fowl to Hunters for the Hungry which processes the meat and provides it to food banks and other feeding programs. This cooperative effort between hunters, processors, and the hunger community is an innovative example of how groups can work together toward a single worthy goal.

This legislation received unanimous support in the House Agriculture Committee, and I strongly encourage passage of this bill.

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

□ 1545

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H. Res. 79 and applaud this body for recognizing the collaborative efforts of hunters, sportsmen's associations, meat processors, State meat inspectors and hunger relief associations to establish Hunters for the Hungry programs across the U.S.

When a hunter donates a deer, it is processed by professional meat cutters at inspected facilities. The meat is then packaged, frozen and distributed to food banks, soup kitchens, church food pantries, the Salvation Army and other nonprofit organizations serving the States' hungry. Funds are raised to cover the cost of processing, distribution and the overhead expenses of operation so that the meat can be provided to these agencies at no cost. Through the program, food banks and soup kitchens are provided with a low-fat, high-protein meat that may not otherwise be available.

In my own State of Virginia, the Virginia Hunters for the Hungry program has distributed over 2.3 million pounds of venison since its establishment in 1991. In the first year, roughly 33,000 pounds of venison was donated, processed and distributed through the program. Now, the average exceeds 300,000 pounds a year, and this program is a reflection of the generosity of the American spirit.

I commend the generosity of Virginia hunters and all who participate in the Hunters for the Hungry program, whose contributions are a step in the right direction in the fight against hunger.

Mr. Speaker, let me say on a personal note that I have had the pleasure of supporting this organization for several years now, and just recently, a few weeks ago, attended a Hunters for the Hungry banquet, at which the spirit of not just hunters but people who are generous and want to take care of the needs of those who can use additional sustenance and I think in a very efficient way have participated in this program and showed that generosity once more.

So I commend all those, not just in Virginia but across the country, who participate in this, and I particularly commend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) who has fostered this legislation.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time it's my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) such time as he may consume.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman PETERSON and Ranking Member GOODLATTE, my good friend from California (Mr. CARDOZA), my classmate, and all the members on the Agriculture Committee for bringing this resolution to the floor today during the inaugural Congressional Sportsmen's Week.

I also want to thank the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, under the leadership of co-chairs RON KIND of Wisconsin and PAUL RYAN of Wisconsin, during this Congress. This bipartisan organization, comprised of close to 300 Members of the House and Senate, focuses on protecting the interests of our Nation's sportsmen. As a proud member of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, I know that it works diligently for our sportsmen who have historically shaped the character and the quality of America's cultural heritage, natural resources and economic vitality.

Mr. Speaker, as Mr. GOODLATTE said, I first introduced the Hunters for the Hungry resolution in the 108th Congress to bring attention to an often overlooked group, our Nation's hunters, who help feed thousands of homeless and hungry people each year. The purpose of this resolution is to praise the work of Hunters for Hungry programs across our country. These programs provide a unique way in which to address our Nation's hunger problem.

Although these organizations are called by different names across the country, Hunters for the Hungry organizations show the humanitarian and the kindhearted spirit of our Nation's hunting community. These programs are volunteer and cooperative efforts among hunters, sportsmen's associations, meat processors, State meat inspectors and hunger relief organizations.

Over the past 3 years, these programs have brought hundreds of thousands of pounds of excess venison to homeless shelters, soup kitchens and food banks. Each year, donations have multiplied, and many programs now cannot even cover the costs of processing, packaging, storing and distributing the abundant supply of donated venison.

Hunters for the Hungry organizations serve as a great example of how our Nation can address issues like hunger without government intervention. These organizations receive no Federal funds, and they operate from donations and volunteer service. We must raise the awareness of these organizations so they can have the resources and the volunteers to serve America's underprivileged.

One such organization, Mr. Speaker, in my district is Pure Cuts Deer Processing in Floyd County. Nick Ballinger operates this volunteer effort, and it feeds thousands of hungry people in northwest Georgia. He's always open to both financial contributions and venison donations so that he can expand the organization and feed more people annually. Nick is just one of many kindhearted hunters who donate their time and money for those in need.

Mr. Speaker, I once again ask the House to speak in one voice of gratitude and urge passage of the Hunters for the Hungry resolution to honor this great community service.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I'd like to rise to congratulate my colleague, Mr. GINGREY from Georgia, on this legislation, and also thank my colleague and friend Mr. GOODLATTE for managing it on the Republican side.

Our chairman on the Democratic side, Mr. PETERSON, is an avid hunter and, I'd like to say, a very successful one as well. I know he wants to extend his gratitude for this bill and totally supports it.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 79.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just considered.

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

There was no objection.

PESTICIDE REGISTRATION IMPROVEMENT RENEWAL ACT

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1983) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to renew and amend the provisions for the enhanced review of covered pesticide products, to authorize fees for certain pesticide products, to extend and improve the collection of maintenance fees, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 1983

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act''.

SEC. 2. REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.

Section 3(c)(3)(B)(ii) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a(c)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''within 45 days'' and all that follows through ''and,'' and inserting ''review the application in accordance with section 33(f)(4)(B) and,''; and

(2) in subparagraph (II), by striking ''within'' and inserting ''not later than the applicable decision review time established pursuant to section 33(f)(4)(B), or, if no review time is established, not later than''.

SEC. 3. REGISTRATION REVIEW.

Section 3(g)(1) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a(g)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''The registrations'' and inserting the following:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The registrations'';

(B) in the second sentence, by striking ''The Administrator'' and inserting the following:

''(ii) REGULATIONS.—In accordance with this subparagraph, the Administrator''; and

(C) by striking ''The goal'' and all that follows through ''No registration'' and inserting the following:

''(iii) INITIAL REGISTRATION REVIEW.—The Administrator shall complete the registration review of each pesticide or pesticide case, which may be composed of 1 or more active ingredients and the products associated with the active ingredients, not later than the later of—

''(I) October 1, 2022; or

''(II) the date that is 15 years after the date on which the first pesticide containing a new active ingredient is registered.

''(iv) SUBSEQUENT REGISTRATION REVIEW.—Not later than 15 years after the date on which the initial registration review is completed under clause (iii) and each 15 years thereafter, the Administrator shall complete a subsequent registration review for each pesticide or pesticide case.

''(v) CANCELLATION.—No registration'';

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) DOCKETING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), after meeting with 1 or more individuals that are not government employees to discuss matters relating to a registration review, the Administrator shall place in the docket minutes of the meeting, a list of attendees, and any documents exchanged at the meeting, not later than the earlier of—

''(I) the date that is 45 days after the meeting; or

''(II) the date of issuance of the registration review decision.

''(ii) PROTECTED INFORMATION.—The Administrator shall identify, but not include in the docket, any confidential business information the disclosure of which is prohibited by section 10.''.

SEC. 4. MAINTENANCE FEES.

(a) TOTAL AMOUNT OF FEES.—Section 4(i)(5)(C) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(i)(5)(C)) is amended by striking ''amount of'' and all that follows through the end of clause (v) and inserting ''amount of $22,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012''.

(b) AMOUNTS FOR REGISTRANTS.—Section 4(i)(5) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(i)(5) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''shall be'' and all that follows through the end of subclause (IV) and inserting ''shall be $71,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012; and''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''shall be'' and all that follows through the end of subclause (IV) and inserting ''shall be $123,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.''; and

(2) in subparagraph (E)(i)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking ''shall be'' and all that follows through the end of item (dd) and inserting ''shall be $50,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012; and''; and

(B) in subclause (II), by striking ''shall be'' and all that follows through the end of item (dd) and inserting ''shall be $86,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.''.

(c) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR COLLECTING MAINTENANCE FEES.—Section 4(i)(5)(H) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(i)(5)(H) is amended by striking ''2008'' and inserting ''2012.''

(d) OTHER FEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(i)(6) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(i)(6)) is amended by striking ''2010'' and inserting ''2014''.

(2) PROHIBITION ON TOLERANCE FEES.—Section 408(m) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 346a(m)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) PROHIBITION.—During the period beginning on the effective date of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act and ending on September 30, 2012, the Administrator shall not collect any tolerance fees under paragraph (1).''.

(e) REREGISTRATION AND EXPEDITED PROCESSING FUND.—

(1) SOURCE AND USE.—Section 4(k)(2)(A) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(k)(2)(A)) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by inserting ''and to offset the costs of registration review under section 3(g)'' after ''paragraph (3)'';

(B) in clause (i), by inserting ''and to offset the costs of registration review under section 3(g)'' after ''paragraph (3)''; and

(C) in clause (ii), by inserting ''and to offset the costs of registration review under section 3(g)'' after ''paragraph (3)''.

(2) EXPEDITED PROCESSING OF SIMILAR APPLICATIONS.—Section 4(k)(3)(A) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(k)(3)(A)) is amended by striking ''2007 and 2008'' and inserting ''2008 through 2012''.

SEC. 5. PESTICIDE REGISTRATION SERVICE FEES.

(a) DOCUMENTATION.—Section 33(b)(2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

''(ii) payment of at least 25 percent of the registration service fee and a request for a waiver from or reduction of the remaining amount of the registration service fee.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) PAYMENT.—The registration service fee required under this subsection shall be due upon submission of the application.

''(E) APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL FEES.—An application may be subject to additional fees if—

''(i) the applicant identified the incorrect registration service fee and decision review period;

''(ii) after review of a waiver request, the Administrator denies the waiver request; or

''(iii) after review of the application, the Administrator determines that a different registration service fee and decision review period apply to the application.

''(F) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PAY FEES.—The Administrator shall reject any application submitted without the required registration service fee.

''(G) NON-REFUNDABLE PORTION OF FEES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall retain 25 percent of the applicable registration service fee.

''(ii) LIMITATION.—Any waiver, refund, credit or other reduction in the registration service fee shall not exceed 75 percent of the registration service fee.

''(H) COLLECTION OF UNPAID FEES.—In any case in which the Administrator does not receive payment of a registration service fee (or applicable portion of the registration service fee) by the date that is 30 days after the fee is due, the fee shall be treated as a claim of the United States Government subject to subchapter II of chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code.''.

(b) AMOUNT OF FEES.—Section 33(b) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003'' and inserting ''Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''S11631'' and all that follows through the end of the subparagraph and inserting ''S10409 through S10411, dated July 31, 2007.''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

''(6) FEE ADJUSTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective for a covered pesticide registration application received during the period beginning on October 1, 2008, and ending on September 30, 2010, the Administrator shall increase by 5 percent the registration service fee payable for the application under paragraph (3).

''(B) ADDITIONAL ADJUSTMENT.—Effective for a covered pesticide registration application received on or after October 1, 2010, the Administrator shall increase by an additional 5 percent the registration service fee in effect as of September 30, 2010.

''(C) PUBLICATION.—The Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register the revised registration service fee schedules.''.

(c) WAIVERS AND REDUCTIONS.—Section 33(b)(7)(F) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(b)(7)(F)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking ''all'' and inserting ''75 percent''; and

(2) in clause (iv)(II), by striking ''all'' and inserting ''75 percent of the applicable.''.

(d) REFUNDS.—Section 33(b)(8)(A) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(b)(8)(A)) is amended by striking ''10 percent'' and inserting ''25 percent.''.

(e) PESTICIDE REGISTRATION FUND.—Section 33(c) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''paragraph (4)'' and inserting ''paragraph (5)'';

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) WORKER PROTECTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012, the Administrator shall use approximately 1/17 of the amount in the Fund (but not less than $1,000,000) to enhance scientific and regulatory activities relating to worker protection.

''(ii) PARTNERSHIP GRANTS.—Of the amounts in the Fund, the Administrator shall use for partnership grants—

''(I) for each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009, $750,000; and

''(II) for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2012, $500,000.

''(iii) PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAM.—Of the amounts in the Fund, the Administrator shall use $500,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012 to carry out the pesticide safety education program.''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(3) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (C) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively;

(B) by striking ''Amounts'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) USE OF INVESTMENT INCOME.—After consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Administrator may use income from investments described in clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (A) to carry out this section.''.

(f) ASSESSMENT OF FEES.—Section 33(d)(2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(d)(2)) is amended by striking ''For fiscal years 2004, 2005 and 2006 only, registration'' and inserting ''Registration''.

(g) DECISION REVIEW TIMES.—Section 33(f) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003'' and inserting ''Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''S11631'' and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting ''S10409 through S10411, dated July 31, 2007.''; and

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) COMPLETENESS OF APPLICATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 21 days after receiving an application and the required registration service fee, the Administrator shall conduct an initial screening of the contents of the application in accordance with clause (iii).

''(ii) REJECTION.—If the Administrator determines under clause (i) that the application does not pass the initial screening and cannot be corrected within the 21-day period, the Administrator shall reject the application not later than 10 days after making the determination.

''(iii) REQUIREMENTS OF SCREENING.—In conducting an initial screening of an application, the Administrator shall determine whether—

''(I)(aa) the applicable registration service fee has been paid; or

''(bb) at least 25 percent of the applicable registration service fee has been paid and the application contains a waiver or refund request for the outstanding amount and documentation establishing the basis for the waiver request; and

''(II) the application contains all the necessary forms, data, and draft labeling, formatted in accordance with guidance published by the Administrator.''.

(h) REPORTS.—Section 33(k) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''March 1, 2009'' and inserting ''March 1, 2014''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by redesignating clauses (ii) through and (iv) as clauses (v) through (vii), respectively;

(ii) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

''(ii) the number of label amendments that have been reviewed using electronic means;

''(iii) the amount of money from the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund used to carry out inert ingredient review and review of similar applications under section 4(k)(3);

''(iv) the number of applications completed for identical or substantially similar applications under section 3(c)(3)(B), including the number of such applications completed within 90 days pursuant to that section;''; and

(iii) in clause (vi) (as redesignated by clause (i))—

(I) in subclause (II), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(II) in subclause (III), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

''(IV) providing for electronic submission and review of labels, including process improvements to further enhance the procedures used in electronic label review; and

''(V) the allowance and use of summaries of acute toxicity studies; and'';

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) a review of the progress in carrying out section 3(g), including—

''(i) the number of pesticides or pesticide cases reviewed;

''(ii) a description of the staffing and resources relating to the costs associated with the review and decision making relating to reregistration and registration review for compliance with the deadlines specified in this Act;

''(iii) to the extent determined appropriate by the Administrator and consistent with the authorities of the Administrator and limitations on delegation of functions by the Administrator, recommendations for—

''(I) process improvements in the handling of registration review under section 3(g);

''(II) providing for accreditation of outside reviewers and the use of outside reviewers in the registration review process; and

''(III) streamlining the registration review process, consistent with section 3(g);

''(E) a review of the progress in meeting the timeline requirements for the review of antimicrobial pesticide products under section 3(h); and

''(F) a review of the progress in carrying out the review of inert ingredients, including the number of applications pending, the number of new applications, the number of applications reviewed, staffing, and resources devoted to the review of inert ingredients and recommendations to improve the timeliness of review of inert ingredients.''.

(i) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—Section 33(m) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(m)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''2008'' and inserting ''2012''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by striking ''2009'' and inserting ''2013''; and

(ii) by striking ''2009'' and inserting ''2013''; and

(B) in subparagraphs (B) and (C)—

(i) in the subparagraph headings, by striking ''2010'' each place it appears and inserting ''2014''; and

(ii) by striking ''2010'' each place it appears and inserting ''2014''; and

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''2008'' each place it appears and inserting ''2012''.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act take effect on October 1, 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today to encourage passage of S. 1983, the Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act. This reauthorization will ensure continued, stable EPA funding for pesticide registration programs, provide predictable timelines for industry, and support the introduction of new and safer products for consumers that are better for the environment.

This legislation received extensive input and strong support from a unique alliance of the pesticides industry and the environmental community. S. 1983 builds on the success of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003 and deserves to be passed with the unanimous consent of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few points I would like to clarify regarding the text of this legislation. Regarding section 5, the summaries of acute toxicity studies shall be based on real data to further protect public health and the environment, and acute toxicity studies shall be conducted in a manner which accomplishes that goal. The summaries of the acute toxicity studies are intended to supplement the full submission of data from the registrants, not to replace that data. Registrants must still provide a full submission of acute toxicity data in their registration application.

There are three errors in the chart printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 31, 2007: The registration service fee for new category No. 133 should be $78,750, rather than $278,250; the decision time for new category No. 47 in fiscal year 3 should be 12 months; and the action description for the new category No. 61 should read: ''Non-food use; outdoor; FIFRA, subsection 2(mm) uses (1).''

And lastly, section 3 of S. 1983 amends FIFRA to add, among other provisions, a new section that is intended to reflect EPA's current practice of identifying in the docket any information claimed, but not necessarily substantiated, as confidential business information. The language in this new section is not intended to change EPA's responsibilities or practices, pursuant to other statutes, regarding the docketing of information claimed as confidential under FIFRA.

With this legislation, EPA will continue to have the resources to review each pesticide product using the best scientific practices in a more predictable timeframe. The pesticide registration program is a model of good government because it includes systemized

stakeholder involvement and furthers the openness and transparency for which all Federal Government programs should strive.

I strongly encourage the passage of this bill.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us represents the efforts of several constituent organizations working with the administration and the Congress to reach consensus.

Among the organizations who worked to produce this proposal were the Natural Resources Defense Council, Crop Life America and the Consumer Specialty Products Association. I appreciate their hard work and their willingness to set aside past differences to develop a fair and balanced funding mechanism for the EPA pesticide registration program that satisfies the needs of government, industry and the environment.

As Chairman CARDOZA pointed out, this legislation renews the successful program established in 2004 to fund the pesticide registration program administered by the Environmental Protection Agency.

The original legislation had many successes including providing stable funding for the EPA, predictable timelines for industry, new products for consumers, and the necessary funding for the EPA to complete the tolerance reassessment process mandated by the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996. While the 2004 legislation doesn't expire until next year, the realities of Federal budgetary pressure and the resulting uncertainty regarding the adequacy of appropriations make immediate action on this reauthorization legislation critical.

S. 1983 reauthorizes the existing pesticide registration program with several enhancements aimed toward clarifying what is covered and which activities the fees can be used to support, while protecting funding for certain environmental grant programs.

Again, I want to commend the groups whose efforts were instrumental in producing this legislation. I also want to commend Chairman PETERSON and Subcommittee Chairman CARDOZA and urge all Members to join us in supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further Members who seek time on my side. I just wish to also thank my colleague from Virginia for his cooperation on working together with us to extend this program.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1983, the Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act, and encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

In 2003, with the collaboration of agriculture, pesticide manufacturers and public interest organizations, Congress established a new fee schedule and registration process timeline for the Environmental Protection Agency, This Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA) was designed to improve pesticide registration and review, and PRIA has been extremely successful for all parties involved.

As the Ranking Member of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Horticulture and Organic Agriculture, which has jurisdiction over pesticide issues, I am pleased the stakeholders have again worked with Congress and the EPA This bill today continues and builds upon the successful pesticide registration process over the next five years.

Before PRIA, applicants for pesticide registration had no certainty on how long the review process at EPA would take or how much they would need to pay in fees. The EPA was under pressure from the public interest community to reassess tolerances for pesticides already registered as required under the Food Quality Protection, Act. As a result, consumers who depend on effective and safe pesticide products were not always able to take advantage of new products. Delays impacted farmers' ability to access improved plant protection and pest products.

PRIA worked because it set a firm fee schedule for pesticide registration applicants, giving the EPA resources needed to do reviews. In return, the EPA was held to specific timelines in its reviews and approvals. PRIA also enabled the EPA to complete tolerance reassessments for products approved in the past through product maintenance fees from manufacturers.

By continuing the fees and increasing registration funding, S. 1983 provides the EPA with the resources needed to maintain this successful system. Additionally, the bill continues the periodic review of registered products, requiring the EPA to reassess each product every 15 years.

The pesticide registration and review process must be based on sound science. Success also requires confidence in the regulatory system. This reauthorization and enhancement of PRIA helps ensure that the EPA is using the best science to review applicants. Timelines for reviews bring more transparency to the process, and this transparency gives confidence to pesticide users such as agriculture, manufacturers and the public interest community.

I urge my colleagues to support continuation of this successful regulatory process that has brought effective and safe products to market not only for agriculture but for all consumers.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1983.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1600

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SEPTEMBER 25, 1957, DESEGREGATION OF LITTLE ROCK CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL BY THE LITTLE ROCK NINE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 668) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the September 25, 1957, desegregation of Little Rock Central High School by the Little Rock Nine.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 668

Whereas on May 17, 1954, the United States Supreme Court announced in Brown v. Board of Education (347 U.S. 483) that, ''in the field of education, the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place'';

Whereas the Brown decision recognized as a matter of law that the segregation of public schools deprived students of the equal protection of the laws under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas in 1957, three years after the landmark Brown v. Board of Education decision, the promise of access and equality within the realm of education remained unfilled in Little Rock, Arkansas, and throughout the Nation;

Whereas on September 4, 1957, nine African American students who would later be deemed the Little Rock Nine, Minnijean Brown, Elizabeth Eckford, Ernest Green, Thelma Mothershed, Melba Pattillo, Gloria Ray, Terrence Roberts, Jefferson Thomas, and Carlotta Walls, were denied admittance to Little Rock Central High by the Arkansas National Guard at the order of the Arkansas Governor;

Whereas on September 23, 1957, the Little Rock Nine, armed with a Federal court order, again tried to attend Little Rock Central High and implement the law of the land, but protests and violence forced the group of students to leave the school;

Whereas on September 25, 1957, this Nation would realize a historic day when the Little Rock Nine, escorted by Federal troops at the order of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, successfully integrated Little Rock Central High;

Whereas throughout their tenure at Little Rock Central High, the Little Rock Nine, with conviction and dignity, championed school integration despite death threats, verbal and physical assaults, school closings, and other adversities;

Whereas the Little Rock Nine are symbolic of the victorious dismantling of school segregation, as well as the full and equal participation in American society that all citizens are entitled to, and continue to advance such principles through the Little Rock Nine Foundation;