Lettuce) Research; Development of Genetically Enhanced Fish and Feeds for Aquaculture Utilizing Specialized Grains; Germplasm Resources Genetics and Physiology of Grass and Legume Seed for Sustainable Cropping Systems; Hops Genetics and Breeding for Improved Flavor, Agronomic Performance and Pest Resistance; Physiology, Biochemistry and Genetic Improvement of Horticultural Crop Productivity and Product Quality; Characterization, Detection and Control of Viruses Infecting Small Fruit Crops; Biology and Management of Foliage and Fruit Diseases of Horticultural Crops; Biology and Control of Insect Pests of Horticultural Crops; Preservation of Clonal Genetic Resources of Temperate Fruit, Nut, and Specialty Crops; Residue Management and Grass Seed Cropping Systems for Sustainable Agriculture; Small Fruit and Nursery Research; Viticulture Research; Genetics and Germplasm Enhancement of Cool Season Food Legumes; Root

Diseases of Wheat/Barley Research; Potato Research Enhancement; Temperate Fruit Flies Research; Behavioral Ecology and Management of Crop Insect Pests with Semiochemicals; Biological Controls and Agricultural Research; Asian Bird Influenza Research; Control of Fungal Pathogens of Small Grains; Evaluation of Temperate Legumes and Warm-Season Grass Mixtures in Sustainable Production Systems; Improved Peanut Product Quality and Bioactive Nutrient Composition with Genetic Resources; Peanut Quality Research; Research/Evaluation for Registration of Chemicals and Approvals of New Animal Drugs for Aquaculture; Rice Research; Aquaculture Research; Harvesting and Ginning Technologies for Stripper Cotton; Plant Stress and Water Conservation Research.

Aflatoxin in cotton.—A recognized food safety hazard, aflatoxin has caused millions of dollars in crop losses to agriculture producers each year. The Committee recognizes the promising research the Agricultural Research Service has accomplished to eliminate aflatoxin as an agricultural hazard. The Committee is providing an increase of $250,000 in FY 2001 to the ARS Western Cotton Research Laboratory, Phoenix, AZ, for expanded research aimed at lowering aflatoxin levels in cotton.

Agricultural law research.—The National Center for Agricultural Law Research and Information is the primary contributor of bibliographic agricultural law information to the USDA National Agricultural Library. The Committee directs the Agricultural Research Service to continue funding in fiscal year 2001 for the National Center for Agricultural Law Research located at the University of Arkansas School of Law.

Animal and plant genomics research.—More rapid and efficient methods are required to characterize, identify and manipulate useful properties of genes and genomes. These new methods or "genomics" are critical for developing improved crops and livestock that help producers to maximize yields of quality products while minimizing environmental degradation and production costs. The Committee provides an increase of $900,000 for research to be carried out at ARS laboratories in Ithaca, NY and Clay Center, Nebraska.

Animal vaccines.—The Committee provides an increase of $900,000 in fiscal year 2001 for expanded research on advanced animal vaccines and diagnostic applications jointly carried out by ARS the University of Connecticut and the University of Missouri.

Aquaculture initiatives for the mid-Atlantic highlands.—The Committee recognizes the Agricultural Research Service's extensive aquaculture research activities and directs the agency to work with Canaan Valley Institute (CVI) headquartered at Canaan Valley, WV, in facilitating aquaculture initiatives and demonstrations in the Mid-Atlantic highlands. CVI provides a forum where small watershed groups, government, industry, and the research community can address economic development issues affecting the Mid-Atlantic highlands states of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia. The Committee provides an increase of $300,000 in FY 2001 for this aquaculture initiative.

Aquaculture initiatives, Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institute.—The Committee provides an increase of $500,000 for collaborative research between the Agricultural Research Service and the

Harbor Branch Institute, with participation of the Florida State University to pursue new research initiatives in the area of aquaculture.

Aquaculture research.—The Committee recognizes the need to conduct fish health management research directed at meeting the needs of the U.S. aquaculture industry including research on improving yields, food quality, disease control, and stress tolerance. The Committee directs the Agricultural Research Service to continue funding in fiscal year 2001 for research activities at the Stuttgart National Aquaculture Research Center located in Stuttgart, AR.

Aquaculture fisheries center.—The Committee provides an increase of $75,000 for the Aquaculture/Fisheries Center at the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff for research related to bird predation on farm-raised fish and the development of value added products for aquaculture.

Aquaculture systems.—The Committee recommends an increase of $575,000 in fiscal year 2001 for expanded research on developing new aquaculture systems focused on rainbow trout in cooperation with the University of Connecticut.

Area-wide IPM.—The Committee supports the USDA initiative to develop area-wide pest management programs using biointensive IPM approaches and other IPM technology that can be used for control of pests as alternatives to chemical pesticides that are at risk from FQPA assessment. The Committee provides an increase of $1,000,000 over the FY 2000 level for expanded research on major IPM research and area-wide demonstration programs based on the use of biorational and biologically-based strategies for control of key pests.

Asian bird influenza.—The Committee provides an increase of $45,000 in fiscal year 2001 for ARS to develop and assess baseline data on Eurasian birds as an influenza reservoir and their migration habits, specifically through increasing the number and diversity of wild bird samples obtained and analyzed.

Avian Leukosis—J. Virus.—The Committee is aware of the significant accomplishments of the ARS Avian Disease and Oncology Laboratory, East Lansing, MI in controlling this virus and provides an increase of $250,000 in FY 2001 for expanded research of this poultry disease.

Barley food health benefits research.—The Committee recognizes the need to investigate the benefits of barley foods to human health. The Committee provides an increase of $200,000 for investigation and documentation of the benefits of barley foods to human health, which are requisites to expanded domestic and international markets of barley.

Biobased materials from agricultural commodities.—The Committee is aware of important breakthroughs in scientific tools and methods that have enabled new, biobased products with novel properties for applications previously met only by petroleum based or nonbiobased materials. The Committee provides an additional $900,000 for expanded research at ARS regional utilization centers at Albany, CA; Wyndmoor, PA and New Orleans, LA.

Biobased products.—The Committee expects the Department to continue its efforts to support and enhance the listing of biobased

products for Federal procurement and provides an increase of $300,000 within available funds.

Biodegradable absorbents from pectins.—The Committee recognizes the importance for research to develop biobased materials from agricultural commodities and by-products using biotechnology, biocatalysis and other integrated technologies. The Committee provides an increase of $500,000 to develop biodegradable biobased absorbents from pectins to be carried out at the ARS research laboratory at Winter Haven, FL.

Biological controls and agricultural research.—The Committee provides an increase of $300,000 for the Center of Biological Controls and the Science Center of Excellence, which are being combined into the Center of Excellence in the Biological and Chemical Sciences at Florida A&M University.

Biological control of insects and weeds.—Arthropods, such as Silverleaf whitefly, Asian longhorned beetle, Russian wheat aphid and others are high priority targets for Integrated Pest Management. The Committee provides an increase of $300,000 to develop biologically based arthropod IPM with emphasis on formulation and delivery of microbial agents at the ARS Yakima research station.

Cereal crops research.—The Committee provides an increase of $250,000 for expanded research on the quality and improved production practices for barley and oats conducted at the Cereal Crops Research Laboratory, Madison, WI.

*Chicken genome mapping.*The Committee provides an increase of $300,000 in FY 2001 for expanded research on chicken genome mapping project being carried out at Beltsville, MD.

Citrus and horticultural research.—The Committee notes the expanded and important mission of the new ARS Ft. Pierce research station as well as its past accomplishments carried out at the former Orlando, FL location. The Committee provides an additional $275,000 for research operations at the Ft. Pierce laboratory which is essential to maintain effective research necessary to support the citrus and horticultural industries.

Coffee and cocoa research.—The Committee is concerned with the infestation of tropical fungal and pest diseases and its devastating impact on coffee and cocoa crop production. The Committee provides an increase of $120,000 for this important disease resistance/alternative crop research project.

Conversion of agricultural materials from biomass.—The Committee supports research efforts to develop and use biobased fuel to decrease dependence on imported petroleum, protect the environment and improve the rural economy. The Committee provides an increase of $500,000 to the National Center for Agricultural Utilization Research, Peoria, IL for this research.

Cotton ginning research.—There is an acute need to develop new cotton ginning equipment to preserve cotton fibers for improved cotton quality. The Committee provides an increase of $900,000 above the level available in FY 2000 for the ARS cotton ginning research conducted at Las Cruces, NM.

Diaprepes root weevil (Diaprepes abbreviates).—The Committee recognizes the seriousness of the Diaprepes root weevil and its impact on citrus, corn, sugarcane, ornamental plants, cotton, yucca,

papaya, and sweetpotato. It is important that this research be continued at the fiscal year 2000 level.

Emerging diseases.—It is the view of the Committee that research on exotic and emerging diseases is an area of high priority and that funding proposed for plant and animal diseases should be equally allocated.

Endophyte Research.—There are over 35 million acres of endophyte infected tall fescue pastures in the U.S. responsible for annual losses to the beef cattle industry. The Committee provides an increase of $270,000 for expanded joint research at the University of Arkansas, University of Missouri, and Oregon State University.

Floriculture and nursery crops research.—The Committee is aware that floriculture and nursery crops represent more than 10% of the total U.S. farm crop cash receipts. The Committee provides an increase of $1,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 for expanded research on this important cash crop. A portion of this funding should continue to be allocated through cooperative agreements with university partners, including the University of California, Cornell University, and Ohio State University.

Food safety research.—The Committee supports expanded initiatives to provide a safe food supply for all Americans. Additional preharvest research is required to design effective programs to control bacteria and parasites carried by animals that are pathogenic for humans. Additional food safety research is required during postharvest operations at all critical points during food processing and storage. The Committee provides an additional $1,600,000 for research on: Antibiotic resistance ($600,000) at Athens, GA; Ames, IA; and College Station, TX; pathogens during preslaughter and transportation ($400,000) at Lubbock, TX and Clay Center, NE; control plants toxins and heavy metals in food crops ($200,000), Beltsville, MD; pathogen control in fruits and vegetable ($200,000), Albany, CA; and pathogen and residue detection during processing and storage ($200,000), Wyndmoor, PA.

Food Quality Protection Act.—The Committee recognizes the Department's responsibilities to find replacement technology for currently used pesticides at risk of being phased out after EPA review. The Committee provides an additional $300,000 for the activities of the Office of Pest Management.

Formosan termite control.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000, the same amount available in fiscal year 2000, for the ongoing formosan termite control and research program at the Southern Regional Research Center.

Fusarium Head Blight.—Generally known as "scab", Fusarium Head Blight poses an extremely serious threat to all classes of wheat and barley in the U.S. The effects of scab are mostly manifested as reduced farm yield, lowered test weights, and reduced grain quality. The problem is amplified because scab infested grain is usually contaminated with vomitoxin, a toxic metabolyte produced when the fungal pathogen invades the developing grain kernel. The Committee is providing an increase of $800,000 in fiscal year 2001 to expand ongoing cooperative effort with land-grant universities to control this serious threat to the wheat and barley industries.

Ginning technologies.—The Committee directs that research carried out by ARS in cotton ginning harvesting and the development of ginning technologies be maintained at fiscal year 2000 funding levels.

Glassy-winged sharpshooter and Pierce's disease.—The Committee is aware of the devastating Pierce's disease, a widespread and lethal disease of grapevines. This disease is currently the most production-limiting disease on grapevine. Pierce's disease was responsible for $33 million in management costs and crop losses in 1999. Methods of control are only partially effective and consist of early detection, removal of infected vines and management of nearby vegetation that harbor insects and pathogens. The disease is spread by the leafhopper vector, Glassy-winged sharpshooter (GWSS). The GWSS feeds at the base of grapevines where pruning is destructive. The Committee provides an increase of $1,100,000 for research to combat the GWSS and Pierce's disease on both a short and long-term basis.

Golden nematode.—The Committee provides an increase of $30,000 to Cornell University to support golden nematode research in plant breeding, nematology and activities involving seed production and extension.

Grain Sorghum.—The Committee is committed to ensuring that research dollars allocated for specific research areas are spent as intended. The Committee directs the Agriculture Research Service to report on all research projects related to grain sorghum. This report is to include a description of each project and how it relates to grain sorghum, any articles published as a result of the research, and an outline of funding used in the project. The report should be submitted no later than February 15, 2001. The Committee expects that all research funding appropriated for grain sorghum to be spent to the direct benefit of that crop, such as increased production, and be developed in coordination with the grain sorghum industry.

Grape rootstock.—Grapes are now the highest value fruit crop in the nation and sixth largest crop overall. Most of the crop is processed to raisins, grape juice, and wine, thereby adding enormous value to the crop. The Committee provides an increase of $38,000 at Geneva, NY for this vitally needed research on grape rootstock development.

Greenhouse and hydroponics research.—The Committee recognizes the need for additional effort in the areas of greenhouse and hydroponics research. Additional emphasis is necessary to enhance soilless culture systems to optimize environmental conditions to enhance plant production and quality while reducing pest and disease problems. The Committee provides an increase of $1,500,000 for ARS research in collaboration with the University of Toledo.

Greenhouse lettuce germplasm, Salinas, CA.—The Committee provides an increase of $38,000 for additional costs associated with the preservation, maintenance, and evaluation of greenhouse lettuce germplasm.

Hog Cholera research.—The Committee supports expanded research on exotic diseases of livestock and provides an increase of $1,300,000 to develop vaccines to prevent the outbreak and spread of hog cholera.

Human nutrition research.—The Committee recognizes the important research being carried out at the ARS Human Nutrition Center at Little Rock, AR and provides an additional $750,000 for fiscal year 2001 to the Children's Hospital.

IPM systems for fruits and vegetables.—The Committee provides an increase of $400,000 for research on the development of improved semiochemical techniques for control of insect pests on fruits and vegetables and other crops treated with organophosphates and carbamates and for pests under large scale eradication or control.

Invasive species research.—There are more than 30,000 invasive species in the U.S. The Committee supports the Department's efforts to detect and eradicate incipient weed populations and manage established species. The Committee provides an increase of $300,000 to support this research through foreign exploration and host testing of new biocontrol agents for weeds.

Lyme disease research.—Lyme disease is a major health threat in the Northeast. Controlling the tick that causes the disease is critical to public health. The Committee directs the Agricultural Research Service to continue funding in FY 2001 research on ecologically based technologies for controlling ixodes scapularis and reducing lyme disease being coordinated at Beltsville, MD, in support of the Northeast Regional Lyme Tick Project and in collaboration with Yale University.

Listeria and E.coli research.—The Committee recognizes the importance of research and new technology developments to identify, control and eliminate Listeria monocytogenes and E.coli 0157:H7 pathogens contamination in foods. The Committee provides an increase of $750,000 for expanded research to control and prevent Listeria monocytogenes in ready-to-eat meat and poultry products and E.coli 0157:H7 in raw beef products.

Lettuce geneticist/breeder, Salinas, CA.—The Committee provides an increase of $38,000 in fiscal year 2001 for continuing support of the geneticist plant breeder hired last year at the ARS research station at Salinas, CA.

Malignant Catarrhal Fever (MCF) Virus.—The Committee provides an increase of $300,000 for this sheep-associated virus infecting small ruminants. This additional funding will be used for research on the development of vaccines critical to the systematic eradication of MCF virus in small ruminants at the ARS laboratory at Pullman, WA, and in cooperation with the ARS sheep station at Dubois, ID, and Washington State University.

Manure management systems.—The Committee supports additional research to improve manure management practices and provides an increase of $300,000 to the ARS Florence, SC research station to develop improved treatment technologies to manage animal waste from swine production to protect water and air quality.

Methyl bromide alternatives research.—The Committee is aware of the important research carried out by ARS to develop alternatives to methyl bromide which is effectively utilized as a soil farming agent and pest control for stored commodities. The Committee provides an increase of $1,620,000 for methyl bromide research. The Committee expects ARS to use these additional funds to support registration requirements of minor use pesticides as al-

ternatives to methyl bromide as well as, to initiate research to develop alternatives to methyl bromide for floriculture crops.

Microbial pathogens in small watersheds.—The kinds of microbial pathogens in small watersheds and their potential sources are not well understood. The Committee provides an increase of $300,000 to the Pasture Systems and Watershed Management Research Laboratory at University Park, PA for the technology required to develop effective management strategies for the benefit of agricultural livestock producers and other landowners in the Northeast.

Mid-West/Mid-South irrigation.—The Committee is aware of the importance of irrigation research in reducing risk and increasing yields on the farm. The Committee directs ARS to provide an increase of $30,000 in fiscal year 2001 for cooperative research into irrigation methods and technologies at the University of Missouri Delta Center in Portageville, Missouri.

Mosquito trapping research and West Nile Virus.—Infectious diseases transmitted by insects in Connecticut and other Northern states have become an increasing concern to public health. Mosquito-borne diseases, such as West Nile encephalitis and Eastern Equine encephalitis have increased in threat. ARS has specified interest in the problem of vector-borne diseases because many of these infectious agents also have potential impact on animal health, people, and human food production. The Committee provides an increase of $800,000 to ARS for research on mosquito trapping and research on the mosquito-borne West Nile Virus. Research is to develop the next generation of novel or improved mosquito traps and attractant-enhanced trapping technology for use in surveillance, detection, population monitoring, and control of vectors of exotic mosquito-borne disease agents. These traps will be used to collect mosquito populations in different regions and assayed to map the geographical range of pathogens, and to predict the likelihood of disease outbreaks. Further, the Committee directs that $450,000 of the increase provided be utilized for cooperative research with the University of Connecticut State Agricultural Experiment Station for research that focuses on the West Nile Virus crisis. These resources will allow the University to enhance its ongoing efforts to control and eradicate this infectious disease.

Nematology research.—The Committee provides an increase of $250,000 in FY 2001 to the ARS research station at Tifton, GA for research on the development of nematode management strategies to address crop yield losses due to increasing population of nematodes.

Organic minor crop research, Salinas CA.—The Committee provides an increase of $38,000 for organic minor crop research at the ARS research station at Salinas, CA.

Parasite mite research.—The Committee directs that research in mite control in honey bee colonies utilized in honey production and crop pollination be maintained at fiscal year 2000 funding levels.

Plant genetics.—The productivity and sustainability of American agriculture depends on accessible and secure germplasm. The Committee provides an increase of $250,000 to the Plant Genetics Resources Laboratory, Geneva, NY for germplasm conservation and

research on the genetic diversity of grape and apple rootstock and other vegetable crops.

Plant germplasm resources.—The Committee supports the ARS research effort to maintain, characterize, evaluate and enhance the Nation's plant germplasm. The Committee provides an increase of $1,875,000 to support ARS repositories and research at Davis, CA; Riverside, CA; Ft. Collins, CO; Griffen, GA; Ames, IA; Urbana, IL; Ithaca, NY; Corvallis, OR; College Station, TX; Pullman, WA; Phoenix, AZ; Washington, DC; Charleston, SC; Aberdeen, ID; and Madison, WI.

Post-harvest and controlled atmosphere chamber.—The Committee provides an increase of $38,000 for research into post-harvest and controlled atmosphere techniques aimed at reducing insect and disease problems in lettuce destined for Japan and other export markets.

Poultry diseases research.—The Committee directs the Secretary to submit a report on the feasibility of consolidating Agricultural Research Services' research on avian viral diseases at the Southeast Poultry Disease Laboratory, Athens, GA. Costs associated with the completion of this feasibility study shall be funded from unobligated balances currently available to this laboratory.

Poult Enterititis-Mortality Syndrome (PEMS).—The Committee provides an increase of $100,000 to the Southeast Poultry Disease Laboratory, Athens, GA for research on the identification and characterization of agents causing Poult Enterititis-Mortality Syndrome.

Plum pox virus.—The Committee recognizes the serious disease of Plum Pox, caused by the plum pox virus (PPV) a virus disease of stone fruits and some nuts, including peaches, plums, apricots, nectarines, cherries and almonds. PPV can cause losses up to 80–100% in susceptible varieties. PPV is quarantined in most countries including the U.S. and importation of budwood and rootstock are prohibited from areas where PPV is known to occur. The Committee provides an increase of $750,000 for research on detection, insect transmission and germplasm enhancement.

Potato research.—The Committee provides an increase of $250,000 for research on the evaluation and enhancement of potato germplasm, including use of genetic engineering techniques, development of new varieties and efficient methods of pest control conducted by ARS at Prosser, WA.

Purple loosestrife research.—The Committee recognizes the progress made on purple loosestrife, an invasive Eurasian weed of wetland areas. While significant reductions of this weed have been made through the release of biological control agents, additional research is required. The Committee provides an increase of $275,000 to the ARS Ithaca, NY research laboratory to carry out this work.

Rangeland resource management.—Rangeland resource management addresses remediation of arid and semi-arid rangelands by developing new methods for monitoring and assessing rangelands ecosystems, developing new technologies for biological control of rangeland weeds, and creating new technology transfer applications for arid land management. The Committee provides an increase of $1,800,000 to the Jornada Experimental Range Program at Las Cruces, NM to expand research in this area which will re-

sult in the development of the best forage—livestock management practices and strategies for the benefit of both ranchers and private and public land managers.

Rapid diagnostic capabilities.—The Committee is aware of the Department's request to provide research capacity to develop "on the spot" diagnostic tools for pathogens that threaten animal and plant agriculture. This research will help the U.S. in preventing and dealing with acts of chemical and biological bioterrorism against agricultural and food security systems. The Committee provides $500,000 for this research initiative.

Rice research.—The Committee recognizes the continuing need for evaluation and enhancement of rice germplasm. The Committee provides an increase of $75,000 in fiscal year 2001 for the National Rice Research Center located in Stuttgart, AR.

Risk Assessment for Bt. Corn.—The Committee is aware of the need for improved insect monitoring for Bt. Corn. Laboratory and field studies are necessary to determine potential impacts of Bt. Corn on migrating insects, such as the monarch butterfly, as well as other insects. The Committee provides an additional $400,000 to the ARS laboratory at Ames, IA for these investigations.

Root diseases in wheat and barley.—The Committee directs ARS to provide an increase of $75,000 in FY 2001 for the ARS Root Disease and Biological Control Laboratory, Pullman, WA for investigation of root diseases. Major research breakthroughs are needed in root disease management to achieve high yields possible under conservation tillage systems.

Small fruits research.—The Committee directs the ARS to maintain funding at the fiscal year 2000 level for the Northwest Center for Small Fruits Research, Corvallis, OR. The Center conducts and coordinates research efforts unique to small fruit industries in the Pacific Northwest, including breeding, insect, disease management, product development, and market analyses.

Soil tilth research.—The Committee recognizes the importance of research to carry out effective soil and water investigations at the ARS National Soil Tilth Laboratory, Ames, IA. The Committee provides an increase of $750,000 over the fiscal year 2000 level to support this important research.

Soybean Research/Iowa State University.—The Committee is aware of the important ARS-supported soybean genetics work being done, and continues to strongly support ongoing research at Ames, Iowa, aimed at increasing the productivity and profitability of soybean production and processing. The Committee expects ARS to continue the program at not less than the current fiscal year 2000 funding levels.

Sugarbeet research.—The Committee is aware of the importance of the sugarbeet research at Ft. Collins, CO. The Committee directs the ARS to fund this project at the fiscal year 2000 level.

Sustainable vineyard practices position.—The Committee provides an increase of $38,000 for sustainable vineyard practices research at UC, Davis. This research is responsible for development of biologically and environmentally sound practices for grape growing which enhance compatibility with soil, water, air, and biotic resources.

Temperate fruit flies.—The Committee provides an increase of $38,000 to the ARS station at Yakima, WA to further develop technology for the control and management of temperate fruit flies. The presence of temperate fruit flies has been cited by potential export markets as barriers to increased cherry exports from the U.S.

U.S. Plant and Water Conservation Laboratory.—The Committee provides an increase of $750,000 for expanded research at the U.S. Plant and Water Conservation Laboratory in Lubbock, TX.

Utilization of Foundry Sand By-Products in Agriculture.—The Committee recognizes the potential for the use of foundry sand by-products as soil amendments or components of blended materials including composts for agricultural situations. Within available funds, the Committee urges the Department to conduct such research as may be appropriate to amass and compile existing data on foundry by-products, perform experiments in controlled environments, and establish field plot tests to quantify beneficial use responses.

Vaccines for brucellosis.—The Committee supports Department efforts to develop vaccines for wildlife. Brucellosis vaccines for wildlife will help eliminate the exposure of domestic animals from this disease as they come in contact with wild animals. The Committee provides an increase of $1,000,000 for this research at the National Animal Disease Center, Ames, IA.

Viticulture research.—The Committee is aware of the emerging importance of the grape and wine industry in the Pacific Northwest. The Committee provides an increase of $68,000 in FY 2001 to address important viticulture research being conducted by ARS in cooperation with the University of Idaho.

Water use management technology.—It is estimated that 50% of the total water consumed in some critical regions of the U.S. Southeast is used for agricultural purposes. The Committee provides an increase of $350,000 in FY 2001 to the ARS Research Station at Tifton, GA to develop and expedite the implementation of remote sensing technologies to improve the use of agricultural inputs, including water, nutrients, and plant protectants. It is expected that this technology could realize efficiency gains of as much as 20% when implemented.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

2000 appropriation	$52,500,000
2001 budget estimate	39,300,000
Provided in the bill	39,300,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	– 13,200,000

The ARS Buildings and Facilities account was established for the acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities which directly or indirectly support research and extension programs of the Department. Routine facilities maintenance, construction or replacement items would continue to be funded under the limitations contained in the regular account.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Agricultural Research Service, Buildings and Facilities, the Committee provides an appropriation of $39,300,000, a decrease of $13,200,000 below the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request.

The following table summarizes the Committee's provisions:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES		
Arizona:		
Water Conservation and Western Cotton Laboratory, Maricopa	0	$5,000
California:		
Western Regional Research Center, Albany	$4,900	4,900
District of Columbia:		
U.S. National Arboretum	3,330	3,330
Iowa:		
National Animal Disease Center, Ames	9,000	9,000
Maryland:		
Beltsville Human Nutrition Research	13,300	13,300
National Agricultural Library	1,770	1,770
New York:		
Plum Island Animal Disease Center	7,000	7,000
Unspecified locations:		
General reduction	0	−5,000
Total, Buildings and Facilities	39,300	39,300

National Arboretum.—The Committee is disappointed that the budget request did not include funding for implementing the National Arboretum's master facilities plan. In particular, a new entrance road to the Arboretum is a time-sensitive project that should proceed as early as possible. Due to budget constraints, the Committee is unable to recommend funding for this work. However, the Department will be expected to include this project in the budget request for fiscal year 2002.

Plum Island Animal Disease Center.—The Committee recommends $7,000,000 for repair and maintenance of buildings and supporting infrastructure at the Plum Island Animal Disease Center at Greenport, NY. The Committee notes that no funds are requested for planning or executing an upgrade of the Center to Biosafety Level 4, and no funds are provided for this purpose. Funds are provided for the following projects:

Replace boiler plant, Phase 3	$3,000,000
Consolidate firehouse/motor pool	2,000,000
Miscellaneous small projects/contingency	2,000,000
Total	7,000,000

Unspecified locations: General reduction.—The Committee recommends a general reduction of $5,000,000 to be applied to the combination of project savings from favorable bids, reduced overhead costs, scope reductions, structuring of bid additives, and other cost reduction initiatives available to the Department to assure that construction projects are not excess to program requirements.

This recommendation by the Committee does not cancel or delay any project.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE

The Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) was established by the Secretary of Agriculture on October 1, 1994, under the authority of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6912). The Service was created by the merger of the Cooperative State Research Service and the Extension Service. The mission of CSREES is to work with university partners to advance research, extension, and higher education in the food and agricultural sciences and related environmental and human sciences to benefit people, communities, and the Nation.

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

2000 appropriation	$481,881,000
2001 budget estimate	460,865,000
Provided in the bill	477,551,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	−4,330,000
2001 budget estimate	+16,686,000

The research and education programs administered by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service were established by Secretary's Memorandum No. 1462, dated July 19, 1961 and Supplement 1, dated August 31, 1961, and under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953. The primary function of research and education activities is to administer Acts of Congress that authorize Federal appropriations for agricultural research and higher education carried out by the State Agricultural Experiment Stations of the 50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Micronesia, and Northern Mariana Islands, and by approved schools of forestry, the 1890 land-grant colleges and Tuskegee University, the 1994 land-grant institutions, and other eligible institutions. Administration of payments and grants involves the approval of each research proposal to be financed in whole or in part from Federal grant funds; the continuous review and evaluation of research and higher education programs and expenditures thereunder; and the encouragement of cooperation within and between the states and with the research programs of the Department of Agriculture.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For payments under the Hatch Act, the Committee provides an appropriation of $180,545,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request.

For cooperative forestry research, the Committee provides an appropriation of $21,932,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request.

For payments to the 1890 land-grant colleges and Tuskegee University, the Committee provides an appropriation of $30,676,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request.

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 enacted [1]	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES			
Payments Under Hatch Act	$180,545	$180,545	$180,545
Cooperative forestry research (McIntire-Stennis)	21,932	21,932	21,932
Payments to 1890 colleges and Tuskegee University	30,676	30,676	30,676
Special Research Grants (P.L. 89–106):			
Advanced spatial technologies (MS)	1,000	0	0
Aegilops cylindricum (jointed goatgrass) (WA)	360	0	360
Aflatoxin (IL)	113	0	113
Agriculture-based industrial lubricants (IA)	250	0	400
Agricultural diversification (HI)	131	0	0
Agricultural diversity/Red River Trade Corridor (MN/ND)	250	0	500
Agricultural telecommunications (NY)	425	0	425
Agriculture water usage (GA)	300	0	300
Agroecology (MD)	0	0	300
Alliance for food protection (NE, GA)	300	0	300
Alternative crops (ND)	550	0	550
Alternative crops for arid lands (TX)	100	0	100
Alternative salmon products (AK)	552	0	0
Animal science food safety consortium (AR, IA, KS)	1,521	0	1,750
Apple fire blight (MI, NY)	500	0	500
Aquaculture (AR)	0	0	250
Aquaculture (FL)	0	0	470
Aquaculture (LA)	330	0	330
Aquaculture (MS)	592	0	0
Aquaculture (NC)	255	0	300
Aquaculture (VA)	100	0	100
Aquaculture (WA)	0	0	300
Aquaculture product and marketing development (WV)	750	0	0
Babcock Institute (WI)	510	0	600
Binational agriculture research and development (BARD) [2]	(400)	2,000	400
Biobased technology (MI)	0	0	300
Biodiesel research (MO)	152	0	0
Biotechnology (NC)	0	0	300
Blocking anhydrous methamphetamine production (IA)	213	0	0
Bovine tuberculosis (MI)	170	0	300
Brucellosis vaccine (MT)	425	0	0
Center for animal health and productivity (PA)	113	0	0
Center for rural studies (VT)	200	0	0
Chesapeake Bay agroecology (MD)	150	0	200
Chesapeake Bay aquaculture (MD)	385	0	400
Citrus canker (FL)	0	0	5,000
Citrus tristeza	595	0	750
Coastal cultivars (GA)	170	0	0
Competitiveness of agricultural products (WA)	680	0	680
Cool season legume research (ID, WA)	329	0	329
Cranberry/blueberry (MA)	150	0	150
Cranberry/blueberry disease and breeding (NJ)	220	0	220
Dairy and meat goat research (TX)	63	0	63
Delta rural revitalization (MS)	148	0	0
Designing foods for health (TX)	319	0	375
Diaprepes/root weevil (FL)	298	0	400
Drought mitigation (NE)	200	0	200
Ecosystems (AL)	500	0	500
Efficient irrigation (NM/TX)	0	0	1,250
Environmental research (NY)	400	0	400
Environmental horticulture (FL)	0	0	300
Environmental risk factors/cancer (NY)	170	0	230
Environmentally-safe products (VT)	170	0	0
Exotic pests (CA)	0	0	2,000
Expanded wheat pasture (OK)	285	0	0
Farm injuries and illnesses (NC)	0	0	300
Farm and rural business finance (IL/AR)	87	0	0

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 enacted [1]	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
Feed barley for rangeland cattle (MT)	637	0	637
Fish and shellfish technologies (VA)	0	0	500
Floriculture (HI)	250	0	0
Food and Agriculture Policy Research Institute (IA, MO)	800	0	1,000
Food irradiation (IA)	200	0	250
Food Marketing Policy Center (CT)	400	0	500
Food processing center (NE)	42	0	42
Food quality (AK)	350	0	0
Food safety (AL)	446	0	0
Food safety research consortium (NY)	0	0	300
Food Systems Research Group (WI)	425	0	500
Forages for advancing livestock production (KY)	213	0	250
Forestry (AR)	523	0	523
Fruit and vegetable market analysis (AZ, MO)	320	0	350
Generic commodity promotion, research and evaluation (NY)	198	0	198
Global change/ultraviolet radiation	1,000	1,567	1,567
Global market support service (AR)	127	0	0
Grain sorghum (KS)	106	0	106
Grass seed cropping systems for sustainable agriculture (WA, OR, ID)	423	0	423
Human nutrition (IA)	473	0	473
Human nutrition (LA)	752	0	752
Human nutrition (NY)	622	0	622
Hydroponic tomato production (OH)	100	0	100
Illinois-Missouri Alliance for Biotechnology	1,184	0	1,184
Improved dairy management practices (PA)	296	0	500
Improved early detection of crop diseases (NC)	170	0	0
Improved fruit practices (MI)	445	0	445
Infectious disease research (CO)	255	0	300
Institute for Food Science and Engineering (AR)	1,250	0	1,250
Integrated production systems (OK)	180	0	0
International agricultural market structures and institutions (KY)	250	0	0
International arid lands consortium	400	0	500
International asparagus competitiveness (WA)	0	0	200
Iowa biotechnology consortium	1,564	0	1,564
Livestock and dairy policy (NY, TX)	475	0	575
Lowbush blueberry research (ME)	220	0	260
Maple research (VT)	100	0	0
Meadowfoam (OR)	300	0	300
Michigan biotechnology consortium	675	0	775
Midwest Advanced Food Manufacturing Alliance	423	0	500
Midwest agricultural products (IA)	592	0	700
Milk safety (PA)	298	0	350
Minor use animal drugs	550	550	0
Molluscan shellfish (OR)	400	0	400
Multi-commodity research (OR)	364	0	364
Multi-cropping strategies for aquaculture (HI)	127	0	0
National beef cattle genetic evaluation consortium (NY)	0	0	300
National biological impact assessment	254	254	0
Nematode resistance genetic engineering (NM)	127	0	127
Nevada arid rangelands initiative (NV)	255	0	300
New crop opportunities (AK)	425	0	0
New crop opportunities (KY)	595	0	700
Non-food uses of agricultural products (NE)	64	0	64
Nursery, greenhouse, and turf specialties (AL)	0	0	300
Oil resources from desert plants (NM)	175	0	175
Organic waste utilization (NM)	100	0	100
Pasture and forage research (UT)	225	0	250
Peach tree short life (SC)	162	0	0
Peanut allergy reduction (AL)	425	0	500
Pest control alternatives (SC)	106	0	0
Phytophthora root rot (NM)	127	0	150
Plant, drought, and disease resistance gene cataloging (NM)	212	0	250

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 enacted [1]	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
Pierce's disease (CA)	0	0	2,000
Potato research	1,300	0	1,400
Precision agriculture (KY)	850	0	500
Preharvest food safety (KS)	212	0	212
Preservation and processing research (OK)	226	0	226
Produce pricing (AZ)	0	0	80
Rangeland ecosystems (NM)	200	0	400
Red snapper research (AL)	510	0	700
Regional barley gene mapping project	425	0	425
Regional crop information and policy centers	0	1,500	0
Regionalized implications of farm programs (MO, TX)	294	0	294
Rice modeling (AR)	296	0	296
Rural Development Centers (PA, IA, ND, MS, OR, LA)	523	523	523
Rural policies institute (NE, IA, MO)	644	0	1,000
Russian wheat aphid (CO)	200	0	200
Safe vegetable production (GA)	0	0	300
Seafood harvesting, processing, and marketing (AK)	552	0	0
Seafood and aquaculture harvesting, processing, and marketing (MS)	305	0	0
Seafood safety (MA)	255	0	300
Small fruit research (OR, WA, ID)	300	0	300
Southwest consortium for plant genetics and water resources	338	0	400
Soybean cyst nematode (MO)	475	0	700
STEEP—water quality in Pacific Northwest	500	0	500
Sustainable agriculture (CA)	255	0	400
Sustainable agriculture (MI)	445	0	445
Sustainable agriculture and natural resources (PA)	95	0	100
Sustainable agriculture systems (NE)	59	0	59
Sustainable beef supply (MT)	637	0	637
Sustainable pest management for dryland wheat (MT)	425	0	425
Swine waste management (NC)	500	0	500
Technological development of renewable resources (MO)	0	0	300
Tillage, silviculture, waste management (LA)	212	0	212
Tomato wilt virus (GA)	200	0	300
Tropical and subtropical research/T STAR	2,724	0	5,000
Tropical aquaculture (FL)	170	0	200
Turkey carnavirus (IN)	200	0	200
Urban pests (GA)	64	0	0
Value-added products (IL)	0	0	100
Vidalia onions (GA)	100	0	300
Viticulture consortium (NY, CA)	1,000	0	1,500
Water conservation (KS)	79	0	79
Weed control (ND)	423	0	423
Wetland plants (LA)	600	0	600
Wheat genetic research (KS)	261	0	261
Wood utilization (OR, MS, NC, MN, ME, MI, ID, TN, AK)	5,136	0	5,786
Wool research (TX, MT, WY)	300	0	300
Total, Special Research Grants	59,948	6,394	74,354
Improved pest control:			
Emerging pest/critical issues	200	467	200
Expert IPM decision support system	177	260	177
Integrated pest management	2,731	2,731	2,731
Minor crop pest management (IR–4)	8,990	10,711	8,990
Pest management alternatives	1,623	4,200	1,623
Total, Improved pest control	13,721	18,369	13,721
Competitive research grants:			
Animals	29,000	35,000	26,000
Markets, trade and development	4,600	7,000	4,600
Nutrition, food safety and health	16,000	22,000	14,000

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 enacted [1]	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
Natural resources and the environment	20,500	25,000	18,500
Plants	41,000	48,000	26,634
Processing for adding value or developing new products	8,200	13,000	7,200
Total, Competitive research grants	119,300	150,000	96,934
Animal Health and Disease (Sec. 1433)	5,109	5,109	5,109
Alternative crops	750	0	750
Critical Agricultural Materials Act	600	0	0
1994 Institutions research program	500	1,000	1,000
Graduate fellowship grants	3,000	5,000	3,000
Institution challenge grants	4,350	6,000	4,350
Multicultural scholars program	1,000	2,000	1,000
Hispanic education partnership grants	2,850	3,500	3,500
Secondary agriculture education	500	500	600
Aquaculture Centers (Sec. 1475)	4,000	4,000	4,000
Sustainable agriculture research and education/SARE	8,000	10,500	9,000
Capacity building grants (1890 institutions)	9,200	9,500	9,500
Payments to the 1994 Institutions	1,552	1,552	1,552
Federal Administration:			
Agriculture development in the American Pacific	564	0	564
Agriculture waste utilization (WV)	425	0	0
Agricultural water policy (GA)	0	0	385
Alternative fuels characterization laboratory (ND)	218	0	218
Animal waste management (OK)	250	0	300
Biotechnology research (MS)	425	0	0
Center for Agricultural and Rural Development (IA)	355	0	500
Center for innovative food technology (OH)	381	0	781
Center for North American Studies (TX)	87	0	87
Climate change research (FL)	170	0	170
Cotton research (TX)	170	0	500
Data information system	2,000	2,250	2,000
Food animal residue avoidance database	0	0	300
Geographic information system	850	0	850
Germplasm development in forage grasses (OH)	100	0	100
Livestock marketing information center (CO)	170	0	170
Mariculture (NC)	250	0	250
Mississippi Valley State University	583	0	0
National Center for Peanut Competitiveness (GA)	300	0	300
Office of extramural programs	310	588	588
Pay costs and FERS	1,100	1,100	1,100
Peer panels	350	350	350
PM–10 air quality study (CA, WA)	873	0	873
Precision agriculture/Geospatial Training and Application Center (AL)	340	0	600
Precision agriculture/Tennessee Valley Research and Extension Center (AL)	85	0	150
Shrimp aquaculture (AZ, HI, MS, MA, SC)	3,354	0	3,354
Sustainable agriculture development (OH)	0	0	500
Urban silviculture (NY)	0	0	250
Water quality (IL)	298	0	298
Water quality (ND)	340	0	340
Wetland plants (WV)	0	0	150
Total, Federal Administration	14,348	4,288	16,028
Total, Research and Education Activities	481,881	460,865	477,551

[1] Includes impact of reductions pursuant to Public Law 106–113.
[2] Fiscal year 2000 funding provided under the Agricultural Research Service.

NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

2000 appropriation	$4,600,000
2001 budget estimate	7,100,000
Provided in the bill	7,100,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+2,500,000
2001 budget estimate	.....

The Native American Institutions Endowment Fund authorized by Public Law 103–382 provides authority to establish an endowment for the 1994 land-grant institutions (31 tribal controlled colleges). This program will enhance educational opportunities for Native Americans by building educational capacity at these institutions in the areas of student recruitment and retention, curricula development, faculty preparation, instruction delivery systems, and scientific instrumentation for teaching. Beginning in 2001, it is proposed that funds also be made available for facility renovation, repair, construction, and maintenance. On the termination of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall withdraw the income from the endowment fund for the fiscal year, and after making adjustments for the cost of administering the endowment fund, distribute the adjusted income as follows: sixty percent of the adjusted income from these funds shall be distributed among the 1994 land-grant institutions on a pro-rata basis, the proportionate share being based on the Indian student count; and forty percent of the adjusted income shall be distributed in equal shares to the 1994 land-grant institutions.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Native American Institutions Endowment Fund, the Committee provides $7,100,000, an increase of $2,500,000 above the amount available in fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request. In addition, the Committee recommends language as requested which provides that funds may be used to support facility renovation, repair, construction, and maintenance.

EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

2000 appropriation	$424,174,000
2001 budget estimate	428,236,000
Provided in the bill	428,740,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+4,566,000
2001 budget estimate	+504,000

Cooperative agricultural extension work was established by the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, as amended. The legislation authorizes the Department of Agriculture to give, through the land-grant institutions, instruction and practical demonstrations in agricultural and home economics and related subjects, and to encourage the application of such information by means of demonstrations, publications, and otherwise to persons not attending or a resident in the colleges. In addition, the Service provides nutrition training to low-income families, 4–H Club work, and educational assistance such as community resource development.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Extension Activities, the Committee provides an appropriation of $428,740,000, an increase of $4,566,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and an increase of $504,000 above the budget request.

The following table reflects the amount provided by the Committee:

EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 enacted [1]	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
Smith Lever Sections 3(b) & 3(c)	$276,548	$276,548	$276,548
Smith Lever Section 3(d)			
Farm safety	3,400	0	4,000
Food and nutrition education (EFNEP)	58,695	61,043	58,695
Indian reservation agents	1,714	5,000	1,714
Pest management	10,783	12,269	10,783
Pesticide applicator training	0	1,500	1,500
Rural development centers	908	908	908
Sustainable agriculture	3,309	4,500	3,309
Youth at risk	9,000	10,000	9,000
Youth farm safety education and certification	0	5,000	1,000
1890 Colleges and Tuskegee University	26,843	26,843	26,843
1890 facilities grants	12,000	12,000	12,000
Renewable Resources Extension Act	3,192	3,192	3,192
Rural health and safety education	2,628	0	0
Extension services at the 1994 institutions	3,060	3,500	3,060
Subtotal	412,080	422,303	412,552
Federal Administration and special grants:			
After-school program (CA)	0	0	420
Ag in the classroom	208	476	576
Beef producers' improvement (AR)	197	0	197
Botanical gardens initiative (IL)	106	0	0
Conservation technology transfer (WI)	170	0	200
Delta teachers academy	3,500	0	3,500
Diabetes detection and prevention (WA)	550	0	975
Efficient irrigation (NM/TX)	0	0	2,000
Extension specialist (MS)	100	0	0
Family farm beef industry network (OH)	0	0	1,390
General administration	4,736	5,457	4,736
Income enhancement demonstration (OH)	246	0	246
Integrated cow/calf resources management (IA)	250	0	300
National Center for Agriculture Safety (IA)	195	0	195
Pilot technology transfer (OK, MS)	326	0	326
Pilot technology transfer (WI)	163	0	163
Range improvement (NM)	197	0	197
Rural development (AK)	277	0	0
Rural development (NM)	280	0	280
Rural development (OK)	150	0	0
Rural rehabilitation (GA)	246	0	0
Vocational agriculture (OK)	0	0	290
Wood biomass as an alternative farm product (NY)	197	0	197
Total, Federal Administration	12,094	5,933	16,188
Total, Extension Activities	424,174	428,236	428,740

[1] Includes impact of reductions pursuant to Public Law 106–113.

Delta Teachers Academy.—The Committee recommends $3,500,000 for the Delta Teachers Academy. Within these funds,

the Committee directs that services shall be provided at a school in Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

Diabetes detection and prevention (WA).—The Committee recommends $975,000 for confirmation of the detection and education pilot demonstration project that has been conducted through the Extension Service in Hawaii and Washington. This technology involves non-invasive eye imaging, diagnosis through existing telemedicine infrastructure and treatment plans.

Expansion of Extension Systems.—The Committee is aware that there are nations such as Lebanon, Russia, and Ukraine that have an interest in developing a system similar to our Cooperative Extension effort. The Committee directs the Department to review these interests and to provide a report regarding which countries have such an interest, what efforts have been or could be undertaken either by the Department or through the Land Grant or private university system to support the establishment of extension systems, what resources are available or would be needed to adequately support such efforts, and whether or not any legislative changes would be required to facilitate the expansion of extension systems to other nations.

Farm Safety: AgrAbility.—Within the funds provided for Smith-Lever 3(d) for Farm Safety, the Committee recommends $3,000,000 for the AgrAbility program, which helps people with disabilities to be able to farm safely, efficiently, and profitably through on-the-farm education and assistance.

Income enhancement demonstration (OH).—The Committee expects that the Agricultural Business Enhancement Center will intensify its efforts in identifying and pursuing improved business practices and alternative market opportunities, including those related to sales at or through Farmers' Markets.

Indian Reservation Agents.—The Committee directs the Department to submit a report on the feasibility of specifying that all states with reservation lands are eligible for funding, and of inviting all such states to submit proposals for funds. This report is to include an analysis of the impact of taking into account each state's total Native American population when allocating funds on a formula basis. This report is to be submitted no later than January 1, 2001.

National Rural Behavioral Health Center (FL).—The Committee is aware of a proposal by the National Rural Behavioral Health Center at the University of Florida to train cooperative extension service agents in crisis intervention and stress management education. This model program would provide the training to better equip extension agents in delivering behavioral health information and programs to residents of rural and farm communities, most of whom live in areas experiencing health service shortages. The Committee urges the Department to work cooperatively with the Health Resources Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services in efforts to provide support for the Center and to build on the Center's initiative to extend the knowledge gained so that extension agents might be empowered to assist rural victims with this education and outreach effort.

4H Programs.—The Committee encourages the Department to work with 4H programs to develop a program for the collection of

discarded and surplus school supplies and clothing for redistribution to needy individuals in the United States and to the extent possible in other nations.

INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

2000 appropriation	$39,541,000
2001 budget estimates	76,194,000
Provided in the bill	39,541,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−36,653,000

Section 406 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 authorizes an integrated research, education, and extension competitive grants program. Water Quality, Food Safety, and Pesticide Impact Assessment Special Research Grants and Smith Level 3(d) programs previously shown under Research and Education and/or Extension Activities are proposed under this account.

INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 enacted	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
Integrated Activities:			
Small farms initiative	0	$4,000	0
Water quality	$13,000	16,204	12,000
Food safety	15,000	15,000	15,000
Pesticide impact assessment	4,541	4,640	4,551
International science and education grants	0	1,000	0
Biobased products program	0	9,600	0
Invasive species	0	1,500	0
Crops at risk from FQPA implementation	1,000	3,000	1,000
FQPA risk mitigation program for major food crop systems	4,000	10,000	4,000
Methyl bromide transition program	2,000	5,000	2,000
Organic transition program	0	1,000	1,000
Anti-hunger and food security program	0	5,250	0
Total, Integrated Activities	39,541	76,194	39,541

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Integrated Activities, the Committee provides an appropriation of $39,541,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $36,653,000 below the budget request.

Competitive Grants: International Involvement.—The Committee directs the Department to focus these research dollars on collaborative effort that can take maximum advantage of developing agricultural production for the benefit of the people of the nation in which the research takes place.

*Water Quality: Farm*A*Syst/Home*A*Syst*.—The Committee is aware of an admirable voluntary environmental risk reduction program known as "Farm*A*Syst/Home*A*Syst". Within funds provided under the Integrated Activities account, the Department is encouraged to give consideration to $4,000,000 for this program. The Administrator of CSREES is directed to report to the Committee on any application received for this program at the time of

receipt, and on the status of funding for this program at the time of any obligation of funds.

Water Quality: Great Lakes.—The Committee expects that attention will be given to the special needs of integrating production agriculture and the Great Lakes.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS

2000 appropriation	$618,000
2001 budget estimate	635,000
Provided in the bill	618,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−17,000

The Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs provides direction and coordination in carrying out laws enacted by the Congress with respect to the Department's marketing, grading, and standardization activities related to grain; competitive marketing practices of livestock, marketing orders and various programs; veterinary services; and plant protection and quarantine. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; Agricultural Marketing Service; and Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, the Committee provides an appropriation of $618,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $17,000 below the budget request.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

2000 appropriation	$437,768,000
2001 budget estimate	512,444,000
Provided in the bill	470,000,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+32,232,000
2001 budget estimate	−42,444,000

The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) was established by the Secretary of Agriculture on April 2, 1972 under the authority of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 and other authorities. The major objectives of APHIS are to protect the animal and plant resources of the nation from diseases and pests. These objectives are carried out under the major areas of activity, as follows:

Pest and Disease Exclusion.—The agency conducts inspection and quarantine activities at U.S. ports-of-entry to prevent the introduction of exotic animal and plant diseases and pests. The agency also participates in inspection, survey, and control activities in foreign countries to reinforce its domestic activities.

Plant and Animal Health Monitoring.—The agency conducts programs to assess animal and plant health and to detect endemic and exotic diseases and pests.

Pest and Disease Management Programs.—The agency carries out programs to control and eradicate pest infestations and animal diseases that threaten the United States; reduce agricultural losses caused by predatory animals, birds, and rodents; provide technical assistance to cooperators such as states, counties, farmer or rancher groups, and foundations; and ensure compliance with interstate movement and other disease control regulations within the jurisdiction of the agency.

Animal Care.—The agency conducts regulatory activities which ensure the humane care and treatment of animals as required by the Animal Welfare and Horse Protection Acts. These activities include inspection of certain establishments that handle animals intended for research, exhibition, and as pets, and monitoring of certain horse shows.

Scientific and Technical Services.—The agency performs other regulatory activities, including the development of standards for the licensing and testing of veterinary biologicals to ensure their safety and effectiveness; diagnostic activities in support of the control and eradication programs in other functional components; applied research aimed at reducing economic damage from vertebrate animals; development of new pest and animal damage control methods and tools; and regulatory oversight of genetically engineered products.

Agricultural Quarantine Inspection.—User fees are collected to cover the cost of inspection and quarantine activities at U.S. ports of entry to prevent the introduction of exotic animal and plant diseases and pests.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

The following table reflects the amounts provided by the Committee:

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 enacted	FY 2001 request	Committee provisions
1. Pest and Disease Exclusion:			
Ag. quarantine inspection	$34,546	$38,450	$38,450
User fees	86,926	87,000	87,000
Subtotal, AQI	121,472	125,450	125,450
Cattle ticks	4,996	5,276	5,276
Foot-and-mouth disease	3,803	3,803	3,803
Import/export	6,809	7,237	7,237
Sanitary/phytosanitary management	7,530	9,892	8,785
Fruit fly exclusion and detection	25,183	55,110	31,910
Screwworm	30,276	30,400	30,400
Tropical bont tick	407	407	407
Total, Pest and Disease Exclusion	200,476	237,575	213,268
2. Plant and Animal Health Monitoring:			
Animal health monitoring and surveillance	65,943	69,501	69,624

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 enacted	FY 2001 request	Committee provisions
Animal and plant health regulatory enforcement	5,850	6,263	6,263
Emergency Management System	627	5,868	2,368
Pest detection	6,680	6,729	6,729
Total, Plant and Animal Health Monitoring	79,100	88,361	84,984
3. Pest and Disease Management Programs:			
Aquaculture	766	576	676
Biocontrol	8,153	8,318	8,318
Boll weevil	15,094	2,856	19,757
Brucellosis eradication	10,876	8,227	8,427
Emerging plant pests	3,507	28,586	3,533
Golden nematode	580	580	580
Gypsy moth	4,363	4,420	4,420
Imported fire ant	100	0	200
Noxious weeds	424	2,124	1,124
Pink bollworm	1,316	1,074	1,548
Pseudorabies	4,563	4,039	4,039
Scrapie eradication	2,989	8,026	3,026
Tuberculosis	4,916	4,974	4,974
Wildlife services operations	31,395	28,684	35,637
Witchweed	1,506	1,506	1,506
Total, Pest and Disease Management	90,548	103,990	97,765
4. Animal Care:			
Animal welfare	10,167	15,167	12,167
Horse protection	361	398	398
Total, Animal Care	10,528	15,565	12,565
5. Scientific & Technical Services:			
Biotechnology/environmental protection	8,523	10,283	10,283
Integrated systems acquisition project	3,497	0	0
Plant methods development labs	4,688	4,806	4,806
Veterinary biologics	10,337	10,751	10,751
Veterinary diagnostics	15,609	17,678	16,678
Wildlife services methods development	10,357	10,525	10,835
Total, Scientific and Technical Services	53,011	54,043	53,353
6. Contingency fund	4,105	4,105	8,065
7. Invasive species	0	8,805	0
Total, Salaries and Expenses	437,768	512,444	470,000
Recap:			
Appropriated	350,842	425,444	383,000
AQI User Fees	86,926	87,000	87,000
	437,768	512,444	470,000

Wildlife Services.—The Committee directs APHIS to assure, to the maximum extent possible, that all control activities be cost-shared with local sponsors. The Committee also expects APHIS to continue work related to blackbird damage control in Louisiana. The Committee provides an additional $2,000,000 for support and expansion of rabies control including domestic programs and international collaboration. The Committee expects the program to target rabies in the midwestern and eastern states and in Texas. The

Committee expects a minimum of $600,000 to be targeted to rabies problems in New York state.

The Committee is concerned about reports that the incidence of raccoon rabies is expanding beyond the current control border. The Department is encouraged to expand this border and to develop additional cooperative agreements with those states in the expanded barrier area.

The Committee also provides $250,000 for wildlife services to contain crop and aquaculture losses in southeastern Missouri, $625,000 for a cooperative agreement with Georgia Wildlife Services and the University of Georgia to conduct research on and control of game bird predation in Georgia, and $100,000 for trapping in Virginia to combat increased predation by coyotes.

The Committee has received reports of increased losses to ranchers in western states. The Committee regrets that limitations on the budget prevent any response to requests for compensation for loss of livestock, but it provides an additional $300,000 to assist in controlling wolf predation.

The Committee is concerned that the spread of the wolf population in western states has caused an increase in Wildlife Services operations that cannot be funded with the current level of appropriations. The Committee directs the Department to prepare a report on increased APHIS activities due to wolf predation with increased costs in fiscal years 1999 and 2000, and projections for costs in fiscal year 2001. The report should include an accounting of all compensation to APHIS from other federal and local agencies and should be provided to the Committees on Appropriations no later than March 1, 2001.

The Committee expects APHIS to intensify its efforts in both research and operations to control migratory fish-eating birds, such as the double crested cormorant, which are causing serious problems to the Southeastern aquaculture industry.

The Committee provides an additional $1,000,000 for aviation operations and aviation safety.

Avocados.—The Committee urges the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service to continue working closely with U.S. avocado growers in implementing procedures for the importation of Mexican avocados. The Committee directs APHIS to report on the status of Mexican avocado imports including any problems in pest surveys, oversight by APHIS personnel and importation, including the diversion of Mexican avocados to other than approved destinations. The Committee also directs APHIS to report to Congress prior to publishing any rules expanding the approved areas or lengthening time periods for importation of Mexican avocados.

Imported Fire Ant.—The Committee supports a program for the control, management, and eradication of the imported fire ant and provides $200,000 for this program of which, $75,000 is for New Mexico.

Hog cholera.—The Committee believes there is a very high risk of introduction of hog cholera into the United States due to the presence of the disease in the Caribbean. The Committee believes this should be viewed as an emergency situation and the following efforts should be undertaken: (1) preclearance of passengers entering the United States from high risk countries; (2) enhanced sur-

veillance of high risk U.S. herds; (3) enforcement of the Swine Health Protection Act; and (4) improved training and educational efforts for state and Federal animal health officials and accredited veterinarians.

Methods Development.—The Committee expects that activities funded by this appropriation shall continue to be carried out by APHIS Wildlife Services and in full cooperation with state wildlife management agencies and the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

The Committee provides $500,000 for research and evaluation of nicarbazin as a means of controlling goose and other avian populations to increase airport safety.

National Farm Animal Identification and Records Project for Dairy Cattle.—The Committee provides continued funding at the fiscal year 2000 level for the National Farm Animal Identification and Records Project for Dairy Cattle to be coordinated with the Holstein Association.

Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standards.—The Committee expects that imported products will be subjected to the same sanitary and phytosanitary standards as domestic products and those that do not meet the U.S. standards will be rejected. APHIS should provide adequate staffing levels at the borders and ports of entry to ensure that sanitary and phytosanitary standards are upheld.

Screwworm.—The Committee expects the Department to continue to work with Mexican authorities to develop an alternative use for the Chiapas screwworm facility and to continue to keep the Committee informed of any developments. This alternative use should focus on those activities that would help the area population produce commercial crops uniquely suitable for production in the area.

Plant Pest and Disease Emergencies.—The Committee is concerned about the increasing risk to our national food supply from plant pests and diseases. Recent examples include citrus canker in Florida, Pierce's disease in California, plum pox virus in Pennsylvania, Asian longhorned beetles in Illinois and New York, and Mediterranean and Mexican fruit flies throughout the southern United States. The Committee notes that the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to declare emergencies and to use the resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation to meet such threats to American agricultural production. This system has served our country well for many years by granting the Secretary the power to make virtually unlimited efforts to eliminate emerging pest and disease problems before outbreaks expand and become unmanageable.

It appears that a problem has now arisen with this system. After the Secretary has made an emergency declaration, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) must apportion funds from the Treasury before the effort can commence. It appears that the exercise of this apportionment function has unnecessarily delayed USDA action, and has permitted problems to expand, and to increase the cost of eradication. The Committee strongly believes that this is not a proper use of OMB's ministerial power.

In particular, the state of Florida is increasing its effort to control and eradicate citrus canker during the current fiscal year. The

Committee supports this effort, and directs the Secretary of Agriculture to report by March 1, 2001 on all requests for OMB apportionment of funds under existing emergency declarations.

Hereafter, the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to submit to the Committee copies of all apportionments requested under emergency declarations at the time they are submitted to OMB, as well as the response received from OMB.

Bovine Tuberculosis.—The Committee is concerned about the health of cattle with the spread of Bovine Tuberculosis in Michigan. The Committee expects the Secretary of Agriculture to recognize and declare this emergency and to accelerate its prevention and eradication efforts by using $7.5 million in CCC emergency funds.

Asian Longhorned Beetle.—The Committee is aware of the serious threat to trees in New York and Illinois and other states and directs the Department to continue its prevention and eradication efforts using CCC emergency funds and Emerging Plant Pest funds as necessary.

Aquaculture.—The Committee provides an appropriation of $676,000 for aquaculture of which $100,000 is to support a wildlife biologist at the northwest Florida Aquaculture Farm in Blountstown, FL to serve north Florida, southeast Alabama and southwest Georgia.

Boll Weevil.—The Committee has increased funding provided to APHIS for the Federal cost-share of the nationwide boll weevil eradication program. The Committee notes that the Federal cost-share has fallen to approximately 5% compared to the original level of 30%, as a result of a substantial increase in participating acreage. The Committee is aware that several programs are incurring significant costs associated with self-financing their eradication activities. In particular, the Committee notes that Oklahoma producers have successfully generated funds through sale of bonds. However, the bonds have been subject to Federal tax, thereby substantially increasing the financing cost and reducing the benefits to the Oklahoma program. The Committee expects APHIS and the Boll Weevil Eradication Action Committee to assist the Oklahoma Foundation in mitigating the unanticipated costs associated with the bond issue.

Brucellosis.—The Committee provides an additional $200,000 for the Greater Yellowstone Brucellosis Committee and the Idaho Wildlife Brucellosis Plan.

Blackbird.—The Committee urges the Department to implement, if feasible, a baiting program to control blackbird damage to sunflowers.

Animal Health Monitoring and Surveillance.—The Committee provides an additional $124,000 for the National Poultry Improvement Program.

Pink Bollworm Eradication.—The Committee recognizes the significant economic losses caused by pink bollworm infestation. The Committee supports efforts which combine the use of sterile moths, Bt cotton varieties and limited application of conventional pesticides. The Committee therefore expects the Secretary to instruct APHIS to utilize all available resources to provide financial assist-

ance, in addition to the direct appropriation and grower assessments, to operate the program during this fiscal year.

Berryman Institute.—The Committee directs the Department to continue the current funding level for the Jack Berryman Institute in Utah.

APHIS Operations at Miami International Airport.—Miami International Airport (MIA) is the nation's busiest international cargo and second busiest international passenger airport. The Committee is concerned about increasing delays in time in transit, duties and processing paperwork burdens attributable to shipment of goods and arriving passengers at MIA. The Committee therefore encourages the U.S. Department of Agriculture to provide additional positions for APHIS cargo and passenger inspection operations at MIA.

Overhead Charges.—The Committee is concerned that overhead costs charged to various programs may be in excess of the amounts needed and directs APHIS to keep these costs as low as possible.

Third Party Inspection.—The Committee directs APHIS to provide inspection support including training, certification and quality audits to businesses providing independent third party agricultural inspections.

Contingency Fund.—The Committee provides an additional $3,960,000 over the amount requested for fiscal year 2001 in the Contingency Fund. The Committee notes that the Administration has proposed using appropriated funds for emergencies previously funded by the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC). The Committee strongly disagrees with this approach and directs the Department to continue funding such emergencies as citrus canker, plum pox, Asian longhorned beetle and Pierce's disease through CCC. The Committee also notes that there are many new demands for funding to combat pests and diseases. Many of these pests and diseases enter the United States because of increased imports and travel. Some are of domestic origin. The Committee has received requests for funding to combat many problems including Asian longhorned beetle, Asian gypsy moth, grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, Pierce's disease, plum pox, rabies, fire ants, Johne's disease, goatsrue/tamarisk and bovine tuberculosis. Frequently, the amounts requested differ from APHIS' analysis of need. The Committee directs APHIS to consult with state and local governments when assistance is requested and use contingency funds whenever appropriate.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

2000 appropriation	$5,200,000
2001 budget estimate	5,200,000
Provided in the bill	5,200,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	.....

The APHIS Buildings and Facilities account funds major nonrecurring construction projects in support of specific program activities and recurring construction, alterations, preventive maintenance, and repairs of existing APHIS facilities.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Buildings and Facilities, the Committee provides an appropriation of $5,200,000 the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request.

The following table summarizes the committee's provisions:

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 enacted	FY 2001 request	Committee provisions
Buildings and Facilities:			
Plum Island, NY	$1,200	$3,200	3,200
Basic buildings and facilities repair, alterations, and preventative maintenance	4,000	2,000	2,000
Total, Buildings & Facilities	5,200	5,200	5,200

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

MARKETING SERVICES

2000 appropriation	$51,497,000
2001 budget estimate	66,572,000
Provided in the bill	56,326,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+4,829,000
2001 budget estimate	−10,246,000

The Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) was established by the Secretary of Agriculture on April 2, 1972, under the authority of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, and other authorities. Through its marketing, consumer, and regulatory programs, AMS aids in advancing orderly and efficient marketing and effective distribution and transportation of products from the Nation's farms.

Programs administered by this agency include market news activities, payments to states for marketing activities, the Plant Variety Protection Act, the Federal administration of marketing agreements and orders, standardization, grading, classing, and shell egg surveillance services, transportation services, and market protection and promotion.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Marketing Services of the Agricultural Marketing Service, the Committee provides an appropriation of $56,326,000, an increase of $4,829,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $10,246,000 below the budget request.

The Committee expects implementation of the Organic Certification Program to continue and that a final rule will be published in fiscal year 2001.

The Committee has included $3,000,000 for mandatory price reporting. The Committee notes that $4,700,000 was made available in fiscal year 2000 for mandatory price reporting, and as of April 30, 2000 the Department was at least three months behind in its implementation schedule. Since the fiscal year 2000 funds are available until expended, the Committee believes that adequate

funds should be available in fiscal year 2001 to carry out the program.

The Committee provides $1,106,000 to complete planning and begin implementation of the Pesticide Data water testing program.

The Committee includes $31,000 to stimulate interest in the identification and development of marketing opportunities for small and limited-resource farmers through the Federal-State Marketing Improvement Program.

The Committee is aware that the Department guidelines for commodity purchase programs relating to small businesses effectively prohibit many farmer cooperatives from participating in such programs. The Committee has included a general provision that the USDA does not prohibit eligibility or participation by farmer-owned cooperatives in the commodity purchase program.

The Committee has included language that allows the transfer of $639,000 from the Marketing Services account to the Expenses and Refunds account for the implementation of the National Organic Standards Program upon promulgation of a final rule. These funds are to provide an incentive for certifying agents to become accredited under the new national program as soon as possible. Accreditation fees that are proposed as part of the program will not be charged during the first 18 months of the program, except to cover travel costs. The $639,000 is needed to cover program costs for 18 months at which time the program expects to be self-supporting through the collection of user fees.

The Committee is encouraged by the attention being paid by AMS to the problems of small and medium-sized producers. The Committee directs the Department to build on these efforts by developing a plan in consultation with the Committee to provide marketing training to producers and producer organizations to enable them to take maximum advantage of opportunities for dealing with new and changing agricultural markets.

The Committee encourages the Department to expand its efforts in collaboration with the North American Farmers Direct Marketing Association to facilitate the exchange of information between marketers and farmers' markets, and to increase its promotion of farmers' markets and direct marketing websites.

The Committee expects the Department to expand its initiative for linking small farmers and cooperatives directly with school food purchasing authorities, and to make specific efforts in this regard in Ohio.

The Committee is concerned about the conditions surrounding the conduct of the current pork producer referendum. The Committee expects the Department to take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that only the ballots of legitimate producers will be counted in this referendum.

The Committee compliments AMS for its efforts to develop and disseminate more information about contracting practices in various sectors of agriculture. The Committee urges and encourages the agency to expand these efforts, and to report to the Committee as to what additional resources might be necessary to provide producers with the amount of information they need to evaluate the adequacy of their own contracts.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

2000 limitation	($60,730,000)
2001 budget limitation	(60,730,000)
Provided in the bill	(60,730,000)
Comparison:	
2000 limitation	.....
2001 budget limitation	.....

The Agricultural Marketing Service provides inspection, grading, and classing services to the cotton and tobacco industries on a user funded basis. The legislative authorities to carry out these programs are: the U.S. Cotton Standards Act; the Cotton Statistics and Estimates Act of 1927, as amended; the Tobacco Inspection Act; the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981; the Dairy and Tobacco Adjustment Act of 1985; and the Uniform Cotton Classing Fees Act of 1987. These programs facilitate the interstate and foreign commerce of these products. This is accomplished by inspecting, identifying, and certifying the quality of these products in accordance with official standards. Grades serve as a basis for prices and reflect the value of the products to the producer as well as the buyer. These programs facilitate the movement of commodities through marketing channels in a quick, efficient, and equitable manner.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For a Limitation on Administrative Expenses of the Agricultural Marketing Service, the Committee provides $60,730,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request.

FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY

(SECTION 32)

MARKETING AGREEMENT AND ORDERS

2000 appropriation	($12,428,000)
2001 budget estimate	(13,438,000)
Provided in the bill	(13,438,000)
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+1,010,000
2001 budget estimate	.....

The Act of August 24, 1935, appropriates 30 percent of all customs receipts for: (a) encouraging exports of agricultural commodities; (b) encouraging domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by diversion to alternative outlets or by increasing their utilization; and (c) reestablishing the farmers' purchasing power.

The primary purpose of section 32 is to strengthen markets by purchasing surplus perishable agricultural commodities to encourage continued adequate production.

The following table reflects the status of this fund for fiscal years 1999 through 2001:

ESTIMATED TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AND BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD, FISCAL YEARS 1999–2001

	FY 1999 actual	FY 2000 current estimate	FY 2001 budget estimate
Appropriation (30 percent of Customs Receipts)	$5,701,865,817	$5,735,557,955	$5,738,448,921
Supplemental Appropriation	145,000,000		
Less Rescission	−7,958,000	−15,000	
Less Transfers:			
Food and Nutrition Service	−5,048,150,000	−4,935,199,000	−5,127,579,102
Commerce Department	−66,426,288	−69,920,523	−72,827,819
Total, Transfers	−5,114,576,288	−5,005,119,523	−5,200,406,921
Budget Authority	724,331,529	730,423,432	538,042,000
Unobligated Balance Available, Start of Year	131,966,602	112,630,114	300,000,000
Recoveries of Prior Year Obligations	3,527,838	0	0
Available for obligation	859,825,969	843,053,546	838,042,000
Less Obligations:			
Commodity Procurement:			
Child Nutrition Purchases	400,000,000	400,000,000	400,000,000
Emergency Surplus Removal	144,484,206	96,000,000	0
Diversion Payments	178,264,816	0	0
Disaster Relief	7,013,711	0	0
Estimated Future Purchases	0	26,041,546	115,000,000
Total, Commodity Procurement	729,762,733	522,041,546	515,000,000
Administrative Funds:			
Commodity Purchase Service	6,580,001	8,584,000	9,604,000
Marketing Agreements & Orders	10,853,121	12,428,000	13,438,000
Total, Administrative Funds	17,433,122	21,012,000	23,042,000
Total, Obligations	747,195,855	543,053,546	538,042,000
Carryout	112,630,114	300,000,000	300,000,000
Return to Treasury	0	0	0
Unobligated Balance Available, End Of Year	112,630,114	300,000,000	300,000,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Marketing Agreements and Orders Program, the Committee provides a transfer from section 32 funds of $13,438,000, an increase of $1,010,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request.

The Committee is aware of the continuing disastrous situation being experienced by agricultural producers of specialty crops who do not receive direct Federal market assistance in agricultural sectors where surpluses have resulted in prices well below the cost of production. The Statement of Managers accompanying the fiscal year 2000 Consolidated Appropriations Act included language urging the Secretary of Agriculture to evaluate the impact market surpluses in the cranberry industry have on prices paid to growers. The language anticipated the Secretary using funds made available under the section 32 program to help stabilize prices through the purchase of cranberry products. Despite the fact that prices being paid to producers in this sector are continuing to decline precipitously due to continuing surpluses, little has been done to address

the situation. The Committee directs the Secretary to redouble efforts to help producers of specialty crops using the projected $300,000,000 carryover in the section 32 program. In carrying out this mandate, the Secretary should focus on purchases of agricultural products grown primarily by small farmers who are most in need.

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

2000 appropriation	$1,200,000
2001 budget estimate	1,500,000
Provided in the bill	1,500,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+300,000
2001 budget estimate	.....

The Federal-State Marketing Improvement Program is authorized by section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 and is also funded from appropriations. Payments are made to state marketing agencies to: identify and test market alternative farm commodities; determine methods of providing more reliable market information; and develop better commodity grading standards. This program has made possible many types of projects, such as electronic marketing and agricultural product diversification. Current projects are focused on the improvement of marketing efficiency and effectiveness, and seeking new outlets for existing farm produced commodities. The legislation grants the U.S. Department of Agriculture authority to establish cooperative agreements with State Departments of Agriculture or similar state agencies to improve the efficiency of the agricultural marketing chain. The states perform the work or contract it to others, and must contribute at least one-half of the cost of the projects.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Payments to States and Possessions, the Committee provides an appropriation of $1,500,000, an increase of $300,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000, and the same as the budget request.

GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

2000 appropriation	$26,433,000
2001 budget estimate	33,549,000
Provided in the bill	27,801,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+1,368,000
2001 budget estimate	−5,748,000

The Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) was established pursuant to the Secretary's 1994 reorganization. Grain inspection and weighing programs are carried out under the U.S. Grain Standards Act and other programs under the authority of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, including the inspection and grading of rice and grain-related products; conducting official weighing and grain inspection activities; and grading dry beans and peas, and processed grain products. Under the Packers and Stockyards Act, assurance of the financial integrity of

the livestock, meat, and poultry markets is provided. The Administration monitors competition in order to protect producers, consumers, and industry from deceptive and fraudulent practices which affect meat and poultry prices.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, the Committee provides $27,801,000, an increase of $1,368,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000, and a decrease of $5,748,000 below the budget request.

The Committee supports GIPSA's expanded role in addressing international grain trade issues and has included an increase of $368,000 for compliance activities specifically as they relate to opening foreign markets for grain and oilseed.

The Committee has included an increase of $600,000 to allow GIPSA to continue to identify anti-competitive behavior, and examine causes and competitive implications of contract livestock production.

GIPSA has embarked on a sustained effort to examine the competitive structure of the poultry industry, and the Committee has provided an increase of $400,000 to carry out this work.

LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES EXPENSES

2000 limitation	($42,557,000)
2001 budget limitation	(42,557,000)
Provided in the bill	(42,557,000)
Comparison:	
2000 limitation	
2001 budget limitation	

The U.S. Grain Standards Act requires, with minor exceptions, that all grain exported by grade must be officially inspected and weighed. The agency's employees or delegated state agencies perform original inspection and weighing services at export port locations in the United States and Canada. Grain which is not being exported may be inspected at interior locations, upon request, by licensed employees of designated state and private agencies. The agency's employees, upon request, perform domestic original inspection and weighing services on grain, oilseeds, pulses, rice, and related grain commodities. The agency's employees supervise and provide oversight for inspectors performing official services.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

The Committee includes a limitation on inspection and weighing services expenses of $42,557,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request. The bill includes authority to exceed by 10 percent the limitation on inspection and weighing services with notification to the Appropriations Committees. This allows for flexibility if export activities require additional supervision and oversight or other uncontrollable factors occur.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD SAFETY

2000 appropriation	$446,000
2001 budget estimate	560,000

Provided in the bill	446,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−114,000

The Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress with respect to the Department's inspection of meat, poultry, and egg products. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Food Safety and Inspection Service.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety, the Committee provides an appropriation of $446,000, the same as the amount provided for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $114,000 below the budget request.

The Committee directs the Under Secretary for Food Safety to review the current laws and policies regarding the handling or inspection of nonambulatory animals and report back to the Committee no later than 180 days with the findings.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

2000 appropriation	$649,119,000
2001 budget estimate	688,204,000
Provided in the bill	673,790,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+24,671,000
2001 budget estimate	−14,414,000

The Food Safety and Inspection Service was established on June 17, 1981, by Secretary's Memorandum No. 1000–1, issued pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

The major objectives of the Service are to assure that meat and poultry products are wholesome, unadulterated, and properly labeled and packaged, as required by the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the Poultry Products Inspection Act; provide continuous in-plant inspection to egg processing plants under the Egg Products Inspection Act; and administer the pathogen reduction program.

The inspection program of the Food Safety and Inspection Service provides continuous in-plant inspection of all domestic plants preparing meat, poultry, or egg products for sale or distribution; reviews foreign inspection systems and establishments that prepare meat or poultry products for export to the United States; and provides technical and financial assistance to states which maintain meat and poultry inspection programs.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Food Safety and Inspection Service, the Committee provides an appropriation of $673,790,000, an increase of $24,671,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $14,414,000 below the budget request.

The Committee provides the full amount requested for inspection costs and for activities related to the Codex Alimentarius.

The Committee provides bill language allowing funds made available to the Food Safety and Inspection Service for fiscal year 2001

to liquidate overobligations and overexpenditures incurred in fiscal years 1997 and 1998.

The Committee remains concerned that the Food Safety and Inspection Service has not finished removing or revising those meat and poultry inspection regulations inconsistent with the HACCP-based inspection system. The agency has missed self-imposed deadlines for completing this project, and the Committee believes the accomplishments in this area, as cited in testimony and correspondence, are not as extensive as they should be. Accordingly, the Committee directs FSIS to prepare by March 1, 2001, a report listing every meat and poultry inspection regulation in place prior to publication of the Pathogen Reduction/HACCP rule, the agency's determination of whether each regulation should be revised or removed in the wake of HACCP implementation and the agency's proposed date for completing that revision or removal.

The Committee believes that agency managers must have an understanding of the establishments that the agency regulates, which necessarily requires the occasional observation of operations in an inspected establishment. The Committee expects all appropriate senior personnel of the agency, specifically senior personnel in the Field Operations, the Public Health and Science and the Policy and Program Development and Evaluation offices, to become HACCP certified and to observe operations in the range of establishments inspected by the agency at least annually. The agency is directed to provide the Committee a report no later than March 1, 2001 listing these senior personnel (GS 14 and above), the date on which they have become HACCP certified and the date and type of establishment in which they have observed operations.

FSIS has a plan to better utilize available inspection personnel through implementation of daily, unscheduled inspection in processing establishments. The Committee expects the Agency to make full use of its authority to ensure that inspection resources are rationally dedicated to address relative food safety risks and to avoid the disruptive effect of continued inspector shortages. To further these objectives, the Agency is expected to evaluate greater flexibility in requirements for frequency of unscheduled inspection and other possible means of enhancing the efficiency of inspection in processing establishments. FSIS should report its findings to the Committee by January 31, 2001.

FARM ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FARM AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

2000 appropriation	$572,000
2001 budget estimate	589,000
Provided in the bill	572,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−17,000

The Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress with respect to the Department's international affairs (except for foreign economic development) and

commodity programs. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Farm Service Agency (which includes the Commodity Credit Corporation), the Risk Management Agency, and the Foreign Agricultural Service.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, the Committee provides an appropriation of $572,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $17,000 below the budget request.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

The Farm Service Agency (FSA) was established by the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994, P.L. 103–354, enacted October 13, 1994. Originally called the Consolidated Farm Service Agency, the name was changed to the Farm Service Agency on November 8, 1995. The FSA administers the agricultural commodity programs financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC); the warehouse examination function; the conservation reserve program (CRP); several other conservation cost-share programs; the Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program (NAP); and farm ownership, operating, emergency disaster, and other loan programs.

Agricultural market transition program.—The Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, P.L. 104–127 (1996 Act), enacted April 4, 1996, mandates that the Secretary offer individuals with eligible cropland acreage the opportunity for a one-time signup in a 7-year, production flexibility contract. Depending on each contract, a participant's prior contract-crop acreage history and payment yield, as well as total program participation, each contract participant shares a portion of a statutorily-specified annual dollar amount. In return, participants must comply with certain requirements regarding land conservation, wetland protection, planting flexibility, and agricultural use. Contract crops, for the purposes of determining eligible cropland and payments, include wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, upland cotton, and rice. This program does not include any production adjustment requirements or related provisions except for restrictions on the planting of fruits and vegetables.

Marketing assistance loan program, price support programs, and other loan and related programs.—The 1996 Act provides for marketing assistance loans to producers of contract commodities, extra long staple (ELS) cotton, and oilseeds for the 1996 through 2002 crops. With the exception of ELS cotton, these nonrecourse loans are characterized by loan repayment rates that may be determined to be less than the principal plus accrued interest per unit of the commodity. Producers have the option of taking a loan deficiency payment, if available, in lieu of the marketing assistance loan.

The 1996 Act also provides for a loan program for sugar for the 1996 through 2002 crops of sugar beets and sugarcane, where the loans may be either recourse or nonrecourse in nature depending on the level of the tariff rate quota for imports of sugar. The 1996 Act provides for a milk price support program, whereby the price

of milk is supported through December 31, 1999, via purchases of butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk. The rate of support is fixed each calendar year, starting at $10.35 per hundredweight in 1996 and declining each year to $9.90 per hundredweight in 1999. The FY 2000 Appropriations Act, P.L. 106–78, extends the milk price support program to January 1, 2001. The 1996 Act and the 1938 Act provide for a peanut loan and poundage quota program for the 1996 through 2002 crops of peanuts. Finally, the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (1949 Act), and the 1938 Act provide for a price support, quota, and allotment program for tobacco.

The interest rate on commodity loans secured on or after October 1, 1996, will be one percentage point higher than the formula which was used to calculate commodity loans secured prior to fiscal year 1997. The CCC monthly commodity loan interest rate will, in effect, be one percentage point higher than CCC's cost-of-money for that month.

The 1996 Act amended the payment limitation provisions in the Food Security Act of 1985, as amended (1985 Act), by changing the annual $50,000 payment limit per person for deficiency and diversion payments to an annual $40,000 payment limit per person for contract payments. The annual $75,000 payment limit per person applicable to combined marketing loan gains and loan deficiency payments for all commodities that was in effect for the 1991 through 1995 crop years continues through the 2002 crop year. Similarly, the 3-entity rule is continued.

Commodity Credit Corporation program activities.—Various price support and related programs have been authorized in numerous legislative enactments since the early 1930's. Operations under these programs are financed through the Commodity Credit Corporation. Personnel and facilities of the Farm Service Agency (FSA) are utilized in the administration of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Administrator of the FSA is also Executive Vice President of the Corporation.

The 1996 Act created new conservation programs to address high priority environmental protection goals and authorized CCC funding for many of the existing and new conservation programs. The Natural Resources Conservation Service administers many of the programs financed through the CCC.

Foreign assistance programs and other special activities.—Various surplus disposal programs and other special activities are conducted pursuant to the specific statutory authorizations and directives. These laws authorize the use of CCC funds and facilities to implement the programs. Appropriations for these programs are transferred or paid to the Corporation for its costs incurred in connection with these activities, such as Public Law 480.

Farm credit programs.—The Department's reorganization has placed the farm credit programs under FSA to facilitate improved coordination between the credit programs and FSA's risk management, conservation, and commodity support programs. FSA reviews applications, makes and collects loans, and provides technical assistance and guidance to borrowers. Under credit reform, administrative costs associated with Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund (ACIF) loans are appropriated to the ACIF Program Account and transferred to FSA salaries and expenses.

Risk management.—Includes the Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program (NAP) which provides crop loss protection for growers of many crops for which crop insurance is not available.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Appropriation	*Transfer from program accts.*	*Total, FSA, S&E*
2000 appropriation [1]	$794,394,000	($211,265,000)	($1,005,659,000)
2001 budget estimate	828,385,000	(266,719,000)	(1,095,104,000)
Provided in the bill	828,385,000	(266,719,000)	(1,095,104,000
Comparison:			
2000 appropriation ..	+33,991,000	(+55,454,000)	(+89,445,000)
2001 budget estimate	.....	.....	.....

[1] Excludes $56,000,000 in Commodity Credit Corporation funds provided by P.L. 106–78 to cover FSA administrative costs to carry out emergency and disaster assistance for producers.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Salaries and Expenses of the Farm Service Agency (FSA), the Committee provides an appropriation of $828,385,000 and transfers from other accounts of $266,719,000, for a total program level of $1,095,104,000. This is an increase of $89,445,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 (excluding supplementals) and the same as the budget request.

The Committee expects the Agency to target lending in farm loan and assistance programs to those in most economic need.

Barley Loan Rate.—The Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 requires the Secretary in implementing the Marketing Loan Assistance Program to establish a loan rate for barley, and respective feed grains, "taking into consideration" barley's feeding value relative to corn. This determination does not reflect, but does not preclude taking into account, the value of malting barley, which represents more than one-half of annual U.S. barley production. In establishing the national average loan rate for barley for the 2000 through 2002 crops, the Committee directs the Secretary to include in the determination prices representing all U.S. barley production for the previous five years, including not less than one-half of the difference between average prices for malting barley and feed barley. The Committee also directs the Secretary to take into account county production and prices of feed barley and malting barley in establishing county loan rates and loan repayment rates, so as to meet the objectives of the non-recourse marketing loan program which include minimizing outlays and commodity forfeitures.

Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program/Habitat for Endangered Species.—The Committee urges the Farm Service Agency (FSA) to put priority on proposals addressing the habitat needs of species listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act, and water quality improvements for water bodies listed as impaired under section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act. The Committee encourages FSA to use maximum flexibility in interpreting Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) policies to ensure that riparian buffer standards are appropriate for the landscape type and actual biological and water quality needs of the relevant watershed. The FSA is directed to administer CREP

in a manner which encourages collaborative partnerships in watershed restoration and protection and where appropriate, combines CREP benefits and financial resources with state, private or regional initiatives that build off the core CREP measures with broader or long-term buffer contracts, including the purchase of easements by other entities.

County Offices.—The Committee is concerned about any Departmental plans to close FSA county offices at a time when the FSA office network is essential to helping farmers address critical economic and environmental issues. The Committee reiterates its strong view that no county office closure or consolidation should occur except in those locations for which closures and relocations are supported by rigorous analysis to ensure actions are cost effective, and that services available to the public will not be reduced.

FSA County Office Employees.—The Committee is disappointed that the budget request did not include funding to support maintaining FSA county office employees at the Fiscal Year 2000 level. Rural communities and agricultural producers rely heavily on the programs administered by the FSA county office employees during periods of economic decline. Since the current economic crisis is not expected to decline in the near future, the Committee directs the FSA to use all available funding sources, program delivery efficiencies and workload management options to support retaining FSA county office employees. The Committee expects the Department to provide budget requests fully supporting the workload needs of county office employees.

Location of Commodity Sales to the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC).—The Committee directs the Department to increase its outreach to producers and grain traders so as to increase the pool of CCC-eligible vendors for any commodity sale. In particular, the Committee expects the Department to make special efforts in Ohio and other Great Lakes States to increase sales and shipments from these areas.

STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

2000 appropriation	$3,000,000
2001 budget estimate	4,000,000
Provided in the bill	3,000,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−1,000,000

This program is authorized under title V of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987. Originally designed to address agricultural credit disputes, the program was expanded by the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 to include other agricultural issues such as wetland determinations, conservation compliance, rural water loan programs, grazing on national forest system lands, and pesticides. Grants are made to states whose mediation programs have been certified by FSA. Grants will be solely for operation and administration of the state's agricultural mediation program.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For State Mediation Grants, the Committee provides an appropriation of $3,000,000, the same as the amount available in fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $1,000,000 below the budget request.

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM

2000 appropriation	$450,000
2001 budget estimate	450,000
Provided in the bill	450,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	.....

Under the program, the Department makes indemnification payments to dairy farmers and manufacturers of dairy products who, through no fault of their own, suffer losses because they are directed to remove their milk from commercial markets due to contamination of their products by registered pesticides. The program also authorizes indemnity payments to dairy farmers for losses resulting from the removal of cows or dairy products from the market due to nuclear radiation or fallout.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Dairy Indemnity Program, the Committee provides an appropriation of $450,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Farm Ownership Loans.—Makes loans to farmers and ranchers for acquiring, enlarging, or improving farms, including farm buildings, land development, use, and conservation, refinancing indebtedness, and for loan closing costs.

Operating Loans.—Makes loans to farmers and ranchers for costs incident to reorganizing a farming system for more profitable operations, for a variety of essential farm operating expenses such as purchase of livestock, farm equipment, feed, seed, fertilizer, and farm supplies; for refinancing land and water development, use, and conservation; for refinancing indebtedness; for other farm and home needs; and for loan closing costs.

Emergency Loans.—Makes loans in designated areas where a natural disaster has caused a general need for agricultural credit which cannot be met for limited periods of time by private cooperatives or other responsible sources.

Indian Tribe Land Acquisition Loans.—Makes loans to any Indian tribe recognized by the Secretary of the Interior or tribal corporation established pursuant to the Indian Reorganization Act, which does not have adequate uncommitted funds, to acquire lands or interest in lands within the tribe's reservation or Alaskan Indian community, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, for use of the tribe or the corporation or the members thereof.

Credit Sales of Acquired Property.—Makes loans in conjunction with the sale of security properties previously acquired during the servicing of its loan portfolio.

Boll Weevil Eradication Loans.—Makes loans to assist foundations in financing the operation of boll weevil eradication programs provided to farmers.

ESTIMATED LOAN LEVELS

2000 loan level	[a] $3,083,292,000
2001 budget estimate	4,557,938,000
Provided in the bill	4,557,938,000
Comparison:	
2000 loan level	+1,474,646,000
2001 budget estimate	.....

[a] Excludes $2,542,294,000 for FY 2000 Supplemental pursuant to P.L. 106–113 enacted 11/29/99.

This fund makes the following loans to individuals: farm ownership, farm operating, and emergency. In addition, the fund makes loans to associations for Indian tribe land acquisition, and boll weevil eradication.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

Approximate loan levels provided by the Committee for fiscal year 2001 for the agricultural credit insurance fund programs are: $1,128,000,000 for farm ownership loans, of which $128,000,000 is for direct loans and $1,000,000,000 for guaranteed loans; $3,177,868,000 for farm operating loans, of which $700,000,000 is for direct loans, $477,868,000 is for guaranteed subsidized loans, and $2,000,000,000 is for guaranteed unsubsidized loans; $2,006,000 for Indian tribe land acquisition loans; $150,064,000 for emergency disaster loans; and $100,000,000 for boll weevil eradication loans.

AGRICULTURE CREDIT PROGRAMS

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 level	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
Farm loan programs:			
Farm ownership:			
Direct	[a] $128,049	$128,000	$128,000
Guaranteed	[b] 431,373	1,000,000	1,000,000
Farm operating:			
Direct	[c] 500,000	700,000	700,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed	[d] 1,697,842	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subsidized guaranteed	[e] 200,000	477,868	477,868
Emergency disaster	[f] 25,000	150,064	150,064
Indian tribe land acquisition	1,028	2,006	2,006
Boll Weevil Eradication	100,000	100,000	100,000
Total, farm loans	3,083,292	4,557,938	4,557,938

[a] Excludes $21,951,000 (FY 2000 Supplemental, P.L. 106–113).
[b] Excludes $568,627,000 (FY 2000 Supplemental, P.L. 106–113).
[c] Excludes $400,000,000 (FY 2000 Supplemental, P.L. 106–113).
[d] Excludes $302,158,000 (FY 2000 Supplemental, P.L. 106–113).
[e] Excludes $702,558,000 (FY 2000 Supplemental, P.L. 106–113).
[f] Excludes $547,000,000 (FY 2000 Supplemental, P.L. 106–113).

ESTIMATED LOAN SUBSIDY AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES LEVELS

	Direct loan subsidy	*Guaranteed loan subsidy*	*Administrative expenses*
2000 appropriation	[a] $38,030,000	[b] $43,976,000	$214,161,000
2001 budget estimate	114,060,000	71,494,000	269,454,000

	Direct loan subsidy	*Guaranteed loan subsidy*	*Administrative expenses*
Provided in the bill	114,060,000	71,494,000	269,454,000
Comparison:			
2000 appropriation	+76,030,000	+27,518,000	+55,293,000
2001 budget estimate			

[a] Excludes $109,218,000 (FY 2000 Supplemental, P.L. 106–113).
[b] Excludes $69,339,000 (FY 2000 Supplemental, P.L. 106–113).

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 established the Program Account. Appropriations to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed in 2001, as well as for administrative expenses.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

The following table reflects the costs of loan programs under credit reform:

	FY 2000 estimate	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
Loan subsidies:			
Farm ownership:			
Direct	[a] $4,827,000	$13,786,000	$13,786,000
Guaranteed	[b] 2,416,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
Subtotal	7,243,000	18,886,000	18,886,000
Farm operating:			
Direct	[c] 29,300,000	63,140,000	63,140,000
Guaranteed unsubsidized	[d] 23,940,000	27,400,000	27,400,000
Guaranteed subsidized	[e] 17,620,000	38,994,000	38,994,000
Subtotal	70,860,000	129,534,000	129,534,000
Indian tribe land acquisition	21,000	323,000	323,000
Emergency disaster	[f] 3,882,000	36,811,000	36,811,000
Total, Loan subsidies	82,006,000	185,554,000	185,554,000
ACIF expenses:			
Salaries and expenses	209,861,000	265,315,000	265,315,000
Administrative expenses	4,300,000	4,139,000	4,139,000
Total, ACIF expenses	296,167,000	455,008,000	455,008,000

[a] Excludes $828,000 (FY 2000 Supplemental, P.L. 106–113).
[b] Excludes $3,184,000 (FY 2000 Supplemental, P.L. 106–113).
[c] Excludes $23,441,000 (FY 2000 Supplemental, P.L. 106–113).
[d] Excludes $4,260,000 (FY 2000 Supplemental, P.L. 106–113).
[e] Excludes $61,895,000 (FY 2000 Supplemental, P.L. 106–113).
[f] Excludes $84,949,000 (FY 2000 Supplemental, P.L. 106–113).

RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY

2000 appropriation	$63,983,000
2001 budget estimate	67,700,000
Provided in the bill	67,700,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+3,717,000
2001 budget estimate	

Under the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform (FAIR) Act of 1996, Risk Management became an agency of the Department of Agriculture, known as the Risk Management Agency

(RMA), reporting to the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.

RMA manages program activities in support of the Federal crop insurance program as authorized by the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 and the FAIR Act of 1996. Functional areas of RMA are research and development, insurance services, and compliance whose functions include policy formulation and procedures and regulations development. Reviews and evaluations are conducted for overall performance to ensure the actuarial soundness of the insurance program.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Risk Management Agency, the Committee provides an appropriation of $67,700,000, an increase of $3,717,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request.

CORPORATIONS

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

2000 appropriation	[a] $710,857,000
2001 budget estimate	[a] 1,727,671,000
Provided in the bill	[a] 1,727,671,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+1,016,814,000
2001 budget estimate	.....

[a] Current indefinite appropriation.

The Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 was designed to replace the combination of crop insurance and ad hoc disaster payment programs with a strengthened crop insurance program.

Producers of insurable crops are eligible to receive a basic level of protection against catastrophic losses, which cover 50 percent of the normal yield at 55 percent of the expected price. The only cost to the producer is an administrative fee of $60 per crop per policy, or $200 for all crops grown by the producer in a county, with a cap of $600 regardless of the number of crops and counties involved. At least catastrophic (CAT) coverage was required for producers who participate in the commodity support, farm credit, and certain other farm programs. This coverage was available either through FSA local offices or private insurance companies. Under the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform (FAIR) Act of 1996, producers have the option of waiving their eligibility for emergency crop loss assistance instead of obtaining CAT coverage required to meet program requirements. Emergency loss assistance does not include emergency loans or payment under the noninsured assistance program (NAP), which is administered by FSA. Beginning with the 1997 crop, the Secretary began phasing out delivery of CAT coverage through the FSA offices, except in those areas where there are insufficient private insurance providers. The private companies serve as the sole source for CAT coverage.

The Reform Act of 1994 also provided increased subsidies for additional "buy-up" coverage levels which producers may obtain from

private insurance companies. The amount of subsidy is equivalent to the amount of premium established for catastrophic risk protection coverage and an amount for operating and administrative expenses for coverage up to 65 percent at 100 percent price. For coverage equal to or greater than 65 percent at 100 percent of the price, the amount is equivalent to an amount equal to the premium established for 50 percent loss in yield indemnified at 75 percent of the expected market price and an amount of operating and administrative expenses.

The reform legislation included the NAP program for producers of crops for which there is currently no insurance available. NAP was established to ensure that most producers of crops not yet insurable will have protection against crop catastrophes comparable to protection previously provided by ad hoc disaster assistance programs. While the NAP program was established as part of the Risk Management Agency, under the FAIR Act of 1996, the NAP program was shifted to FSA and has been incorporated into the Commodity Credit Corporation program activities.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund, the Committee provides an appropriation of such sums as may be necessary, the same as provided in fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

The Corporation was organized on October 17, 1933, under the laws of the State of Delaware, as an agency of the United States, and was managed and operated in close affiliation with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. On July 1, 1939, it was transferred to the Department of Agriculture by the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1. On July 1, 1948, it was established as an agency and instrumentality of the United States under a permanent Federal charter by Public Law 80–806, as amended. Its operations are conducted pursuant to this charter and other specific legislation.

The Commodity Credit Corporation engages in buying, selling, lending, and other activities with respect to agricultural commodities, their products, food, feed, and fibers. Its purposes include stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices; maintaining the balance and adequate supplies of selected commodities; and facilitating the orderly distribution of such commodities. In addition, the Corporation also makes available materials and facilities required in connection with the storage and distribution of such commodities. The Corporation also disburses funds for sharing of costs with producers for the establishment of approved conservation practices on environmentally sensitive land and subsequent rental payments for such land for the duration of conservation reserve program contracts.

Activities of the Corporation are primarily governed by the following statutes: the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, as amended; the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, P.L. 104–127 (1996 Act), enacted April 4, 1996; the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (1949 Act); the Agricultural Adjust-

ment Act of 1938, as amended (1938 Act); and the Food Security Act of 1985, as amended (1985 Act).

The 1996 Act requires that the following programs be offered for the 1996 through 2002 crops: seven-year production flexibility contracts for contract commodities (wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, and rice); nonrecourse marketing assistance loans for contract commodities, extra long staple (ELS) cotton, and oilseeds; a nonrecourse loan program for peanuts; and a nonrecourse/recourse loan program for sugar. The 1996 Act also requires a milk price support program that begins after enactment of the Act and continues through December 31, 1999, followed by a recourse loan program for dairy product processors. The FY 2000 Appropriations Act, P.L. 106–78 extends the milk price support program through January, 2001.

The 1996 Act establishes the environmental conservation acreage reserve program (ECARP), which encompasses the conservation reserve program (CRP), the wetlands reserve program (WRP), and the environmental quality incentives program (EQIP). Each of these programs is funded through the Corporation.

The 1996 Act also authorizes other new Corporation funded conservation programs, including the conservation farm option; flood risk reduction contracts; wildlife habitat incentives, and farmland protection programs.

The Corporation is managed by a board of directors appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, who is ex officio, a director, and chairman of the board. The board consists of six members, in addition to the Secretary, who are designated according to their positions in the Department of Agriculture.

Personnel and facilities of the Farm Service Agency, FSA state and county committees, and other USDA agencies are used to carry out Corporation activities.

The Corporation has an authorized capital stock of $100 million held by the United States and authority to borrow up to $30 billion. Funds are borrowed from the Federal Treasury and may also be borrowed from private lending agencies.

The specific powers (15 U.S.C. 714c) of the Commodity Credit Corporation are as follows:

In the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to chapter 91 of title 31, the Corporation is authorized to use its general powers only to—

(a) Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

(b) Make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

(c) Procure agricultural commodities for sale to other government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements.

(d) Remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities.

(e) Increase the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by expanding or aiding in the expansion of domestic markets or by developing or aiding in the development of new and additional markets, marketing facilities, and uses for such commodities.

(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for agricultural commodities.

(g) Carry out conservation or environmental programs authorized by law.

(h) Carry out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

2000 appropriation	[a] $30,037,136,000
2001 budget estimate	[a] 27,771,007,000
Provided in the bill	27,771,007,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	−2,266,129,000
2001 budget estimate	

[a] Current indefinite appropriation.

If necessary to perform the functions, duties, obligations, or commitments of the Commodity Credit Corporation, administrative personnel and others serving the Corporation shall be paid from funds on hand or from those funds received from the redemption or sale of commodities. Such funds shall also be available to meet program payments, commodity loans, or other obligations of the Corporation.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Reimbursement for Net Realized Losses to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Committee provides $27,771,007,000, a decrease of $2,266,129,000 below the amount provided in fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FOR HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

2000 limitation	$5,000,000
2001 budget estimate	5,000,000
Provided in the bill	5,000,000
Comparison:	
2000 limitation	
2001 budget estimate	

The Commodity Credit Corporation's (CCC) hazardous waste management program is intended to ensure compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended, and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended.

Investigative and cleanup costs associated with the management of CCC hazardous waste are paid from USDA's hazardous waste management appropriation. CCC funds operations and maintenance costs only.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For CCC Operations and Maintenance for Hazardous Waste Management, the Committee provides a limitation of $5,000,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request.

TITLE II—CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

2000 appropriation	$693,000
2001 budget estimate	711,000
Provided in the bill	693,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−18,000

The Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress with respect to natural resources and the environment. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Natural Resources Conservation Service and the Forest Service.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, the Committee provides an appropriation of $693,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $18,000 below the budget request.

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE

NRCS, formerly the Soil Conservation Service (SCS), is the lead Federal conservation agency for private land. SCS was established in 1935 to carry out a continuing program of soil and water conservation on the Nation's private and non-Federal land. NRCS was established by the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6962). The agency combines the authorities of the former SCS and directs financial or technical assistance programs for natural resource conservation.

NRCS provides America's private land conservation through local conservation districts to individuals, communities, watershed groups, tribal governments, Federal, state, and local agencies, and others. The NRCS staff at the local level work with state and local conservation staff and volunteers in a partnership to assist individuals and communities to care for natural resources. NRCS also develops technical guidance for conservation planning and assistance. This technical guidance is tailored to local conditions and is widely used by NRCS staff and governmental and nongovernmental organizations to ensure that conservation is based on sound science.

The benefits of these activities are multifaceted, including sustained and improved agricultural productivity; cleaner, safer, and more dependable water supplies; reduced damages caused by floods and other natural disasters; and an enhanced natural resource

base to support continued economic development, recreation, and the environment.

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

2000 appropriation	$660,812,000
2001 budget estimate	747,243,000
Provided in the bill	676,812,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+16,000,000
2001 budget estimate	−70,431,000

The purpose of conservation operations is to sustain agricultural productivity and protect and enhance the natural resource base. This is done through providing America's private land conservation to land users, communities, units of state and local government, and other Federal agencies in planning and implementing natural resources solutions to reduce erosion, improve soil and water quantity and quality, improve and conserve wetlands, enhance fish and wildlife habitat, improve air quality, improve pasture and range conditions, reduce upstream flooding, and improve woodlands. Assistance is also provided to implement highly erodible land (HEL), wetlands (swampbuster), wetlands reserve program (WRP), and conservation reserve program (CRP) provisions of the 1985 Food Security Act, as amended by the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990, the 1993 Omnibus Reconciliation Act, and the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Conservation Operations, the Committee provides an appropriation of $676,812,000, an increase of $16,000,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $70,431,000 below the budget request.

The Committee does not include funds for global climate change, biomass products initiative, or the Community Federal Information Partnerships as requested in the budget. These programs do not support the current level of on-the-ground conservation technical assistance.

The Committee does not concur with the request to transfer $36,000,000 from NRCS for Common Computing Environment (CCE)/Service Center Modernization (SCM), but rather encourages the Chief to work with the Secretary to determine a fair and equitable amount to support CCE/SCM efforts.

The Committee includes legislative language prohibiting the use of funds to carry out the urban resources partnership (URP) program and the American heritage rivers initiative (AHRI). This prohibition of the use of NRCS funds to carry out the AHRI does not apply to the work being done on the Hudson River and the Upper Susquehanna-Lackawanna River. The Committee notes that an evaluation report conducted by the Office of Inspector General found: (1) that the Under Secretary chose not to follow the normal legislative process to initiate the URP program, and (2) good management practices were not followed in implementing an URP program and $20.3 million in program expenditures were made without proper statutory authority and funding authorities. The Committee directs that the $2,204,000, and the associated staff years

included in the explanatory notes for URP program and AHRI be used to fund conversation technical assistance.

The Committee includes $18,000,000 for the Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative, an increase of $1,000,000 above the current funding level.

The Committee has provided for the continuation of the following projects: $400,000 to promote pastureland management and rotational grazing in Central New York; $250,000 to establish best management practices to individual farmers to reduce the impact of agriculture-related non-point sources of pollution in the Skaneateles and Owasco, New York watersheds; $250,000 to address agriculture non-point source pollution in the Onondaga Lake Watershed; $600,000 for the Great Lakes Basin Program for Soil and Erosion Sediment Control; $250,000 for technical assistance to the Westchester Soil and Conservation District to address land use and water quality issues affecting the Long Island Sound; $100,000 for the Trees Forever Program in Iowa; and, fiscal year 2000 funding and staffing levels in support of Chesapeake Bay activities.

The Committee has included additional funding for the following projects: $100,000 to promote pastureland management and rotational grazing in central New York for a total of $500,000; $100,000 for the Great Lakes Basin Program for Soil and Erosion Sediment Control for a total of $700,000; $50,000 for technical assistance to the Westchester Soil and Conservation District to address land use and water quality issues affecting the Long Island Sound for a total of $300,000; $500,000 to establish an innovative, collaborative approach to protecting the resources of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary; $100,000 for the Trees Forever Program in Illinois; $250,000 for technical assistance to the Lake Tahoe Basin Soil Conservation Project; $525,000 to implement phase II of a multi-year agreement between NRCS and the Watershed Agricultural Council in Walton, New York, of this amount $80,000 should be for monitoring of perpetual stewardship easements; $525,000 for a cooperative agreement to build surface water retention/pond projects in Georgia; $290,000 to expand cooperative efforts with Delaware State University for plant materials; $100,000 for conservation tillage and soil quality in Alabama; $1,500,000 for a pilot program to improve NRCS field office telecommunications capabilities in remote areas of New Mexico serving mostly minority or disadvantaged populations; $250,000 to design and implement natural stream restoration initiatives in the Mid-Atlantic Highlands of which $125,000 shall be for the Canaan Valley Institute and $125,000 for the NRCS office in Morgantown, West Virginia; $200,000 for the soil survey geographic database to conduct digitized soil surveys in the Mid-Atlantic Highlands in conjunction with the Canaan Valley Institute; $125,000 for a pilot AFO/CAFO project in Utah in cooperation with the Utah Farm Bureau, the Utah Cattlemen Association, and the Utah Dairymen Association; $1,600,000 for the creation and implementation of pilot projects for innovative technology systems resulting in a 75 percent reduction in nutrients of wastewater discharged by confined animal feeding operations through organizations such as Florida Agricultural Resources Mobilization Foundation, Inc. and the North Carolina Agricultural Finance Authority to accelerate the process of selection, funding, implementing, and

evaluating systems through pilot projects; $100,000 for the Dairy Quality assurance program in California; and an increase of $8,660,000 for a total of $53,670,000 for AFO/CAFO work.

The Committee encourages the NRCS to provide technical assistance for the Embrass River Watershed and Shad Lake in Illinois.

The Committee directs the NRCS to use up to $600,000 in EQIP funds for conservation measures and up to 500 acres from the wetlands reserve program to restore wetlands and purchase permanent easements in the Illinois River Basin in Illinois.

The Committee encourages the NRCS to provide financial support to the National Agroforestry Center to the extent the Center can provide direct benefits in support of NRCS programs.

The Committee encourages the agency to provide adequate funds to the National Water Management Center in Lonoke, Arkansas.

The Committee encourages the NRCS to augment the telecommunications pilot project in New Mexico from existing telecommunications funds.

The Committee recognizes the long-term nature of the technical assistance work associated with EQIP contracts, and recommends that the technical assistance component be reimbursed for all costs associated with new and existing contracts.

The Committee encourages NRCS to be reimbursed for the cost of technical assistance needed to support EQIP and to conduct voluntary on-farm environmental assessments as part of the pork industry's On-Farm Odor/Environmental Assistance Program.

The Committee encourages the NRCS to allocate EQIP funds to the maximum extent possible to conduct voluntary on-farm assessments for the pork industry's On-Farm Odor/Environmental Assistance Program.

The Committee recognizes the major difficulties created by the encroachment of urban areas on rural areas. The Committee believes that there is a need to develop a more comprehensive and integrated view of transportation, land use by commercial, residential, agricultural, and public entities. The Committee directs the Service to develop a proposal for such a comprehensive view, including consultation with entities such as the American Farmland Trust and the Nature Conservancy. In the development of this proposal, the Committee expects the Service to identify pilot projects for this activity, including highway development in northwest Ohio, and the pilot land use and open space program for Macomb and St. Clair Counties, Michigan.

WATERSHED SURVEYS AND PLANNING

2000 appropriation	$10,368,000
2001 budget estimate	10,368,000
Provided in the bill	10,868,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+500,000
2001 budget estimate	+500,000

The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 83–566, August 4, 1954, provided for the establishment of the Small Watershed Program (16 U.S.C. 1001–1008), and section 6 of the Act provided for the establishment of the River Basin Surveys and Investigations Program (16 U.S.C. 1006–1009). A separate ap-

propriation funded the two programs until fiscal year 1996 when they were combined into a single appropriation, Watershed Surveys and Planning.

River Basin activities provide for cooperation with other Federal, state, and local agencies in making investigations and surveys of the watersheds of rivers and other waterways as a basis for the development of coordinated programs. Reports of the investigations and surveys are prepared to serve as a guide for the development of agricultural, rural, and upstream watershed aspects of water and related land resources, and as a basis of coordination of this development with downstream and other phases of water development.

Watershed planning activities provide for cooperation between the Federal government and the states and their political subdivisions in a program of watershed planning. Watershed plans form the basis for installing works of improvement of floodwater retardation, erosion control, and reduction of sedimentation in the watershed of rivers and streams and to further the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water. Watershed planning consists of assisting local organizations to develop their watershed work plan by making investigations and surveys in response to requests made by sponsoring local organizations. These plans describe the soil erosion, water management, and sedimentation problems in a watershed and works of improvement proposed to alleviate these problems. Plans also include estimated benefits and costs, cost sharing and operating and maintenance arrangements, and other appropriate information necessary to justify Federal assistance for carrying out the plan.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Watershed Surveys and Planning, the Committee provides an appropriation of $10,868,000, an increase of $500,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and an increase of $500,000 above the budget request.

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

2000 appropriation [1]	$91,643,000
2001 budget estimate	83,423,000
Provided in the bill	83,423,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	−8,220,000
2001 budget estimate	.....

[1] Excludes $80,000,000 in emergency funding provided by P.L. 106–113.

The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566, 83d Cong.), as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001–1005, 1007–1009), provides for cooperation among the Federal government, the states, and local political subdivisions in a program to prevent erosion, floodwater, and sediment damages in the watersheds or rivers and streams, and to further the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water.

The work of the Department under this item includes financial assistance for the installation of works of improvement specified in approved watershed work plans including structural measures, land treatment measures, and program evaluation studies in se-

lected watershed projects to determine the effectiveness of structural and land treatment measures installed. In addition, NRCS makes loans to local organizations to finance the local share of the costs of installing planned works of improvement.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations, the Committee provides an appropriation of $83,423,000, a decrease of $8,220,000 below the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and the same amount as the budget request. Language is included which limits the amount spent on technical assistance to not more than $44,423,000. The Committee expects more funding to be spent on completing ongoing projects and reducing the backlog of watershed projects.

The Committee is aware of and expects progress to continue on the following projects: the four pilot projects in North Florida related to dairy and poultry cleanup efforts; Glen Shoals Lake in Illinois; Bexar-Medina-Atascosa Watershed Project in Texas; Little Red River and the Big Slough Watersheds in Arkansas; Soap Creek Watershed in Iowa; Elm Fork Watershed Structure 19 in Texas; Sumter County, South Carolina; Upper Hocking Watershed, East Fork Buck Creek Watershed and Rush Creek Watershed; and the Chino Dairy Preserve Project, San Bernardino, California.

The Committee includes bill language that of the funds available for Emergency Watershed Protection activities, $1,045,000 shall be available for DuPage County, Illinois for financial and technical assistance.

The Committee believes that dams built by the USDA are essential to the safety and livelihood of the areas they encompass, and has earmarked $4,100,000 in subsidy budget authority for a low-cost loan program as requested in the President's budget. The subsidy level will provide a $60,000,000 loan program level that will provide loans to State and local governments for the rehabilitation of aging dams built over the past 50 years. The Committee receive numerous requests to fund dam rehabilitation. The Committee encourages the NRCS to identify those projects in greatest need of rehabilitation including: Mud River Watershed and West Fork Clarks River Watershed in Kentucky, and Calwell Lake Dam and Wolf Run Lake Dam in Guernsey, Noble and Washington Counties, Ohio.

The Committee is aware of continued flooding in the Devils Lake basin in North Dakota, and notes that the lake has risen 25 feet over the last several years. The Committee encourages, the NRCS in cooperation with the FSA to assist in the locally coordinated flood response and water management activities being developed with the Federal Emergency Management Agency. NRCS and FSA utilize conservation programs in providing water holding and storage areas on private land as necessary intermediate measures in watershed management.

The Committee recognizes that the Manatee Agriculture Water Reuse System (MARS) may provide a model for protecting scarce agricultural water resources in Florida's unique watersheds and the rest of the nation. The subcommittee therefore urges the Secretary to consider providing the maximum grant allowable through

his discretionary authority under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to assist farmer access to the MARS project in Manatee County, Florida.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

2000 appropriation	$35,265,000
2001 budget estimate	36,265,000
Provided in the bill	41.015,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+5,750,000
2001 budget estimate	+4,750,000

The Natural Resources Conservation Service has general responsibility under provisions of section 102, title I of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, for developing overall work plans for resource conservation and development projects in cooperation with local sponsors; to help develop local programs of land conservation and utilization; to assist local groups and individuals in carrying out such plans and programs; to conduct surveys and investigations relating to the conditions and factors affecting such work on private lands; and to make loans to project sponsors for conservation and development purposes and to individual operators for establishing soil and water conservation practices.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Resource Conservation and Development, the Committee provides an appropriation of $41,015,000, an increase of $5,750,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and an increase of $4,750,000 above the budget request.

The Committee fully funds the President's request of $6,492,515 for headquarters and centers/institutes. The Committee directs that all other funds go to direct support of Resource Conservation and Development's area operations. The Committee recognizes that there are 50 pending applications for the program, and expects these applications to be funded to the maximum extent practicable.

FORESTRY INCENTIVES PROGRAM

2000 appropriation	$5,377,000
2001 budget estimate	.....
Provided in the bill	.....
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	−5,377,000
2001 budget estimate	.....

The Forestry Incentives Program is authorized by the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–313), as amended by section 1214, title XII, of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 and the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996. Its purpose is to encourage the development, management, and protection of nonindustrial private forest lands. The program will be carried out by providing technical assistance and long-term cost sharing agreements with private landowners.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

The Committee concurs with the President's budget and does not provide funding for the Forestry Incentives Program. This program promotes timber production on private lands, and in support of the budget these efforts will be continued through the State and Private Forestry program in the Forest Service.

TITLE III—RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–354) abolished the Farmers Home Administration, Rural Development Administration, and Rural Electrification Administration and replaced those agencies with the Rural Housing Service, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, and Rural Utilities Service and placed them under the oversight of the Under Secretary for Rural Development. These agencies deliver a variety of programs through a network of state, district, and county offices.

In the 1930's and 1940's these agencies were primarily involved in making small loans to farmers; however, today these agencies have a multi-billion dollar loan program throughout all America providing loan and grant assistance for single family, multi-family, housing, and special housing needs, as well as a variety of community facilities, infrastructure, and business development programs.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

2000 appropriation	$588,000
2001 budget estimate	605,000
Provided in the bill	588,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−17,000

The Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress with respect to the Department's rural economic and community development activities. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Rural Housing Service, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, and Rural Utilities Service.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development, the Committee provides an appropriation of $588,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $17,000 below the budget request.

The Committee expects the Department to give consideration to the following projects or organizations requesting assistance under the Rural Community Advancement Program and other rural development programs: grants and loans for the Southern New Mexico state fair grounds buildings and infrastructure improvements; a grant to the Pueblo of Acoma for the Baca pipeline; a grant to the Pueblo of Laguna water development project (NM); a grant to the New Mexico Farm and Ranch Heritage Museum; assistance for the development and construction of the Agribusiness Center in Statesboro (GA); funding for sewage treatment and wastewater collection in the city of Blaine, WA; funds for agricultural economic

development in the New York City Watershed; a Rural Business Enterprise Grant for development and promotion of agritourism in New York; the provision of water and sewer services for the city of Jenkins, KY; improvements to the Iberville Parish (LA) Water Project; improvements to the Livingston Parish (LA) Water Project; the purchase and repair of the Crown Building in Craig County, VA; construction of a shell building in the Floyd County (VA) Industrial Park; a rural business enterprise grant for development of infrastructure in the Glen Lyn (VA) Industrial Park; rural business enterprise grants for small business incubators in Southwest Virginia including the Floyd County Jacksonville Center, the Town of Grundy, the Virginia Highlands, the Southwest Regional Enterprise Center and the Dickenson County Kitchen Incubator; forgiveness or rescheduling for a wastewater system loan made to the town of Grundy, VA; expansion of the farmer's market in Duffield, VA; a rural business opportunity grant to plan and design a cheese processing facility in Washington County, VA; loans or grants for farmworker housing in Hillsborough County, FL; preservation and upgrading of the Lyles Station School in Gibson County, IN; a regional employment, economic and software development center for the Middle Georgia College in Cochran, GA; improvements to the water and sewer system for the Satsop Development Park in Grays Harbor, Grays Harbor County, WA; assistance to farmers' markets in Bath, Bourbon, Estill, Nicholas and Powell counties (KY); a rural business enterprise grant to preserve and restore the York (PA) Farmers' Market; the Interpretive Plan for the Lincoln Highway and Gettysburg Borough (PA); the Central Valley Applied Agricultural and Technology Center in Clovis, CA for a multi-use community agriculture education project; the Burlington Community Land Trust's proposal to construct the Vermont Public Market; the Southern Vermont Recreation Center Foundation for a senior center and community facility in Springfield, VT; the Community Recreation, Exercise and Wellness organization for a multi-purpose therapy and rehabilitation project in Morrisville, VT; a safe drinking water project in Jackson and Vinton counties (OH); a community facilities grant for the Iron County (MI) Association for repairs to an event complex; assistance to the Rural Center of North Carolina to assist rural communities with planning costs for water and wastewater treatment projects; a project to improve facilities at the Curry County, NM fairgrounds; a feasibility study for the construction of a regional fire fighters' training facility in the City of Clovis, NM; assistance to Rural Enterprises Inc. for development, marketing and implementation of a rural infrastructure tax-exempt loan pool through a bond issue in Durant, OK; the Montana Agricultural Product Processing Consortium for processing higher value products derived from Montana agricultural commodities; a cooperative development grant for the Mission Valley (MT) Market Project for a regional shared-use processing center; a value-added cooperative center at Montana State University-Northern in Havre for cooperative activities a rural economic development grant for Malt Montana, Inc. to assist the manufacture of custom malt; a feasibility study for agricultural options in Dawson County, MT; infrastructure improvements for the city of Scobey, MT; funding for the construction of a straw fiberboard plant in Rudyard, MT; a

project for repair and upgrades to the Tillamook Railroad (OR) and the associated fiber optic telecommunication network; support for a "Value-Added Initiative" at Western Illinois University to identify new opportunities to produce value-added products; funding from the Rural Community Development Initiative for the SWODA Development Corporation for investment in infrastructure in western Oklahoma; assistance to the Greater Fleming County (KY) Regional Water Commission for well drilling, connections and related equipment and facilities; assistance to the Belvidere-Boone County New Uses Agriculture-Technology District (IL) for continued work on research and development of bio-based products; funding from the community facilities account to complete the upgrading and renovation of St. Clair Park within the city of Greensburg, Westmoreland County, PA; the Tucker County Development authority's Industrial Park water and sewer project in Davis, WV; the Vandalia (WV) Heritage Foundation's program for revitalization through community and economic development; facilitation of economic diversification and community development in communities in Barbour County, WV; the Adaland Restoration Committee's project to increase tourism through restoration of heritage properties in Phillipi, WV; a biofuels research project at the Center for Energy Research, Education and Service at Ball State University (IN); assistance for the construction of a Vocational Agricultural Complex at the Antelope Valley's new fairgrounds and construction of a 19,000 square foot exhibit hall for the fairgrounds in Lancaster, CA; a rural business enterprise grant or a community facilities grant to the Western Massachusetts food processing center in Greenfield, MA; the application of the Hampden Hampshire Housing Partnership's application for rental subsidy assistance for 17 units at the Mountain View Apartments in Hadley, MA; funding for the high technology University Research Park in Carbondale, IL to promote regional economic development; forgiveness or rescheduling for rural development loans issued to the Green County (KY) Sanitation District #1; funding for construction enhancements, additional farm acreage, and various equipment for the Cumberland Farm Products Association in Monticello, KY; a Rural Business Enterprise Grant to the City of Ellington, MO, to construct water and sewer lines for retail operations; a Rural Business Enterprise Grant to the Southeast Missouri Port Authority for motive rail equipment and facilities; a grant for a Micro Rural Business Development Center on the campus of Tougaloo College in Jackson, MS; grants to the Village of Teutopolis (IL) for upgrading and extending the existing sewer system; and a multipurpose facility for the Lamar County (GA) Livestock and Agricultural Exposition Authority.

The Committee expects the Department to consider only those applications judged meritorious when subjected to established review procedures.

The Committee directs the Department to consider assistance for a rent-to-own project in the town of Troy, NC.

The Committee directs the Department to work with the Town of Ulster, NY to work out the difficulties of establishing the Glenerie Water District under the constraints of the New York State Department of Audit and Control.

The Committee has provided set asides for Rural Empowerment Area Partnership Zones in several programs in the rural development mission area. The Committee directs that when evaluating an application submitted by a community designated as a Rural Empowerment Area Partnership Zone, the Secretary shall also consider the following factors when assigning points for poverty, unemployment, and other demographic factors: local constraints to economic growth and activity; low density settlement patterns; stagnant or declining employment; and isolation resulting in disconnection from markets, suppliers, and centers of information and finance.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, RURAL DEVELOPMENT

	Administrative expenses	*Transfers*	*Total expenses*
2000 level [1]	$120,270,000	413,262,000	$533,532,000
2001 budget request	130,371,000	450,589,000	580,960,000
Provided in the bill	120,270,000	413,262,000	533,532,000
Comparison:			
2000 appropriation			
2001 budget estimate	−10,101,000	−37,327,000	−47,428,000

[1] In Fiscal Year 2000, Salaries and Expenses were provided in separate accounts for the Rural Utilities Service, the Rural Housing Service and the Rural Business-Cooperative Service. In Fiscal Year 2001, a new consolidated account is being established to administer all Rural Development programs.

These funds are used to administer the loan and grant programs of the Rural Utilities Service, the Rural Housing Service and the Rural Business-Cooperative Service, including reviewing applications, making and collecting loans and providing technical assistance and guidance to borrowers; and to assist in extending other Federal programs to people in rural areas.

Under credit reform, administrative costs associated with loan programs are appropriated to the program accounts. Appropriations to the salaries and expenses account will be for costs associated with grant programs.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Salaries and Expenses of the Rural Development mission areas, the Committee provides an appropriation of $120,270,000, a decrease of $10,101,000 below the budget request. The Committee agrees to the Administration request to combine three separate salary and expense accounts into one account for rural development. In fiscal year 2000, a total of $120,270,000 was provided for these three accounts.

RURAL COMMUNITY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM

2000 appropriation	[1]$693,637,000
2001 budget estimate	762,542,000
Provided in the bill	775,837,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+82,200,000
2001 budget estimate	+13,295,000

[1] Includes $5,000,000 for FY 2000 Supplemental pursuant to P.L. 106–113 enacted November 29, 1999.

The Rural Community Advancement Program [RCAP], authorized by the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of

1996 (Public Law 104–127), consolidates funding for the following programs: direct and guaranteed water and waste disposal loans, water and waste disposal grants, emergency community water assistance grants, solid waste management grants, direct and guaranteed community facility loans, community facility grants, direct and guaranteed business and industry loans, rural business enterprise grants, and rural business opportunity grants. This proposal is in accordance with the provisions set forth in the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, Public Law 104–127. Consolidating funding for these 12 rural development loan and grant programs under RCAP will provide greater flexibility to tailor financial assistance to applicant needs.

With the exception of the 10 percent in the "National office reserve" account, funding will be allocated to rural development State directors for their priority setting on a State-by-State basis. State directors are authorized to transfer not more than 25 percent of the amount in the account that is allocated for the State for the fiscal year to any other account in which amounts are allocated for the State for the fiscal year, with up to 10 percent of funds allowed to be reallocated nationwide.

Community facility loans were created by the Rural Development Act of 1972 and finance a variety of rural community facilities. Loans are made to organizations, including certain Indian tribes and corporations not operated for profit and public and quasipublic agencies, to construct, enlarge, extend, or otherwise improve community facilities providing essential services to rural residents. Such facilities include those providing or supporting overall community development such as fire and rescue services, health care, transportation, traffic control, and community, social, cultural, and recreational benefits. Loans are made for facilities which primarily serve rural residents of open country and rural towns and villages of not more than 20,000 people. Health care and fire and rescue facilities are the priorities of the program and receive the majority of available funds.

The Community Facility Grant Program authorized in the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–127), would be used in conjunction with the existing direct and guaranteed loan programs for the development of community facilities, such as hospitals, fire stations, and community centers. Grants will be targeted to the lowest income communities. Communities that have lower population and income levels would receive a higher cost-share contribution through these grants, to a maximum contribution of 75 percent of the cost of developing the facility.

The Rural Business and Industry Loans Program was created by the Rural Development Act of 1972, and finances a variety of rural industrial development loans. Loans are made for rural industrialization and rural community facilities under Rural Development Act amendments to the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act authorities. Business and industrial loans are made to public, private, or cooperative organizations organized for profit, to certain Indian tribes, or to individuals for the purpose of improving, developing or financing business, industry, and employment or improving the economic and environmental climate in rural areas. Such

purposes include financing business and industrial acquisition, construction, enlargement, repair or modernization, financing the purchase and development of land, easements, rights-of-way, buildings, payment of startup costs, and supplying working capital. Industrial development loans may be made in any area that is not within the outer boundary of any city having a population of 50,000 or more and its immediately adjacent urbanized and urbanizing areas with a population density of more than 100 persons per square mile. Special consideration for such loans is given to rural areas and cities having a population of less than 25,000.

Rural business enterprise grants were authorized by the Rural Development Act of 1972. Grants are made to public bodies and nonprofit organizations to facilitate development of small and emerging business enterprises in rural areas, including the acquisition and development of land; the construction of buildings, plants, equipment, access streets and roads, parking areas, and utility extensions; refinancing fees; technical assistance; and startup operating costs and working capital.

Rural business opportunity grants are authorized under section 306(a)(11) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended. Grants may be made not to exceed $1,500,000 annually to public bodies and private nonprofit community development corporations or entities. Grants are made to identify and analyze business opportunities that will use local rural economic and human resources; to identify, train, and provide technical assistance to rural entrepreneurs and managers; to establish business support centers; to conduct economic development planning and coordination, and leadership development; and to establish centers for training, technology, and trade that will provide training to rural businesses in the utilization of interactive communications technologies.

The water and waste disposal program is authorized by several actions, including sections 306, 306A, 306C, 306D, 309A, and 310B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq., as amended). This program makes loans for water and waste development costs. Development loans are made to associations, including corporations operating on a nonprofit basis, municipalities and similar organizations, generally designated as public or quasipublic agencies that propose projects for the development, storage, treatment, purification, and distribution of domestic water or the collection, treatment, or disposal of waste in rural areas. Such grants may not exceed 75 percent of the development cost of the projects and can supplement other funds borrowed or furnished by applicants to pay development costs.

The solid waste grant program is authorized under section 310B(b) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended. Grants are made to public bodies and private nonprofit organizations to provide technical assistance to local and regional governments for the purpose of reducing or eliminating pollution of water resources and for improving the planning and management of solid waste disposal facilities.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

The following table provides the Committee's recommendations as compared to the budget request:

RURAL COMMUNITY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM

[Budget authority in thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 level	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
Housing:			
Community facility loans:			
Guaranteed	0	0	.....
Direct	$10,150	$29,225	$10,150
Community facility grants	13,000	24,000	23,000
Subtotal, housing	23,150	53,225	33,150
Business:			
Business and industry loans:			
Guaranteed	$26,435	$10,125	$10,125
Direct	0	2,910	2,910
Rural business enterprise grants	37,664	40,664	50,664
Rural business opportunity grants	[1] 500	8,000	10,000
Subtotal, business	64,599	61,699	73,699
Utilities:			
Water and waste disposal loans:			
Guaranteed	0	0	.....
Direct	73,420	140,249	75,500
Water and waste disposal grants	529,768	502,369	588,488
Solid waste management grants	2,700	5,000	5,000
Subtotal, utilities	605,888	647,618	668,988
Total, loans and grants	693,637	762,542	775,837

[1] Excludes $5,000,000 for FY 2000 supplemental pursuant to P.L. 106–113 enacted November 29, 1999.

The Committee notes that the house-passed fiscal year 2000 supplemental legislation provides an additional $28,000,000 for water and waste grants and an additional $15,000,000 for community facilities grants. The Committee further notes that the Administration has provided from the Fund for Rural America an additional $28,000,000 for water and waste projects, an additional $2,000,000 for community facilities grants, an additional $1,000,000 for rural business opportunity grants and an additional $1,300,000 to subsidize business and industry loan guarantees of approximately $40,000,000. These additional funding levels are not indicated in the previous table.

The following earmarks are included in bill language for the Rural Community Advancement Program: Federally Recognized Native American Tribes, $12,000,000, of which $250,000 is for transportation technical assistance; the Rural Community Development Initiative, $6,000,000; hazardous weather early warning systems, $5,000,000; transportation technical assistance, $500,000; rural partnership technical assistance grants, $5,000,000; Mississippi Delta region counties, $2,000,000; loans for marketing and processing biobased products, $2,000,000; water and waste disposal systems in the Colonias, $20,000,000; water and waste disposal systems in Alaska, $20,000,000; technical assistance for rural

waste systems, $18,515,000; $9,500,000 for a circuit rider program; empowerment zones, enterprise communities and Rural Area Economic Partnership Zones, $42,574,650, of which, $30,000,000 is for rural utilities programs.

The Committee notes that lack of transportation is among the many economic hardships facing Native Americans. The availability of transit for persons without cars is nearly three times worse for Native American communities than elsewhere in the United States. The Committee has provided an earmark of $250,000 to develop the transportation capabilities of these communities so that they can have better access to employment, education and health care.

Of the funds provided for technical assistance for rural waste systems, the Committee directs that $7,300,000 be designated for the Rural Community Assistance Programs.

The Committee notes that tourism can provide substantial income to economically depressed rural areas of the United States and that communities in states such as Vermont have developed successful programs for agritourism. The Committee has provided $2,000,000 in the bill for agritourism and directs the Department to cooperate closely with communities seeking assistance for such programs.

The Committee provides $6,000,000 for the Rural Community Development Initiative (RCDI). The fiscal year 2000 legislation also provided $6,000,000 for this initiative but there is no indication to date that any funds have actually been used for the benefit of rural America. The Committee directs the Department to ensure that the RCDI delivers positive benefit to rural communities.

Of the funds provided in the bill for the Rural Business Opportunity Grants program, the Committee directs the Department to provide $2,000,000 for projects in communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones.

The Committee supports continued efforts to provide adequate technical service for centrally owned and managed cluster well systems. Therefore, the Committee supports the Well-Care program and recognizes needs that can be filled through the water and waste loan and grant programs.

RURAL HOUSING SERVICE

The Rural Housing Service (RHS) was established under Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994, dated October 13, 1994.

The mission of the Service is to improve the quality of life in rural America by assisting rural residents and communities in obtaining adequate and affordable housing and access to needed community facilities. The goals and objectives of the Service are: (1) facilitate the economic revitalization of rural areas by providing direct and indirect economic benefits to individual borrowers, families, and rural communities; (2) assure that benefits are communicated to all program eligible customers with special outreach efforts to target resources to underserved, impoverished, or economically declining rural areas; (3) lower the cost of programs while retaining the benefits by redesigning more effective programs that

work in partnership with state and local governments and the private sector; and (4) leverage the economic benefits through the use of low-cost credit programs, especially guaranteed loans.

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

ESTIMATED LOAN LEVEL

2000 loan level	[1] $4,589,373,000
2001 budget estimate	5,385,009,000
Provided in the bill	5,073,497,000
Comparison:	
2000 loan level	+484,124,000
2001 budget estimate	−311,512,000

[1] Excludes $70,000,000 for FY 2000 Supplemental pursuant to P.L. 106–113 enacted November 29, 1999.

This fund was established in 1965 (Public Law 89–117) pursuant to Section 517 of Title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. This fund may be used to insure or guarantee rural housing loans for single family homes, rental and cooperative housing, farm labor housing, and rural housing sites. Rural housing loans are made to construct, improve, alter, repair or replace dwellings and essential farm service buildings that are modest in size, design, and cost. Rental housing insured loans are made to individuals, corporations, associations, trusts, or partnerships to provide moderate-cost rental housing and related facilities for elderly persons in rural areas. These loans, are repayable in not to exceed 30 years. Farm labor housing insured loans are made either to a farm owner or to a public or private nonprofit organization to provide modest living quarters and related facilities for domestic farm labor. Loan programs are limited to rural areas which include towns, villages, and other places of not more than 10,000 population, which are not part of an urban area. Loans may also be made in areas with a population in excess of 10,000, but less than 20,000, if the area is not included in a standard metropolitan statistical area and has a serious lack of mortgage credit for low- and moderate-income borrowers.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 level	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:			
Low-income family housing (sec. 502):			
Direct	[1] $1,100,000	$1,300,000	$1,100,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed	3,200,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
Rental housing (sec. 515)	114,321	120,000	114,321
Multi-family guaranteed (sec. 538)	100,000	200,000	100,000
Housing repair (sec. 504)	[2] 32,396	40,000	32,396
Farm labor (sec. 514)	[3] 25,001	[4] 0	.....
Credit sales of acquired property	7,503	15,000	16,780
Site loans (sec. 524)	5,152	5,000	5,000
Self-help housing land development fund	5,000	5,009	5,000
Total, loan authorization	4,589,373	5,385,009	5,073,497

[1] Excludes $50,000,000 for FY 2000 Supplemental pursuant to P.L. 106–113 enacted November 29, 1999.
[2] Excludes $15,000,000 for FY 2000 Supplemental pursuant to P.L. 106–113 enacted November 29, 1999.
[3] Excludes $5,000,000 for FY 2000 Supplemental pursuant to P.L. 106–113 enacted November 29, 1999.
[4] The budget requests these loans in the Farm Labor Program account.

ESTIMATED LOAN SUBSIDY AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES LEVELS

	Direct loan subsidy	*Guaranteed loan subsidy*	*Administrative expenses*
2000 appropriation	[1] $161,560,000	$20,000,000	$375,879,000
2001 budget estimate	284,811,000	47,440,000	409,233,000
Provided in the bill	.....	.....	.....
Comparison:			
2000 appropriation	.....	.....	.....
2001 budget estimate	.....	.....	.....

[1] Excludes $11,099,000 for FY 2000 Supplemental pursuant to P.L. 106–113 enacted November 29, 1999.

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 2000 established the Program Account. Appropriations to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed in 2001, as well as for administrative expenses.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

The following table reflects the costs of the loan programs under credit reform. In many cases, changes from the fiscal year 2000 amounts reflect changes in the loan subsidy rates as set by the Office of Management and Budget.

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 level	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
Loan subsidies:			
Single family (sec. 502):			
Direct	[1] $93,830	$208,780	$176,760
Unsubsidized guaranteed	19,520	44,400	7,400
Housing repair (sec. 504)	[2] 9,900	14,176	11,481
Farm labor (sec. 514)	[3] 11,308	[4] 0	.....
Rental housing (sec. 515)	45,363	59,124	56,326
Multi-family guaranteed (sec. 538)	480	3,040	1,520
Credit sales of acquired property	874	2,452	874
Housing site dev. (sec. 524)	4	0	.....
Self-help housing land development fund	281	279	279
Total, Loan subsidies	192,659	332,251	254,640
RHIF expenses:			
Administrative expenses	375,879	409,233	375,879

[1] Excludes $4,265,000 for FY 2000 Supplemental pursuant to P.L. 106–113 enacted November 29, 1999.
[2] Excludes $4,584,000 for FY 2000 Supplemental pursuant to P.L. 106–113 enacted November 29, 1999.
[3] Excludes $2,250,000 for FY 2000 Supplemental pursuant to P.L. 106–113 enacted November 29, 1999.
[4] The budget requests these loans in the Farm Labor Program account.

The Committee notes that the House-passed fiscal year 2000 supplemental legislation provides the following additional amounts: $25,000,000 for section 502 direct loans providing for a loan level of $296,000,000; $4,000,000 for section 504 housing repair providing for a loan level of $13,000,000 and $15,872,000 for section 515 rental housing providing for a loan level of $40,000,000. These additional funding levels are not indicated in the previous table.

The Committee provides bill language increasing the single-family housing loan guarantee fee from one percent to two percent. This change was proposed in the Administration's fiscal year 2001 budget.

RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

2000 appropriation	$640,000,000
2001 budget estimate	680,000,000
Provided in the bill	655,900,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+15,900,000
2001 budget estimate	−24,100,000

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 established a rural rental assistance program to be administered through the rural housing loans programs.

The objective of the program is to reduce rents paid by low-income families living in Rural Housing Service financed rental projects and farm labor housing projects. Under this program, low-income tenants will contribute the higher of: (1) 30 percent of monthly adjusted income; (2) 10 percent of monthly income; or (3) designated housing payments from a welfare agency.

Payments from the fund are made to the project owner for the difference between the tenant's payment and the approved rental rate established for the unit.

The program is administered in tandem with Rural Housing Service Section 515 rural rental and cooperative housing programs and the farm labor loan and grant programs. Priority is given to existing projects for units occupied by low-income families to extend expiring contracts or provide full amounts authority to existing contracts; any remaining authority will be used for projects receiving new construction commitments under Sections 514, 515, or 516 for very low-income families with certain limitations.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rental Assistance Program, the Committee provides a program level of $655,900,000, an increase of $15,900,000 above the amount available in fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $24,100,000 below the budget request.

The Committee notes that the House-passed fiscal year 2000 supplemental legislation provides an additional $13,600,000 for the rental assistance program that is not indicated in the previous table.

MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANTS

2000 appropriation	$28,000,000
2001 budget estimate	40,000,000
Provided in the bill	28,000,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−12,000,000

This grant program is authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. Grants are made to local organizations to promote the development of mutual or self-help programs under which groups of usually six to ten families build their own homes by mutually exchanging labor. Funds may be used to pay the cost of construction supervisors who will work with families in the construction of their homes and for administrative expenses of the organizations providing the self-help assistance.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Mutual and Self-Help Housing Grants, the Committee provides an appropriation of $28,000,000, the same as the amount available in fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $12,000,000 below the budget request.

The Committee notes that the House-passed fiscal year 2000 supplemental legislation provides an additional $6,000,000 for the mutual and self-help housing grants that is not indicated in the previous table.

FARM LABOR PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Loan level	Subsidy level	Grants
2000 appropriation [1]	0	0	0
2001 budget estimate	$30,000,000	$15,777,000	$20,000,000
Provided in the bill	28,520,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Comparison:			
2000 appropriation	+28,520,000	+15,000,000	+15,000,000
2001 budget estimate	−1,480,000	−777,000	−5,000,000

[1] In Fiscal Year 2000, farm labor housing loans were included in the Rural Housing Insurance Fund, and farm labor grants were included in Rural Housing Assistance Grants.

This new account consolidates three farm labor programs into one account. This consolidation will provide more flexibility for distributing rural farm labor housing assistance. The account consists of direct farm labor housing loans, domestic farm labor housing grants and low-income migrant and seasonal farmworker grants.

The direct farm labor housing loan program is authorized under section 514, and the rural housing for domestic farm labor housing grant program is authorized under section 516 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. The loans, grants, and contracts are made to public and private nonprofit organizations for low-rent housing and related facilities for domestic farm labor. Grant assistance may not exceed 90 percent of the cost of a project. Loans and grants may be used for construction of new structures, site acquisition and development, rehabilitation of existing structures, and purchase of furnishings and equipment for dwellings, dining halls, community rooms and infirmaries.

The low-income migrant and seasonal farmworker grants are made to public agencies or private organizations with tax exempt status under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue code of 1986, that have experience in providing services to low-income migrant and seasonal farmworkers. The type of assistance to be provided is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Farm Labor Program Account, the Committee provides a loan subsidy of $15,000,000 which supports a loan level of $28,520,000 instead of a loan subsidy of $15,777,000 which supports a loan level of $30,000,000 which was the budget request. The Committee also provides an additional $15,000,000 in grants, a decrease of $5,000,000 below the budget request. Of the $15,000,000 in grants, $12,000,000 is for farm labor housing grants and $3,000,000 is for grants for migrant and seasonal farmworkers.

The Committee notes that the House-passed fiscal year 2000 supplemental legislation provides an additional $5,000,000 for grants to low-income and migrant seasonal farm workers. The Committee further notes that the Administration has provided from the Fund for Rural America an additional $2,500,000 for grants for farmworker housing for fiscal year 2000. These additional funding levels are not indicated in the previous table.

RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS

2000 appropriation	[1] $45,000,000
2001 budget estimate	[2] 39,000,000
Provided in the bill	39,000,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	−6,000,000
2001 budget estimate	.....

[1] Excludes $7,250,000 for farm labor housing grants and $7,250,000 for very low-income housing grants pursuant to the FY 2000 Supplemental, P.L. 106–113 enacted November 29, 1999.
[2] Rural housing for domestic farm labor grants are requested in the Farm Labor Program account.

The following programs are consolidated under the Rural Housing Assistance Grants: very low-income housing repair grants, rural housing preservation grants, compensation for construction defects, and supervisory and technical assistance grants.

The Very Low-Income Housing Repair Grants program is authorized under Section 504 of Title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. The program makes grants to very low-income families to make necessary repairs to their homes in order to make such dwellings, safe and sanitary, and remove hazards to the health of the occupants, their families, or the community. A grant can be made in combination with a Section 504 very low-income housing repair loan.

Rural Housing Preservation Grants are used for home repair for low- and very low-income people. The purpose of the preservation program is to improve the delivery of rehabilitation assistance by employing the expertise of housing organizations at the local level. Eligible applicants will compete on a state-by-state basis for grants funds. These funds may be administered as loans, loan write-downs, or grants to finance home repair. The program is administered by local grantees.

Compensation for Construction Defects provides funds for grants to eligible section 502 borrowers to correct structural defects, or to pay claims of owners arising from such defects on a newly constructed dwelling purchased with RHS financial assistance.

The supervisory and technical assistance grant program is carried out under the provisions of section 509(f) and 525 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. Under section 509, grants are made to public and private nonprofit organizations for packaging loan applications for housing under sections 502, 504, 514/516, 515, and 533 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. The assistance is to be directed to underserved areas where at least 20 percent or more of the population is at or below the poverty level, and at least 10 percent or more of the population resides in substandard housing. Under section 525, grants are made to public and private nonprofit organizations and other associations for the developing, conducting, administering or coordinating of technical and supervisory assist-

ance programs to demonstrate the benefits of Federal, State, and local housing programs for low-income families in rural areas.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Housing Assistance Grants program, the Committee provides an appropriation of $39,000,000, a decrease of $6,000,000 below the amount provided for fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request.

RURAL BUSINESS-COOPERATIVE SERVICE

The Rural Business-Cooperative Service (RBS) was established by Public Law 103–354, Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994, dated October 13, 1994. Its programs were previously administered by the Rural Development Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Agricultural Cooperative Service.

The mission of the Rural Business-Cooperative Service is to enhance the quality of life for all rural residents by assisting new and existing cooperatives and other businesses through partnership with rural communities. The goals and objectives are to: (1) promote a stable business environment in rural America through financial assistance, sound business planning, technical assistance, appropriate research, education, and information; (2) support environmentally-sensitive economic growth that meets the needs of the entire community; and (3) assure that the Service benefits are available to all segments of the rural community, with emphasis on those most in need.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

Current economic conditions, together with the rapid changes taking place throughout the global economy, underscore the need for policies and programs to strengthen the ability of farmers to join together in cooperative self-help efforts to improve their income, manage their risk, move more into value-added production and processing, and capture a larger share of the consumer dollar. Programs carried out by Cooperative Services within the Rural Business and Cooperative Service as authorized under the Cooperative Marketing Act of 1926 (7 U.S.C. 453 (a) and (b)), including those related to research, education and technical assistance, play an important role in helping promote such cooperative self-help efforts for the benefit of farmers. Accordingly, the Committee believes such programs should be given a high priority to ensure the levels of funding and staffing necessary to meet their objectives.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

ESTIMATED LOAN LEVEL

2000 loan level	$38,256,000
2001 budget estimate	64,495,000
Provided in the bill	38,256,000
Comparison:	
2000 loan level	.....
2001 budget estimate	−26,239,000

The rural development (intermediary relending) loan program was originally authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–452). The making of rural development loans by the Department of Agriculture was reauthorized by Public Law 99–425, the Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1986.

Loans are made to intermediary borrowers (small investment groups) who in turn will reloan the funds to rural businesses, community development corporations private nonprofit organizations, public agencies, et cetera, for the purpose of improving business, industry, community facilities, and employment opportunities and diversification of the economy in rural areas.

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 established the Program Account. Appropriations to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated in 2001, as well as for administrative expenses.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account, the Committee provides for a loan level of $38,256,000, the same as the amount provided in fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $26,239,000 below as the budget request.

ESTIMATED LOAN SUBSIDY AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES LEVELS

	Direct loan subsidy	*Administrative expenses*
2000 appropriation	$16,615,000	$3,337,000
2001 budget estimate	32,834,000	3,640,000
Provided in the bill	19,476,000	3,337,000
Comparison:		
2000 appropriation	+2,861,000	.....
2001 budget estimates	−13,358,000	−303,000

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

ESTIMATED LOAN LEVEL

2000 loan level	$15,000,000
2001 budget estimate	15,000,000
Provided in the bill	15,000,000
Comparison:	
2000 loan level	.....
2001 budget estimate	.....

The rural economic development loans program was established by the Reconciliation Act of December 1987 (P.L. 100–203), which amended the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, by establishing a new section 313. This section of the Rural Electrification Act (7 U.S.C. 901) established a cushion of credits payment program and created the rural economic development subaccount. The Administrator of RUS is authorized under the Act to utilize funds in this program to provide zero interest loans to electric and telecommunications borrowers for the purpose of promoting rural economic development and job creation projects, including funding for feasibility studies, start-up costs, and other reasonable expenses for the purpose of fostering rural economic development.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account, the Committee provides for a loan level of $15,000,000, the same as provided for fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request.

The Committee has provided language, requested by the Administration, to use earnings generated by the interest differential on voluntary cushion of credit payments made by Rural Utilities Service borrowers to provide necessary loan subsidies for rural economic development loans. By using these earnings for subsidy budget authority, additional loans funds will be available to rural communities. The discretionary cost of these loans is offset by reductions to rural economic development grants made from the cushion of credit.

ESTIMATED LOAN SUBSIDY

	Direct loan subsidy
2000 appropriation	[1] $3,453,000
2001 budget estimate	[1] 3,911,000
Provided in the bill	3,911,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+458,000
2001 budget estimate	

[1] Offset by a rescission from interest on the cushion of credit payments, as authorized by section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

RURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

2000 appropriation	$6,000,000
2001 budget estimate	11,500,000
Provided in the bill	6,500,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+500,000
2001 budget estimate	−5,000,000

Rural Cooperative Development Grants are authorized under section 310B(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended. Grants are made to fund the establishment and operation centers for rural cooperative development with their primary purpose being the improvement of economic conditions in rural areas. Grants may be made to nonprofit institutions or institutions of higher education. Grants may be used to pay up to 75 percent of the cost of the project and associated administrative costs. The applicant must contribute at least 25 percent from non-federal sources. Grants are competitive and are awarded based on specific selection criteria.

The Appropriate Technology Transfer to Rural Areas (ATTRA) program was first authorized by the Food Security Act of 1985. The program provides information and technical assistance to agricultural producers to adopt sustainable agricultural practices that are environmentally friendly and lower production costs.

Cooperative agreements are authorized under 7 U.S.C. 2201 to any qualified State department of agriculture, university, and other State entity to conduct research that will strengthen and enhance the operations of agricultural marketing cooperatives in rural areas.

Cooperative Research Agreements are authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2204. The funds are used for Cooperative Research Agreements, primarily with colleges and universities to address critical operational, organizational and structural issues facing cooperatives.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Rural Cooperative Development Grants, the Committee provides an appropriation of $6,500,000, an increase of $500,000 above the amount available in fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $5,000,000 below the budget request.

Of the funds provided, not to exceed $2,000,000 is provided for a cooperative agreement for the Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas (ATTRA) program.

NATIONAL SHEEP INDUSTRY IMPROVEMENT CENTER REVOLVING FUND

2000 appropriation	0
2001 budget estimate	$5,000,000
Provided in the bill	5,000,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+5,000,000
2001 budget estimate	

The National Sheep Industry Improvement Center was established by the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 to promote activities to strengthen and enhance production or marketing of sheep and goat products in the United States. The Center may provide loans or grants to eligible entities to provide assistance to the industry for infrastructure development, business development, production, resource development, and market and environmental research. The 1996 Act provided $20,000,000 in mandatory funding for the establishment and operation of the Center and authorized additional discretionary appropriations of $30,000,000.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the National Sheep Industry Improvement Center Revolving Fund the Committee provides an appropriation of $5,000,000, the same as the budget request. No funds were provided for this account in fiscal year 2000.

RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE

The Rural Utilities Service (RUS) was established under the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–354), October 13, 1994. RUS administers the electric and telephone programs of the former Rural Electrification Administration and the water and waste programs of the former Rural Development Administration.

The mission of the RUS is to serve a leading role in improving the quality of life in rural America by administering its electric, telecommunications, and water and waste programs in a service oriented, forward looking, and financially responsible manner. All three programs have the common goal of modernizing and revitalizing rural communities. RUS provides funding and support service for utilities serving rural areas. The public-private partnerships established by RUS and local utilities assist rural communities in

modernizing local infrastructure. RUS programs are also characterized by the substantial amount of private investment which is leveraged by the public funds invested into infrastructure and technology, resulting in the creation of new sources of employment.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

ESTIMATED LOAN LEVEL

2000 loan level	$2,611,500,000
2001 budget estimate	2,045,000,000
Provided in the bill	2,040,000,000
Comparison:	
2000 loan level	−571,500,000
2001 budget estimate	−5,000,000

The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901 et seq.), as amended provides the statutory authority for the electric and telecommunications programs.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

The following table reflects the loan levels for the rural electrification and telecommunications loan program account:

	FY 2000 enacted	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
Loan authorizations:			
Electric:			
Direct, 5%	$121,500,000	$50,000,000	$50,000,000
Direct, Municipal rate	295,000,000	300,000,000	295,000,000
Direct, FFB	1,700,000,000	800,000,000	800,000,000
Private Sector Guarantee		400,000,000	400,000,000
Subtotal	2,116,500,000	1,550,000,000	1,545,000,000
Telecommunications:			
Direct, 5%	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000
Direct, Treasury rate	300,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000
Direct, FFB	120,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000
Subtotal	495,000,000	495,000,000	495,000,000
Total, Loan authorizations	2,611,500,000	2,045,000,000	2,040,000,000

ESTIMATED LOAN SUBSIDY AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES LEVEL

	FY 2000 enacted	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
Loan subsidies:			
Electric:			
Direct, 5%	$1,095,000	$4,980,000	$4,980,000
Direct, Municipal rate	10,827,000	20,850,000	20,480,000
Direct, FFB			
Private Sector Guarantee		40,000	40,000
Subtotal	11,922,000	25,870,000	25,500,000
Telecommunications:			
Direct, 5%	840,000	7,770,000	7,770,000
Direct, Treasury rate	2,370,000		
Direct, FFB			

	FY 2000 enacted	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
Subtotal	3,210,000	7,770,000	7,770,000
Total, Loan subsidies	15,132,000	33,640,000	33,270,000

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 established the Program Account. An appropriation to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed in 2001, as well as for administrative expenses.

The Committee notes that the House-passed fiscal year 2000 supplemental legislation provides an additional $1,021,000 for rural utilities 5 percent hardship loans providing for a loan level of $113,250,000. These additional amounts are not indicated in the previous table.

RURAL TELEPHONE BANK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

ESTIMATED LOAN LEVEL

2000 loan level	$175,000,000
2001 budget estimate	175,000,000
Provided in the bill	175,000,000
Comparison:	
2000 loan level	
2001 budget estimate	

The Rural Telephone Bank (RTB) was required by law to begin privatization (repurchase of Federally owned stock) in fiscal year 1996. RTB borrowers are able to borrow at private market rates and no longer require Federal assistance.

The Rural Telephone Bank is managed by a 13-member board of directors. The Administrator of RUS serves as Governor of the Bank until conversion to private ownership, control, and operation. This will take place when 51 percent of the Class A stock issued to the United States and outstanding at any time after September 30, 1996, has been fully redeemed and retired. Activities of the Bank are carried out by RUS employees and the Office of the General Counsel of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Telephone Bank, the Committee provides for a loan level of $175,000,000, the same as the level for fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request.

The Committee includes the same provision from the fiscal year 2000 bill which limits the retirement of the Class A stock of the Rural Telephone Bank.

The Committee does not concur with proposed bill language using unobligated balances of the Rural Telephone Bank Liquidating Account to pay for loan subsidies or administrative expenses of the Rural Telephone Bank.

ESTIMATED LOAN SUBSIDY AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES LEVELS

	Direct loan subsidy	*Administrative expenses*
2000 appropriation	$3,290,000	$3,000,000
2001 budget estimate	2,590,000	3,000,000
Provided in the bill	2,590,000	3,000,000
Comparison:		
2000 appropriation	−700,000	.....
2001 budget estimate	.....	.....

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 established the Program Account. Appropriations to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated in 2001, as well as for administrative expenses.

DISTANCE LEARNING AND TELEMEDICINE PROGRAM

	Loan level	*Subsidy level*	*Grants*
2000 appropriation	$200,000,000	$700,000	$20,000,000
2001 budget estimate	400,000,000	0	27,000,000
Provided in the bill	400,000,000	0	19,500,000
Comparison:			
2000 appropriation	+200,000,000	−700,000	−500,000
2001 budget estimates	.....	.....	−7,500,000

The Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program was authorized by the Food Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990, as amended by the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996. This program provides incentives to improve the quality of phone services, provide access to advanced telecommunications services and computer networks, and to improve rural opportunities.

This program provides the facilities and equipment to link rural education and medical facilities with more urban centers and other facilities providing rural residents access to better health care through technology and increasing educational opportunities for rural students. These funds are available for loans and grants.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program, the Committee provides an appropriation of $19,500,000, a decrease of $1,200,000 below the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $7,500,000 below the budget request.

The Committee expects the Department to give consideration to the following projects or organizations requesting assistance under the Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program: The aquaculture education, training and technical support initiative at the Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institution at Ft. Pierce, FL and Florida State University; development of the Telecommunications Center for Education by the University Colleges of Technology at the State University of New York; establishment of a distance learning site at the Appalachian School of Law in Grundy, VA; a distance learning and telemedicine program for the Southwest Virginia Education and Training Network; the distance learning program at Peirce College in Philadelphia, PA; development of a rural outreach and telemedicine network for Community Medical Centers based in

Fresno, CA; a project of the Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute (NM) to provide geospatial technology transfer to tribal nations; funding for a distance learning laboratory to supplement agricultural training for the Foothills Technical Institute (AR); and a partnership between the Wheeling (WV) Jesuit University Center of Educational Technologies with the Thomas Education Center to provide distance learning for local communities.

The Committee expects the Department to consider only those applications judged meritorious when subjected to established review procedures.

TITLE IV—DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD, NUTRITION AND CONSUMER SERVICES

2000 appropriation	$554,000
2001 budget estimate	570,000
Provided in the bill	554,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−16,000

The Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress with respect to the Department's food, nutrition and consumer activities. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Food and Nutrition Service.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services the Committee provides $554,000, the same amount as provided in fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $16,000 below the budget request.

The Committee recommends that the Secretary of Agriculture consider a pilot program with the Alisal Union School District in Salinas, California to combine the administration of the Summer food service program and the School lunch program.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

The Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) represents an organizational effort to eliminate hunger and malnutrition in this country. Nutrition assistance programs are intended to provide access to a nutritionally adequate diet for families and persons with low-incomes, and encourage better eating patterns among the Nation's children. These programs include:

Child Nutrition Programs.—Federal assistance is provided to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and Guam for use in serving nutritious lunches and breakfasts to children attending schools of high school grades or under, to children of preschool age in child care centers and homes, and to children in other institutions in order to improve the health and well-being of the Nation's children, and broaden the markets for agricultural food commodities. Through the special milk program, assistance is provided to the States for making reimbursement payments to eligible schools and child care institutions which institute or expand milk service in order to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children.

Food Stamp Program.—This program is aimed at making more effective use of the Nation's food supply and at improving nutritional standards of needy persons and families, in most cases, through the issuance of food coupons which may be used in retail stores for the purchase of food. The program also includes Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Public Law 97–35) authorized a block grant for Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico which gives the Commonwealth broad flexibility in establishing a nutrition assistance program that is specifically tailored to the needs of its low-income households.

The program includes the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations which provides nutritious agricultural commodities to low-income persons living on or near Indian reservations who choose not to participate in the Food Stamp Program. The program also includes $100,000,000 for commodity purchases under the Emergency Food Assistance Program.

Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC).—This program helps to safeguard the health of pregnant, postpartum, and breastfeeding women, and infants, and children up to age five who are at nutritional risk by providing food packages designed to supplement each participant's diet with foods that are typically lacking. Delivery of supplemental foods may be done through health clinics, vouchers redeemable at retail food stores, or other approved methods which a cooperating State health agency may select.

The Farmers Market Nutrition Program provides (WIC or WIC-eligible) participants with coupons to purchase fresh, nutritious, unprepared food, such as fruits and vegetables, from farmers markets. The program is designed to accomplish two major goals: (1) improve the diets of WIC or WIC-eligible participants and (2) increase the awareness and use of farmers' markets by low-income households.

The Commodity Assistance Programs (CAP).—This program combines funding for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) and administrative expenses for The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP).

CSFP provides supplemental foods to infants and children up to age six, and to pregnant, postpartum, and breastfeeding women with low-incomes who reside in approved project areas. In addition, this program operates commodity distribution projects directed at low-income elderly persons.

TEFAP provides grant funds to State agencies to assist in the cost of storage and distribution of donated commodities for needy individuals.

Food Donations Programs.—Nutritious agricultural commodities are provided to residents of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands. Cash assistance is provided to distributing agencies to assist them in meeting administrative expenses incurred. Funding is provided for use in non-Presidentially declared disasters and for FNS administrative costs in connection with disaster relief for all disasters. Commodities or cash-in-lieu of commodities are provided to assist nutrition programs for the elderly.

Food Program Administration.—This account represents most salaries and Federal operating expenses of the Food and Nutrition Service and the Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion (CNPP). As of September 30, 1999, there were 1,539 full-time permanent and 105 part-time and temporary employees in the agency. There were 539 in the Washington headquarters and 1,000 in the field, which includes 613 in seven regional offices and the balance in four food stamp compliance offices; one computer support center in Minneapolis, Minnesota; one administrative review office; and 69 field offices. The Center oversees improvements in and revisions to the nutrition guidance systems. CNPP is the focal point for advancing and coordinating nutrition promotion and education policy to improve the health of all Americans.

Funds for Strengthening Markets, Income, and Supply (Section 32).—This program includes the donation of commodities purchased under the surplus removal activities of the Agricultural Marketing Service. Special programs provide food to needy children and adults who are suffering from general and continued hunger.

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

	Direct appropriation	*Transfer from section 32*	*Total program level*
2000 appropriation	$4,611,829,000	$4,935,199,000	$9,554,028,000
2001 budget estimate ...	4,578,482,000	4,967,574,000	9,546,056,000
Provided in the bill	4,407,460,000	5,127,579,000	9,535,039,000
Comparison:			
2000 appropriation	−204,369,000	+192,380,000	−18,989,000
2001 budget estimate	−171,022,000	+160,005,000	−11,017,000

Working through State agencies, the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) provides Federal assistance in cash and commodities for use in preparing and serving nutritious meals to children while they are attending school, residing in service institutions, or participating in other organized activities away from home. The purpose of this program is to help maintain the health and proper physical development of America's children. The child nutrition account includes the School Lunch Program; the School Breakfast Program; the Summer Food Service Program; and Child and Adult Care Food Programs. In addition, the Special Milk Program provides funding for milk service in some kindergartens, as well as in schools, nonprofit child care centers, and camps which have no other Federally assisted food programs. Milk is provided to children either free or at a low cost depending on their family income level. FNS provides cash subsidies to State administered programs and directly administers the program in the States which have chosen not to do so. Funds for this program are provided by direct appropriation and transfer from section 32. Grants are also made for nutritional training and surveys and for State administrative expenses. Under current legislation, most of these payments are made on the basis of reimbursement rates established by law and applied to lunches and breakfasts actually served by the States.

The William F. Goodling Child Nutrition Reauthorization Act of 1998, Public Law 105–336, contains a number of child nutrition provisions. These include:

Summer Food Service Program (SFSP).—Reauthorizes the program through 2003 and relaxes the site limitations for private nonprofit sponsors in SFSP.

School Breakfast Program (SBP).—(1) Authorizes a pilot project to study the effects of providing free breakfasts to all students without regard to family income; and (2) requires participating schools to obtain a food safety inspection conducted by a State or local agency.

Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP).—Authorizes payments for snacks provided to children through age 18 in after-school programs. Permanently authorizes and provides funds for demonstration projects to expand services to homeless children and family day care homes in low-income areas. Beginning on July 1, 1999, the Homeless Child Nutrition Program and the Homeless Summer Food Service Program transfer into CACFP.

National School Lunch Program (NSLP).—(1) Significantly expands reimbursement for snacks for children up to age 18 in after-school care programs; (2) provides for free snacks in needy areas; and (3) requires participating schools to obtain a food safety inspection conducted by a State or local agency.

Special Milk Program.—Through the Special Milk Program, funds are provided to State agencies to reimburse eligible participants for all or part of the cost of fluid milk consumed. Under Public Law 97–35, participation in the Special Milk Program is restricted to schools and institutions that do not participate in another meal service program authorized by the Child Nutrition or School Lunch Acts. Effective October 1, 1986, based on authority in Public Law 99–661, children in split session kindergarten programs in nonprofit schools who do not have access to the meal service programs operating in those schools may participate in the program.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Child Nutrition Programs, the Committee provides a total of $9,535,039,000, a decrease of $18,989,000 below the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $11,017,000 below the budget request. Of the total amount provided, $4,407,460,000 is by direct appropriation and $5,127,579,000 is by transfer from Section 32.

Child Nutrition Programs:	
School lunch program	$5,387,523,000
School breakfast program	1,495,684,000
Child and adult care food program	1,807,435,000
Summer food service program	323,499,000
Special milk program	16,843,000
State administrative expenses	127,321,000
Commodity procurement and computer support	360,223,000
School meals initiative	10,000,000
Food safety education	2,000,000
Coordinated review effort	4,511,000
Total	$9,535,039,000

The Committee provides $10,000,000 for the School Meals Initiative. Included in this amount is $4,000,000 for food service training grants to States; $1,600,000 for technical assistance materials; $800,000 for the National Food Service Management Institute coop-

erative agreement for food service; $400,000 for print and electronic food service resource systems; and $3,200,000 for other activities.

The Department invests a significant amount of money in the school nutrition programs. The Committee is concerned about the effect foods sold in competition with the school meal programs may be having on the integrity of the program. Specifically, the Department should review, and include in a report information on any statutory limits or judicial rulings that restrict the ability of the Department to regulate these competitive foods. The Committee urges the Department to review the effect that competitive foods may have on the school meal programs and to report back to the Committee on this subject.

The Committee has included language that allows the Secretary to transfer $6,000,000 from the WIC account to the Child Nutrition Program, to complete the funding for the school breakfast pilot project, once the fiscal year 2000 carryover is determined to be in excess of $100,000,000.

The Committee has consolidated all funding for studies and evaluations under the Economic Research Service.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

2000 appropriation	$4,032,000,000
2001 budget estimate	4,148,100,000
Provided in the bill	4,067,000,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+35,000,000
2001 budget estimate	−81,100,000

The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) safeguards the health of pregnant, breastfeeding, and postpartum women and infants, and children up to age five who are at nutritional risk because of inadequate nutrition and inadequate income.

The William F. Goodling Child Nutrition Reauthorization Act of 1998, Public Law 105–336, reauthorizes the program through 2003 and added several provisions to the program. The act requires that an individual seeking certification or recertification in the program must provide documentation of family income.

Infant Formula Rebate Contracts.—The act permits State agencies to award infant formula rebate contracts to the bidder offering the lowest net wholesale price, unless the State agency demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the weighted average retail price for different brands of formula in that State does not vary by more than 5 percent.

The Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (FMNP) is designed to accomplish two major goals: (1) to improve the diets of WIC participants by providing them with coupons to purchase fresh, nutritious, unprepared food, such as fruits and vegetables, from farmers' markets; and (2) to increase the awareness and use of farmers' markets by low-income households.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) the Committee provides an appropria-

tion of $4,067,000,000, an increase of $35,000,000 above the amount available in fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $81,100,000 below the budget request.

The Committee notes that WIC participation has decreased dramatically. Since October 1999 when WIC participation was 7.449 million, the number of monthly participants has dropped to 7.117 million as of February 2000. That is a decrease of more than 332,000 participants.

This Committee believes that WIC is one of the best programs government has to offer to address the vulnerabilities that at-risk pregnant and post partum women, infants and children have available to them. Accordingly, the Committee has provided consistent, bipartisan support for the WIC program. But at a time when participation in the program is showing a precipitous drop-off, the Committee is in a position to continue to help the WIC program as well as other important programs in this bill.

The President's fiscal year 2001 budget request estimates that WIC participation will average 7.4 million during fiscal 2001 and end fiscal year 2001 with 7.5 million participants. There is nothing in the WIC participation data that indicates such a participation level can be reached. The current projected WIC carry over ranges from $160,000,000 to over $200,000,000 based on current average participation levels. The Committee recommendation provides a $35,000,000 increase over the fiscal year 2000 appropriation, and allows for average monthly participation of at least 7.4 million throughout fiscal year 2001. Even then, the WIC program will still carry over more then $100,000,000 at the end of fiscal year 2001.

The Committee recommendation includes language to allow funds to be used for WIC electronic benefit transfer systems and raises the authorized level of infrastructure funding to accommodate the funding level needed to develop EBT systems.

The Committee maintains language regarding the Farmers Market Nutrition Program that makes the first $10 million available for that program within 45 days of the enactment of this Act with the balance becoming available upon the determination that funds are not needed to maintain caseload.

The Committee understands that the Food and Nutrition Service is considering a proposed regulation that would broaden the variety of produce available for purchase under the WIC program. We understand that this action is based on the recent FNS report titled Review of the Nutritional Status of WIC Participants which concluded that participating WIC mothers and children were deficient in vital nutrients found in fruits and vegetables. The committee strongly supports this proposal and expects USDA to expeditiously move forward to ensure that WIC vouchers are broadened to ensure that a variety of fresh fruits and vegetables are available for purchase by WIC participants.

The Committee is concerned that when our Nation's military personnel are transferred to overseas posts they are no longer eligible for WIC benefits. The Committee encourages the Secretary of Agriculture to work with the Secretary of Defense to provide a solution to this problem.

The Committee includes language that permits the Secretary to transfer any carryover funds in excess of $100,000,000 to fund the

remaining piece of the school breakfast pilot project; an additional $5,000,000 for the commodity supplemental food program; and $10,000,000 for the elderly feeding program with prior notification to the Committee on Appropriations.

While the Committee supports and encourages state and local agency efforts to utilize WIC as an important means of participant referral to other health care services, it recognizes the tremendous constraints that WIC programs are experiencing as a result of expanding health care priorities. The Committee also recognizes that the Department's broad interpretation of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, with respect to the delivery of screening, assessment and referral services, on behalf of other federal agencies or departments. The delivery of which may jeopardize WIC agencies' ability to deliver the core mission of WIC program services—quality nutrition education and counseling, breast-feeding promotion and support, and related health care services. The Committee wishes to clarify that while WIC plays an important role in screening and referral to other health care services, it was never the Committee's intention that WIC should perform aggressive screening, referral and assessment functions on behalf of other programs, nor was it the Committee's intention that WIC State and Local agencies should assume the full burden of entering into and negotiating appropriate cost sharing agreements. The Committee again includes bill language to preserve WIC funding for authorized WIC services and again directs the Secretary to work with other Federal departments and agencies to ensure that except for basic education and referral purposes, WIC funds are not used to pay the administrative expenses or to coordinate operations or activities of other Federal agency services, activities or programs not authorized by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, unless fully reimbursed by those agencies.

The Committee is concerned about the Department's failure to publish a final rule on WIC Food Delivery Systems. This rule was first published for public comment in December 1990, and republished for public comment in June 1999. State and local WIC agencies have done their best to protect the integrity of the WIC program; however, they have been hampered in their efforts to ensure full compliance because of a lack of adequate federal regulation. The needs of WIC participants to receive the supplementary foods that are essential to their overall health and nutritional well-being and the interests of the American people to be protected from fraud and abuse require that a final rule be published. The Committee directs the Secretary to release the final rule on WIC Food Delivery Systems no later than October 31, 2000.

The Committee has consolidated all funding for studies and evaluations under the Economic Research Service.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

2000 appropriation	$21,071,751,000
2001 budget estimate	22,131,993,000
Provided in the bill	21,231,993,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+160,242,000
2001 budget estimate	−900,000,000

The Food Stamp Program, authorized by the Food Stamp Act of 1964, attempts to alleviate hunger and malnutrition among low-income persons by increasing their food purchasing power. Eligible households receive food stamps with which they can purchase food through regular retail stores. They are thus enabled to obtain a more nutritious diet than would be possible without food stamp assistance.

Participating households receive free food stamps in amounts determined by household size and income. Since March 1975, food stamp projects have been established throughout the country. State social service agencies assume responsibility for certifying eligible households and issuing the stamps through suitable outlets. The Food and Nutrition Service establishes a range of household food stamp allotments which are updated annually.

Authorized grocery stores accept the stamps as payment for food purchases and forward them to commercial banks for cash or credit. The stamps flow through the banking system to a Federal Reserve Bank for redemption out of a special account maintained by the U.S. Treasury Department. A major alternative to the paper food stamp system is Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT). By the end of fiscal year 1999, thirty-two systems (Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont) and the District of Columbia are Statewide and eight systems (California, Iowa, Kentucky, New York, Ohio, Washington, Wisconsin and Wyoming) are in some stage of planning or implementing their EBT systems.

The program also includes the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations which provides nutritious agricultural commodities to low-income persons living on or near Indian reservations who choose not to participate in the Food Stamp Program.

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

All direct and indirect administrative costs incurred for certification of households, issuance of food coupons, quality control, outreach, and fair hearing efforts are shared by the Federal Government and the States on a 50–50 basis.

In addition, State agencies which reduce quality control error rates below 6 percent receive up to a maximum match of 60 percent of their administrative expenses. Also, State agencies are paid up to 100 percent of the costs of administering the program on Indian reservations. The Food Stamp Program is in operation in all 50 States, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the District of Columbia.

The Food Stamp Act Amendments of 1982 provided for the establishment of a system for levying fiscal sanctions on States which fail to reduce high error rates below a prescribed target.

Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico.—The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, Public Law 97–35, authorized a block grant for nutrition assistance to Puerto Rico which gives the Commonwealth broad flexibility in establishing a nutrition assistance program which is specifically tailored to the needs of its low-income

households. Beginning in fiscal year 1987, funding for this block grant program was included under the food stamp appropriation account.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Food Stamp Program, the Committee provides $21,231,993,000, an increase of $160,242,000 above the amount available in fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $900,000,000 below the budget request. The total amount includes $100,000,000 for a contingency reserve in fiscal year 2001; $1,301,000,000 for nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico; and $100,000,000 for the emergency food assistance program.

The Committee does not concur with the budget request for a $1,000,000,000 reserve for the food stamp program, but provides $100,000,000, the same amount as fiscal year 2000.

Pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2028, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico must submit a yearly plan to the Secretary of Agriculture that contains information regarding how food and assistance benefits under the Nutrition Assistance Program (NAP) for Puerto Rico are to be provided during the following fiscal year. The Secretary must approve or disapprove this plan by August 1 of the fiscal year that it is submitted. The Committee strongly urges the Secretary not to approve any NAP plan that does not require at least 75 percent of NAP funds to be spent on food at businesses where staple foods make up more than 50 percent of eligible food sales. Such a requirement will help to ensure that benefits distributed under NAP are used for their congressionally-intended purpose: to provide food assistance to needy persons.

The Committee has consolidated all funding for studies and evaluations under the Economic Research Service.

The Committee is encouraged by the implementation of EBT systems around the country and supports the goal that all States must be operating an EBT system by 2002. The Committee directs the Secretary to report to the Committee, no later than 120 days after enactment of this Act, on efforts by the Food and Nutrition Service to ensure that all States will be operating an EBT system by 2002.

The Committee believes the agency should focus more on preventive strategies to combat retailer trafficking of food stamps. Two years ago, the Committee urged the Food and Nutrition Service, FNS, to require preauthorization visits for all high risk stores. The Committee is disappointed that more preauthorization visits have not been required and directs the agency to work with its field offices to ensure that all new high risk retailer applicants are visited before they are authorized to participate in the program.

The Committee also agrees with a previous Inspector General recommendation that the National office needs to provide more direction and oversight to regional and field offices and that half of all field offices should be reviewed each year. FNS established new oversight procedures as a result of an OIG 1992 retailer audit, but does not enforce them.

The Committee includes $194,000,000 for the Food Stamp Employment and Training Program. The budget estimate for this program include a projected end-of-year carryover of $166,000,000 at the end of fiscal year 2000, and a projected end-of-year carryover

of $210,000,000 at the end of fiscal year 2001. The fiscal year 2001 recommended appropriation for Employment and Training has the effect of reducing the projected fiscal year 2001 end-of-year carryover to $185,000,000. There are no outlay savings associated with this recommended funding level.

COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

2000 appropriation	$133,300,000
2001 budget estimate	158,300,000
Provided in the bill	138,300,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+5,000,000
2001 budget estimate	−20,000,000

The Commodity Assistance Program provides funding for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) and administrative expenses for The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP).

Commodity Supplemental Food Program.—The CSFP provides supplemental food to infants and children up to age six, and to pregnant, postpartum, and breast-feeding women who have low-incomes, and reside in approved project areas. In addition, this program operates commodity distribution projects directed at low-income elderly persons 60 years of age or older.

The 1996 FAIR Act (P.L. 104–127) reauthorized CSFP through fiscal year 2002. In addition, this law requires CCC to donate 4 million pounds of nonfat dry milk and 9 million pounds of cheese to the program annually, subject to availability.

TEFAP provides grant funds to State agencies to assist in the cost of storage and distribution of donated commodities for needy individuals.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

The Committee provides an appropriation of $138,300,000 for the commodity assistance program, an increase of $5,000,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $20,000,000 below the budget request.

The Committee has included $45,000,000 for administration of the emergency food assistance program. These funds may be used for administration purposes or for food costs at the discretion of the states.

The Committee has included language that allows the Secretary to transfer $5,000,000 from the WIC account to the Commodity Supplemental Food Program once the fiscal year 2000 carryover is determined to be in excess of $100,000,000.

The Committee supports the modification of administrative funding formula of the Commodity Supplemental Food Program to be certain that per participant administrative funds are not reduced as a result of declining food costs.

The Committee does not concur with the budget request to fund the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program in this account.

The Committee has included language providing $20,781,000 for administrative expenses for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program.

FOOD DONATIONS PROGRAMS

2000 appropriation	$141,081,000
2001 budget estimate	151,081,000
Provided in the bill	141,081,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−10,000,000

Nutrition Program for the Elderly.—The Nutrition Program for the Elderly (NPE) provides cash and commodities to States for distribution to local organizations that prepare meals served to elderly persons in congregate settings or delivered to their homes. The program promotes good health through nutrition assistance by reducing the isolation experienced by the elderly. This program is a supplement to the Department of Health and Human Services' (DHHS) funding for programs for the elderly with cash commodities on a per meal basis for each meal served to an elderly person.

Pacific Island Assistance.—This program provides for a directly funded food distribution program for low-income individuals in the nuclear-affected islands. This program attempts to alleviate hunger and malnutrition in low-income households by providing nutritious agricultural commodities to eligible persons. It also provides funding for use in non-presidentially declared disasters and for FNS' administrative costs in connection with disaster relief.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Food Donations Programs the Committee provides an appropriation of $141,081,000, the same amount as the amount available for fiscal year 2000, and a decrease of $10,000,000 below the budget request. Included in this amount is $140,000,000 for the nutrition program for the elderly.

The Committee has included language that allows the Secretary to transfer $10,000,000 from the WIC account to the Nutrition Program for the Elderly once the fiscal year 2000 carryover is determined to be in excess of $100,000,000.

FOOD PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

2000 appropriation	[1] $111,392,000
2001 budget estimate	128,558,000
Provided in the bill	116,392,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+5,000,000
2001 budget estimate	−12,166,000

[1] Does not reflect a transfer from the Economic Research Service of $1,000,000 (P.L. 106–78) for studies and evaluations.

The Food Program Administration appropriation provides for most of the Federal operating expenses of the Food and Nutrition Service, which includes the Child Nutrition Programs; Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC); the Commodity Assistance Program, including the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, administrative expenses of The Emergency Food Assistance Program and the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program; the Food Donations Programs, including the Nutrition Program for the Elderly, Pacific Island Assistance and Disaster Feeding; the Food Stamp Program and the Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion.

The major objective of food program administration is to efficiently and effectively carry out the nutrition assistance programs mandated by law. This is to be accomplished by the following: (1) giving clear and consistent guidance and supervision to State agencies and other cooperators; (2) assisting the States and other cooperators by providing program, managerial, financial, and other advice and expertise; (3) measuring, reviewing, and analyzing progress toward program objectives; and (4) carrying out regular staff support functions.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Food Program Administration, the Committee has provided $116,392,000, an increase of $5,000,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000, and a decrease of $12,166,000 below the budget request.

The Committee has maintained all funding for studies and evaluations under the Economic Research Service's Food and Consumer Economics Division. The Committee does not reduce the funding available for studies and evaluations. Full discretion on how these funds are to be spent has been left to the Department. The Committee continues to believe that consolidating these funds under ERS is prudent and fiscally responsible. It is expected that FNS staff, as well as staff from other agencies, will provide input and continue to work with ERS staff to assure that all program and policy needs of the Department are being met.

The Committee understands that small farmers may be precluded from bidding on contracts with school food service authorities by virtue of state efforts to require multi-item bidding. The Committee expects the Food and Nutrition Service to work with the Agricultural Marketing Service to identify cases in which such restrictions might exist, evaluate the impact of such restrictions, and take such action as necessary to facilitate sales by small producers to school food service authorities.

The Committee includes language that no funds shall be used for the Colonias initiative included in the budget request or any other initiative related to the Colonias without the prior approval of the Committee on Appropriations.

The Committee encourages the Food and Nutrition Service to acquire commodities from local farmer's markets and cooperatives for nutrition programs to the maximum extent possible.

TITLE V—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE AND GENERAL SALES MANAGER

	Appropriation	*Transfer from loan accounts*	*Total, FAS*
2000 appropriation	$109,186,000	($4,266,000)	($113,452,000)
2001 budget estimate	113,587,000	(4,266,000)	(117,853,000)
Provided in the bill	109,186,000	(4,266,000)	(113,452,000)
Comparison:			
2000 appropriation			
2001 budget estimate	−4,401,000		−4,401,000

The Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) was established March 10, 1953, by Secretary's Memorandum No. 1320, Supplement 1. Public Law 83–690, approved August 28, 1954, transferred the agricultural attaches from the Department of State to the Foreign Agricultural Service.

The primary function of this organization is to help American agriculture in maintaining and expanding foreign markets for agriculture products vital to the economic well-being of the nation. It maintains a worldwide agricultural intelligence and reporting service to assist the U.S. agricultural industry in its export operations through a continuous program of analyzing and reporting foreign agricultural production, markets, and policies. It attempts to develop foreign markets for U.S. farm products through administration of special export programs and through helping to secure international trade conditions that are favorable toward American products. FAS is also responsible for coordinating, planning, and directing the Department's programs in international development and technical cooperation in food and agriculture formerly carried out by the Office of International Cooperation and Development.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Committee provides an appropriation of $109,186,000 and transfers of $4,266,000, for a total program level of $113,452,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $4,401,000 below the budget request.

The Committee provides bill language permitting the Department to maintain up to $2,000,000 solely for the purpose of offsetting international currency fluctuations.

The Committee also provides bill language allowing the Department more flexibility in hiring employees overseas so that it can compete effectively in hiring with other U.S. Government agencies.

The Department has informed the Committee that restrictions on additional funding for the FAS imagery program have been lifted. The Committee believes that the imagery program provides an essential service to American agriculture while also serving as an important source of information on natural disasters in foreign coun-

tries which allows the Administration to make decisions on foreign assistance. The Committee supports more flexibility in funding from the Commodity Credit Corporation and directs the Department to report on the FAS imagery program in its next annual budget request to Congress.

The Committee is concerned that the Department does not hold the lead position in the federal government on international agricultural development activities. Without sufficient personnel trained in agricultural matters, it is unlikely that other agencies can provide better assistance than can the Department of Agriculture. The Committee directs the Department to provide a report on international development activities by location, identifying and quantifying the federal resources in use at each location. In particular, the Committee expects the report to include specific identification of whether personnel are assigned for short term or long term presence, or if they may be in an area only as temporary consultants.

The Committee continues to believe that U.S. commodities are among the most powerful tools in our nation's arsenal. The Committee compliments the Department for its efforts to maximize the use of U.S. commodities around the world and encourages the Department to maintain this effort as a priority. In particular, the Committee remains strongly supportive of the monetization of commodities where the proceeds of such monetization are used to respond to the needs of the people of the recipient nations.

The Committee expects that no appropriated funds will be used to pay for travel and other expenses of non-U.S. Government employees participating in the Reverse Trade Mission Program.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall use currently available authorities to ensure that all forms of rice (rough, brown and milled) are fairly represented in all Department of Agriculture food aid, export market development, export promotion and other export related programs.

The Committee expects that the Quality Samples Program (QSP) administered by the Foreign Agricultural Service will be continued to help develop new markets and expand existing markets for United States agricultural products. Funds made available through CCC to carry out activities under the QSP shall be no less than $2,500,000, the same level as in fiscal year 2000.

PUBLIC LAW 480

PROGRAM AND GRANT ACCOUNTS

PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE I PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 established the Program Account. Appropriations to this account are used to cover the lifetime subsidy cost associated with direct loans obligated in 2000 and beyond, as well as for administrative expenses.

Financing sales of agricultural commodities to developing countries and private entities for dollars on credit terms, or for local currencies (including for local currencies on credit terms) for use under section 104; and for furnishing commodities to carry out the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended (title I).—Title I of the legisla-

tion authorizes financing of sales to developing countries for local currencies and for dollars on credit terms. Sales for dollars or local currency may be made to foreign governments. The legislation provides for repayment terms either in local currencies or U.S. dollars on credit terms of up to 30 years, with a grace period of up to 5 years.

Local currencies under title I sales agreements may be used in carrying out activities under section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended. Activities in the recipient country for which these local currencies may be used include developing new markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, paying U.S. obligations, and supporting agricultural development and research.

Title I appropriated funds may also be used under the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended, to furnish commodities on credit terms or on a grant basis to assist developing countries and countries that are emerging democracies that have a commitment to introduce and expand free enterprise elements in their agricultural economies.

Ocean freight differential costs in connection with commodities sales financed for local currencies or U.S. dollars (title I).—The Commodity Credit Corporation pays ocean freight differential costs on shipments under this title. These costs are the difference between foreign flag and U.S. flag shipping costs.

Commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad (title II) (7 U.S.C. 1721–1726).—Commodities are supplied without cost through foreign governments to combat malnutrition and to meet famine and other emergency requirements. Commodities are also supplied for nonemergencies through public and private agencies, including intergovernmental organizations. The Commodity Credit Corporation pays ocean freight on shipments under this title, and may also pay overland transportation costs to a landlocked country, as well as internal distribution costs in emergency situations. The funds appropriated for title II are made available to private voluntary organizations and cooperatives to assist these organizations in meeting administrative and related costs.

Commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad (title III).—Commodities are supplied without cost to least developed countries through foreign governments for direct feeding, development of emergency food reserves, or may be sold with the proceeds of such sale used by the recipient country for specific economic development purposes. The Commodity Credit Corporation may pay ocean freight on shipments under this title, and may also pay overland transportation costs to a landlocked country, as well as internal distribution costs.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

The following table reflects the loan levels, subsidy levels, and administrative costs for all Public Law 480 programs:

	FY 2000 enacted	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
Public Law 480 Program Account:			
Title I—Credit sales:			
Program level	($166,298,000)	($180,000,000)	($180,000,000)

	FY 2000 enacted	FY 2001 estimate	Committee provisions
Direct loans	(145,298,000)	(159,678,000)	(159,678,000)
Ocean freight differential	21,000,000	20,322,000	20,322,000
Loan subsidies	119,813,000	114,186,000	114,686,000
Title II—Commodities for disposition abroad:			
Program level	(800,000,000)	(837,000,000)	(800,000,000)
Appropriation	800,000,000	837,000,000	800,000,000
Title III—Commodity grants:			
Program level	(-0-)	(-0-)	(-0-)
Appropriation	-0-	-0-	-0-
Salaries and expenses:			
General Sales Manager	1,035,000	1,035,000	1,035,000
FSA	815,000	815,000	815,000
Subtotal	1,850,000	1,850,000	1,850,000
Total, Public Law 480:			
Program level	(966,298,000)	(1,017,000,000)	(980,000,000)
Appropriation	942,663,000	973,358,000	936,358,000

The Committee has provided bill language allowing transfer authority, not to exceed 15 percent, among titles I, II, and III of PL 480.

The Committee expects that monetized funds from food aid shipments to the Newly Independent States be used only for agricultural privatization and reform.

CCC EXPORT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

2000 appropriation	$3,820,000
2001 budget estimate	3,820,000
Provided in the bill	3,820,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	.....

Under the export credit programs, guarantees are provided by CCC for the repayment of commercial credit extended to finance U.S. agricultural export sales. The GSM–102 program covers export credit with repayment terms of up to three years. The GSM–103 program provides intermediate-term credit with repayment terms of three to ten years. The Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, as amended, requires that not less than $5.5 billion be made available annually from 1996 through 2002 for GSM–102 and GSM–103. The FAIR Act provides $200,000,000 for the Emerging Markets Export Credit Program.

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 established the Program Account. Appropriations to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the loan guarantees committed in 2000 and beyond, as well as for administrative expenses.

Funding for the loan subsidy costs of CCC export credit is provided through a permanent, indefinite appropriation and not by annual appropriation.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation Export Loans Program Account, the Committee provides an appropriation of $3,820,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and the same as the budget request.

TITLE VI—RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Appropriation	*Prescription drug user fee*	*Total, FDA, S&E*
2000 appropriation	$1,037,661,000	$145,434,000	$1,183,095,000
2001 budget estimate	1,156,905,000	149,273,000	1,306,178,000
Provided in the bill	[1] 1,090,905,000	149,273,000	1,240,178,000
Comparison:			
2000 appropriation	+53,244,000	+3,839,000	+57,083,000
2001 budget estimate	−66,000,000	.....	−66,000,000

[1] $1,117,905,000 (appropriation) minus $27,000,000 (rescission) equals $1,090,905,000 (net).

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is the principal consumer protection agency of the Federal Government. The agency's mission and sole objective is to protect and promote the public health through its science-based core activities of premarket review and postmarket assurance. FDA has jurisdiction over a wide variety of products that affect every person, every day: foods and cosmetics; human and animal drugs; biologics including blood and vaccines; medical devices; and radiological products. FDA activities assure that these products are safe and effective, as well as properly labeled.

FDA works extensively with stakeholders—industry, consumers, and other interested parties—to: (1) set food and product standards; (2) evaluate the safety and efficacy of new drugs and medical devices before they are marketed; (3) conduct and sponsor research studies to detect health hazards and violations of laws or regulations, and improve the agency's base of scientific knowledge to allow for better regulatory decision-making; (4) inform business firms and consumers about FDA-related topics; (5) work with state and local agencies to develop programs that will supplement or complement those of FDA; (6) maintain surveillance over foods, drugs, medical devices and electronic products to ensure that they are safe, effective, and honestly labeled; and (7) take legal action when necessary to remove violative products from the marketplace and to prosecute firms or individuals that violate the law.

FDA must respond to fulfill several challenges in order to meet statutory requirements and its mission: research and development-fueled pressures on regulatory responsibilities; greater product complexity driven by breakthroughs in technology; growth in the recognized adverse effects associated with product use; unpredictable new health and safety threats; emerging challenges in the international arena; and the increased volume and diversity of imports.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Food and Drug Administration, the Committee provides a total direct appropriation of $1,117,905,000 for salaries and expenses, rescinds $27,000,000 from prior appropriations, and makes available an additional $149,273,000 in fees collected under the Prescription Drug User Fee Act, for a total of $1,240,178,000. This is an increase of $57,083,000 above the total amount available in fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $66,000,000 below the budget request.

Agricultural Products Testing Laboratory.—Within sums provided for food safety, the Committee directs the FDA to provide $1,500,000 for a contract with the New Mexico State University's Physical Science Laboratory to establish a laboratory in Dona Ana County, New Mexico. The laboratory will conduct rapid screening analyses of fresh fruits and vegetables (imported and domestic) for microbiological contamination of products sampled by FDA in the Texas, New Mexico, Arizona area. The laboratory will augment FDA's capabilities and facilitate rapid testing of these perishable products.

Competitive Exclusion Products.—The Committee finds that competitive exclusion products offer an innovative and valuable approach to reducing Salmonella and other harmful bacteria in poultry and livestock. The Committee is concerned, however, that only one competitive exclusion product has been approved to date despite public statements by FDA, USDA, and the President's Food Safety Council supporting this emerging technology. In view of significant public health benefits of competitive exclusion products, the FDA should review new animal drug applications for these products on an expedited basis.

Contact dermatitis.—The Committee is aware that contact dermatitis is the most common occupational illness in the United States costing the U.S. economy over $1 billion annually. The American Academy of Dermatology and the American Contact Dermatitis Society estimate that nearly 3,000 chemicals and other materials can induce allergic contact dermatitis and over 50,000 chemicals are capable of producing skin irritation. The Committee grows increasingly concerned that U.S. physicians lag behind their counterparts in other countries in their ability to effectively diagnose, treat and train future physicians to care for this epidemic. Only 24 allergens have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration for use in patch test kits, the only available test for this skin disease. European, Canadian, and South American physicians have over 400 allergens available for testing. The Committee directs the FDA to return regulatory authority for patch test kits and their allergens to the Center for Devices and Radiological Health, and further directs the Center to reinstate those allergens that were available to U.S. physicians prior to 1986, and expedite the approval of all other allergens in use in Europe and Canada, but which have not been approved for use in the United States.

Dietary supplements.—The Committee directs the Food and Drug Administration to report on the implementation of the decision in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit in Pearson v. Shalala regarding dietary supplement health claims. This report is to in-

clude the specific steps the agency plans to follow to carry out the decision with regard to dietary supplements, as well as the agency's basis for treating dietary supplements differently from conventional foods.

The Committee instructs the Food and Drug Administration to report to the Committee within 6 months of enactment of the bill, a summary of the total dollar amount spent in fiscal year 2000 in assessing the safety of dietary supplements, and in meeting the legal statutory burden under the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act of 1994 for demonstrating safety problems with dietary supplements.

The Committee instructs the Food and Drug Administration to report to the Committee, within 6 months of enactment of the bill, on the dollar cost to implement the Dietary Supplement Strategy 10 Year Plan.

Food Irradiation.—The Conference Report accompanying the FDA Modernization Act of 1997 directed FDA to complete a final rule by November 1998 revising its regulations regarding the labeling of foods treated with ionizing radiation. To date, the FDA has not completed this requirement. The Committee believes that any required disclosure should not be perceived as a warning or give rise to inappropriate consumer anxiety. The Committee expects FDA to make final by September 30, 2001 regulations that prescribe alternative truthful and non-misleading labeling disclosures that may be used on foods treated by ionizing radiation in lieu of the existing FDA-required disclosure. The Committee expects a report on the status of the proposed regulation by November 15, 2000.

Generic Drugs.—It is the view of the Committee that one of the most effective and immediate means to address the rising cost of prescription drugs is to ensure that the American consumer has timely access to more affordable generic medicines. In recent years Congress has provided increased appropriations for the Office of Generic Drugs to hire more reviewers to reduce the backlog of generic applications and to accelerate generic drug approval. Despite such increases, current approval times for generic drugs are three times the statutory requirements. In an effort to continue to reduce approval times, the Committee directs that an increase of $1,500,000 (from within funds provided) shall be used for the upgrade of information technology systems that allow for the electronic submission of generic drug applications.

Genetically modified foods.—The Committee expects the Food and Drug Administration to develop a unified effort to respond to consumer safety and environmental concerns while providing sufficient information that would allow consumers to make informed choices about the production and consumption of bioengineered foods. Any regulatory decision should be based on sound, verifiable science. The Committee also expects FDA to coordinate its activities with those of the Department of Agriculture to provide a unified approach across agency jurisdictions.

Medical Devices.—The Committee notes that advances in research and development in the medical device industry are likely to increase the number of new technologies submitted for review by the Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH) and the

Center for Biologics, Evaluation and Research (CBER). Therefore, the Committee requests the FDA to dedicate a level of funds in the fiscal year 2002 budget request to meet statutory review times for medical devices. Further, the Committee urges the Center to continue its work to expand the list of eligible devices so as to improve the success of the third-party review program for medical devices, and to actively utilize its authority to contract with outside technical expertise when such expertise is needed to assist in the prompt and efficient review of breakthrough technologies.

Mutual Recognition Activities/International Harmonization.—The Committee is concerned about the world-wide proliferation of regulatory regimes for medical devices and pharmaceutical products. In order to ensure that patients around the world receive the latest technology promptly, it is critical that the regulatory systems of the various nations of the world coordinate activities in such a way as to ensure the safety and efficacy of products, while limiting the burden of regulatory barriers to innovation and manufacture. The Committee is particularly concerned about the potential for barriers to the global marketing of products that are approved for use in the United States. Therefore, the Committee directs the Food and Drug Administration to report on the nature and scope of its activities to promote mutual recognition and international harmonization, aimed at approval systems as well as product surveillance. This report is to be submitted to the Committee by January 1, 2001.

National Center for Food Safety and Technology.—Within the amounts provided for food safety, the Committee recommends $3,000,000 for the National Center for Food Safety and Technology in Summit-Argo, Illinois, to continue collaborative research in food safety among government, academia, and private industry.

Orphan drugs.—The Committee is concerned that the current method of review for biologics that are substantially equivalent to orphan drugs may be creating a competitive disadvantage for biologics. While concern for efficacy and safety remain paramount, the Committee expects the FDA to develop a system to treat biologics and chemical-based substances on a more equal basis when these alternatives to protected orphan drugs are developed.

Radiopharmaceuticals.—The Committee believes that there is a need to have the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) clarify its existing enforcement authority and position on the compounding of radiopharmaceuticals. Radiopharmaceuticals are excluded from the exemptions provided by section 127 the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997 (FDAMA) (see 21 USC 353a(e)(21)). With respect to radiopharmaceuticals, FDAMA was not intended to change the law that was in effect at the time of its enactment (H. Rep. No. 105–399, 105th Cong., 1st Sess. 95 1997). Furthermore, the law at the time FDAMA was enacted did not exempt radiopharmaceuticals from the adulteration, misbranding, and new drug requirements of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Therefore, FDA should clarify its enforcement policy on the compounding of radiopharmaceuticals to stop the compounding of radiopharmaceuticals that are essentially copies of approved and commercially available drug products. The Committee urges the agency to promptly issue guidance setting forth its enforcement policy with

regard to the compounding of radiopharmaceuticals, but nothing herein shall preclude the agency from taking enforcement action under current law prior to issuance of such guidance.

Seafood Inspection.—The appropriations request included detailed authorization language which would transfer seafood inspection activities from the National Marine Fisheries Service to the Food and Drug Administration. The Committee feels strongly that this is a matter to be addressed by the authorization committee, and therefore has not included the requested authorization language.

Secondary Market for Prescription Drugs.—The Committee supports the recent FDA action to delay the effective date for implementing certain requirements of the Prescription Drug Marketing Act until October 1, 2001 and reopen the administrative record in order to receive additional comments. The Committee believes the agency should thoroughly review the potential impact of the proposed provisions on the secondary wholesale pharmaceutical industry. The Committee directs the FDA to provide a report to the Committee by January 15, 2001 summarizing the comments and issues raised and agency plans to address the concerns.

Shellfish Safety.—FDA's Office of Seafood has a memorandum of understanding with the Interstate Shellfish Sanitation Commission (ISSC) to develop shellfish safety regulations. The Committee understands that the agency funds this agreement at a level of $200,000, and directs that this level of effort is to continue in fiscal year 2001.

Tobacco.—On March 21, 2000, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit that FDA lacks jurisdiction under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act to regulate tobacco products. Subsequent to this decision, the Food and Drug Administration has taken steps to terminate contracts with State agencies regarding age and picture identification provisions that have been in effect, and the Agency is in the process of terminating the enforcement program. Therefore, the budget request of $39,000,000 to carry out these activities in fiscal year 2001 is no longer required, and the Committee recommends reducing the budget request accordingly. In addition, the Committee recommends rescinding $27,000,000 of the funds provided for fiscal year 2000, which are no longer required under current law.

Vibrio Vulnificus.—The Committee expects that FDA will continue its work with the Interstate Shellfish Sanitation Commission (ISSC) to promote educational and research activities related to Vibrio Vulnificus. The Committee directs the use of $250,000 for this effort, within the amounts appropriated for the Food Safety Initiative.

Waste-management Education and Research Consortium.—Within sums provided for food safety, the Committee directs the Food and Drug Administration to provide not less than $100,000 for the Waste-management Education and Research Consortium (WERC) to continue its work in minimizing microbial hazards.

Recommendations by activity.—The Committee recommends that of the total amount provided: (1) $302,557,000 shall be for the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition and related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (2) $329,797,000 shall be for

the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research and related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (3) $153,479,000 shall be for the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (4) $62,761,000 shall be for the Center for Veterinary Medicine and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (5) $171,677,000 shall be for the Center for Devices and Radiological Health and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (6) $37,868,000 shall be for the National Center for Toxicological Research; (7) $25,855,000 shall be for Rent and Related activities, other than the amounts paid to the General Services Administration; (8) $104,954,000 shall be for payments to the General Services Administration for rent and related costs; and (9) $78,230,000 shall be for other activities, including the Office of the Commissioner, the Office of Senior Associate Commissioner, the Office of International and Constituent Relations, the Office of Policy, Planning, and Legislation, the Office of Management and Systems, and central services for these offices. Funds may be transferred from one specified activity to another with the prior approval of the Committee.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

2000 appropriation	$11,350,000
2001 budget estimate	31,350,000
Provided in the bill	11,350,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	.....
2001 budget estimate	−20,000,000

The Buildings and Facilities account was established for repair and improvement of existing facilities, as well as for construction of new facilities when needed.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Buildings and Facilities of the Food and Drug Administration, the Committee provides an appropriation of $11,350,000, the same as the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $20,000,000 below the budget request.

The Committee recommends $8,350,000 for repairs and improvements to existing facilities, and $3,000,000 for continuing construction of phase III at the Arkansas Regional Laboratory. The Committee does not recommend the request for $20,000,000 for the first phase of construction of the replacement Los Angeles laboratory. This funding has been provided in House action on the bill H.R. 3908. While the Committee supports replacement of this laboratory, it does not recommend the request for advanced appropriation of $23,000,000 for the second phase of Los Angeles construction. Such funds are not required at this time, and the Committee will consider this item in the future. The Committee is concerned about the impact the transfer of the FDA laboratories to Irvine will have on FDA employees who currently work at the FDA laboratories in Los Angeles. The Committee expects the FDA to retain these experienced employees and to take steps to minimize the impact on employees throughout the planning and implementation of the move to Irvine.

Arkansas Regional Laboratory.—The Committee approves the full amount of the budget request of $3,000,000 which will go towards a portion of the third and final phase of the overall Arkansas Regional Laboratory project at Jefferson, Arkansas. This phase will provide for the renovation of the existing Building 50 in its entirety for joint Office of Regulatory Affairs and National Center for Toxicological Research administrative support space and the restoration of the laboratory project site.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

2000 appropriation	$63,000,000
2001 budget estimate	72,000,000
Provided in the bill	69,000,000
Comparison:	
2000 appropriation	+6,000,000
2001 budget estimate	−3,000,000

The Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) administers the Commodity Exchange Act of 1936, as amended. The purpose of the Commission is to further the economic utility of futures and option markets by encouraging their efficiency, assuring their integrity, and protecting participants against abusive trade practices, fraud, and deceit. The objective is to enable the markets to better serve their designated function in providing a price discovery mechanism and as a means of offsetting price risk. In properly serving these functions, the futures markets contribute toward better planning, more efficient distribution and consumption, and more economical marketing.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Committee provides an appropriation of $69,000,000, an increase of $6,000,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $3,000,000 below the budget request.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

2000 limitation	($35,800,000)
2001 budget estimate	.....
Provided in the bill	(36,800,000)
Comparison:	
2000 limitation	(+1,000,000)
2001 budget estimate	(+36,800,000)

The Farm Credit Administration (FCA) originally created by Executive Order No. 6084 on May 27, 1933, was transferred to the Department of Agriculture on July 1, 1939, by Reorganization Plan No. 1. From December 4, 1953 to January 23, 1986, the Administration was an independent agency under the direction of a Federal Farm Credit Board (12 U.S.C. 636). The Farm Credit Amendments Act of 1985 (P.L. 99–205) clarified the FCA's role as an arm's-length financial regulator, granting it the same intermediate enforcement powers as other Federal financial regulatory agencies. The Act also replaced the Federal Farm Credit Board of 13 Presi-

dentially appointed part- time Board members with the FCA Board, comprised of a Chairman and two other Board members, all serving in a full-time capacity. Not more than two members of the Board shall be members of the same political party.

The FCA is responsible for regulating, supervising, and examining the institutions of the Farm Credit System (System). The FCA and the System institutions operate under the authority of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.). The institutions of the System are the Farm Credit banks, Federal land bank associations, Federal intermediate credit banks, production credit associations, Federal land credit associations, agricultural credit associations, and banks for cooperatives. The combined lending activities in the System institutions provided short- and long-term credit to the nation's farmers, ranchers, and producers and harvesters of aquatic products, and their cooperatives. System institutions are owned by their member borrowers. The operation of the System is funded through the sale of systemwide consolidated bonds and discount notes in the public money markets, and the institutions are fully liable for the payment of these securities. The operating expenses of the FCA are paid by the System institutions and by the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation through assessments, which are deposited in a special fund in the Treasury which is available for the use of the FCA.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For a limitation on the expenses of the Farm Credit Administration, the Committee provides $36,800,000, an increase of $1,000,000 above the amount available for fiscal year 2000 and an increase of $36,800,000 above the budget request. The fiscal year 2001 budget proposed no limitation on the expenses of the Farm Credit Administration.

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The General Provisions contained in the accompanying bill for fiscal year 2001 are fundamentally the same as those included in last year's appropriations bill.

Section 724: Language is included to prohibit funds from being used to carry out programs under the Fund for Rural America.

Section 725: Language is included to limit the amount of funds available for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program to $174,000,000.

Section 727: Language is included to prohibit funds from being used to carry out the Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems.

Section 728: Language is included that funds in this Act shall not be used to carry out any commodity purchase program that would prohibit eligibility or participation by farmer-owned cooperatives.

Section 729: Language is included that prohibits funds from being used to carry out the Conservation Farm Option program.

Section 730: Language is included prohibiting the use of funds to carry out certain activities unless the Secretary of Agriculture inspects and certifies agricultural processing equipment and charges a fees for those activities.

Section 734: The Committee reminds the Administration of the Constitutional power of the Senate to advise and consent to treaties. The Committee notes with disapproval that this Administration exhibited disdain for the will of the Senate when the Administration signed the Kyoto Protocol in contravention of Senate Resolution 105–98, known as the Byrd-Hagel Resolution, which was approved by a vote of 95 ayes and 0 nays.

The Committee notes with disapproval that nearly three years after the Kyoto Protocol was adopted on December 11, 1997, it still has not been submitted to the Senate for advice and consent as to ratification. The Committee is concerned that such protracted refusal to make submission to the Senate flouts the powers and prerogatives of the Congress as a whole. The Committee directs that within three years of the date of adoption, the Kyoto Protocol shall be submitted by the Administration to the Senate for advice and consent as to ratification. The Committee also notes that the Kyoto Protocol has not yet entered into force pursuant to Article 25 of the Protocol.

This year the Committee has clarified that funds shall not be spent for items found solely in the Kyoto Protocol and nowhere in the laws of the United States. These items include carbon emissions trading schemes and the Clean Development Mechanism. The Committee has taken keen note of the Administration's comments that there has been confusion regarding this funding limitation. The Committee notes with disapproval dozens of expenditures by

the Administration for the Kyoto Protocol mechanisms. The Committee encourages United States exports to improve the environment of foreign nations and does so with express reference to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Likewise all other provisions of the UNFCCC which have legislative enactment are encouraged.

Section 735: Language is included requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to compensate wheat producers and handlers for losses due to karnal bunt not later than 45 days after the receipt of a valid claim.

Section 736: This provision makes the towns of Lloyd, New York and Harris, New York eligible for rural development loans and grants.

Section 737: This provision increases the fee on single family guaranteed loans from one percent to two percent.

Section 738: This provision conforms the contracting authority for persons overseas employed by the Foreign Agricultural Service to the authority provided to the Department of State.

Section 739: Language is included that extends the dairy price support program and delays the dairy recourse loan program.

Section 740: Language is included that provides $4,000,000 for a hunger fellowship program.

Section 741: This bill includes language that supersedes Section 718 of Public Law 105–277, as amended, and provides that on a permanent basis beginning with fiscal year 2001, funds made available through the annual appropriations process for the market access program, or any program that replaces the market access program, may be used to promote any agricultural commodity as defined in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, as amended, except for products that have been specifically excluded from the market access program by Section 1302, Title I of Public Law 103–66, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

Section 742: Language is included prohibiting the use of funds regarding certain floodplains in Arkansas.

Section 743: Language is included that enhances the ability of the Friends of the National Arboretum to provide additional support for the National Arboretum.

Section 744: Language is included that the Secretary shall include the value of lost production when compensating owners of trees destroyed as part of the Citrus Canker Eradication program in Florida.

Section 745: The Committee is aware that USDA has recently issued a final rule regarding the use of Alternate Protein Products in the National School Lunch Program, School Breakfast Program, Summer Food Service Program, and Child and Adult Care Food Program. The Committee is also aware that prior to promulgating this rule, USDA asked meat and vegetable protein industry groups to work together to build consensus on the use of alternative protein products in USDA's feeding program and is aware USDA's final rule does not reflect this consensus. The Committee believes that these comments have merit and warranted careful consideration by the USDA. The Committee therefore instructs USDA to reinstate fortification requirements and to disclose to program par-

ticipants meat and poultry products containing greater than 30% Alternative Protein Products.

Section 746: This section provides that ratites and squab slaughtered for human consumption be subject to the poultry Products Inspection Act.

Section 747: Language is included that provides for compensation, out of available funds, to nursery stock producers for losses caused by Hurricane Irene in October 1999.

Section 748: The Committee has studied the Action Plan to Eliminate Salmonella Enteritidis Illnesses Due to Eggs, published on December 10, 1999. The Committee applauds and shares the commitment to egg safety evidenced by the plan. The Committee also expects that a thorough economic impact analysis of the action plan will be completed prior to the issuance of any proposed rule pursuant to the plan, in order to prevent any undue adverse impact on producers.

In preparing regulations to implement the action plan, the Committee expects that the Food and Drug Administration and other relevant agencies will (1) combine proposed rules on Salmonella Enteritidis testing and HACCP-based prerequisite programs for shell egg producers, in order to expedite the implementation of quality assurance programs; (2) strongly consider including in their rulemaking a ban on the repackaging of eggs returned from retail establishments, as well as nationwide standards for "sell-by" or "best-by" dates; (3) modify the egg warning label proposed by the agency on July 6, 1999, to ensure that the label is consistent with equivalent labels on meat and poultry products, and to take into account additional protective measures in the action plan; (4) to the extent funds are available, consider a program to indemnify producers who may be required to divert eggs to pasteurization, based on the difference in price received for diverted eggs and shell eggs sold in retail markets; and (5) report to the Committee on the procedures it will use to assure that any functions assigned to state agencies under the action plan will be implemented in a consistent manner in all jurisdictions. The Committee expects that where possible, the agency will utilize the services of personnel of the Agricultural Marketing Service (as well as state agency personnel cooperating with AMS under existing agreements) who already perform inspection or other functions in shell egg packing plants, under a cooperative agreement or similar arrangement whereby the Service's costs would be reimbursed by the agency.

Section 749: Language is included that allows the USDA to make loans to poultry farmers who have incurred losses due to disasters.

Section 750: Language is included that extends the time within which to compensate cotton producers in Georgia out of available funds.

Section 751: Language is included that provides emergency funds for market/quality loss payments for apples and potatoes.

Section 752: Language is included prohibiting the use of funds to reimburse crop insurance providers and agents for administrative and operating costs that exceed 20 percent of the premium.

TITLE VIII—TRADE SANCTIONS REFORM AND EXPORT ENHANCEMENT

Language is included providing for Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement.

TRANSFER OF UNEXPENDED BALANCES

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted describing the transfer of unexpended balances provided in the accompanying bill. Transfers of unexpended balances are assigned to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations by clause 1(b)(3) of rule X.

1. Office of the Secretary.—The bill allows the transfer of unobligated balances of representation funds in the Foreign Agricultural Service to the Office of the Secretary.

2. Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments.—The bill allows transfers to or from the rental payments account based on changing space requirements.

3. Hazardous Materials Management.—The bill allows the funds appropriated to the Department for hazardous materials management to be transferred to agencies of the Department as required.

4. Departmental Administration.—The bill requires reimbursement for expenses related to certain hearings.

5. Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.—The bill requires a portion of the funds appropriated to the Office of the Assistant Secretary to be transferred to agencies.

6. Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.—Authority is included to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer from other appropriations or funds of the Department such sums as may be necessary to combat emergency outbreaks of certain diseases of animals, plants, and poultry.

7. Agricultural Marketing Service.—The bill limits the transfer of section 32 funds to purposes specified in the bill.

8. Farm Service Agency.—The bill provides that funds provided to other accounts in the agency may be merged with the salaries and expenses account of the Farm Service Agency.

9. Dairy Indemnity Program.—The bill authorizes the transfer of funds to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

10. Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund.—The bill provides that funds from the account shall be transferred to the Farm Service Agency salaries and expenses account.

11. Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations.—The bill provides that funds for administering loans shall be transferred to the Rural Development Salaries and Expenses account.

12. Rural Community Advancement Program.—The bill provides that funds for certain administrative expenses may be transferred to the Rural Development Salaries and Expenses account.

13. Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account; Rural Development Loan Program Account; Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account and Rural Telephone Bank Program Account.—The bill provides that administrative funds may be transferred to the Rural Development Salaries and Expenses Account.

14. Rural Housing Assistance Program; Rural Business-Cooperative Assistance Program; and Rural Utilities Assistance Program.—The bill allows funds to be transferred between authorized programs within the account.

15. Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account.—Language is included that allows for transfer of cushion of credit payments to this account.

16. Child Nutrition Programs.—The bill includes authority to transfer section 32 funds to these programs.

17. Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC).—The bill permits transfer of funds to other programs under certain conditions.

18. Foreign Agricultural Service.—The bill allows for the transfer of funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation Export Loan Program Account and Public Law 480 Program Account.

19. Public Law 480.—The bill allows for the transfer of up to 15 percent of the funds between title II and title III, and provides that funds made available for the cost of title I agreements and for title I ocean freight differential may be used interchangeably.

20. Commodity Credit Corporation Export Loans Program.—The bill provides for transfer of funds to the Foreign Agricultural Service and to the Farm Service Agency for overhead expenses associated with credit reform.

CHANGES IN THE APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1)(A) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted describing the effect of provisions in the accompanying bill which directly or indirectly change the application of existing law. In most instances, these provisions have been included in prior appropriations bills, often at the request of or with the knowledge and consent of the responsible legislative committees.

Language is included in various parts of the bill to continue ongoing activities of those Federal agencies which require annual authorization or additional legislation which to date has not been enacted.

Language is included in the bill in several accounts that earmarks funds for empowerment zones and enterprise communities as authorized by title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

The bill includes a number of provisions which place limitations on the use of funds in the bill or change existing limitations and which might, under some circumstances, be construed as changing the application of existing law:

1. *Office of the Secretary.*—Language is included to limit the amount of funds for official reception and representation expenses, as determined by the Secretary.

2. *Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments.*—Language is included which allows the transfer of limited amounts to and from this account.

3. *Departmental Administration.*—Language is included to reimburse the agency for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings.

4. *Agricultural Research Service.*—The bill includes language that prohibits funds from being used to carry out research related to the production, processing or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products. Language is included that allows the Agricultural Research Service to grant an easement at the Beltsville, MD agricultural research center, and language is included that authorizes the Agricultural Research Service to charge fees for any permit, easement, lease or other special use authorization for the occupancy or use of land and facilities issued by the agency and such fees shall be credited to the Agricultural Research Service and remain available until expended.

5. *Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service.*—The bill includes language that prohibits funds from being used to carry out research related to the production, processing or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products.

6. *Native American Institutions Endowment Fund.*—Language is included which provides that funds may be used to support facility renovation, repair, construction, and maintenance.

7. *Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.*—A provision carried in the bill since fiscal year 1973 regarding state matching funds has been continued to assure more effective operation of the brucellosis control program through state cost sharing, with resulting savings to the Federal budget.

Language is included to allow APHIS to recoup expenses incurred from providing training to non-APHIS personnel.

8. *Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Inspection and Weighing Services.*—The bill includes authority to exceed the limitation on inspection and weighing services by 10 percent with notification to the Appropriations Committees. This allows for flexibility if export activities require additional supervision and oversight, or other uncontrollable factors occur.

9. *Agricultural Marketing Service.*—The bill includes language that allows the Secretary to charge user fees for AMS activity related to preparation of standards.

10. *Agricultural Marketing Service, Limitation on Administrative Expenses.*—The bill includes language to allow AMS to exceed the limitation on administrative expenses by 10 percent with notification to the Appropriations Committees. This allows flexibility in case crop size is understated and/or other uncontrollable events occur.

11. *Dairy Indemnity Program.*—Language is included that allows the Secretary to utilize the services of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of making dairy indemnity payments.

12. *Commodity Credit Corporation Fund, Reimbursement for Net Realized Losses.*—Language is included to provide for the reimbursement appropriation. Language is also included which limits the amount of funds that can be spent on operation and maintenance costs of CCC hazardous waste sites.

13. *Risk Management Agency.*—Language is included to limit the amount of funds for official reception and representation expenses.

14. *Natural Resources Conservation Service—Conservation Operations*.—This language, which has been included in the bill since 1938, prohibits construction of buildings on land not owned by the government, although construction on land owned by states and counties is authorized by basic law. This paragraph also includes language carried in the bill since 1950, which prohibits the use of funds for demonstration projects authorized by the Act of April 27, 1935.

15. *Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations.*—Language, which was also included in the Emergency Jobs Bill of 1983 (P.L. 98–8) and all bills since 1984, provides that funds may be used for rehabilitation of existing works.

16. *Rural Housing Service—Rental Assistance Program*.—Language is included which provides that agreements entered into during the current fiscal year be funded for a five-year period.

17. *Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loan Program Account.*—Language is included to allow borrowers' interest rates for loans to exceed seven percent.

18. *Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account.*—Language is included that allows for transfer of cushion of credit payments to this account.

19. *Child Nutrition Programs.*—Language is included to prohibit funds from being used for studies and evaluations.

20. *Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)*.—Language is included to prohibit funds from being used for studies and evaluations, and to allow certain transfers of funds.

21. *Food Stamp Program.*—Language is included to prohibit funds from being used for studies and evaluations, and to limit funds available for employment and training.

22. *Commodity Assistance Program.*—Language is included that allows a specific funding level for Commodity Supplemental Food Program administrative expenses.

23. *Foreign Agricultural Service*.—Language carried since 1979 enables this organizational unit to utilize funds received by an advance or by reimbursement to carry out its activities involving international development and technical cooperation. The bill includes language that prohibits funds from being used to promote the sale or export of tobacco or tobacco products. Language is included to limit the amount of funds for official reception and representation expenses.

24. *Commodity Futures Trading Commission*.—Language is included to allow CFTC to recoup expenses incurred from providing training to non-CFTC personnel.

25. *General Provisions*.—

Section 704: This provision permits the Secretary to transfer funds made available by this Act, as well as other available unobligated balances of the Department of Agriculture, to the Working Capital fund for the acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and provides that no funds appropriated to an agency shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without the approval of the agency administrator.

Section 705: This provision, carried since 1976, is again included which provides that certain appropriations in this Act shall remain available until expended where the programs or projects involved are continuing in nature under the provisions of authorizing legislation, but for which such legislation does not specifically provide for extended availability. This authority tends to result in savings by preventing the wasteful practice often found in government of rushing to commit funds at the end of the fiscal year without due regard to the value of the purpose for which the funds are used. Such extended availability is also essential in view of the long lead time frequently required to negotiate agreements or contracts which normally extend over a period of more than one year. Under these conditions such authority is commonly provided in Appropriations Acts where omitted from basic law. These provisions have been carried through the years in this Act to facilitate efficient and effective program execution and to assure maximum savings. They involve the following items: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the contingency fund to meet emergency conditions, fruit fly program, the integrated systems acquisition project, the boll weevil program, up to 10 percent of the screwworm program, and up to $2,000,000 for costs associated with colocating regional offices; Food Safety and Inspection Service, field automation and information management project; funds appropriated for rental payments; Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, funds for competitive research grants, and funds for the Native American Institutions Endowment Fund; Farm Service Agency, salaries and expenses to county committees; Foreign Agricultural Service, middle-income country training program and up to $2,000,000 for foreign currency fluctuations.

Section 708: This provision, included since fiscal year 1981, limits the overhead that can be charged on cooperative agreements to a maximum of 10 percent. This provision is necessary because many universities attempted to apply the same overhead rates to cooperative agreements as was being applied to grants and contracts, without giving consideration to the cooperator's contributions as an offset to the overhead charges.

Section 710: This provision, added in 1987, provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to restrict the authority of CCC to lease space. This provision allows CCC to continue to lease space at a lower cost than space leased by GSA.

Section 711: This provision provides that none of the funds in this Act may be made available to pay indirect costs charged against agricultural research, education, or extension grants awarded by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service in excess of 19 percent of total direct costs, except for grants available under the Small Business Innovation and Development Act.

Section 712: This provision clarifies that loan levels provided in the Act are to be considered estimates and not limitations. The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 provides that the appropriated subsidy is the controlling factor for the amount of

loans made and that as lifetime costs and interest rates change, the amount of loan authority will fluctuate.

Section 713: This provision allows funds made available in the current fiscal year for the Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account; Rural Telephone Bank Program Account; the Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account; and the Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account to remain available until expended. The Credit Reform Act requires that the lifetime costs of loans be appropriated. Current law requires that funds unobligated after five years expire. The life of some loans extends well beyond the five-year period and this provision allows funds appropriated to remain available until the loans are closed out.

Section 714: This provision provides that sums necessary for the current fiscal year pay raises shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

Section 715: This provision provides that the Agricultural Marketing Service; Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration; and the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; and the food safety activities of the Food Safety and Inspection Service may use cooperative agreements.

Section 716: This provision provides that the Natural Resources Conservation Service may use cooperative agreements.

Section 717: Provides that not more than 5 percent of Class A stock of the Rural Telephone Bank may be retired in fiscal year 2001. The provision also prohibits the maintenance of any account or subaccount which has not been specifically authorized by law. The provision also prohibits a transfer of any unobligated funds of the Rural Telephone Bank telephone liquidating account to the Treasury or the Federal Financing Bank that are in excess of current requirements.

Section 718: Provides that of the funds made available, not more than $1,500,000 shall be used to cover expenses of activities related to all advisory committees, panels, commissions, and task forces of the Department of Agriculture except for panels used to comply with negotiated rule makings and panels used to evaluate competitive award grants.

Section 719: Provides that none of the funds may be used to carry out certain provisions of meat and poultry inspection acts.

Section 720: This provision prohibits any employee of the Department of Agriculture from being detailed or assigned to any other agency or office of the Department for more than 30 days unless the individual's employing agency or office is fully reimbursed by the receiving agency or office for the salary and expenses of the employee for the period of assignment.

Section 721: This provision prohibits the Department of Agriculture from transmitting or making available to any non-Department of Agriculture employee questions or responses to questions that are a result of information requested for the appropriations hearing process.

Section 722: Language is included that requires approval of the Chief Information Officer and the concurrence of the Executive Information Technology Investment Review Board for ac-

quisition of new information technology systems or significant upgrades.

Section 723: Language is included that requires certain reprogramming procedures of funds provided in Appropriations Acts.

Section 724: Language is included to prohibit funds from being used to carry out programs under the Fund for Rural America.

Section 725: Language is included to limit the amount of funds available for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program to $174,000,000.

Section 726: Language is included to prohibit contract acreage payments to a producer who plants wild rice on contract acreage unless the contract payment is reduced by an acre for each acre planted to wild rice.

Section 727: Language is included to prohibit funds from being used to carry out the Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems.

Section 728: Language is included that funds in this Act shall not be used to carry out any commodity purchase program that would prohibit eligibility or participation by farmer-owned cooperatives.

Section 729: Language is included that prohibits funds from being used to carry out the Conservation Farm Option program.

Section 730: Language is included prohibiting the use of funds to carry out certain activities unless the Secretary of Agriculture inspects and certifies agricultural processing equipment and charges a fees for those activities.

Section 731: Language is included that prohibits funds from being used to prepare a budget submission to Congress that assumes reductions from the previous year's budget due to user fee proposals unless the submission also identifies spending reductions which should occur if the user fees are not enacted.

Section 732: Language is included that prohibits the use of funds to carry out a Community Food Security program or any similar activity without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

Section 733: Language is included that prohibits the use of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act for the National Swine Research Center.

Section 734: Language is included that provides that hereafter no funds shall be used for the Kyoto Protocol, including such Kyoto mechanisms as carbon emissions trading schemes and the Clean Development Mechanism that are found solely in the Kyoto Protocol and nowhere in the laws of the United States.

Section 735: Language is included requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to compensate wheat producers and handlers for losses due to karnal bunt not later than 45 days after the receipt of a valid claim.

Section 736: This provision makes the towns of Lloyd, New York and Harris, New York eligible for rural development loans and grants.

Section 737: This provision increases the fee on single family guaranteed loans from one percent to two percent.

Section 738: This provision conforms the contracting authority for persons overseas employed by the Foreign Agricultural Service to the authority provided to the Department of State.

Section 739: Language is included that extends the dairy price support program and delays the dairy recourse loan program.

Section 740: Language is included that provides $4,000,000 for a hunger fellowship program.

Section 741: This bill includes language that supersedes Section 718 of Public Law 105–277, as amended, and provides that on a permanent basis beginning with fiscal year 2001, funds made available through the annual appropriations process for the market access program, or any program that replaces the market access program, may be used to promote any agricultural commodity as defined in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, as amended, except for products that have been specifically excluded from the market access program by Section 1302, Title I of Public Law 103–66, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

Section 742: Language is included prohibiting the use of funds regarding certain floodplains in Arkansas.

Section 743: Language is included that enhances the ability of the Friends of the National Arboretum to provide additional support for the National Arboretum.

Section 744: Language is included that the Secretary shall include the value of lost production when compensating owners of trees destroyed as part of the Citrus Canker Eradication program in Florida.

Section 745: Language is included that instructs USDA to reinstate fortification requirements and to disclose to federal nutrition program participants meat and poultry products containing greater than 30 percent alternative protein products.

Section 746: This section provides that ratites and squab slaughtered for human consumption be subject to the Poultry Products Inspection Act.

Section 747: Language is included that provides for compensation, out of available funds, to nursery stock producers for losses caused by Hurricane Irene in October 1999.

Section 748: Language is included that any regulation which establishes requirements for producers/packers to conduct Salmonella Enteritidis tests shall defray or reimburse such costs to producers/packers.

Section 749: Language is included that allows the USDA to make loans to poultry farmers who have incurred losses due to disasters.

Section 750: Language is included that extends the time within which to compensate cotton producers in Georgia out of available funds.

Section 751: Language is included that provides emergency funds for market/quality loss payments for apples and potatoes.

Section 752: Language is included prohibiting the use of funds to reimburse crop insurance providers and agents for administrative and operating costs that exceed 20 percent of the premium.

26. *Title VIII—Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement.*—Language is included providing for Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement.

COMPLIANCE WITH CLAUSE 3 OF RULE XIII (RAMSEYER RULE)

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

AGRICULTURE MARKET TRANSITION ACT

* * * * * * *

Subtitle D—Other Commodities

CHAPTER 1—DAIRY

SEC. 141. MILK PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM.

(a) * * *

(b) RATE.—The price of milk shall be supported at the following rates per hundredweight for milk containing 3.67 percent butterfat:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4) During each of calendar years 1999 [and 2000] *through 2001*, $9.90.

* * * * * * *

(h) PERIOD OF EFFECTIVENESS.—This section (other than subsection (g)) shall be effective only during the period beginning on the first day of the first month beginning after the date of enactment of this title and ending on December 31, [2000] *2001*. The program authorized by this section shall terminate on December 31, [2000] *2001*, and shall be considered to have expired notwithstanding section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907).

* * * * * * *

SEC. 142. RECOURSE LOAN PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL PROCESSORS OF DAIRY PRODUCTS.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall be effective beginning January 1, [2001] *2002*.

SECTION 321 OF THE CONSOLIDATED FARM AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

SEC. 321. (a) * * *

(b) HAZARD INSURANCE REQUIREMENT.—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) LOANS TO POULTRY FARMERS.—

(A) INABILITY TO OBTAIN INSURANCE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the Secretary may make a loan to a poultry farmer under this subtitle to cover the loss of a chicken house for which the farmer did not have hazard insurance at the time of the loss, if the farmer—

(I) applied for, but was unable, to obtain hazard insurance for the chicken house;

(II) uses the loan to rebuild the chicken house in accordance with industry standards in effect on the date the farmer submits an application for the loan (referred to in this paragraph as "current industry standards");

(III) obtains, for the term of the loan, hazard insurance for the full market value of the chicken house; and

(IV) meets the other requirements for the loan under this subtitle, other than (if the Secretary finds that the applicant's farming operations have been substantially affected by a major disaster or emergency designated by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)) the requirement that an applicant not be able to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere.

(ii) AMOUNT.—The amount of a loan made to a poultry farmer under clause (i) shall be an amount that will allow the farmer to rebuild the chicken house in accordance with current industry standards.

(B) LOANS TO COMPLY WITH CURRENT INDUSTRY STANDARDS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the Secretary may make a loan to a poultry farmer under this subtitle to cover the loss of a chicken house for which the farmer had hazard insurance at the time of the loss, if—

(I) the amount of the hazard insurance is less than the cost of rebuilding the chicken house in accordance with current industry standards;

(II) the farmer uses the loan to rebuild the chicken house in accordance with current industry standards;

(III) the farmer obtains, for the term of the loan, hazard insurance for the full market value of the chicken house; and

(IV) the farmer meets the other requirements for the loan under this subtitle, other than (if the Secretary finds that the applicant's farming operations have been substantially affected by a major disaster or emergency designated by the President

under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)) the requirement that an applicant not be able to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere.

(ii) AMOUNT.—The amount of a loan made to a poultry farmer under clause (i) shall be the difference between—

(I) the amount of the hazard insurance obtained by the farmer; and

(II) the cost of rebuilding the chicken house in accordance with current industry standards.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 1121 OF THE ACT OF OCTOBER 21, 1998

AN ACT Making omnibus consolidated and emergency appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

SEC. 1121. INDEMNITY PAYMENTS FOR COTTON PRODUCERS.

(a) * * *

(b) CONDITIONS ON PAYMENT TO STATE.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall make the payment to the State of Georgia under subsection (a) only if the State also contributes $5,000,000 to the indemnity fund and agrees to expend all amounts in the indemnity fund by [not later than January 1, 2000] *not later than January 1, 2001*, to provide compensation to cotton producers as provided in such subsection. If the State of Georgia fails to make its contribution of $5,000,000 to the indemnity fund by July 1, 1999, the funds that would otherwise be paid to the State shall be available to the Secretary for the purpose of providing partial compensation to cotton producers as provided in such subsection.

* * * * * * *

(d) ADDITIONAL DISBURSEMENT.—

(1) COTTON STORED IN GEORGIA.—The State of Georgia shall use funds remaining in the indemnity fund established in accordance with this section to compensate cotton producers in other States who stored cotton in the State of Georgia and incurred losses in 1998 or 1999 as a result of the events described in subsection (a).

(2) GINNERS AND OTHERS.—The State of Georgia may also use funds remaining in the indemnity fund established in accordance with this section to compensate cotton ginners and others in the business of producing, ginning, warehousing, buying, or selling cotton for losses they incurred in 1998 or 1999 as the result of the events described in subsection (a), if—

(A) as of March 1, 2000, the indemnity fund has not been exhausted;

(B) the State of Georgia provides cotton producers (including cotton producers described in paragraph (1)) an additional time period prior to May 1, 2000, in which to establish eligibility for compensation under this section;

(C) the State of Georgia determines during calendar year 2000 that all cotton producers in that State and cotton pro-

ducers in other States as described in paragraph (1) have been appropriately compensated for losses incurred in 1998 or 1999 as described in subsection (a); and

(D) such additional compensation is not made available until May 1, 2000.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table lists the appropriations in the accompanying bill which are not authorized by law:

State Mediation Grants
Dairy Indemnity Program
Elderly Feeding Program
Emerson-Leland Hunger Fellowships

RESCISSIONS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following information is submitted describing the rescissions recommended in the accompanying bill:

The bill proposes rescission of $3,911,000 of funds derived from interest on the cushion of credit payments in fiscal year 2001 under the Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account, which is an annual technical adjustment contained in the budget estimates.

The bill proposes rescission of $27,000,000 appropriated for "Food and Drug Administration Salaries and Expenses" for fiscal year 2000 in Public Law 106–78. These funds are no longer required due to the March 21, 2000 Supreme Court decision that FDA lacks jurisdiction to regulate tobacco products.

COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

Clause 3(c)(2) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires an explanation of compliance with section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, which requires that the report accompanying a bill providing new budget authority contain a statement detailing how that authority compares with the reports submitted under section 302 of the Act for the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year from the Committee's section 302(a) allocation. This information follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Full committee data	302(b) allocation		This bill	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Comparison with Budget Resolution:				
Discretionary	$14,376	$14,861	$14,491	$14,867
Mandatory	48,128	31,061	60,884	31,061
Total	62,504	45,922	75,375	45,928

NOTE.—The amounts in this bill are technically in excess of the subcommittee section 302(b) suballocation. However, pursuant to section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended,

increases to the Committee's section 302(a) allocation are authorized for funding designated as emergency requirements. After the bill is reported to the House, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget will provide an increased section 302(a) allocation consistent with the funding provided in the bill. That new allocation will eliminate the technical difference prior to floor consideration.

FIVE-YEAR OUTLAY PROJECTIONS

In compliance with section 308(a)(1)(B) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the following table contains five-year projections associated with the budget authority provided in the accompanying bill:

[Five year projections, in millions of dollars]

Budget Authority	75,375
Outlays:	
2001	39,628
2002	4,786
2003	548
2004	320
2005 and beyond	507

The bill provides no new revenues or tax expenditures, and will have no effect on budget authority, budget outlays, spending authority, revenues, tax expenditures, direct loan obligations, or primary loan guarantee commitments available under existing law for fiscal year 2001 and beyond.

ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the financial assistance to state and local governments is as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

New budget authority	18,810
Fiscal year 2001 outlays resulting therefrom	15,461

PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

During fiscal year 2001, for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), the following information provides the definition of the term "program, project, and activity" for departments and agencies under the jurisdiction of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Subcommittee. The term "program, project, and activity" shall include the most specific level of budget items identified in the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2001, the House and Senate Committee reports, and the conference report and accompanying joint explanatory statement of the managers of the committee of conference.

If a Sequestration Order is necessary, in implementing the required Presidential Order, departments and agencies shall apply any percentage reduction for fiscal year 2001 pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 99–177 to all items specified in the explanatory

notes submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate in support of the fiscal year 2001 budget estimates, as amended, for such departments and agencies, as modified by congressional action, and in addition:

For the Agricultural Research Service the definition shall include specific research locations as identified in the explanatory notes and lines of research specifically identified in the reports of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

For the Natural Resources Conservation Service the definition shall include individual flood prevention projects as identified in the explanatory notes and individual operational watershed projects as summarized in the notes.

For the Farm Service Agency the definition shall include individual state, district, and county offices.

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the results of each rollcall vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLLCALL NO. 1

Date: May 10, 2000.

Measure: Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mr. Obey.

Description of motion: To provide an additional $13.7 million in emergency appropriations for investigation and follow-up legal actions related to market concentrations and anti-competitive behavior in agriculture.

Results: Rejected 21 yeas to 28 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Cramer	Mr. Bonilla
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Callahan
Mr. Dicks	Mr. DeLay
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Dickey
Mr. Farr	Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Goode
Ms. Kaptur	Ms. Granger
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Hobson
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Obey	Mr. Kolbe
Mr. Olver	Mr. Latham
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Lewis
Ms. Pelosi	Mr. Nethercutt
Mr. Price	Mr. Packard
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Peterson
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Porter
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Regula

Mr. Visclosky

Mr. Rogers
Mr. Skeen
Mr. Sununu
Mr. Tiahrt
Mr. Walsh
Mr. Wamp
Mr. Wolf
Mr. Young

ROLLCALL NO. 2

Date: May 10, 2000.

Measure: Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mr. Delay.

Description of motion: To strike title VIII of the bill that would implement a process to lift agricultural or medical sanctions against any foreign country unless the President justifies any proposed sanction and the imposition of any proposed sanction is approved in law. Title VIII also includes exceptions for imposing sanctions.

Results: Rejected 24 yeas to 35 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Bonilla	Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Boyd
Mr. DeLay	Mr. Callahan
Mr. Forbes	Mr. Cramer
Mr. Frelinghuysen	Ms. DeLauro
Ms. Granger	Mr. Dickey
Mr. Hobson	Mr. Dicks
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Dixon
Mr. Kingston	Mr. Edwards
Mr. Lewis	Mrs. Emerson
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Farr
Mr. Miller	Mr. Goode
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Hinchey
Mr. Murtha	Mr. Istook
Mrs. Northup	Mr. Jackson
Mr. Packard	Ms. Kaptur
Mr. Porter	Ms. Kilpatrick
Mr. Regula	Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Rogers	Mr. Kolbe
Mr. Skeen	Mr. Latham
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Nethercutt
Mr. Wicker	Mr. Obey
Mr. Wolf	Mr. Olver

Mr. Young

Mr. Pastor
Ms. Pelosi
Mr. Peterson
Mr. Price
Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Sabo
Mr. Serrano
Mr. Sununu
Mr. Tiahrt
Mr. Visclosky
Mr. Walsh
Mr. Wamp

ROLLCALL NO. 3

Date: May 10, 2000.

Measure: Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Ms. Kaptur.

Description of motion: To provide $53,100,000 of emergency appropriations to prevent, control, and eradicate pests and plant and animal diseases.

Results: Rejected 22 yeas to 28 nays.

Members Voting Yea

Mr. Boyd
Mr. Cramer
Ms. DeLauro
Mr. Dicks
Mr. Edwards
Mr. Farr
Mr. Forbes
Mr. Hinchey
Mr. Hoyer
Ms. Kaptur
Ms. Kilpatrick
Mrs. Lowey
Mr. Mollohan
Mr. Obey
Mr. Olver
Mr. Pastor
Ms. Pelosi
Mr. Price
Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Sabo
Mr. Serrano
Mr. Visclosky

Members Voting Nay

Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Bonilla
Mr. Callahan
Mr. DeLay
Mr. Dickey
Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Goode
Ms. Granger
Mr. Hobson
Mr. Kingston
Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Kolbe
Mr. Latham
Mr. Miller
Mrs. Northup
Mr. Packard
Mr. Porter
Mr. Regula
Mr. Rogers
Mr. Skeen
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Tiahrt
Mr. Walsh
Mr. Wamp
Mr. Wicker
Mr. Wolf
Mr. Young

ROLLCALL NO. 4

Date: May 10, 2000.

Measure: Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mr. Hinchey.

Description of motion: To provide $115,000,000 in emergency appropriations for apple market loss assistance and for quality loss payments for apples and potatoes.

Results: Adopted 26 yeas to 22 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Cramer	Mr. Bonilla
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Callahan
Mr. Dickey	Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mrs. Emerson	Mr. Goode
Mr. Farr	Mr. Hobson
Mr. Forbes	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Kolbe
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Latham
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Miller
Mrs. Lowey	Mrs. Northup
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Packard
Mr. Nethercutt	Mr. Rogers
Mr. Obey	Mr. Skeen
Mr. Olver	Mr. Sununu
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Tiahrt
Mr. Peterson	Mr. Wamp
Mr. Price	Mr. Wicker
Mr. Regula	Mr. Wolf
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Young
Mr. Sabo	
Mr. Serrano	
Mr. Visclosky	
Mr. Walsh	

ROLLCALL NO. 5

Date: May 10, 2000.

Measure: Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mr. Edwards.

Description of motion: To provide $284 million in emergency appropriations for crop loss assistance authorized by section 801 of Public Law 106–78.

Results: Rejected 18 yeas to 27 nays.

Members Voting Yes	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Cramer	Mr. Bonilla
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Callahan
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Forbes	Mr. Dickey

Mr. Hinchey
Mr. Hoyer
Mr. Jackson
Ms. Kaptur
Mrs. Lowey
Mr. Mollohan
Mr. Obey
Mr. Olver
Mr. Pastor
Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Sabo
Mr. Serrano
Mr. Visclosky

Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Frelinghuysen
Ms. Granger
Mr. Hobson
Mr. Kingston
Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Kolbe
Mr. Lewis
Mr. Miller
Mr. Nethercutt
Mr. Packard
Mr. Peterson
Mr. Porter
Mr. Rogers
Mr. Skeen
Mr. Sununu
Mr. Tiahrt
Mr. Walsh
Mr. Wamp
Mr. Wicker
Mr. Wolf
Mr. Young

ROLLCALL NO. 6

Date: May 10, 2000.

Measure: Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Ms. Kaptur.

Description of motion: To provide $80 million in emergency appropriations for equity capital and grants to establish farmer-owned cooperatives for the processing and marketing of agricultural commodities (including livestock).

Results: Rejected 19 yeas to 26 nays.

Members Voting Yea

Mr. Boyd
Mr. Cramer
Mr. Dixon
Mr. Edwards
Mr. Farr
Mr. Forbes
Mr. Hinchey
Mr. Hoyer
Mr. Jackson
Ms. Kaptur
Mrs. Lowey
Mr. Mollohan
Mr. Moran
Mr. Obey
Mr. Olver
Mr. Pastor
Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Sabo

Members Voting Nay

Mr. Aderholt
Bonilla
Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Dickey
Mr. Emerson
Mr. Frelinghuysen
Ms. Granger
Mr. Hobson
Mr. Kingston
Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Kolbe
Mr. Latham
Mr. Lewis
Mr. Miller
Mr. Nethercutt
Mr. Packard
Mr. Porter
Mr. Rogers

Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Skeen
	Mr. Sununu
	Mr. Tiahrt
	Mr. Walsh
	Mr. Wamp
	Mr. Wicker
	Mr. Wolf
	Mr. Young

ROLLCALL NO. 7

Date: May 10, 2000.

Measure: Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mr. Hinchey.

Description of motion: to increase appropriations for Community facility grants by $10,000,000, Rural business enterprise grants by $10,000,000, Rural business opportunity grants by $2,000,000, Water and waste disposal grants by $34,000, and Solid waste management grants by $1,000,000, and reduce the commission on crop insurance policies from 24.5 percent of the premium to 20.0 percent.

Results: Adopted 25 yeas to 23 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Bonilla
Mr. Cramer	Mr. Callahan
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Ms. DeLauro	Ms. Granger
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Hobson
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Istook
Mrs. Emerson	Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Farr	Mr. Kolbe
Mr. Forbes	Mr. Latham
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Miller
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Nethercutt
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Packard
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Porter
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Rogers
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Skeen
Mr. Moran	Mr. Sununu
Mr. Obey	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Olver	Mr. Tiahrt
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Wamp
Mr. Price	Mr. Wicker
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Wolf
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Young
Mr. Serrano	
Mr. Visclosky	

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(a)(1)(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an

amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLLCALL NO. 8

Date: May 10, 2000.

Measure: Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Ms. DeLauro.

Description of motion: To provide $14,400,000 in emergency appropriations for services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, and the Egg Products Inspection Act.

Results: Rejected 20 yeas to 24 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Bonilla
Mr. Cramer	Mr. Callahan
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Dickey
Mr. Dixon	Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Farr	Mr. Goode
Mr. Forbes	Mr. Hobson
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Knollenberg
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Kolbe
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Latham
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Miller
Mr. Obey	Mr. Nethercutt
Mr. Olver	Mr. Porter
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Rogers
Mr. Price	Mr. Skeen
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Sununu
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Walsh
	Mr. Wamp
	Mr. Wicker
	Mr. Wolf
	Mr. Young

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary	15,435	2,914	2,836	-12,599	-78
Executive Operations:					
Chief Economist	6,408	8,612	6,408	.....	-2,204
National Appeals Division	11,707	12,610	11,718	+11	-892
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	6,581	6,765	6,581	.....	-184
Office of the Chief Information Officer	6,046	14,680	10,051	+4,005	-4,629
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	4,783	6,465	4,783	.....	-1,682
Common computing environment	.....	75,000	25,000	+25,000	-50,000
Total, Executive Operations	35,525	124,132	64,541	+29,016	-59,591
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	613	629	613	.....	-16
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments	140,343	182,747	150,343	+10,000	-32,404
Payments to GSA	(115,542)	(125,542)	(125,542)	(+10,000)	.....
Building operations and maintenance	(24,801)	(31,205)	(24,801)	.....	(-6,404)
Repairs, renovations, and construction	.....	(26,000)	.....	.....	(-26,000)
Hazardous materials management	15,700	30,073	15,700	.....	-14,373
Departmental administration	34,708	40,740	34,708	.....	-6,032
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers	3,000	10,000	3,000	.....	-7,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	3,568	3,778	3,568	.....	-210
Office of Communications	8,138	9,031	8,138	.....	-893
Office of the Inspector General	65,097	70,214	65,097	.....	-5,117

Office of the General Counsel	29,194	32,881	29,194	.....	-3,687
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics.	540	1,356	540	.....	-816
Economic Research Service	65,363	55,424	66,419	+1,056	+10,995
National Agricultural Statistics Service	99,333	100,615	100,851	+1,518	+236
Census of Agriculture	(16,490)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(-1,490)	.....
Agricultural Research Service	830,384	894,258	850,384	+20,000	-43,874
Buildings and facilities	52,500	39,300	39,300	-13,200	.....
Total, Agricultural Research Service	882,884	933,558	889,684	+6,800	-43,874
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:					
Research and education activities	481,881	460,865	477,551	-4,330	+16,686
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund	(4,600)	(7,100)	(7,100)	(+2,500)	.....
Extension activities	424,174	428,236	428,740	+4,566	+504
Integrated activities	39,541	76,194	39,541	.....	-36,653
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service	945,596	965,295	945,832	+236	-19,463
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs.	618	635	618	.....	-17
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses	437,768	512,444	470,000	+32,232	-42,444
AQI user fees	(87,000)	(87,000)	(87,000)	.....	.....
Buildings and facilities	5,200	5,200	5,200	.....	.....
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	442,968	517,644	475,200	+32,232	-42,444

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services	51,497	66,572	56,326	+4,829	-10,246
Standardization user fees	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	.....	.....
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(60,730)	(60,730)	(60,730)	.....	.....
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32)	12,428	13,438	13,438	+1,010	.....
Payments to states and possessions	1,200	1,500	1,500	+300	.....
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	65,125	81,510	71,264	+6,139	-10,246
Grain Inspection, Packers & Stockyards Administration:					
Salaries and expenses	26,433	33,549	27,801	+1,368	-5,748
Limitation on inspection and weighing services	(42,557)	(42,557)	(42,557)	.....	.....
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety	446	560	446	.....	-114
Food Safety and Inspection Service	649,119	688,204	673,790	+24,671	-14,414
Lab accreditation fees 1/	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	.....	.....
Total, Food Safety and Inspection Service	649,119	688,204	673,790	+24,671	-14,414
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing	3,529,746	3,885,489	3,630,183	+100,437	-255,306
Farm Assistance Programs					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services	572	589	572	.....	-17

Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses	794,394	828,385	828,385	+33,991	.....
(Transfer from export loans)	(589)	(589)	(589)	.....	.....
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(815)	(815)	(815)	.....	.....
(Transfer from ACIF)	(209,861)	(265,315)	(265,315)	(+55,454)	.....
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts	(211,265)	(266,719)	(266,719)	(+55,454)	.....
Total, salaries and expenses	(1,005,659)	(1,095,104)	(1,095,104)	(+89,445)	.....
State mediation grants	3,000	4,000	3,000	.....	-1,000
Dairy indemnity program	450	450	450	.....	.....
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency	797,844	832,835	831,835	+33,991	-1,000
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	(128,049)	(128,000)	(128,000)	(-49)	.....
Guaranteed	(431,373)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(+568,627)	.....
Subtotal	(559,422)	(1,128,000)	(1,128,000)	(+568,578)	.....
Farm operating loans:					
Direct	(500,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(+200,000)	.....
Guaranteed unsubsidized	(1,697,842)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(+302,158)	.....
Guaranteed subsidized	(200,000)	(477,868)	(477,868)	(+277,868)	.....
Subtotal	(2,397,842)	(3,177,868)	(3,177,868)	(+780,026)	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Indian tribe land acquisition loans	(1,028)	(2,006)	(2,006)	(+978)	.....
Emergency disaster loans	(25,000)	(150,064)	(150,064)	(+125,064)	.....
Boll weevil eradication loans	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	.....	.....
Total, Loan authorizations	(3,083,292)	(4,557,938)	(4,557,938)	(+1,474,646)	.....
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	4,827	13,786	13,786	+8,959	.....
Guaranteed	2,416	5,100	5,100	+2,684	.....
Subtotal	7,243	18,886	18,886	+11,643	.....
Farm operating loans:					
Direct	29,300	63,140	63,140	+33,840	.....
Guaranteed unsubsidized	23,940	27,400	27,400	+3,460	.....
Guaranteed subsidized	17,620	38,994	38,994	+21,374	.....
Subtotal	70,860	129,534	129,534	+58,674	.....
Indian tribe land acquisition	21	323	323	+302	.....
Emergency disaster loans	3,882	36,811	36,811	+32,929	.....
Total, Loan subsidies	82,006	185,554	185,554	+103,548	.....

ACIF expenses:					
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)	209,861	265,315	265,315	+55,454	.....
Administrative expenses	4,300	4,139	4,139	-161	.....
Total, ACIF expenses	214,161	269,454	269,454	+55,293	.....
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	296,167	455,008	455,008	+158,841	.....
(Loan authorization)	(3,083,292)	(4,557,938)	(4,557,938)	(+1,474,646)	.....
Total, Farm Service Agency	1,094,011	1,287,843	1,286,843	+192,832	-1,000
Risk Management Agency	63,983	67,700	67,700	+3,717	.....
Total, Farm Assistance Programs	1,158,566	1,356,132	1,355,115	+196,549	-1,017
Corporations					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund	710,857	1,727,671	1,727,671	+1,016,814	.....
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses	30,037,136	27,771,007	27,771,007	-2,266,129	.....
Operations and maintenance for hazardous waste management (limitation on administrative expenses)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	.....	.....
Total, Corporations	30,747,993	29,498,678	29,498,678	-1,249,315	.....
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs	35,436,305	34,740,299	34,483,976	-952,329	-256,323
(By transfer)	(211,265)	(266,719)	(266,719)	(+55,454)	.....
(Loan authorization)	(3,083,292)	(4,557,938)	(4,557,938)	(+1,474,646)	.....
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(108,287)	(108,287)	(108,287)	.....	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment.	693	711	693	.....	-18
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations	660,812	747,243	676,812	+16,000	-70,431
Watershed surveys and planning	10,368	10,368	10,868	+500	+500
Watershed and flood prevention operations	91,643	83,423	83,423	-8,220	.....
Resource conservation and development	35,265	36,265	41,015	+5,750	+4,750
Forestry incentives program	5,377	.....	.....	-5,377	.....
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service	803,465	877,299	812,118	+8,653	-65,181
Total, title II, Conservation Programs	804,158	878,010	812,811	+8,653	-65,199
TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development	588	605	588	.....	-17
Rural Development:					
Rural community advancement program	693,637	762,542	775,837	+82,200	+13,295
RD expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	.....	130,371	120,270	+120,270	-10,101
(Transfer from RHIF)	.....	(409,233)	(375,879)	(+375,879)	(-33,354)
(Transfer from RDLFP)	.....	(3,640)	(3,337)	(+3,337)	(-303)
(Transfer from RETLP)	.....	(34,716)	(31,046)	(+31,046)	(-3,670)

(Transfer from RTP)	.....	(3,000)	(3,000)	(+3,000)	.....
Total, RD expenses	.....	(580,960)	(533,532)	(+533,532)	(-47,428)
Total, Rural Development	693,637	892,913	896,107	+202,470	+3,194
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family (sec. 502)	(1,100,000)	(1,300,000)	(1,100,000)	.....	(-200,000)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(3,200,000)	(3,700,000)	(3,700,000)	(+500,000)	.....
Housing repair (sec. 504)	(32,396)	(40,000)	(32,396)	.....	(-7,604)
Farm labor (sec. 514)	(25,001)	.....	.....	(-25,001)	.....
Rental housing (sec. 515)	(114,321)	(120,000)	(114,321)	.....	(-5,679)
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	(100,000)	(200,000)	(100,000)	.....	(-100,000)
Site loans (sec. 524)	(5,152)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(-152)	.....
Multi-family housing credit sales	(1,250)	(5,000)	(1,780)	(+530)	(-3,220)
Single family housing credit sales	(6,253)	(10,000)	(15,000)	(+8,747)	(+5,000)
Self-help housing land development fund	(5,000)	(5,009)	(5,000)	.....	(-9)
Total, Loan authorizations	(4,589,373)	(5,385,009)	(5,073,497)	(+484,124)	(-311,512)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family (sec. 502)	93,830	208,780	176,760	+82,930	-32,020
Unsubsidized guaranteed	19,520	44,400	7,400	-12,120	-37,000
Housing repair (sec. 504)	9,900	14,176	11,481	+1,581	-2,695
Farm labor (sec. 514)	11,308	.....	.....	-11,308	.....
Rental housing (sec. 515)	45,363	59,124	56,326	+10,963	-2,798
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	480	3,040	1,520	+1,040	-1,520
Site loans (sec. 524)	4	.....	.....	-4	.....
Multi-family housing credit sales	494	2,452	874	+380	-1,578

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Single family housing credit sales	380	.....	.....	-380	.....
Self-help housing land development fund	281	279	279	-2	.....
Total, Loan subsidies	181,560	332,251	254,640	+73,080	-77,611
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RHS)	375,879	.....	.....	-375,879	.....
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	.....	409,233	375,879	+375,879	-33,354
Rental assistance program:					
(Sec. 521)	634,100	674,100	650,000	+15,900	-24,100
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D))	5,900	5,900	5,900	.....	.....
Total, Rental assistance program	640,000	680,000	655,900	+15,900	-24,100
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund	1,197,439	1,421,484	1,286,419	+88,980	-135,065
(Loan authorization)	(4,589,373)	(5,385,009)	(5,073,497)	(+484,124)	(-311,512)
Mutual and self-help housing grants	28,000	40,000	28,000	.....	-12,000
Rural housing assistance grants	45,000	39,000	39,000	-6,000	.....
Farm labor program account	.....	35,777	30,000	+30,000	-5,777
Subtotal, grants and payments	73,000	114,777	97,000	+24,000	-17,777

RHS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	61,551	.....	.....	-61,551	.....
(Transfer from RHIF)	(375,879)	.....	.....	(-375,879)	.....
Total, RHS expenses	(437,430)	.....	.....	(-437,430)	.....
Total, Rural Housing Service	1,331,990	1,536,261	1,383,419	+51,429	-152,842
(Loan authorization)	(4,589,373)	(5,385,009)	(5,073,497)	(+484,124)	(-311,512)
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:					
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(38,256)	(64,495)	(38,256)	.....	(-26,239)
Loan subsidy	16,615	32,834	19,476	+2,861	-13,358
Administrative expenses (transfer to RBCS)	3,337	.....	.....	-3,337	.....
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	.....	3,640	3,337	+3,337	-303
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund	19,952	36,474	22,813	+2,861	-13,661
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	.....	.....
Direct subsidy	3,453	3,911	3,911	+458	.....
Rural cooperative development grants	6,000	11,500	6,500	+500	-5,000
National sheep industry improvement center revolving fund	.....	5,000	5,000	+5,000	.....
RBCS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	24,612	.....	.....	-24,612	.....
(Transfer from RDLFP)	(3,337)	.....	.....	(-3,337)	.....
Total, RBCS expenses	(27,949)	.....	.....	(-27,949)	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service	54,017	56,885	38,224	-15,793	-18,661
(By transfer)	(3,337)	.....	.....	(-3,337)	.....
(Loan authorization)	(53,256)	(79,495)	(53,256)	.....	(-26,239)
Rural Utilities Service:					
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5%	(121,500)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(-71,500)	.....
Direct, Municipal rate	(295,000)	(300,000)	(295,000)	.....	(-5,000)
Direct, FFB	(1,700,000)	(800,000)	(800,000)	(-900,000)	.....
Guaranteed	.....	(400,000)	(400,000)	(+400,000)	.....
Subtotal	(2,116,500)	(1,550,000)	(1,545,000)	(-571,500)	(-5,000)
Telecommunications:					
Direct, 5%	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	.....	.....
Direct, Treasury rate	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	.....	.....
Direct, FFB	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)	.....	.....
Subtotal	(495,000)	(495,000)	(495,000)	.....	.....
Total, Loan authorizations	(2,611,500)	(2,045,000)	(2,040,000)	(-571,500)	(-5,000)

Loan subsidies:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5%	1,095	4,980	4,980	+3,885	.....
Direct, Municipal rate	10,827	20,850	20,480	+9,653	-370
Direct, FFB	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Guaranteed	.....	40	40	+40	.....
Subtotal	11,922	25,870	25,500	+13,578	-370
Telecommunications:					
Direct, 5%	840	7,770	7,770	+6,930	.....
Direct, Treasury rate	2,370	.....	.....	-2,370	.....
Direct, FFB	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal	3,210	7,770	7,770	+4,560	.....
Total, Loan subsidies	15,132	33,640	33,270	+18,138	-370
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RUS)	31,046	.....	.....	-31,046	.....
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	.....	34,716	31,046	+31,046	-3,670
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account	46,178	68,356	64,316	+18,138	-4,040
(Loan authorization)	(2,611,500)	(2,045,000)	(2,040,000)	(-571,500)	(-5,000)
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(175,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)	.....	.....
Direct loan subsidy	3,290	2,590	2,590	-700	.....
RTP administrative expenses (transfer to RUS)	3,000	.....	.....	-3,000	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RTP administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	.....	3,000	3,000	+3,000	.....
Total	6,290	5,590	5,590	-700	.....
Distance learning and telemedicine program:					
(Loan authorization)	(200,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)	(+200,000)	.....
Direct loan subsidy	700	.....	.....	-700	.....
Grants	20,000	27,000	19,500	-500	-7,500
Total	20,700	27,000	19,500	-1,200	-7,500
RUS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	34,107	.....	.....	-34,107	.....
(Transfer from RETLP)	(31,046)	.....	.....	(-31,046)	.....
(Transfer from RTP)	(3,000)	.....	.....	(-3,000)	.....
Total, RUS expenses	(68,153)	.....	.....	(-68,153)	.....
Total, Rural Utilities Service	107,275	100,946	89,406	-17,869	-11,540
(By transfer)	(34,046)	.....	.....	(-34,046)	.....
(Loan authorization)	(2,986,500)	(2,620,000)	(2,615,000)	(-371,500)	(-5,000)
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs	2,187,507	2,587,610	2,407,744	+220,237	-179,866
(By transfer)	(413,262)	(450,589)	(413,262)	.....	(-37,327)
(Loan authorization)	(7,629,129)	(8,084,504)	(7,741,753)	(+112,624)	(-342,751)

TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services	554	570	554	.....	-16
Food and Nutrition Service:					
Child nutrition programs	4,611,829	4,570,482	4,407,460	-204,369	-163,022
Transfer from section 32	4,935,199	4,967,574	5,127,579	+192,380	+160,005
Discretionary spending	7,000	8,000	.....	-7,000	-8,000
Total, Child nutrition programs	9,554,028	9,546,056	9,535,039	-18,989	-11,017
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	4,032,000	4,148,100	4,067,000	+35,000	-81,100
Food stamp program:					
Expenses	19,605,751	19,730,993	19,730,993	+125,242	.....
Reserve	100,000	1,000,000	100,000	.....	-900,000
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico	1,268,000	1,301,000	1,301,000	+33,000	.....
The emergency food assistance program	98,000	100,000	100,000	+2,000	.....
Total, Food stamp program	21,071,751	22,131,993	21,231,993	+160,242	-900,000
Commodity assistance program	133,300	158,300	138,300	+5,000	-20,000
Food donations programs:					
Needy family program	1,081	1,081	1,081	.....	.....
Elderly feeding program	140,000	150,000	140,000	.....	-10,000
Total, Food donations programs	141,081	151,081	141,081	.....	-10,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Food program administration	111,392	128,558	116,392	+5,000	-12,166
Total, Food and Nutrition Service	35,043,552	36,264,088	35,229,805	+186,253	-1,034,283
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs	35,044,106	36,264,658	35,230,359	+186,253	-1,034,299
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service and General Sales Manager:					
Direct appropriation	109,186	113,587	109,186	.....	-4,401
(Transfer from export loans)	(3,231)	(3,231)	(3,231)	.....	.....
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(1,035)	(1,035)	(1,035)	.....	.....
Total, Program level	(113,452)	(117,853)	(113,452)	.....	(-4,401)
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:					
Title I - Credit sales:					
Program level	(176,000)	(180,000)	(180,000)	(+4,000)	.....
Direct loans	(145,298)	(159,678)	(159,678)	(+14,380)	.....
Ocean freight differential	21,000	20,322	20,322	-678	.....
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:					
Program level	(800,000)	(837,000)	(800,000)	.....	(-37,000)
Appropriation	800,000	837,000	800,000	.....	-37,000
Loan subsidies	119,813	114,186	114,186	-5,627	.....

Salaries and expenses:					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS)	1,035	1,035	1,035	.....	.....
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	815	815	815	.....	.....
Subtotal	1,850	1,850	1,850	.....	.....
Total, Public Law 480:					
Program level	(976,000)	(1,017,000)	(980,000)	(+4,000)	(-37,000)
Appropriation	942,663	973,358	936,358	-6,305	-37,000
CCC Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):					
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS)	3,231	3,231	3,231	.....	.....
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	589	589	589	.....	.....
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account	3,820	3,820	3,820	.....	.....
Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs	1,055,669	1,090,765	1,049,364	-6,305	-41,401
(By transfer)	(4,266)	(4,266)	(4,266)	.....	.....
TITLE VI - FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	1,037,661	1,156,905	1,117,905	+80,244	-39,000
Prescription drug user fee act	(145,434)	(149,273)	(149,273)	(+3,839)	.....
Subtotal	(1,183,095)	(1,306,178)	(1,267,178)	(+84,083)	(-39,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rescission	.....	.....	-27,000	-27,000	-27,000
Total, Salaries and expenses (net)	(1,183,095)	(1,306,178)	(1,240,178)	(+57,083)	(-66,000)
Export and certification	(4,907)	(5,992)	(5,992)	(+1,085)	.....
Limitation on payments to GSA	(99,954)	(104,954)	(104,954)	(+5,000)	.....
Buildings and facilities	11,350	31,350	11,350	.....	-20,000
Advance appropriations, FY 2002	.....	23,000	.....	.....	-23,000
Total, Food and Drug Administration	1,049,011	1,211,255	1,102,255	+53,244	-109,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	63,000	72,000	69,000	+6,000	-3,000
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(35,800)	.....	(36,800)	(+1,000)	(+36,800)
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration	1,112,011	1,283,255	1,171,255	+59,244	-112,000
TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Hunger fellowships	2,000	.....	4,000	+2,000	+4,000
Loss assistance for apples and potatoes (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	115,000	+115,000	+115,000
Sec. 388 Fair Act - NH	250	.....	.....	-250	.....
Total, title VII, General provisions	2,250	.....	119,000	+116,750	+119,000

TITLE VIII					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Commodity Credit Corporation					
Crop loss (contingent emergency appropriations)	1,200,000	.....	.....	-1,200,000	.....
Market loss (contingent emergency appropriations)	5,520,351	.....	.....	-5,520,351	.....
Specialty Crops:					
Peanuts (contingent emergency appropriations)	42,000	.....	.....	-42,000	.....
Suspend sugar assessments (contingent emergency appropriations)	42,000	.....	.....	-42,000	.....
Tobacco (contingent emergency appropriations)	326,601	.....	.....	-326,601	.....
Subtotal, Specialty crops	410,601	.....	.....	-410,601	.....
Oilseeds (contingent emergency appropriations)	467,974	.....	.....	-467,974	.....
Livestock and dairy (contingent emergency appropriations)	320,614	.....	.....	-320,614	.....
Upland cotton competitiveness (contingent emergency appropriations)	201,000	.....	.....	-201,000	.....
Extend milk price supports (contingent emergency appropriations)	-102,000	.....	.....	+102,000	.....
Crop insurance (contingent emergency appropriations)	400,000	.....	.....	-400,000	.....
Crop insurance discount associated costs (contingent emergency appropriations)	250,000	.....	.....	-250,000	.....
Water and waste loan forgiveness (contingent emergency appropriations)	2,000	.....	.....	-2,000	.....
Trade sanctions reform and export enhancement	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, title VIII	8,670,540	.....	.....	-8,670,540	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	84,312,546	76,844,597	75,274,509	-9,038,037	-1,570,088
Appropriations	(75,642,006)	(76,821,597)	(75,186,509)	(-455,497)	(-1,635,088)
Rescission	.....	.....	(-27,000)	(-27,000)	(-27,000)
Contingent emergency appropriations	(8,670,540)	.....	(115,000)	(-8,555,540)	(+115,000)
Advance appropriations	.....	(23,000)	.....	.....	(-23,000)
(By transfer)	(628,793)	(721,574)	(684,247)	(+55,454)	(-37,327)
(Loan authorization)	(10,712,421)	(12,642,442)	(12,299,691)	(+1,587,270)	(-342,751)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(144,087)	(108,287)	(145,087)	(+1,000)	(+36,800)

1/ In addition to appropriation.

NOTE: FY 2000 Enacted budget authority includes the impact of 0.38 percent reduction pursuant to P.L. 106-113.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. DAVID R. OBEY AND HON. MARCY KAPTUR

Regrettably, this bill falls short of meeting basic needs in the programs it covers. In addition, it contains some very harmful legislative riders—most notably involving restrictions on discussions and research in the area of global climate change and on programs to ensure that the eggs we eat are free from harmful bacteria. During committee consideration, Democrats offered several amendments to try to make up some of the most important shortfalls. Unfortunately, most of these amendments were defeated.

The bill also does very little to address the crises of low prices, low incomes, and economic decline that is plaguing much of rural America. Because these problems tend to involve fundamental issues of federal farm policy, in many ways the Agriculture Committee is a better forum than the Appropriations Committee for debating the causes and fashioning basic solutions. There are indications that the Agriculture Committee may be prepared to consider a farm assistance package this year—something which it did not do in 1998 or 1999. We would welcome that development and look forward to the ensuing debate. However, to the extent that the task of fashioning emergency assistance for farmers and ranchers once again falls to the Appropriations Committee, we will do our utmost to try to ensure that the assistance is distributed fairly and broadly and goes to where it is most needed.

While emergency aid may seem to have dominated the work of the Agriculture Appropriations subcommittee in the past two years, we must not lose sight of the important and wide-ranging programs covered by the regular appropriations in this bill. In addition to activities that directly help farmers and ranchers, the bill also funds most federal food safety efforts, regulation of the safety and effectiveness of drugs and medical devices by the FDA, nutrition programs for children and the elderly, housing, water and sewer and economic development programs available throughout rural and small town America (both on and off farms), and conservation programs of vital importance to protecting water quality and preventing erosion and other environmental damage.

In short, this bill is important not just to people who live and work on farms, but to everyone who has an interest in safe food, clean water, protection from dangerous and ineffective drugs, meeting the nutritional needs of vulnerable low-income children and senior citizens, and preventing the spread of agricultural pests and diseases that can threaten urban trees and gardens as well as farmers' crops.

As we will describe below, the FY 2001 Agriculture Appropriations bill reported by the committee falls short of meeting many of these needs. In saying so, we mean no criticism of Chairman Skeen and the others involved in developing this bill. They did the best

they could with the hand that was dealt them. Rather, the fundamental problem is that the congressional budget resolution—which reflects and implements the budgetary policies and priorities of the majority party in Congress—has allowed insufficient resources for this bill and for the other appropriations measures that meet major domestic needs.

Overall, the budget allocation that the Agriculture subcommittee was given allows an increase of $431 million in non-emergency discretionary appropriations over the previous year's level. In percentage terms, that's growth of about 3 percent—barely enough to keep up with inflation, and well below the growth rate of the economy. In fact, if ones takes into account that some of the basic on-going programs covered by the bill were funded in part by emergency appropriations last year, the year-to-year increase is probably closer to $200 million or about 1.5 percent. And compared to the President's budget request for fiscal year 2001, the bill is short by $1.1 billion.

Following are some of the practical consequences of these shortfalls.

Food safety

For the Agriculture Department's Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS)—which is responsible for inspecting and ensuring the safety of all domestic and imported meat and poultry products—the bill falls short of the President's budget request by more than $14 million. Pay costs make up about three quarters of this agency's budget, and the increase provided by the bill is not enough to cover the higher pay and benefit costs resulting from the pay raises received by all federal employees. To cover the costs of basic inspections of processing plants, the bill would require the FSIS to reduce assistance for state-run meat and poultry inspection systems, or cut back on inspections of imports or on laboratory operations, or take other problematic steps. And the improvements and initiatives that the Administration had proposed—such as risk assessment studies, upgrades to egg safety, and expanded collaboration with state and local food safety programs—will be almost impossible to achieve under this appropriation.

To its credit, the bill does fully fund the budget request for the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) operating account—other than the request for tobacco-related programs. These appropriations for regulation on food and drug safety are badly needed, and we hope they can be preserved in conference.

On the other hand, the bill falls short in other food safety areas within the Agriculture Department, in addition to the inadequate appropriation for the Food Safety and Inspection Service just discussed. For example, it fails to provide for an important initiative within the Agricultural Marketing Service to begin a systematic program of testing fruits and vegetables to assess levels and patterns of microbiological contamination, as well as failing to provide requested funds for food safety research.

During the Committee markup, Representative DeLauro offered an amendment to bring funding for FSIS up to the Administration's request (using emergency appropriations). That amendment was defeated by a vote of 20 to 24 (roll call number 8).

Farmers and consumers both squeezed by the middleman

Many believe that a major cause of family farmers' current difficulties is the increasing squeeze they face as the markets that they sell their products into and buy their seed and other inputs from become more and more dominated by a handful of large corporations. Many formerly independent producers are simply becoming contractors for agri-business corporations, which can essentially dictate the terms on which these farmers and ranchers operate and the prices they will pay and receive. The Clinton Administration once again requested some modest funding increases to provide the Agriculture Department with some additional staff and a bit more resources to analyze and investigate the growing concentration of economic power in agricultural markets and to take action against abusive practices that violate existing law. This bill denies most of these requested increases, providing only $1.4 million of the $7.1 million increase requested for the Grain Inspection, Packers, and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) and no increase at all for the Department's Office of General Counsel.

Funding to investigate and respond to market concentration

When the bill was considered by the Appropriations Committee, Representative Obey offered an amendment to provide an additional $13.7 million (on an emergency basis), to help the federal government respond to market concentration and abusive practices in agriculture. That amendment was defeated by a vote of 21 to 28 (roll call number 1).

Addressing the problems of concentration in agriculture will also require substantive legislation to strengthen the enforcement powers of the federal government. However, more funds and more staff to better enforce existing law would have been a useful first step, and we regret that the committee refused to take that step.

Assistant to producer cooperatives

Another useful step that could be taken to help small and medium-sized producers reposition in today's marketplace would be to make some funding available to enhance and expand producer-owned cooperatives. These co-ops can provide alternative processing and marketing facilities, to help add value to crops and provide markets not under the control of giant agri-business corporations. In our view, it is more prudent to provide relatively modest funding now to enable producers to derive income from the marketplace than to once again later in the year provide billions in ill-targeted emergency economic assistance.

During the committee markup of this bill, Representative Kaptur offered an amendment to provide $80 million in emergency funds to be used for equity capital and grants to establish and upgrade farmer-owned cooperatives and other cooperatives that would help create market-oriented opportunities in rural America. The amendment was similar to a proposal made by the Clinton Administration, as part of its farm safety net initiative. The Kaptur amendment was defeated, however, by a vote of 19 to 26 (roll call number 6).

Animal and plant pests and diseases

Various parts of the country are facing serious outbreaks of agricultural pests and diseases. Many of these problems recently arrived from outside the U.S. Citrus canker is devastating fruit trees in parts of Flroida—including trees in urban yards as well as in commercial groves. The Asian Longhorned beetle—which evidently entered the country in wood packing material from China—is killing hardwood trees in New York and Illinois, and threatens to spread further. Plum pox—which destroys peaches, plums, and other stone fruits—has turned up in Pennsylvania (apparently the first appearance in the United States of this disease which is normally found in Europe and the Middle East). Bovine tuberculosis is threatening to spread in Michigan. Pierece's disease is becoming an increasing serious problem for the California grape industry. And the list could go on.

To help detect and eradicate these and other pests, the Administration requested a substantial increase for the Agriculture Department's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS). This bill, however, underfunds that request by $42 million. In fact, since the committee provided increases above the President's request for certain line items within APHIS (such as boll weevil control and wildlife services), the measures falls short of the amounts requested to deal with emerging pest and disease problems by about $53 million.

Rep. Kaptur offered an amendment during committee markup to provide $53 million in emergency appropriations to bring the bill up to the Administration's request for effectively dealing with these problems. That amendment was defeated 22 to 28 (roll call number 3).

Natural Resources Conservation Service

The Agriculture Department's Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS, formerly known as the Soil Conservation Service) provides advice and technical assistance to farmers and ranchers in designing and implementing conservation measures on their land. In some cases, this assistance is needed to help comply with requirements of federal farm programs; in other cases, farmers and ranchers are simply seeking help in preventing soil erosion and otherwise preserving and enhancing their land. This is an extremely popular program in farm country, and the Agriculture Subcommittee received letters from many Members and constituents urging a substantial increase in funding.

The President's budget proposed an $86 million increase for NRCS conservation operations, including $28 million more for basic "on the ground" technical assistance, $20 million for assistance to animal feeding operations in devising and implementing waste management plans, and $13 million for other purposes under the President's Clean Water Actin Plan, as well as funding for several other initiatives.

The bill, however, provides only $16 million of the $86 million requested increase. Most of that amount is allocated to partially fund the proposed increase for animal feeding operations, and to various specific projects designated in the committee report. According to NRCS, the bill's funding level would require its conservation staff

to be reduced by 261 positions below the FY 2000 level. Given the importance of NRCS services—not just to farmers and ranchers but also to attaining clean water and other environmental protection goals—the bill is taking a large step in the wrong direction.

Rural development

The bill, as reported by subcommittee, did provide increases (totaling about $163 million above FY 2000) for rural development programs, and Chairman Skeen is to be commended for finding the funds to make that possible. However, most of the increases are needed just to offset higher credit subsidy costs resulting from higher interest rates, and therefore do little more than keep levels of loans and loan guarantees from declining.

An amendment offered by Representative Maurice Hinchey during the full committee markup (roll call number 7) added another $57 million for rural water and waste grants, community facilities grants, and rural business enterprise and rural business opportunity grants—all programs that fill vital needs. (These increases were financed by reducing the commissions paid by the federal government to agents who sell crop insurance.)

Even after the Hinchey amendment, however, the bill remains about $180 million below the President's request for rural development. Some of the largest shortfalls come in rural housing programs, as well as rural development loans (the "intermediary relending" program) and assistance for development of cooperatives. Given the needs that exist in rural America, it is unfortunate that the Majority's budget program does not allow more funding for rural housing and economic development.

Other funding issues

There are several other funding issues and problems in this bill. For example, it provides $37 million less than requested by the Administration for overseas food assistance under title II of the PL 480 "Food for Peace" program. Not only does this program help meet real human needs in areas suffering from food shortages and disasters, but it also helps farmers by removing surplus commodities from U.S. markets and thereby relieving downward pressures on prices. At a time of disastrously low prices for many commodities, we should be doing more—not less—to help reduce domestic surpluses by putting them to use in meeting urgent humanitarian needs overseas.

The measure also underfunds a number of accounts that pay the salaries of USDA employees. It is understandable that, in a time of tight budgets, Congress tends to put money into priorities other than basic "salaries and expenses" appropriations. However, such a policy also leads to serious problems. Among other things, federal employees receive cost-of-living pay raises each year, and unless increases are provided to cover the cost of those raises and associated benefit costs, it becomes necessary to reduce staffing levels. While some staff reductions can be offset by increased efficiency, it will be very hard to prevent cost that have been occurring at USDA from having a harmful impact on delivery of services and oversight and management of programs and resources.

Language regarding Kyoto Protocol

During subcommittee markup of this bill, an amendment was adopted adding language to the bill that seeks to restrict use of funds for mechanisms related to addressing the threat of global climate change. This amendment was adopted on a straight party-line vote, with all Republican Members voting "Yes", and all Democrats voting "No".

The provisions thereby added to this bill go well beyond compromise language included in previous years' appropriations bills, which prohibited use of funding "to propose or issue rules, regulations, decrees, or orders for the purpose of implementation, or in preparation for implementation of the Kyoto Protocol". Rather, the new language seems to prohibit any spending to discuss, research, or work on developing approaches such as carbon emissions trading systems or the Clean Development Mechanism that could be used to implement any system for reduction of greenhouse gases and global warming that might be agreed on in the future.

The new restrictions are ironic, considering that objections to the Kyoto Protocol as it now exists tend to focus on inadequate participation by the developing world and potentially high costs to the U.S. economy. Little progress can be made toward solving those problems and improving the Kyoto Protocol if the executive branch is forbidden to work on or discuss mechanisms that could help reduce costs and increase participation by developing nations. Including such restrictions in an agriculture appropriations bill seems especially unfortunate, since there appears to be an important and positive role that could be played by farmers and farmland in addressing global warming problems.

We can imagine no useful purpose for including this new restrictive language in the agriculture appropriations bill, and will work to ensure that any measure enacted into law contains no restrictive language that goes beyond what was agreed to last year.

Egg safety

A second unfortunate provision added to the bill in subcommittee is legislative language restricting the actions that can be taken by the Food and Drug Administration and the Agriculture Department to reduce bacterial contamination and improve the safety of eggs. Among other things, this language requires the government to pay producers and packers of eggs for the costs of any tests they might be required to conduct to detect the presence of *Salmonella* bacteria. The government does not reimburse other industries or food producers for tests required to ensure that their products are safe for consumers, but rather treats food safety costs as part of the basic costs of production. It is not clear why eggs should be treated differently. In addition, the bill language seeks to limit the number of tests that can be required and the circumstances under which the government can require eggs to be pasteurized because of suspected bacterial contamination.

In essence, this language makes various scientific and policy judgments about egg safety. These are judgments which the Appropriations Committee does not have the background or expertise to make—certainly not based on just a few minutes of debate during markup and without the benefit of hearings on the subject. While

the amendment may have been intended to reduce the possibility that unnecessary costs could be imposed on the egg industry by new food safety rules, this kind of legislative rider on an appropriations bill is absolutely the wrong way to go about achieving that goal. Instead, the federal agencies involved should be allowed to continue their public rulemaking process, with appropriate oversight by the congressional committees having expertise and jurisdiction over the issues.

Effort to supplement funding for 1999 disaster loss assistance

Finally, we regret the committee's defeat of an amendment offered by Representative Chet Edwards during consideration of this bill. The amendment would have added $284 million to emergency appropriations made last Fall to assist farmers who suffered losses due to droughts, floods and other natural disasters during the 1999 crop year.

Losses eligible for this assistance have turned out to be larger than anticipated, and the amounts appropriated last year have proved insufficient to compensate farmers under the basic formula for this program. Because appropriations were less than the amounts needed under the formula for 1999, payments had to be pro-rated, with farmers receiving only 69.6 percent of the amounts for which they would otherwise be eligible. A similar, but less severe situation arose in the disaster assistance program for the 1998 crop year, in which farmers received only 84.9 percent of the amounts for which they were eligible.

The Edwards amendment would have added funds to the 1999 disaster loss program, in order to bring payments up to 1998 levels. In other words, farmers who lost crops due to natural disasters in 1999 would have received a supplemental payment, so that they would receive the same percentage compensation as farmers who lost crops in 1998. It seems only fair to treat both groups alike, and the extra assistance could have been put to good use by farmers who suffered severe losses in the droughts, storms and floods of 1999. Unfortunately, however, the Edwards amendment was defeated by a vote of 18 to 27 (roll call number 5).

The following table, based on Agriculture Department data, shows payments under the existing 1999 crop loss program made to farmers in each state as of May 11, 2000, along with an estimate of the additional amounts that farmers in the state would have received under the Edwards amendment.

ESTIMATED EFFECTS OF EDWARDS AMENDMENT ON DISASTER LOSS ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS TO FARMERS BY STATE

[In millions of dollars]

State	Payments received under existing appropriation	Est. additional payments under Edwards amdt.
Alabama	$19.9	$4.4
Alaska	*	*
Arizona	3.4	0.7
Arkansas	23.0	5.1
California	59.7	13.1
Colorado	13.3	2.9
Connecticut	4.1	0.9

ESTIMATED EFFECTS OF EDWARDS AMENDMENT ON DISASTER LOSS ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS TO FARMERS BY STATE—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

State	Payments received under existing appropriation	Est. additional payments under Edwards amdt.
Delaware	1.5	0.3
Florida	10.8	2.4
Georgia	73.2	16.1
Hawaii	*	*
Idaho	9.4	2.1
Illinois	12.6	2.8
Indiana	15.5	3.4
Iowa	15.3	3.4
Kansas	31.6	7.0
Kentucky	41.1	9.0
Louisiana	13.5	3.0
Maine	1.9	0.4
Maryland	7.7	1.7
Massachusetts	4.7	1.0
Michigan	7.5	1.6
Minnesota	47.8	10.5
Mississippi	20.7	4.5
Missouri	39.6	8.7
Montana	31.2	6l9
Nebraska	20.3	4.5
Nevada	0.1	*
New Hampshire	0.7	0.2
New Jersey	10.6	2.3
New Mexico	4.2	0.9
New York	13.4	2.9
North Carolina	61.9	13.6
North Dakota	141.8	31.2
Ohio	23.0	5.0
Oklahoma	31.7	7.0
Oregon	14.1	3.1
Pennsylvania	30.0	6.6
Puerto Rico	11.8	2.6
Rhode Island	0.8	0.2
South Carolina	26.3	5.8
South Dakota	40.4	8.9
Tennessee	29.1	6.4
Texas	188.6	41.5
Utah	1.5	0.3
Vermont	2.3	0.5
Virginia	15.1	3.3
Washington	19.8	4.3
West Virginia	3.4	0.8
Wisconsin	6.9	1.5
Wyoming	1.2	0.3

*Indicates amounts less than $100,000.

Note.—This table is based on Agriculture Department data showing crop loss payments distributed as of May 11, 2000. Some funds remained to be distributed, and thus final figures for the program (and for the Edwards amendment) will be higher in some states than the estimates shown in the table.

○