Reynolds
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Souder
Sununu
Tancredo
Tauscher
Thomas
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Upton
Velazquez
Wamp
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—239

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bishop
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Chambliss
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doolittle
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frost
Ganske
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Hill
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Holden
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Mascara
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Miller, Gary
Mink
Moran (KS)
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickering
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Schaffer
Sessions
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Burton
Callahan
Dicks
Gibbons
Hansen
Houghton
Istook
LaFalce
Millender-McDonald
Mollohan
Murtha
Serrano
Visclosky
Wexler

□ 1935

Messrs. HUNTER, MCDERMOTT, HAYES, FATTAH, and KUCINICH changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. HART, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. MOORE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 367, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 367, I was detained in a traffic accident. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT) assumed the chair.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 42. Joint Resolution memorializing fallen firefighters by lowering the American flag to half-staff in honor of the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial Service in Emmitsburg, Maryland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in consultation between the two sides, I would like to tell Members what we are attempting to do in resolution of the bill that is before the House at this time.

There is a unanimous consent that is being drafted, and at some point when it is completely drafted and cleared on both sides, we would propose the unanimous consent in the full House. Basically this is what we would like to do this evening, if we can.

The next series of votes will occur around 10 p.m., and those will be the final votes of the evening. It is our intent to continue to try to complete the bill tonight, and any votes that would be remaining would be voted on in the morning when the House reconvenes.

Under the agreement, there are a number of amendments that we think we will have realistic time agreements on, and we can deal with those amendments in fairly short order. The gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) has an amendment, and he has graciously agreed to cut back the time and put a 45-minute limit on it and vote that amendment tonight.

In addition, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has an amendment to the Sanders amendment, and he has requested 10 minutes on the Obey amendment to the Sanders amendment. That would be included in the unanimous consent agreement. The anticipation is that the vote on the Sanders amendment would lead us to 10 p.m. We would have a series of votes at that time, including that amendment. And from that time, Members would be free from voting this evening; and we would continue with debate.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBEST. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, there is also a Vitter amendment, but we can include that in our time.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, we have consulted on both sides. We will continue beyond 10:00 with the intention of completing the bill tonight and having the final votes in the morning.

Mr. Chairman, we will proceed with debate as we refine the unanimous consent agreement.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALSH

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 63 offered by Mr. WALSH:

At the end of chapter 1 of subtitle C of title I (page 75, after line 17), insert the following new section:

SEC. 147. STUDY OF NATIONAL DAIRY POLICY.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—Not later than April 30, 2002, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a comprehensive economic evaluation of the potential direct and indirect effects of the various elements of the national dairy policy, including an examination of the effect of the national dairy policy on—

(1) farm price stability, farm profitability and viability, and local rural economies in the United States;

(2) child, senior, and low-income nutrition programs, including impacts on schools and institutions participating in the programs, on program recipients, and other factors; and

(3) the wholesale and retail cost of fluid milk, dairy farms, and milk utilization.

(b) NATIONAL DAIRY POLICY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''national dairy policy'' means the dairy policy of the United States as evidenced by the following policies and programs:

(1) Federal Milk Marketing Orders.

(2) Interstate dairy compacts (including proposed compacts described in H.R. 1827 and S. 1157, as introduced in the 107th Congress).

(3) Over-order premiums and State pricing programs.

(4) Direct payments to milk producers.

(5) Federal milk price support program.

(6) Export programs regarding milk and dairy products, such as the Dairy Export Incentive Program.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) reserves a point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It requires

the Secretary of Agriculture to study the direct and indirect impacts of the various elements of our Nation's dairy policy, including an examination of its effects on farm price stability, farm profitability and viability, and local rural economics.

Earlier the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) offered an amendment that would have allowed States to join together in regional-based State cooperations to develop a promising solution to the continuing dairy crisis, all at no cost to the government.

Considering the level of interest and support for developing policy that protects both farmers and consumers, I believe it is useful to study the many existing and proposed dairy policies. The result of my amendment would be a comprehensive economic evaluation of programs such as the Federal milk market orders, Federal milk price supports, export programs and over-order premiums and pricing programs. The study would also require an examination of the dairy compacts, similar to those included in the amendment offered today by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD).

I strongly believe that the action of 25 States, and a sound, proven record, is enough for this Congress to base and set policy on, but there are still Members who need more evidence. Therefore, I am confident that a study will help this body recognize the value of regionally based solutions to the continuing national dairy crisis.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, as we have seen in recent weeks, there certainly is an effort to develop a national policy, and it has been somewhat elusive. I understand the gentleman's concerns. We appreciate the gentleman offering this amendment, and I would be happy to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws his point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1945

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MS. HOOLEY OF OREGON

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 30 offered by Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon:

In section 925 (page _____, beginning line _____), insert ''(other than organically grown caneberries)'' after ''caneberries'' each place it appears.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, under existing regulations, the Federal Government recognizes organic agricultural products as different from those grown conventionally. This distinction should be respected when considering the institution of a marketing order for caneberries.

Produce that is organically grown is strictly segregated from produce that is conventionally grown and is labeled as a distinctly separate product in the marketplace. Often there are entirely different venues where organic goods are made available to the consumer. Oversupply problems do not plague organic growers. Growers have cultivated niche markets that are different from markets for conventional grown caneberries.

A Federal market order system that does not allow an exemption for organic caneberries would place and unnecessary and unwelcome impediment on a small but healthy sector of American commerce.

It is my understanding after talking with the chairman that my amendment would be setting a precedent, and an exemption could be achieved through the rules process within the AMS. I respect the chairman's concerns and, therefore, I withdraw my amendment.

However, I ask for his and the committee's commitment in addressing organic growers concerns in relation to the new Federal marketing order.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this important matter to our attention. I am certainly willing and prepared to work with her and the Agriculture Marketing Service to make sure the concerns of organic caneberry growers are addressed in regards to any new Federal marketing order for caneberry growers. I appreciate the gentlewoman not offering her amendment. I would be happy to work with her.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. I thank the chairman for his leadership and his commitment to our farmers and rural communities.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 51 offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

In section 181, strike subsection (e) (page 128, line 23, through page 129, line 9), and insert the following new subsection:

(e) ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY RELATED TO URUGUAY ROUND COMPLIANCE.—If the Secretary determines that expenditures under subtitles A, B, and C that are subject to the total allowable domestic support levels under the Uruguay Round Agreements (as defined in section 2(7) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(7))), as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, will exceed such allowable levels for any applicable reporting period, the Secretary may make adjustments in the amount of such expenditures during that period to ensure that such expenditures do not exceed, but in no case are less than, such allowable levels. To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall achieve the required adjustments by reducing the amount of marketing loan gains and loan deficiency payments obtained by persons whose marketing loan gains, loan deficiency payments and any certificates would otherwise exceed a total of $150,000 for a crop year.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this relates to the amendment that I had yesterday in terms of giving a greater advantage to the average, the medium-sized farmer, giving a lesser advantage to the very large farms in the country. This amendment relates to a WTO decision that might come, saying that the United States is going to have to reduce its subsidies for agricultural production. In the event that WTO makes that decision, the existing language in the bill has provisions where there would be an across-the-board reduction. My amendment says that the first reductions would come from those farmers receiving more than $150,000 in price support benefit payments.

The provisions of the amendment yesterday was scored to save the government $1.31 billion if we had a real limitation of $150,000 on the particular payments that go out to farmers for price supports.

I think as we proceed with this bill, as we move ahead to where we are going with agricultural policy in the future, somehow we need a policy that is going to help the farmers that need the help the most. I think it is unconscionable that we continue to give million-dollar awards. There are 152 farmers in the United States that received over $1 million in benefits. I think we need to continue to look at policies that are, number one, going to be market-oriented, number two, not to encourage increased production, and, number three, be fair to most all the farmers in the United States.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the reason that I am opposed to this amendment is, I do not know how it would work. Let me quickly explain, if I might, what I perceive as the unworkability of the amendment.

As the gentleman from Michigan mentioned, we have in the bill a circuit breaker in which if, in fact, we do bump the limit under the amber box, under negotiated agreements of the amount that can be expended that fall into that box, there is a trigger mechanism by which it would allow the Secretary to make adjustments across the board in order to comply with that.

None of us want to exceed the limit. We have talked about that all throughout the 2 years of discussion on this farm bill. The problem with this amendment, however, is that that decision and that determination of when we hit the limit, it will be after the fact. It will be after the people have received their money. It will be after the crop happened to be already in the loan, and you take the action from that point forward. You cannot take it back to the people that have already received the money. And so the action of any trigger mechanism would be to respond to the overage from that point on.

Again, the problem is that that money will have already been expended, it will already be in the hands. It may be 1, 2, 3 years after the money has been expended before there is a recognition of the fact that we have bumped the limit under the amber box. In terms of would you, could you take it out of those people's amounts of money in the future, they may not be eligible to receive any money in the future. And so, therefore, it would all be prospective.

I just do not think this would be a workable amendment and, as I indicated, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBEST. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Hopefully we are not going to bump up against this limit, because it is going to be very complicated however we do it, if we bump against a WTO provision that says we have got to pay back and somehow reduce the subsidies that have already gone out. So hopefully that is not going to occur in the way we finally draft the bill.

Mr. COMBEST. One would hope not as well, but the gentleman made the point himself in trying to retrace the money that has already been paid out.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. You are going to have to do that, anyway.

Mr. COMBEST. No, you would not have to do that, anyway. I did not yield to the gentleman, but I did hear him say that you would have to do that, anyway. You would make the adjustments into the future if, in fact, you bumped the limit. That is what the trigger mechanism is.

I again oppose the amendment. I think it is totally unworkable.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, also. My analysis of this is if this provision were imposed, it would result in the forfeiture to CCC of commodities placed under loan when a person reaches the $150,000 limit. CCC would subsequently sell these commodities to minimize carrying costs and to move them to the market as quickly as possible. CCC is expected to incur expenditures equal to the LDP and MLG cost. Consequently, no savings are expected.

Therefore, I join with the chairman in his opposition and his explanation as well as this point that I believe is relevant.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 31 offered by Mr. INSLEE:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE X—ADDITIONAL MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 1001. RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES.

(a) ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY INCENTIVES PROGRAM.—Section 1240 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa), as amended by section 231 of this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4); and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) assistance to farmers and ranchers for the assessment and development of their on-farm renewable resources, including biomass for the production of power and fuels, wind, and solar.''.

(b) COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE.—The Secretary of Agriculture, through the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service and, to the extent practicable, in collaboration with the Natural Resources Conservation Service, regional biomass programs under the Department of Energy, and other appropriate entities, may provide education and technical assistance to farmers and ranchers for the development and marketing of renewable energy resources, including biomass for the production of power and fuels, wind, solar, and geothermal.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, this relatively simple amendment will allow farmers to receive assessment and technical assistance from the Department of Agriculture in assessing and developing renewable energy resources on their farms. We have learned that farmers have tremendous potential in developing their wind resources. In our State, we have seen some tremendous development of wind turbine energy on agricultural lands. Biomass is a great potential as well as solar. We think that this is an appropriate use of flexible dollars for farmers to ask for assistance to develop these new technological resources in a very environmentally friendly way. We appreciate the committee's cooperation in assessing this potential.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. INSLEE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, we have looked at this. We do, as the gentleman knows through the discussion, have some concerns. It may take some adjustment throughout. The committee would be happy to work with the gentleman on trying to achieve that.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. DOOLEY OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 19 offered by Mr. DOOLEY of California:

At the end of title VII (page 321, after line 23), insert the following new subtitle:

Subtitle F—Funding Sources

SEC. 793. USE OF PORTION OF FUNDS FOR FIXED, DECOUPLED PAYMENTS TO INSTEAD FUND ADDITIONAL COMPETITIVE RESEARCH EFFORTS.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding section 104, for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2011, the Secretary of Agriculture shall use $100,000,000 of the funds that would otherwise be provided to producers in the form of fixed, decoupled payments for that fiscal year to make an additional deposit into the Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems account.

(b) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For each of fiscal years 2002 through 2011, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make grants under section 2(b) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)) to the faculty of institutions eligible to receive grants under the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321 et seq.), including Tuskegee University, West Virginia State College, 1994 Institutions (as defined in section 532 of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note)), and Hispanic-serving institutions (as defined in section 1404(9) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103(9)).

(2) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—The total amount of grants awarded under paragraph (1) for each fiscal year shall be not less than ten percent of the total amount deposited into the Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems account during that fiscal year.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today is one which is designed to really reflect the priorities of American farmers. I am proud to be a fourth-generation farmer in the San Joaquin Valley of California. But really, when I look at the farm policy we are advocating today, this bill would provide almost $100 billion in direct payments to farmers over the next 10 years. This money, a lot of it, is much needed to ensure the financial viability of a lot of our farmers. But I also know that those farmers that are in the fields also understand that we have to have a balance, that it is important for us to also recognize that some of these Federal tax dollars could be put to good use by investing in research.

And so what my bill does, it takes one cent of every dollar that we are

spending on direct payments to farmers and puts it into a competitive research program. That $100 billion, almost $100 billion in direct payments that we are going to be providing over the next 10 years, it takes $1 billion of that and sets it into the competitive research program through USDA. These research dollars that will become available will ensure that we are investing in technology and improved agricultural practices that will benefit all commodities.

It is unfortunate that that $100 billion that we are providing in direct payments to farmers in this farm bill is going almost exclusively to the producers of the major field crops, whether it be wheat, whether it be corn, whether it be rice, whether it be cotton. The specialty crop growers, whether they be grapes and the apple growers and the vegetable growers, get very, very little.

What this amendment would do would be to ensure that those commodities, along with the major commodities, would get some money in order to invest in research programs at our leading research and academic institutions throughout this country that could be invested in a manner to ensure that it would enhance the productivity of our farmers, that it would enhance their profitability, that it would enhance their viability.

I think if you asked the farmers throughout the country whether or not they were willing to set aside one cent out of every dollar they were going to receive in subsidies over the next 10 years, they would say yes. That is what this amendment does. It would provide $100 million a year annually for competitive research programs for agriculture, which unfortunately, has been flat over the last 20 years.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that we had an agreement of 10 minutes and 10 minutes on this, 10 minutes in support and 10 minutes in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That has yet to be entered as a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that exclusive of my time, that we would have 10 minutes in support as well as 10 minutes in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I want to say, primarily to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), that there is not a more intelligent, thoughtful, studious, interested, committed, caring member of the Committee on Agriculture about American agriculture than the gentleman from California. I say that with tremendous sincerity and honesty. I have deep respect for him.

I oppose this amendment, not on the substance of the amendment nearly as much as I do on the effect of the amendment. When I was fortunate enough to chair the Research Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, and I have made statements then and since that time, that I think probably research money is some of the best money we could spend. We increased in committee, in the bill that is before the House that this amendment would affect, an increase of $1.16 billion in funding for the initiative. Is it as much as any of us would want? I would say no. Is there as much in any part of this bill as anyone would want? I would say probably not. If there is, I have not found them yet.

But my main objection to this, Mr. Chairman, is what I have said, and we are going to hear a lot, and that is the balance. It was the same reason I objected to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), is that this takes money from part of this very delicate balance that we have and it does shift it into another area.

□ 2000

I wanted to make certain that everyone understands that I am not objecting to agriculture research or increasing funding for agriculture research; but when we had all of these competing interests in committee with a finite amount of money, I think we did a significantly generous increase, and for that reason, I would oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I, too, must say I have to reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment for the same reasons that the chairman has talked about, because I, too, would like to have increased the funding for research, just as I sincerely would have liked to increase the funding for conservation, just like we will have a later debate about increasing the funding for rural development. But as we live within the budget of $73.5 billion, these decisions were made; and I feel compelled to stay with the commitment at this point in time and encourage our colleagues to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), who has drawn attention to an important role in agricultural research, ensuring that American farmers are indeed prepared for the 21st century and on the cutting edge of technological advances and innovation.

Surely one of the most important things Congress can do to support the future competitiveness of American farmers is indeed supporting agricultural research. Through agricultural research we have been able to increase yields, improve environment sensitivity, add to significant value, both ecological as well as economic, and advance agriculture outputs for the world's population.

With the increased pressure from emerging nations overseas bearing down on American agricultural markets, continued technological innovation must continue, because we cannot compete with those countries from the standpoint of human capital. We must build upon our research capacity to retain the competitiveness of American agriculture.

I would like to bring to the attention of the committee one particular component of this amendment that is very important to the minority institutions, those of the 1890s, those of Hispanic-serving, as well as the Indian-serving, the Native American institutions. All of these institutions play a very important role on small disadvantaged sustainable agriculture, particularly in the minority community.

By voting for this amendment, we ensure the output and the research and the involvement of these institutions with the other major land grant universities. This is an opportunity where we can bring together all of the land grant institutions working together, both for sustainable development, as well as for the big ideas as well.

Again, I want to commend my colleague from California and to say this is the right way. I know both the chairman and the ranking member regret that they cannot be enthusiastically supporting this, but I would hope, indeed, that Members would understand the value of research is so important that we really are not taking away from farmers, we are adding to it.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I recognize the tightness of the budget; but nothing is more important than research, and most especially research that will yield food. There are so many families and so many children that go to sleep hungry and wake up hungry every day. The one way that we can help to solve this problem is to do the research so we can find better ways to have better yields so that the least that we can do is to feed the children.

I know that the Historically Black Colleges and Universities and the Hispanic-serving institutions would also have an opportunity to join in, who know probably this issue and this problem almost better than anyone else. So I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me time. Let me applaud the gentleman for his leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the farm bill because I believe this is an important investment in America's future. Farm security, investment in the food chain and recognizing that as we look to a new day in securing America, we are going to have to look to the investment in our farmers, small and large.

At the same time, I believe the Dooley amendment provides the opportunity to take just a small measure of dollars, $100 million, to provide cutting-edge research and technological development as the keys to our Nation's competitiveness in an increasingly global trade market for agricultural products. If we do not invest in the cutting-edge technology, we cannot be in front of the curve to be able to be competitive, to be able to reach the pinnacle, if you will, of the kind of agricultural development that will make us internationally competitive.

Let me also thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) for recognizing that the land grant colleges, historically black colleges and the Hispanic-serving colleges can be very much a vital part of this research. May I remind everyone of Booker T. Washington and as well George Washington Carver, Booker T. Washington with the Tuskegee Institute and as well George Washington Carver invested in the understanding of farming. These institutions are able to provide the cultural insight and the rural insight into research, and it helps them to develop individuals who will be leaders in research as it relates to competitiveness in agriculture.

I would simply say this is a mere drop in the bucket. I do not want to diminish the amendment, but it certainly is a worthwhile amendment. I ask all my colleagues in a bipartisan way to support the Dooley amendment.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise asking my colleagues to support this amendment. I will tell you how it even impacts me personally. Over 10 years ago, when I came into Congress, I was a full-time farmer. At that time we were producing about on our cotton fields in the San Juaquin Valley about 1,000 pounds per acre of cotton. Today we are producing almost 1,800 pounds of cotton. The financial viability of my farm was not the result of program payments that are coming to us from the Federal Government. The profitability of my farm is much more a function of the investment in research that has resulted in improved varieties that have enhanced yields.

That is the crux of this amendment. It is taking one cent out of every dollar that we would be providing in direct payments and investing it in research so we can continue to see improvements in yields, so we can see improvements in productivity. That has far more to do with the financial viability of farmers than the $100 million we are providing in direct payments to farmers. That is not an investment in the future.

I just ask my colleagues to step back and take an honest and objective evaluation of what this amendment is all about. It is taking one penny of every dollar in taxpayer subsidies and saying let us invest it in research, let us invest it in the future, et cetera, et cetera. The farmers will see an enhanced level of productivity which will be more to their bottom line than these direct taxpayer payments.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

The amendment was rejected.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2646, FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

Mr. COMBEST. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2646 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 248, that debate on amendment No. 47 and all amendments thereto shall not exceed 55 minutes, with 45 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and 10 minutes controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY); and that no further amendment may be offered after the legislative day of Thursday, October 4, 2001, except one pro forma amendment each offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture or their designees for the purpose of debate.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBEST. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on amendment No. 11 to be offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO), that time be limited to 20 minutes on the amendment and all amendments thereto, equally divided by the proponent and an opponent.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, I wanted to make sure there will be another amendment from the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) included within my time. I would hope there would be no objection to that.

Mr. COMBEST. Madam Speaker, the gentleman would not be prevented from offering other amendments, which would be included in the time of the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

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

There was no objection.

FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 248 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2646.

□ 2012

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (Chairman pro tempore) in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 19 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, debate on amendment No. 47 and all amendments thereto shall not exceed 55 minutes, with 45 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and 10 minutes controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY); and no further amendment may be offered after the legislative day of today, except one pro forma amendment each offered by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture or their designees for the purpose of debate, and any debate on the Bono