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Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, West Fork is in a remote part of Dolores County, Colorado, surrounded by the San Juan National Forest. Emergency and fire response is a challenge in this part of the country because the closest fire station is currently 26 miles away. The amendment I have offered would authorize the Forest Service to convey approximately 3.6 acres of National Forest System land to Dolores County for the strict purpose of building and operating a fire station in the West Fork area.

In addition to creating emergency and fire response challenges, the lack of a dedicated fire station has created insurance challenges for homeowners in West Fork. In an area surrounded by the national forest, it is critical to have fire insurance for your home and other structures on your property. With no fire station in reasonable proximity to the area, it is nearly impossible for homeowners to obtain fire insurance in West Fork.

The text of this amendment is identical to the West Fork Fire Station Act, which passed the House by a voice vote last month. I encourage my colleagues to once again support this measure as an amendment to H.R. 2.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERY

The Acting CHAIR. The Amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIPTON) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole, will control the debate.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Acting Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERY), the amendment was agreed to; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIPTON) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole, will control the debate.

The Acting CHAIR. The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIPTON), pursuant to House Resolution 900 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereof.

AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIPTON), Pursuant to House Resolution 900 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. 2.

Mr. WEBER of Texas (Mr. WEBER) kindly resume the chair.
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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. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, with Mr. WEBER of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.
The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 20 printed in part C of House Report 115-677 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERG) was agreed to.

Pursuant to House Resolution 900, no further amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute referred to in House Resolution 891 shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115–679.

Each such further amendment shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115–679.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 1301 and insert the following new sections:

**SEC. 1301. SUGAR PROGRAM.**

(a) **Loan Rate.—**Section 156 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272) is amended by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following new subsections:

"(a) SUGAR CANE.—The Secretary shall make loans available to processors of domestically grown sugar cane at a rate equal to—" 18.75 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2018 crop year; and

"(2) 18.00 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2019 through 2023 crop years.

(b) **Avoiding Forfeitures While Ensuring Adequate Supplies at Reasonable Prices.—**Section 156(f) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272b) is amended—

(1) in subsection heading, by inserting "WHILE ENSURING ADEQUATE SUPPLIES AT REASONABLE PRICES" after "FORFEITURES"; and

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting "ensure adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices and" after "shall":

(c) **Preservation of Employment.—**Section 156(i) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272c) is amended by striking "2018" and inserting "2023."

**SEC. 1302. INCREASE IN MINIMUM PRICES FOR BIOENERGY PRODUCERS TERMINATION.**

Section 9016 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8116) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) **TERMINATION.**—The Secretary may not carry out the flexibility program under subsection (b) for the 2019 or subsequent crops of eligible commodities.".

**SEC. 1303. ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS.**

Part VII of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 198aa et seq.) is amended as follows:

"PART VII—SUGAR

**SEC. 339. ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS.**

(1) **RENEWAL.—**Notwithstanding any other provision of law, at the beginning of fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter through the end of the effective period, the Secretary shall establish the tariff-rate quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugar to provide adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices, but at no less than the minimum level necessary to comply with obligations under international trade agreements that have been approved by Congress.

(2) **ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary shall adjust tariff-rate quotas established under subsection (a) in such a manner as to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that stocks of raw cane and refined beet sugar are adequate throughout the crop year to meet the needs of the marketplace, including the efficient utilization of cane refining capacity.

(3) **TRANSFERS VOLUNTARY.**—Any transfer under this subsection shall be valid only pursuant to a voluntary agreement between the transferor and the transferee, consistent with procedures established by the Secretary.

(4) **LIMITATIONS ON TRANSFERS WITH RESPECT TO FISCAL YEAR.**

(A) **In General.**—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations that—

(B) **In General.**—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations that—

(A) provide full use of the tariff-rate quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugar and ensure adequate supplies for cane refineries in the United States;

(B) provide that any country that has been allocated a share of the quotas may temporarily transfer all or part of the share to any other country that has also been allocated a share of the quotas.

(4) **EFFECTIVE PERIOD.**—This section shall be effective for fiscal years only through the 2023 crop year for sugar."

Strike section 6410.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague MIKE CONAWAY and the other members of the Agriculture Committee for their work on the farm bill. I have every intention of voting for the bill and have stated that on many occasions.

Having been working on a reauthorization of a major bill recently, I can certainly sympathize with the effort here and say that, overall, this bill is an improvement on past farm bills because it responds to the desperate need of work force insecurity for able-bodied people.

However, there is another piece of this bill that has been around for a long time, 85 years, that is not corrected, is decidedly bad policy, and is long overdue to be corrected, and our amendment does that.

This amendment is not new. In fact, this body has debated it in every farm bill I have voted on over a generation. That issue of which I speak is the issue with sugar and the need for reform of the way we treat sugar, which is different from all other commodity programs.

It is the only program that provides both loan support and supply management. Supply management is the ugly cousin of direct payments. It rewards inactivity.

Americans are outraged when they hear tales of direct payments to farmers for not producing something. That same injustice—reward for inactivity, protection from competition—is what we find in the sugar program.

Let’s be crystal-clear about what the sugar program does. It puts the government in charge of deciding how much sugar will be produced in this country, which inflates the cost, and it guarantees the processing industry a base profit by giving them subsidized loans. We stopped these practices years ago for other commodities, and only sugar is left with this sweet deal.

When the government gets into picking winners and losers, American jobs are at risk. The International Trade Commission has stated that for every job the sugar program protects we lose 35 jobs in manufacturing. Jobs. Congress should not be in the business of defending a program that is a bona fide job killer.

This amendment has a broad coalition of support. Free market groups, economists, environmentalists, consumer groups, and manufacturers all support this amendment.

Let me tell you about the other coalition. It is not very large. It is made up of 13 vertically integrated sugar processors. That is government transferring wealth to these processors. It shifts costs onto our Nation’s manufacturers and consumers by almost $4 billion annually.

We are going to hear arguments about candy bars, candy companies, and a lot of other distractions. But it is all brought up to shift your attention away from the very program we are here to debate, the sugar program.

In reality, the sugar program hastes sunshine. It hastes getting the spotlight. But I am glad we are debating it here today.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to Ms. FOXX’s amendment.

She singles out sugar, cuts its program back to where it was 33 years ago, and denigrates the hardworking men and women who are farmers. Those processors she mentioned are co-op owned; they are owned by those hardworking farmers. There is no inactivity with respect to the sugar industry. She couldn’t be more wrong or more disrespectful of them.

Her amendment would not save the taxpayer one dime. Fifteen out of the last 16 years, the sugar program has worked. The reason we have not changed it over all those years is because it does work. If we were to move it under title I to treat it exactly the way other commodities are treated, it would cost billions of taxpayer dollars. We don’t want that, and the sugar industry is not asking for that.

This amendment will not save the consumer one penny. These large sugar users buy sugar at a great cost—buy by the carload. When the price of sugar dropped to half of what it should have been in 2013 as a result of Mexico cheating on the trade deal, they did not share that profit with anybody.

Quite frankly, just to put it succinctly, if sugar was such a driving cost in the cost of all production and the cost to all the jobs that the gentleman mentioned, my diet soda would cost dramatically less than a sugar soda. They don’t. They cost exactly the same. They still give this product away in restaurants.

So, as we go about this issue, this is about protecting American jobs and American hardworking farmers from unfair undue competition from around the world.

We don’t let other products come into this country at below the cost of production. We do it when we fight steel. We had a recent fight against Turkey over the imports of steel because it was below the cost of production. We would protect all other products that way. We just simply leave this one in place because it works year-in and year-out, except for the 1 year Mexico cheated on the program, and that is when it cost the American taxpayers money.

So it doesn’t cost; it doesn’t save taxpayer money, and it doesn’t save consumers money. It is simply a windfall of sorts to the sugar buyers and users.

I don’t have a grudge against them at all. Like I said, I eat and drink their products. I am trying to defend American farmers from products being produced overseas by slave labor in some instances, child labor in other instances, standards under which we don’t produce. It is dumped into these markets because those governments, unlike ours, have a direct payment to their farmers and producers to keep them in business.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I thank her for her leadership on this issue.

This amendment is long overdue. The sugar program that currently exists has distorted the marketplace for too long. According to one estimate, it has driven up consumer prices by over $4 billion a year. And it is making it more difficult for us to negotiate greater market access in trade negotiations overseas.

Mr. Chairman, I am also disappointed that many of my fiscally responsible reform amendments were rejected late last night in the Rules Committee, such as:

Why do multimillionaires and billionnaires still qualify for agriculture subsidies under the current bill?

Why are multiple people on the same farm receiving the same subsidies under this bill, from husbands to wives, to sons, to daughters, the nieces, the cousins?

Why can’t we at least track where the crop insurance premium subsidies are going, which is currently prohibited under this bill?

This legislation should be working for family farmers, not powerful special interests here in Washington. I fear it is a missed opportunity.

This amendment at least introduces some modicum of reform, which is long overdue in a program that has distorted the marketplace for too long.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to accept this amendment today.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), who is the ranking member of the powerful Agriculture Committee.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish my friends on the Ways and Means Committee would actually do something about the illegal subsidization that is going on in the sugar industry in the world instead of coming here and complaining about a program that actually works.

I have the biggest sugar district in the country. The people who grow sugar in my district are small farmers. They use their own money to build the plant. It is probably 25 percent of the economy in the north part of my district.

All this amendment would do is give these jobs and this market away to other countries that are subsidizing their people more than we are in the United States. And they are working these plants with child labor, slave labor, in these other places.

Is that what you want to do? Give away our jobs to places where there are no environmental regulations, where we go down the river. They are making sugar out of sugarcane. They are burning it with gas. It goes right into the atmosphere. There is no EPA. There are no regulations whatsoever. They are putting this vinsasse, which is like oil, right into the river.

And we are going to get rid of an industry in the United States that is doing a good job? It is the lowest cost producer in the world, and we are going to give it up because other people are cheating?

Now, people say that this thing costs money. It only cost money 1 year, and the reason is because the Mexicans dumped in our market and our government didn’t do anything about it. When we finally got the suspension agreement in place, then we were able to get this thing stabilized.

So this is an amendment that is not needed. This is a program that works. The reason we have this program is to protect ourselves from all these other countries that are subsidizing their industries more than we are in the United States.

We are the lowest cost producer in my district. We are the lowest cost producer of anyplace in the world. We can compete, but we can’t compete against governments that are dumping money in and not following environmental regulations and not following child labor laws. We can’t compete against that.

So please vote down this amendment. It is something that is not necessary and is not needed.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, not my words, but the International Trade Commission says that for every job sugar protects, we lose three manufacturing jobs.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

I come here to the House floor as the son, grandson, and great-grandson of farmers. I grew up working on a farm in rural Texas, and I strongly oppose Federal subsidies to agriculture in general and the sugar program in particular.

Under the Federal sugar program, which dates back to the New Deal, domestic sugar prices are propped up via a Byzantine system of marketing, allotments, import quotas, price supports, and a loan guarantee program so bad it would make a Soviet commissar blush.

This may be a sweet deal for sugar producers, but it is not a sweet deal for the auto mechanic in Mesquite, Texas; the store clerk in Mineola, Texas; or the teacher in Garland, Texas, that I represent in the Fifth District. Where is their government subsidy program?
This is antijob. It is a food tax. It is income redistribution at its worst. And it is not commensurate with any free market principle I know.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to support the amendment.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I point out that over half of all U.S. sugar processing operations in the United States since 1980 have closed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, this is a farm policy. The farm policy is there to produce a policy so that the American farmers can go out and raise crops for the United States of America to continue to produce the highest quality, the most abundant, and the cheapest food produced in the world of any industrialized nation. That is why we have a farm policy.

This amendment of Ms. FOXX goes after the American farmers for the betterment of multinational soda companies and candy companies, and the price of sugar won’t go down. In my hometown, a 4-pound bag of sugar costs $2.64.

I would ask every Member of Congress: How many constituents in your district have come up to you and pleaded for you to do something about the cost of sugar?
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This is about the American farmer, not about candy companies and soda companies. It is misdirected. I oppose it and strongly advise everybody to vote against it.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would also point out the additional closed plants and jobs lost in the sugar growing industry.

U.S.- and foreign-sweetened product manufacturers have announced 100 plant openings, acquisitions, or expansions within the United States over that same time frame.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support fair sugar policy.

The sugar program represents a hidden tax on American businesses and consumers and is responsible for the loss of U.S. food manufacturing jobs. Each month, families go to the grocery store, and unbeknownst to them, the sugar in many of the products they buy is subject to a cost that is generally 30 to 40 percent higher than the world cost. Very few, if any, will ever know that a hidden sugar tax has been imposed upon them by the sugar program. This hidden tax totals at least $2.4 billion a year for American consumers.

There are more than 600,000 sugar-using industry jobs in our Nation, including thousands in Virginia’s Sixth District. I want to stand up and be counted as an advocate for keeping those jobs in the United States.

I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for this amendment to help put an end to the hidden costs of the sugar program.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time is left on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that that hidden tax that my colleagues are talking about will not be shared with the consumers. It has never been shared with the price of sugar. It goes down. It will simply shift those profits into multinational corporations that are depending by supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, as you may guess, I am a big fan of a good candy bar.

In 1983, a candy bar cost 35 cents and had a cost of about 2 cents worth of sugar. Thirty-five years later, I am still a fan of the same candy bar. In 2018, that same candy bar costs $1.49—they are a little slimmer—and the cost of sugar is still 2 cents.

United States retail sugar costs are the lowest in the world: 59 cents a pound compared to 71 cents on the open market. The sugar program cost the taxpayers zero in the last 16 years.

Rather than message about alleged conservative amendments, let’s focus on addressing meaningful changes. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, the fact is that there are lots of companies that use sugar and are behemoths. I represent a number of them in Portland, Oregon, that are confectioners, candy makers, and bakers who are concerned about this.

In terms of the benefit, think about the 13 mega processors that the sugar program forces manufacturers to pay far more than they need. This is a $3 billion burden on the taxpayer.

We have an opportunity here to deal with one other thing. If we start getting the pricing right, there is another hidden tax in terms of the sugar system that we have, and that has been on the Florida Everglades.

We have a $7.5 billion down payment because of the damage that has been inflicted on the Everglades by the massive cane sugar operation that has increased dramatically in the last 50 years, a cost that taxpayers will be footing and environmental costs to go with the burden on sugar-using industries.

I strongly urge approval of the amendment.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the Republican chair-
make sure that we remain competitive and we can defend our folks.

Mr. Chairman, I represent thousands of farmers from Louisiana who depend upon this crop. If we pass this amendment, the precedent that it sets rolling into other types of crops will devastate American farmers.

This amendment is a flawed amendment. It is going to undermine our agriculture industry across the United States. I urge opposition. Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not only about being again a Soviet-style regime and the quotas and a variety of other things that come with it, but this amendment is, hopefully, about common sense.

The one thing we don’t want to subsidize are the things that cause us problems. Nebraska has utilized more than a quarter of a trillion dollars in healthcare costs as type 2 diabetes has ballooned. To give you the exact number, $327 billion a year is spent on type 2 diabetes.

So the idea of saying let’s subsidize our sugar so that we can then spend more on healthcare is something that needs to be looked at.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It is interesting to listen to the various arguments here, but certainly there is unfair competition, if you will—it is hard to even call it competition—overseas, but we have unfair trade practices. Sugar policy here helps us defend ourselves.

These are manufacturing jobs in western Nebraska and our sugar beet is number one. That means they will be postponed.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvana (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the current U.S. sugar program represents an anti-free market scheme that imposes a massive hidden tax on both American businesses and consumers for the benefit of a small, concentrated group of special interests.

People say, well, we have got the safest, cheapest food source in the world in the United States. It is cheap because we are paying for it with our taxes. These are Soviet-style policies imposing significant, unnecessary costs on the domestic food manufacturing industry and the consumer.

Policies have imposed $2.4 billion to $4 billion worth of losses to sugar users across the Nation. These industries provide jobs to 600,000 Americans, including 40,000 Pennsylvanians.

Mr. Chairman. I urge passage.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in solidarity with south Texas sugar and in opposition to the Foxx-Davis amendment.

In deep south Texas, we are proud of our sugar corporation, our sugar mill, and the jobs they support. Our existing sugar policy is the playing field for American producers in the ever volatile world of the sugar market. It works. Sugar growers in my district can attest to that. Better yet, it has come at no cost to taxpayers for 14 of the last 15 years.

I ask everyone to vote “no” on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has the right to close.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Foxx amendment.

In my home State of Minnesota, sugar beet is number one. That means this amendment will directly hurt my State’s economy.

Minnesota’s sugar creates more than 28,000 jobs and has an annual impact of more than $3 billion. This amendment will cost Minnesota and other sugar-producing States so much more. It will hurt farmers, small businesses, schools, hospitals—real lives of real people in rural communities that this bill is supposed to help.

We should be supporting American farmers instead of sending their jobs to countries that heavily subsidize sugar production, like Brazil and Mexico. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this harmful amendment, and I ask them to stand with farmers in Minnesota and all across the United States.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, in closing, our government’s current sugar program is a job killer. It ensures profits for the connected few at the expense of the many. It operates at a substantial cost to taxpayers, consumers, and businesses. It is rooted in supply management economics that were drafted nearly 90 years ago.

Every other commodity program was subjected to reforms during the last farm bill except the sugar program. Economists, consumer groups, environmentalists, manufacturers, editorial boards, and groups on both the left and right of the ideological spectrum have all endorsed the idea of substantially reforming this program.

It is time to end Congress’ codification of a special interest giveaway. It is time to modernize the sugar program. I ask my colleagues to support our amendment and the farm bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I couldn’t disagree more.

The arguments that are touted by the folks who are in favor of this amendment will not be shared with consumers. They will be kept by these multinational corporations and, yes, the small sugar users across this country.

There are no tax dollars involved, despite the rhetoric to the contrary, except for 1 year out of 16, because this program worked. This program was not changed in 2014 because it works. It doesn’t cost the taxpayers any money, sugar prices are not distorted, and the manufacturers will not be able to support the one instance where they have lowered the cost of their product when sugar prices did in fact drop as a result of unfair, unequled competition around this world.

If we could talk the rest of the world into going to a free market, to a level playing field, then I would agree completely with my colleagues who support this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to this amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, in closing, our sugar corporation, our sugar mill, and the jobs they support. Our existing sugar policy is the playing field for American producers in the ever volatile world of the sugar market. It works. Sugar growers in my district can attest to that. Better yet, it has come at no cost to taxpayers for 14 of the last 15 years.

I ask everyone to vote “no” on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has the right to close.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115–679.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 28, line 3, insert a comma after “2008”.

Page 28, line 6, strike “covered commodity” and all that follows through “basis” on line 7, and insert the following: “covered-commodity- by-covered-commodity basis”.

Page 103, strike lines 3 through 4.

Page 110, line 17, insert “, or eligible for indemnity or compensation payments through programs administered by the Secretary” before the period at the end.

Page 111, line 1, insert “, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service,” after “Conservation Service”.

Page 218, line 15, strike “bachelors” and insert “bachelors’”.
Page 245, line 13 strike "and" and insert "or".

Page 255, line 15 strike "member," and insert "member; and".

Page 257, line 18 strike "enactment of" and insert "enactment of the.

Page 263, line 4 strike "and" and insert "of".

Page 269, line 20 strike "Section 5" and insert "Effective October 1, 2020, section 5".

Page 273, line 24 strike "discrimination against health care".

Page 279, line 5 strike the following:

"(B) by striking "supplemental security"

Page 281, line 18 strike "or" and insert "or disabled after "elderly"

Page 281, line 19 strike "or" and insert "disability after "elderly"

Page 281, line 20 strike "elderly".

Page 283, line 1 insert "(including volunteer work that is limited to 6 months of a 12-month period)" after "work".

Page 286, strike line 10.

Page 288, line 17 strike the period and the close quotation marks.

Page 290, after line 17, insert the following:

"(iv) Employment and training for veterans operated by the Department of Labor or the Department of Veterans Affairs, and approved by the Secretary," and

Page 294, line 25 strike "paragraph" and insert paragraphs (4) and (5).

Page 298, line 2 strike "(D), and (C)" and insert "(C), and (D)"

Page 301, line 2 insert "with and the approval of the chief executive officer of the State," after "agency".

Page 303, line 22 strike "6" and insert "7".

Page 305, line 24 insert "most recent 24-month period for which Department of Labor unemployment rates are available, nor earlier than the" after "the".

Page 305, line 14 strike "15 PERCENT" and insert "PERCENTAGE".

Page 309, line 11 strike "and" at the end, and insert a period.

Page 310, strike lines 12 and 13.

Page 315, strike lines 19 through 22, and insert the following:

"(ii) FISCAL YEARS 2021 THROUGH 2025.—Subject to clauses (v) and (vi), for each of the fiscal years 2021 through 2025, a State agency may provide a number of grants and loans to eligible recipients that do not exceed 12 percent of the number of covered individuals in the State in fiscal year 2019, as estimated by the Secretary, based on the survey conducted to carry out section 16(c) for the most recent fiscal year and other factors as the Secretary considers appropriate due to the timing and limitations of the survey."

Page 317, line 8 strike ", (iv)" and insert "(v)

Page 317, line 17 strike "(v)" and insert "(vi)

Page 318, line 19 strike clause (iv) and re designate succeeding clauses accordingly.

Page 324, beginning on line 22, strike "unpaid or volunteer work that is limited to 6 months of a 12-month period" and insert "other work experience".

Page 329, line 3 add "and" at the end.

Page 331, line 5 strike "and" at the end.

Page 335, strike lines 6 through 8.

Page 339, strike lines 9 and 10, and insert the following:

"(C) in subparagraph (F)—
(i) clause (ii) by striking "one hundred and twenty hours per month" and inserting "the hours required under section 6(d)(1)(B)", and (ii) by striking clause (iii), (D) by striking subparagraphs (D) and (E), and inserting the following:

Page 341, line 16 strike "(D)" and insert "(E)

Page 343, strike lines 18 and 19, and insert the following:

"(F) by redesignating subparagraphs (F) through (M) as subparagraphs (E) through (L).

Beginning on page 259, strike line 22 and all that follow through line 2 on page 260, and insert the following:

"(1) AMENDMENTS TO THE FOOD AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2008.—The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 5(d)(14) by striking "6(d)(4)(I)" and inserting "6(d)(4)(G)", and

(B) in section 17(b)(1)(B)(v)(III)(dd) by striking "(4)(F)(i), or (4)(K)" and inserting "(4)(A)(i), (4)(E)(i), or (4)(J)"

Page 345, strike lines 24 and 25, and insert the following:

"(1) by amending subsection (e)(5) to read as follows:

(5) is—

(A) a parent or other household member with responsibility for the care of a dependent child under age 6 or of an incapacitated person; or

(B) a parent or other household member with responsibility for the care of a dependent child above the age of 5 and under the age of 12 for whom adequate child care is not available to enable the individual to attend school and satisfy the requirements of paragraph (4); and

Page 347, after line 24, insert the following:

"(C) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

"(C) RETURN OF UNUSED EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING FUNDS TO THE TREASURY.—If a State agency will not expend all of the funds allocated to the State agency for a fiscal year under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall deposit such unused funds in the general receipts of the Treasury.

Page 349, line 1 strike "(C)" and insert "(D)

Page 351, line 3 strike "(D)" and insert "(E)

Page 353, beginning on line 22, strike subsection (g).

Page 355, line 10 strike "(h)" and insert "(i)"

Page 357, strike lines 11 and 12, and insert the following:

"(1) AMENDMENTS.—Section 20(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 3209(b) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "6(d)(1)(B)", and

(ii) by striking "or (F)" and inserting "(F), (G), and (H)"

(B) in paragraph (4) by striking "sixteen" and inserting "18"

Page 359, strike lines 1 through 6, and insert the following:

"(B) in section 17(b) by striking paragraph (2)

Page 361, after line 6, insert the following:

"(D) in subparagraph (iii) of section 3 to determine whether benefits are properly used by or on behalf of participating households residing in such facilities and whether such facilities are using more than one source of Federal or State funding to meet the food needs of residents;

(B) may carry out similar reviews for currently participating residential drug and alcohol treatment and rehabilitation programs, and group living arrangements for the blind and disabled;

"(C) shall gather information and these entities shall be required to submit information deemed necessary for a full and thorough review; and

(D) shall report the results of these reviews to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry of the Senate not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2018, along with recommendations as to any additional requirements that would be appropriate for such facilities and retailers, and whether these entities should continue to be mental nutrition assistance program benefits and determining the correct amount of such benefits at the time of household certification.

Page 369, line 5, strike the comma at the end and insert a semicolon.

Page 371, line 5 strike lines 6 and 7.

Page 373, line 25, strike "and" at the end.

Page 379, after line 25, insert the following:

"(VII) requires that the State demonstration projects are voluntary for all retail food stores and that all recipients are able to use benefits in non-participating retail food stores; and"

Page 381, line 1, strike "(VII)" and insert "(VIII)"

Page 383, line 1 strike "(VIII)" and insert "(IX)"

Page 385, line 1, strike "(IX)" and insert "(X)"

Page 387, line 1, strike "(X)" and insert "(XI)"

Page 391, line 5, strike "B Russell" and insert "B. Russell"

Page 393, after line 13, insert the following:

"(D) FUNDs availability.—Funds appropriated under this paragraph shall remain available for obligation for a period of 2 fiscal years, and

Page 395, strike lines 19 through 23, and insert the following:

"(7) in section 17(b)(1)(B)(v)(III)(aa) by striking "3(3)" and inserting "3(3)"

Page 399, after line 10, insert the following:

"SEC. 4007. REVIEW OF SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM OPERATIONS.

Section 9 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2018), as amended by section 4026, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i) REVIEW OF PROGRAM OPERATIONS.—

(1) The Secretary—

(A) shall review a representative sample of currently authorized retail food stores as defined in subsections (o)(2) and (k)(3) of section 3 to determine whether benefits are properly used by or on behalf of participating households residing in such facilities and whether such facilities are using more than one source of Federal or State funding to meet the food needs of residents;

(B) may carry out similar reviews for currently participating residential drug and alcohol treatment and rehabilitation programs, and group living arrangements for the blind and disabled;

(C) shall gather information and these entities shall be required to submit information deemed necessary for a full and thorough review; and

(D) shall report the results of these reviews to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry of the Senate not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2018, along with recommendations as to any additional requirements that would be appropriate for such facilities and retailers, and whether these entities should continue to be
authorized to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

(2) Nothing in this section shall authorize the Secretary to deny any application for continuing participation, any application for authorization, or any request to withdraw the authorization of any facility or entity referenced in subsections (a)(2) and (b)(3) of section 2013 of this title, on the condition that, on an annual basis, the local agency in the State administering the commodity supplemental food program—

(a) determine that the participant has a

(b) has sufficient reason to determine that the participant still meets the income eligibility standards, which may include a determination that the participant has a fixed income.”. Page 301, line 3, redesignate section 4103 as section 1094.

SEC. 4103. ELIGIBILITY FOR COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM.

Section 5(g) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note) is amended—

(1) by striking “Except” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except”, and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) Certification.—

(A) Definition of certification period.—In this section, the term ‘certification period’ means the period in which a participant in the commodity supplemental food program may continue to receive benefits under that program based on a formal review of the eligibility of the participant.

(B) Minimum certification period.—Subject to subparagraph (C), a State shall establish a certification period of not less than 1 year.

(C) Extensions.—On the request of a State, the Secretary shall approve a State certification period of more than 1 year on the condition that, on an annual basis, the local agency in the State administering the commodity supplemental food program—

(i) assess and express continued interest of each participant in receiving program benefits; and

(ii) has sufficient reason to determine that the participant still meets the income eligibility standards, which may include a determination that the participant has a fixed income.”.

Page 301, line 3, redesignate section 4103 as section 1094.

SEC. 4205. REVIEW AND REVISION OF CERTAIN NUTRITION REGULATIONS.

(a) Review of existing regulations.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and for the purposes described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall review—

(1) the final regulations on “National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program: Nutrition Standards for All Foods Sold in School as Required by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010” published by the Department of Agriculture in the Federal Register on July 29, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 50123 et seq.); and

(2) the final regulations on “Nutrition Standards in the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs” published by the Department of Agriculture in the Federal Register on January 26, 2012 (77 Fed. Reg. 4080 et seq.).

(b) Finalizing new regulations.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the write-in personal and school leaders (including school administrators, school boards, and parents), shall finalize new regulations that revise the regulations described in subsection (a) based on the review of such regulations under such subsection, including any requirements for

milk, to ensure that the requirements of such regulations—

(1) are based on research based on school-age children;

(2) do not add costs in addition to the reimbursements required to carry out the school lunch program authorized under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.); and

(3) maintain healthy meals for students.

Page 277, line 10, strike “health” and insert “health”.

Page 277, line 21, add a period at the end.

Page 278, line 12, strike “road mile” and insert “road-mile”.

Page 344, line 4, strike “and” at the end.

Page 361, after the final period, insert the following (and redesignate any succeeding section accordingly):

SEC. 6116. FEDERAL BROADBAND PROGRAM COORDINATION.

(a) Consultation between USDA and NTIA.—The Secretary shall consult with the Administration of the Department of Commerce and the Federal Communications Commission about the availability of broadband, including what steps are needed to support broadband deployment, including areas with respect to which an entity is receiving—

(i) support under a broadband loan or grant program of the Department of Agriculture; or

(ii) Connect America Fund or Mobility Fund support under the Federal universal service support mechanisms established under section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254).

(b) Consultation between USDA and FCC.—(1) By USDA.—The Secretary shall consult with the Commission before making a broadband loan or grant for a project to serve an area with respect to which another entity is receiving Connect America Fund or Mobility Fund support under the Federal universal service support mechanisms established under section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254).

(2) By FCC.—The Commission shall consult with the Secretary before offering or providing Connect America Fund or Mobility Fund support under the Federal universal service support mechanisms established under section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254).

(c) Harmonization of services and data.—The Commission shall consult with the Secretary to harmonize the services and data provided under the Connect America Fund and Mobility Fund programs and activities in order to develop coordination mechanisms to ensure that—

(A) each entity is served only once;

(B) the Federal and State agencies coordinate on the implementation of the Federal universal service support mechanisms established under section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254); and

(C) the broadband programs and activities are consistent with the purposes described in section 254(j) of the Federal Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254).

(d) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) Assistant Secretary.—The term “Assistant Secretary” means the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information.

(2) Commission.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission.

(3) Rural area.—The term “rural area” has the meaning given the term in section 1933(b)(3) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1966.

Page 361, line 14, strike “tribe” and insert “Tribes”.


Page 379, line 24, strike “by striking” and all that follows through “inserting” on line 25, and insert the following: “by striking ‘maintained under section 333(b)(2)(A)”.

Page 390, line 16, strike “and inserting” and all that follows through “and” on line 17, and insert the following: “and inserting ‘355 or”.

Page 394, line 6, strike “tribes” and insert “Tribes”.

Page 414, line 2, strike the extra space before “communities”.

Page 486, after line 11, insert the following: “(b) Priorities.—Section 412(b)(1) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7632(b)(1)) is amended by striking ‘multi-institutional’ and inserting ‘or multi-institutional’.

Page 486, line 12, strike “(b)” and insert “(c)”.

Page 486, line 29, strike “(c)” and insert “(d)”.

Page 455, line 20, insert “or ranchers” after “farmers”.

Page 541, line 1, insert “address” before “other”.

Page 546, line 5, strike “in” and insert “on”.

Page 554, line 18, strike “The Administration” and insert “The Commission”.

Page 575, line 2, strike “Department of Agriculture” and insert “Food and Drug Administration”.

Page 598, line 3, strike “and subparagraph (B)” of paragraph (1) and all that follows through “Secretary” on line 6, and insert the following:

Page 598, line 9, insert “,” not more than 4 percent may be retained by the Secretary to

healthcare, commercial, and industrial purposes in rural areas.

(C) The cost to deploy and support such technologies in several rural geographies.

(3) Identify and quantify the availability of broadband and services on existing broadband deployment in rural areas, including ways to do the following:

(A) Harmonize broadband notification and reporting requirements and develop common verification procedures across all federally supported broadband programs.

(B) Consolidate and utilize the existing broadband service data.

(C) Collect and share data on those projects in rural areas where Federal programs are currently supporting broadband deployment, including areas with respect to which an entity is receiving—

(i) support under a broadband loan or grant program of the Department of Agriculture; or

(ii) Connect America Fund or Mobility Fund support under the Federal universal service support mechanisms established under section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254).

(D) Leverage support technologies and services from online platforms for providers of broadband service.

(d) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) Assistant Secretary.—The term “Assistant Secretary” means the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information.

(2) Commissioner.—The term “Commissioner” means the Federal Communications Commission.

(3) Rural area.—The term “rural area” has the meaning given the term in section 1933(b)(3) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1966.
pay administrative costs incurred by the Secretary after ’10499B’. Page 598, line 10, insert ‘of such paragraph’ after ‘(B)’.

Page 599, line 12, strike ‘and (B)’ and all that follows through ‘paragraph’ on line 13. Page 598, line 13, strike ‘ten’ and insert ‘10’.

Page 599, line 3, insert before the period at the end the following: ‘to be made available for expenditure without further appropriation’.

Page 621, line 23, strike ‘boys’ and insert ‘boys’.

Page 622, line 8, strike ‘boys’ and insert ‘boys’.

Page 635, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 11608. ESTABLISHMENT OF FOOD ACCESS LIAISON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), as amended by sections 11204 and 11607, is amended by adding at the end the following:

(SEC. 223. FOOD ACCESS LIAISON.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish the position of Food Access Liaison to coordinate Department programs to reduce barriers to food access and monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of such programs in accordance with this section.

(b) DUTIES.—The Food Access Liaison shall—

(1) coordinate the efforts of the Department, including regional offices, to experiment and consider programs and policies aimed at reducing barriers to food access for consumers, including but not limited to participants in nutrition assistance programs;

(2) provide outreach to entities engaged in activities to reduce barriers to food access in accordance with the statutory authorization for each program;

(3) provide outreach to entities engaged in activities to reduce barriers to food access, including businesses, markets and producers, and others involved in food production and distribution, with respect to the availability of, and eligibility for, Department programs;

(4) raise awareness of food access issues in interactions with employees of the Department;

(5) make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to efforts to reduce barriers to food access; and

(6) submit to Congress an annual report with respect to the efforts of the Department to reduce barriers to food access.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance to entities that are participants, or seek to participate, in Department of Agriculture programs related to reduction of barriers to food access.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2 includes a substantive, enforceable supportive work requirement for work-capable individuals 18 to 59. Waivers and exemptions were tightened to address the weaknesses in our economy and our labor market that make it hard for them to get ahead.

Instead, this farm bill largely ignores the complex challenges faced by low-wage workers, imposing harsh new sanctions and requirements that will take food away from families who are willing but unable to find consistent work.

Hungry never helped anyone find a job. According to the CBO, the Chairman’s bill will move billions of dollars off the kitchen table, largely to finance state bureaucracies intended to assist recipients with employment. Food will remain critical fuel for the success of these families, yet this bill would effectively starve Peter to feed Paul.

Losing SNAP will make it harder for these families to make ends meet. We fully expect our food banks to experience the brunt of this bill. Food banks already struggle to meet the demand in their communities, and we will not be able to keep up. We are also very concerned that this bill will repeal state flexibility and put massive new responsibilities on states in pursuit of their food stamp beneficiaries.

These ideas ignore the evidence-based policy making that the Chairman has espoused by selling a promise on work, but not delivering on the necessary funding to make that workable.

We urge every member of the committee to reject this proposal, and return to a bipartisan process that will help more hard-working Americans avoid hunger and achieve financial security.

Sincerely,

Colleen Cole, CEO, Feeding Texas; Zack Wilson, Executive Director, High Plains Food Bank; Theresa Mangapora, Executive Director, Brazos Valley Food Bank; Roby Harris, Executive Director, Coastal Bend Food Bank; Dennis Cullinane, CEO, East Texas Food Bank; Robin Cadile, President/CEO, Food Bank of the Rio Grande Valley; Jody Houston, CEO, Food Bank of West Central Texas; Brian Greene, President/CEO Houston Food Bank;

Trisha Cunningham, President/CEO, North Texas Food Bank; Dan Maher, Executive Director, Southeast Texas Food Bank; Allie Hansen, Executive Director, South Texas Food Bank; Libby Campbell, Executive Director, West Texas Food Bank; Derrick Crabbs, President/CEO, Central Texas Food Bank; Gregory Duke, Executive Director, Concho Valley Regional Food Bank;

Susan Goodell, CEO, El Pasoans Fighting Hunger Food Bank; DeAnne Economedes, Interim CEO, Food Bank of the Rio Grande Valley; Richard Nye, Executive Director, Dallas County Food Bank; Allison Hulett, President/CEO, Montgomery County Food Bank; Eric Cooper, President/CEO, San Antonio Food Bank; David Weiler, CEO, South Plains Food Bank; Bo Soderberg, Executive Director, Tarrant Area Food Bank; Kara Nickens, Executive Director, Wichita Falls Area Food Bank.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I thought that this bill couldn’t get any worse, but I was wrong. This amendment is a sure sign that this underlying farm bill is flawed. This manager’s amendment is longer than most bills that we consider in this House.

It is simply good policy to send unexpended funds back to the Treasury. This amendment does that.

Our colleagues on the other side said we did not count veteran-specific workforce development programs as a part of the 11607, is amended by adding at the end the following: ‘to have offered in committee or on this floor, and we would have accepted it. They chose to stay on the sidelines.

I have a great food bank in my district, West Texas Food Bank. Its chief executive related how important it was to provide a 1-year certification period for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program for seniors, a program currently serving seniors. This may serve more seniors, some of whom serve others, and allows seniors easier access to this important program.

It is engagements like this that is what our process is all about, and we have amended our bill through this manager’s amendment to include those.

Mr. Chair, we also have changes here that strengthen our framework for coordinating between USDA on FCA on important operations, broadband work that is going on across jurisdictions. We want those two agencies to work together to better utilize the funding to make sure that rural America gets that broadband support that we really need. That is included in here as well.

It also allows that communities will have a better opportunity to work for themselves rather than fighting the current bureaucracy here in Washington, D.C.

This amendment also includes a variety of technical amendments, corrections to the bill, that you would normally have in a manager’s amendment, and I ask my colleagues to support the manager’s amendment.

Mr. Chair, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

It is good policy to send unexpended funds back to the Treasury. This amendment does that.

Our colleagues on the other side said we did not count veteran-specific workforce development programs as a part of the 11607, is amended by adding at the end the following: ‘to have offered in committee or on this floor, and we would have accepted it. They chose to stay on the sidelines.

I have a great food bank in my district, West Texas Food Bank. Its chief executive related how important it was to provide a 1-year certification period for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program for seniors, a program currently serving seniors. This may serve more seniors, some of whom serve others, and allows seniors easier access to this important program.

It is engagements like this that is what our process is all about, and we have amended our bill through this manager’s amendment to include those.

Mr. Chair, we also have changes here that strengthen our framework for coordinating between USDA on FCA on important operations, broadband work that is going on across jurisdictions. We want those two agencies to work together to better utilize the funding to make sure that rural America gets that broadband support that we really need. That is included in here as well.

It also allows that communities will have a better opportunity to work for themselves rather than fighting the current bureaucracy here in Washington, D.C.

This amendment also includes a variety of technical amendments, corrections to the bill, that you would normally have in a manager’s amendment, and I ask my colleagues to support the manager’s amendment.

Mr. Chair, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Most SNAP recipients are children, seniors and people with disabilities. Among SNAP recipients who can work, most already—just not at wages that allow them to escape poverty—to help them succeed.

We have also heard from our conservative stakeholders that workfare is an important tool for BP participants. Baseline individuals 18 to 59, and explicit examples of where this has been implemented correctly, this amendment includes establishment of that.

It is good policy to send unexpended funds back to the Treasury. This amendment does that.

Our colleagues on the other side said we did not count veteran-specific workforce development programs as a part of the 11607, is amended by adding at the end the following: ‘to have offered in committee or on this floor, and we would have accepted it. They chose to stay on the sidelines.

I have a great food bank in my district, West Texas Food Bank. Its chief executive related how important it was to provide a 1-year certification period for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program for seniors, a program currently serving seniors. This may serve more seniors, some of whom serve others, and allows seniors easier access to this important program.

It is engagements like this that is what our process is all about, and we have amended our bill through this manager’s amendment to include those.

Mr. Chair, we also have changes here that strengthen our framework for coordinating between USDA on FCA on important operations, broadband work that is going on across jurisdictions. We want those two agencies to work together to better utilize the funding to make sure that rural America gets that broadband support that we really need. That is included in here as well.

It also allows that communities will have a better opportunity to work for themselves rather than fighting the current bureaucracy here in Washington, D.C.

This amendment also includes a variety of technical amendments, corrections to the bill, that you would normally have in a manager’s amendment, and I ask my colleagues to support the manager’s amendment.

Mr. Chair, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Most SNAP recipients are children, seniors and people with disabilities. Among SNAP recipients who can work, most already—just not at wages that allow them to escape poverty—to help them succeed.

We have also heard from our conservative stakeholders that workfare is an important tool for BP participants. Baseline individuals 18 to 59, and explicit examples of where this has been implemented correctly, this amendment includes establishment of that.
First, it puts a Band-Aid on the beating the majority took during the markup when they finally realized that disabled people would be hurt by their zeal to sever LIHEAP from SNAP. But to do that, to help disabled people, cost them money, so they had to find savings. And they landed on taking away more flexibility from States for waivers, the result of which is that 600,000 people—600,000 more able-bodied adults without dependents—will lose SNAP.

Hunger is a part of it: The 600,000 will be kicked off right away, at least a year before the mandatory work scheme—which is underfunded and will be a mass of bureaucracy—is in effect. So in spite of the rhetoric to provide on-ramps, off-ramps, trampolines, or whatever to help people get good jobs, they do not deliver—not for SNAP, and not for farmers.

As I have said over and over and over again, a farm bill should be a bipartisan effort. It should be reflective of bipartisan concerns. It should help farmers, and it should help those struggling with hunger. In fact, this bill makes anything to help people struggling on the farm, and it should help those struggling with hunger. In fact, this bill makes worse.

In fact, this bill makes worse, and it should help those struggling with hunger. In fact, this bill makes worse.

Mr. Chair, again, I want to thank the chairman for his diligence and leadership on this issue, and not only in regard to the commodity title but certainly the nutrition title, to our vice chairman and chairman of the Nutrition Subcommittee, G.T. Thompson, for his diligence as well. And I appreciate the work on the part of our Agriculture Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I yield how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Chair, I have the honor of not only sitting on the Committee on Agriculture but also of sitting on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, so I know very well how important healthy, hunger-free children are to a good education system.

On top of already harmful policies, the Conaway manager’s amendment compromises the current science-based nutrition standards in Federal schools that are recognizing and legislating nutrition standards, this amendment, if adopted, will further threaten the school meals programs upon which millions of children rely.

The USDA updated the current standards based on rigorous, evidence-based processes, as required by the last bipartisan Child Nutrition Reauthorization. These standards rely on expert, nonpartisan recommendations. Regarding child nutrition, we now see kids eating 16 percent more vegetables and 23 percent more fruit at lunch. Further, according to a poll by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 97 percent of Americans support the National School Nutrition Standards and 86 percent say the School Nutrition Standards should stay or be strengthened.

There is simply no reason to depart from science-based and evidence-based standards. We should not compromise the health of our children. That is why the American Academy of Pediatrics, American Diabetes Association, American Heart Association, and others oppose rolling back the standards. I urge my colleagues to oppose these efforts that would further threaten the health of our Nation’s children and students.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I am ready to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, let me close by saying this manager’s amendment highlights how deeply flawed this bill is. I regret very much that a flawed bill is being brought to the House floor because of a flawed process.

I am the ranking Democrat in the Nutrition Subcommittee. I didn’t see the nutrition title until it was made public to the press. We had 23 hearings in the Agriculture Committee. This nutrition title does not reflect those hearings. We should have had a hearing on this nutrition title to understand the impacts that it will have on some of the most vulnerable people in this country.

We live in the richest country in the history of the world. We have millions who are food insecure or hungry. We have an obligation here in the House of Representatives to make sure that we don’t let them fall through the cracks. And yet, we have this bill that will make hunger worse in America. This manager’s amendment does nothing to fix it. In fact, in some cases it makes it worse.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject it but, more importantly, reject this bill. Send it back to committee. Let’s do it right. Let’s have a bipartisan bill, one that we can all be proud of.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, the gentlewoman just previously mentioned the increase in fruits and vegetables being eaten by children in school. I would point out that our bill includes $1.2 billion in incentives to help moms and dads out there who are on SNAP to buy fruits and vegetables and dairy to get their kids to eat their veggies and thereby hopefully increasing those commodities.

Mr. Chair, we have a good bill here, the base bill. This simply makes it better. With that, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115–679.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, line 18, strike subsection (a) and insert the following new subsection:

(a) DETERMINATION OF PAYMENT ACRE.

Subject to subsection (d), for the purpose of price loss coverage and agriculture risk coverage, the payment acres for each covered
commodity on a farm shall be equal to, with respect to base acres for the covered commodity on the farm—

(1) for crop years 2019 and 2020, 85 percent of such base acres;
(2) for crop year 2021, 76.5 percent of such base acres;
(3) for crop year 2022, 68 percent of such base acres;
(4) for crop year 2023, 59.5 percent of such base acres;
(5) for crop year 2024, 51 percent of such base acres;
(6) for crop year 2025, 42.5 percent of such base acres;
(7) for crop year 2026, 34 percent of such base acres;
(8) for crop year 2027, 25.5 percent of such base acres;
(9) for crop year 2028, 17 percent of such base acres; and
(10) for crop year 2029, 8.5 percent of such base acres.

Page 32, line 11, strike ‘‘2023’’ and insert ‘‘2029’’.

Page 32, line 25, strike ‘‘2023’’ and insert ‘‘2029’’.

Page 33, line 14, strike ‘‘2023’’ and insert ‘‘2029’’.

Page 34, line 9, strike ‘‘2023’’ and insert ‘‘2029’’.

Page 35, after line 16, insert the following new subsections:

(h) Termination of Authority.—The Secretary may not make payments under this section after crop year 2029.

Page 35, line 23, strike ‘‘2023’’ and insert ‘‘2029’’.

Page 38, line 10, strike ‘‘2023’’ and insert ‘‘2029’’.

Page 40, after line 3, insert the following new subsection:

(h) Termination of Authority.—The Secretary may not make payments under this section after crop year 2029.

Strike section 1301 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 1301. SUGAR POLICY.

(a) Phase Out of Current Program and Loan Rates.—

(1) Sugar Cane.—Section 156(a) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking ‘‘2018’’ and inserting ‘‘2029’’;
(1) and (2) by inserting at the end the following new sentence: ‘‘The authority to carry out this section shall terminate on September 30, 2029.’’

(b) Phase Out of Flexible Marketing Allocations for Sugar.—

(1) Sugar Estimates.—Section 359b(a)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359bb(a)(1)) is amended by striking ‘‘2018’’ and inserting ‘‘2029’’.

(2) Sugar Allocations.—Section 359b(c)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359bb(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B);
(B) by striking ‘‘at a level that is’’ and inserting the following: ‘‘at a level equal to—

(1) for crop year 2021, 76.5 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;
(2) for crop year 2022, 68 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;
(3) for crop year 2023, 59.5 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;
(4) for crop year 2024, 51 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;
(5) for crop year 2025, 42.5 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;
(6) for crop year 2026, 34 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;
(7) for crop year 2027, 25.5 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;
(8) for crop year 2028, 17 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year; and
(9) for crop year 2029, 8.5 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year.

(c) Phase Out of Premiums.—Beginning with reinsurance year 2021, in determining the amount of premium to be paid under paragraphs (2), (6), (7), and (8), the Corporation shall multiply the amount specified under subparagraphs (B)(1), (C)(1), (D)(1), (E)(1), (F)(1), (G)(1), and (H)(1) of paragraph (2), subparagraphs (A)(1), (B)(1), (C)(1), and (D)(1) of paragraphs (2), (6), and (7), and subparagraphs (A)(1), (B)(1), (C)(1) and (D)(1) of paragraphs (2), (6), and (7), the Corporation shall terminate on the first day of reinsurance year 2030.’’.

(b) Phase Out of Administration and Operating Costs Reimbursements.—Section 508(c)(4) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508c(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraphs (B), (C), (E), and (F); and
(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraphs:

(A) Reductions.—Beginning with reinsurance year 2021, in calculating the rate established by the Board to reimburse approved crop insurance providers and agents for the administrative and operating costs of the providers and agents, the Secretary shall multiply the percent specified in subparagraph (A)(1) by—

(1) in reinsurance year 2021, 9.0;
(2) in reinsurance year 2022, 8.8;
(3) in reinsurance year 2023, 8.7;
(4) in reinsurance year 2024, 8.6;
(5) in reinsurance year 2025, 8.5;
(6) in reinsurance year 2026, 8.4;
(7) in reinsurance year 2027, 8.3;
(8) in reinsurance year 2028, 8.2; and
(9) in reinsurance year 2029, 8.1.

(B) Report.—Not later than December 31, 2023, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that includes an assessment of whether reimbursements under this paragraph for administrative and operating costs are effective.

SEC. 10007. REQUIREMENTS TO PROVIDE INSURANCE.

(a) Stacked Income Protection Plan.—Section 508(b)(a)(1) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(b)(2)) is amended by striking ‘‘the Corporation shall’’ and inserting ‘‘the Corporation may’’.

(b) Peanut Revenue Crop Insurance.—Section 508(c)(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1508c(a)) is amended by striking ‘‘the Corporation shall’’ and inserting ‘‘the Corporation may’’.

(c) Update Standard Reinsurance Agreement.—The Secretary shall update the 2019 Standard Reinsurance Agreement to include the company in a position, with respect to all plans of insurance for all crops in any State where actuarial documents are available in which it writes an eligible crop insurance contract and shall accept applications from all eligible producers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from California (Mr. McINTOSS) and
a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, farm subsidies—taking money from taxpayers to inflate the price of their own groceries, was never a good idea. They are the poster children of corporate welfare since the vast proportion of them go to large corporations and family farms. And 60 percent of American farms get no subsidies at all, contradicting the claim that somehow American agriculture couldn't exist without them.

We spend about $30 billion a year subsidizing about 40 percent of our farms. That is $160 a year out of the direct taxes of an average family in America, and that doesn’t include the cost to consumers from higher prices. As we just heard, the sugar program alone costs taxpayers subsidized insurance to other backstops, young people and other than the government distortions that pricing. Producers respond by planting less soybeans and sugar cane and more wheat and cabbage, prices for soybeans and sugar decline and prices for wheat and cabbage increase. Producers respond by planting less soybeans and sugar cane and more wheat and cabbage—unless unless the government distorts those price signals through subsidies. Producers want more of what consumers don’t want and less of what they do. Thus, producers are artificially induced to perform below their potential productivity.

Many of the subsidies today are in the form of crop insurance. Farmers get heavily subsidized insurance to guarantee them profits for their products. Who pays those subsidies? Taxpayers. What is insurance? It is the monetization of risk. It is the way markets assign a dollar value to the risk that one undertakes in any human endeavor. It is the way government guarantees them profits for their products. Most farmers don’t get them right now. Those who do tend to be major corporations and not family farmers.

Now, my amendment preserves subsidies for the next 2 years and then gradually phases them out over the next 10 years. To continue these subsidies without government subsidies. Insurers and taxpayers subsidize the cost of that insurance. Insurers don’t have to do anything. What payments to adjust their operations. But at the end of this 12-year process, we have a much more efficiently functioning agricultural market that is accurately responding to the whims of government bureaucrats.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SIMPSON). Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Peterson).

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I oppose this amendment.

I was here when we tried something similar to this. It wasn’t as extreme, but it was supposed to save us a little bit of money. Does the gentleman remember?

It ended up costing us five times more than what we saved because it didn’t work.

This is a fantasy that is out there for some people. People have no clue how much it costs to farm nowadays, what kind of risks you take in farming. And if you want to make sure that we have a sufficient food supply for this whole country, this is the way to do it, because, without crop insurance, without these other backstops, young people and ordinary people will not be able to farm. The people who will farm are people with deep pockets, and that is not what we want in this country.

I oppose this amendment.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Crawford).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, where do I begin? I guess it was JFK who said the farmer is the only businessman who—we buy, sell, and pays freight both ways.

We are comparing apples and oranges here with a business that is, say, I don’t know, an accountant maybe—I don’t know, Mr. Chairman—and a farmer. Farming is inherently risky, so that is not even debatable.

The issue we have here, though, is is it worth it to an individual to make an investment in our national security?

Our ability to feed ourselves is absolutely crucial to our national security, number one. Number two, we support our farmers at a fraction of what the rest of the world does, and so we get much better value, much better return on investment.

I think the disposable income of an average American is somewhere in the 12 percent range, and we can afford on food; and if you think about and compare it to, say, in Europe where they are upwards of 20 percent and Japan in the 25 percent range. On our disposable income, we get a much better return, much much better value to the taxpayer.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Lucas), the former chair of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, why do we invest in agriculture? Because the ability to eat, to feed ourselves is one of the most fundamentally important things that goes on in an economy. We make those investments so that we can always have a sufficient food supply of the highest quality and fiber at the most affordable prices.

Empires, countries, republics, democracies have been destroyed throughout history when they lost their ability to feed themselves.

I will tell you a strong farm bill, the investment we make is one of the key foundations to protecting the Constitution, just like our responsibilities to have a standing army to defend the cost, to defend the airspace, to defend our folks.

Maybe you don’t want to make that investment, maybe you are willing to take a chance, but when we don’t have enough to eat, it will be too late to fix the problem.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would remind the ranking member that the reason the 1996 Freedom to Farm bill ended up costing us more is because we ended up adding a whole new set of subsidies to it. Experience is important to heed.

New Zealand has four times more dependence on agriculture than the United States—they are four times more dependent—and it once maintained an extensive subsidy program just like ours. In 1984, New Zealand ended those subsidies. Well, what happened? Farm productivity rose, farm earnings rose, farm output all rose. What did New Zealand farmers who opposed the ending of subsidies, say once those subsidies were removed and the economy responded? The Federated Farmers of New Zealand says that it thoroughly debunked the myth that the farming sector cannot prosper without government subsidies.

Mr. Chairman, it is long past time to debunk that same myth in our own country, restore to consumers the power to command what producers grow, and restore to producers the accurate price signals they need to maximize their productivity in a free and undistorted market.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, we have got a clear-cut choice: you either want American producers to produce American food or you don’t. That is what this is simply about.

When I think about the farm bill, you can see that the safety net we have in place, but it works—as the chairman said, the lowest cost price food in the developed world.

Here is why that is important. Half of American workers live paycheck to paycheck. Their food budget is where they flex. Their rent doesn’t change. Their house payment doesn’t change. Their car payment doesn’t change. But if something comes up in the middle of the month, it is coming out of that food budget.

I don’t want to make that mom’s job any tougher than it already is by raising the cost of food arbitrarily, capriciously, by ignoring the vast amount of competition around this world that is fundamentally unfair.

If we could go to that utopia that my friend from California would like to get us to, fantastic, but we can’t do that. They barely could do it in New Zealand, let alone the U.S. We could not do that against the rest of the world.

I would argue that U.S. production is a bit more complicated than whatever New Zealand might or might not be doing. We have got to compete in a world global market against foreign treasuries that are spending stunningly more money than we are.

China spent $100 billion on three products in 1 year to subsidize their production. Did that send the wrong signal to those folks? Yes, it did. We farmers and our rice farmers and our other producers have to compete against the prices that are depressed like that.

We can’t go against the rest of the world. If the rest of the world will go to a level playing field, I have got not one farmer out there who would say: No, no, no, we want to keep it in place. We want to be in the cash market. That is where they want to make their money. This amendment would strip them of the ability to do that.

Vote “no” on McClintock. Vote “no” on McClintock. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McClintock).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. McClintock. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LAHOOD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed House Report 115-679.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title I, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1612. ONE-TIME FILING FOR ARC AND PLC.

(a) ONE-TIME FILING.—Except as provided in subsection (b), during the first enrollment period announced by the Farm Service Agency after the date of the enactment of this Act, producers on a farm may file a one-time program contract with the Secretary to enroll in agricultural risk coverage or price loss coverage through crop year 2023.

(b) UPGRADED PROGRAM CONTRACT REQUIRED.—In the case of a change in a farming operation for which producers on a farm have filed a one-time program contract pursuant to subsection (a), such producers shall file an updated program contract with the Secretary not later than one year after such change in the farming operation occurs.

(c) NOTICE OF OTHER ANNUAL REPORTING.—The Secretary shall provide to each producer that files a one-time program contract pursuant to subsection (a) a notice that includes the annual and semi-annual reporting requirements applicable to such producer, as determined by the Secretary.

(d) REGULATIONS REVISIED.—The Secretary shall—

(1) issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section; and

(2) revise section H12.41 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, in accordance with this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have introduced will allow farmers to operate more efficiently, reduce regulatory burdens, and provide more certainty for our farmers.

Our farmers work tirelessly to provide food for our families, our country, and to grow products that are shipped all over the world. From raising livestock to growing crops such as soybeans and corn, they contribute to the lifeblood of my State of Illinois and also our national economy.

To fully support the agriculture community, we must maintain an efficient and effective programs and programs that allow our farmers to globally competitive. Given the tremendous impact of the agriculture industry on the U.S. economy, we must work to ensure that our farmers are able to operate without burdensome and time-consuming regulatory requirements.

My district in central and west-central Illinois is the eighth largest district in the country in terms of corn and soybean production in the country, and I hear from my farmers across my district and from my own agriculture advisory committee that the amount of time spent filling out paperwork for these programs, even when there is no change to their farming operation, takes up too much of their valuable time which could be used on their farms.

Under the current rules, to file an annual contract, farmers need to collect signatures from landlords or other individuals with an interest in the land. Many landlords reside out of the State or out of the country, making this paperwork burdensome and very difficult in many cases.

Under our amendment, farmers will be able to and be eligible for a one-time signup for ARC and PLC for the duration of the 5-year farm bill so long as there are no changes to the current farming operation. If a farmer does make changes to their farming operation, they must reflect those changes in a new signup, as is the current process. This simple fix will help our farmers spend more time farming and less time filling out paperwork.

I want to thank Chairman CONAWAY and his staff for working with me on this amendment, and I appreciate all of his support for this commonsense reform that is so important to our farmers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I don’t oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chair, this is common sense, and I support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

The amendment was agreed to.
I thank him for bringing up this important issue. I agree with the gentleman from Alabama that our farmers and ranchers should not be competing with the Federal Government for viable cropland. H.R. 2 makes many changes to the CRP program, including lowering the rental rate payment to 80 percent of the county average and stepping this percentage down for subsequent reenrollments of the same tract.

I understand, however, the gentleman’s concern with the increase in enrolled acres, and I commit to working with the gentleman and his staff on this issue during the coming conference report, should we get there.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for his leadership and commitment.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

May 17, 2018

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. FASO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 115–679.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 115–679.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2407. SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES CONSERVATION.


(1) in section 5(e), by striking “and December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2015, and December 31, 2022”;

(2) in section 6(d), by striking “, respectively” and inserting “,” and a program update shall be completed by December 31, 2022”;

(3) in section 7—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “and 2016” and inserting “, 2016, and 2022”; and

(B) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “and 2017” and inserting “, 2017, and 2023”;

(4) in section 10, by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”;

(5) by redesignating sections 8 through 10 as sections 9 through 11, respectively; and

(6) by inserting after section 7 the following:

"SEC. 8. CONSERVATION PROGRAMS ASSESSMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In coordination with the appraisal of soil, water, and related resources and with the national soil and water conservation program established under this Act, the Secretary may carry out a conservation effects assessment project to quantify and identify the environmental and economic effects of conservation practices, develop the science base for managing the agricultural landscape for environmental quality and sustainability of crop capacity, and improve the efficacy of conservation practices and programs by evaluating conservation effects.

(b) SCOPE.—The project under this subsection may be carried out at national, regional, and watershed scales, and may include cropland, grazing lands, wetlands, forests, and such other lands as the Secretary may determine appropriate.

(c) ACTIVITIES.—The project under this subsection may include research, literature reviews and bibliographies, modeling, assessment, monitoring and outreach, extension education, and such other activities as the Secretary may determine appropriate.

"SEC. 9. GOALS AND ASSESSMENT PROCESS FOR CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.

(a) NATURAL RESOURCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In coordination with the appraisal of soil, water, and related resources, the soil and water conservation program, and the conservation effects assessment project established by this Act, the Secretary shall identify, and periodically revise, specific natural resource and environmental objectives and anticipated conservation outcomes and results, by resource concern, for the conservation programs established under subtitles D and H of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 and the landscape conservation initiatives developed by the Secretary.

(2) ASSESSMENTS.—To help measure outcomes and results, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, make assessments of changes in the status and conditions of natural resources and the environment that result from the application of conservation activities supported directly by such conservation programs and initiatives.

(b) MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF ASSOCIATED CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a coordinated monitoring and evaluation process for programs and initiatives to assess progress toward the identified objectives, to gather information to improve program and initiative implementation in accordance with desired program and initiative outcomes and results, and to assess the need for modifications to program or initiative rules or statutes.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—In implementing the monitoring and program evaluation process under paragraph (1), the Secretary may consider and incorporate resource concern inventories, quality criteria, conservation practices and enhancements, and such other information as determines relevant for applying the monitoring and program evaluation process across each of the major land uses identified by the Secretary.

(3) MONITORING AND EVALUATION PROCESSES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue a design for the comprehensive monitoring and evaluation process, a schedule for implementing the process, and a plan for coordinating the process with the national soil and water conservation program and conservation effects assessment project established under this Act.

(B) METHODOLOGY.—The design for the monitoring and evaluation process shall—
"(i) include detailed information concerning the requisite frequency of the monitoring process at the field, water body, habitat, or other level and the manner in which the data collected at the lab site, watershed level, county or local level, State level, national level, and any other level the Secretary determines necessary; and

(ii) take into account the cumulative nature of conservation over time, the interactions and sequencing effects between conservation effects at different times for which effects to be realized, and other related measurement challenges.

(C) TRANSPARENCY.—The Secretary shall ensure that the proceedings and recommendations of the technical committee are available to the public.

(V) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall ensure that any on-farm monitoring activities that may be included as part of the monitoring and program evaluation process are voluntary on the part of the producer, and may include appropriate compensation, as determined practicable, quantitative, measurable, and timely for each program established under subtitle D or H of the Food Security Act of 1985 and the landscape conservation initiatives developed by the Secretary; and

(C) guidance to the conservation project partners working to implement conservation programs with user-friendly tools to provide a description of the efforts, approaches, tools, and methods partners might consider using to measure and model conservation outcomes and results of their projects.

(2) REPORT ON OUTCOMES.—In conjunction with each of the reports to Congress pursuant to subsection (A) of this section, and periodically thereafter, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(A) an assessment of program outcomes to achieve stated natural resource conservation enhancements, or conservation objectives in the activities that would take place under this bill to ensure that any personally identifiable information that would be contained within the analysis of conservation programs is further protected by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CONAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, Mr. FASO has my commitment to work with him to address the Farm Bureau's concerns to get them to the point that they are okay with this. I support the gentleman's amendment under those terms.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chairman, I am encouraged by the support for my amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115–679.

Mr. FASO. Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. McLINTOCK.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115–679.

The Acting CHAIR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment which would provide the USDA the tools it needs to quantifiably measure conservation outcomes.

These programs are substantively the same as a bipartisan bill I introduced earlier this year with Representative MARCIA FUDGE.

If included in the farm bill, my amendment would have the USDA measure, evaluate, and report on various conservation programs across the Nation. This information is necessary to help define, evaluate, and justify taxpayer return on conservation investment programs.

Right now, the USDA can provide information on the impact of our conservation programs in terms of contracts and acres, but they lack the ability to provide the actual impact of these programs on improving water quality concerns. By ensuring that the USDA has all of the tools necessary to collect this information, we can better protect and preserve these programs into the future.

The USDA's voluntary conservation programs are consistently helping farmers in initiatives that protect natural resources while also increasing farm productivity. This amendment would ensure that the USDA can continue to improve existing conservation programs and practices while also supporting our Nation's farmers.

Mr. Chairman, we will also seek, in response to concerns that have been raised by the Farm Bureau, to, in conference, further refine the privacy protections relating to the research activities that would take place under this bill to ensure that any personally identifiable information that would be contained within the analysis of conservation programs is further protected by the United States Department of Agriculture.
Page 256, line 17, strike ‘‘and’’ at the end.

Page 256, after line 17 insert the following:

(ii) by striking ‘‘age six’’ and inserting ‘‘3 years of age’’; and

Page 256, line 18, strike ‘‘(ii)’’ and insert ‘‘(iii)’’.

Page 257, line 2, strike ‘‘or (G) a pregnant woman,’’ and insert ‘‘(G) a married individual and who resides in the household with a spouse who complies with the requirements of paragraph (1)(B); or (H) a pregnant woman,’’.

Page 257, line 9, strike ‘‘(iii)’’ and insert ‘‘(iv)’’.

Page 257 line 25, strike the close quotation marks, the comma, and ‘‘and’’.

Page 257, after line 25, insert the following:

‘‘(iv) E-VERIFY.—An employment and training program designed by the State agency may not be approved unless such program requires that each individual who participates in such program is permitted to engage in employment in the United States on the basis of the status of such individual as determined under the employment verification system in effect under section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a).’’

Page 256, strike lines 24 and 25, and insert the following:

(i) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking ‘‘age 6’’ and inserting ‘‘age 3 or of an incapacitated person’’;

(ii) in subparagraph (B) by striking ‘‘of 5’’ and inserting ‘‘of 2’’;

(B) in paragraph (7) by striking ‘‘or’’ at the end,

(C) in paragraph (8) by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘‘; or’’;

and

(D) and by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(ii) an individual who is responsible for a dependent individual and who resides in the household with a spouse who complies with the requirements of subsection (d)(1),’’;

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does two things: It increases from 20 percent to 70 percent the percentage of able-bodied adults in SNAP that would be required to comply with the work requirements in the bill, and it requires the use of the E-Verify system to assure that work training is available only to legal residents in this country who are legally entitled to work.

H.R. 2 provides for a requirement that work-capable, nonemployed adults look for work or train for work in order to receive SNAP benefits. That is important. When Maine implemented a work requirement for able-bodied welfare recipients, they found that 84 percent of this population left the welfare rolls and, within a year, had doubled their effective pay. Alabama saw the same results.

Unfortunately, H.R. 2 would only engage about 20 percent of the population. This amendment would boost the work participation rate to 70 percent of able-bodied adults in the program. It does so by implementing changes recommended by The Heritage Foundation.

H.R. 2’s work requirement affects parents of children under age 6. This amendment reduces the exemption to those with children under age 3 but with an important difference: H.R. 2’s requirements extend the work requirements to both spouses of children under the age of 6. This, in effect, is a marriage penalty that treats married couples as if they were single.

The amendment applies to only one spouse in the family, allowing the parents to share domestic and work responsibilities between themselves in any manner they feel is appropriate. This recognizes, encourages, and rewards marriage as the stable and nurturing environment that it is.

H.R. 2 allows States to waive the work requirement in geographic areas defined by them with higher-than-normal unemployment rates. This amendment deletes the waiver for an important reason: Where there is high unemployment, there is also more reason to encourage job training and job searching in order to equip recipients to compete in tighter job markets. Sidelining these individuals is self-defeating both for them and for the local economies.

Also, the amendment removes the ability of States to define these geographic areas in a manner that would defeat the work requirement in the first place.

H.R. 2 also allows States to exempt 15 percent of the able-bodied population from the work requirement. This amendment takes it to 5 percent.

Finally, this amendment requires that SNAP recipients be screened by the E-Verify system to assure that training is going only to those who are not using taxpayer money to train illegal immigrants whom Federal law prohibits from being here.

This amendment transforms the work requirement in H.R. 2 from an empty and symbolic gesture covering geographic areas in a manner that would defeat the work requirement in the first place. This recognition, encourages, and rewards marriage as the stable and nurturing environment that it is.

H.R. 2 provides for a requirement that work-capable, nonemployed adults look for work or train for work in order to receive SNAP benefits. That is important. When Maine implemented a work requirement for able-bodied welfare recipients, they found that 84 percent of this population left the welfare rolls and, within a year, had doubled their effective pay. Alabama saw the same results.

Unfortunately, H.R. 2 would only engage about 20 percent of the population. This amendment would boost the work participation rate to 70 percent of able-bodied adults in the program. It does so by implementing changes recommended by The Heritage Foundation.

H.R. 2’s work requirement affects parents of children under age 6. This amendment reduces the exemption to those with children under age 3 but with an important difference: H.R. 2’s requirements extend the work requirements to both spouses of children under the age of 6. This, in effect, is a marriage penalty that treats married couples as if they were single.

The amendment applies to only one spouse in the family, allowing the parents to share domestic and work responsibilities between themselves in any manner they feel is appropriate. This recognizes, encourages, and rewards marriage as the stable and nurturing environment that it is.

H.R. 2 allows States to waive the work requirement in geographic areas defined by them with higher-than-normal unemployment rates. This amendment deletes the waiver for an important reason: Where there is high unemployment, there is also more reason to encourage job training and job searching in order to equip recipients to compete in tighter job markets. Sidelining these individuals is self-defeating both for them and for the local economies.

Also, the amendment removes the ability of States to define these geographic areas in a manner that would defeat the work requirement in the first place.

H.R. 2 also allows States to exempt 15 percent of the able-bodied population from the work requirement. This amendment takes it to 5 percent.

Finally, this amendment requires that SNAP recipients be screened by the E-Verify system to assure that training is going only to those who are not using taxpayer money to train illegal immigrants whom Federal law prohibits from being here.

This amendment transforms the work requirement in H.R. 2 from an empty and symbolic gesture covering just one-fifth of the able-bodied population receiving food stamps to more than 70 percent.

It rewards, rather than penalizes, married couples and recognizes that the shared responsibilities of marriage are one of the single greatest factors in reducing poverty. Children born into homes with both parents are five times more likely to live in poverty. It is time our policies reflected the importance of marriage in protecting our children.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO).

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the impetus behind the gentleman from California’s amendment, but I think this amendment, if it were adopted, would threaten to destroy the carefully constructed efforts that we have endeavored to engage in. I may not agree with the gentleman from California’s amendment, but I think this amendment, if it were adopted, would threaten to destroy the carefully constructed efforts that we have endeavored to engage in. I may not agree with the gentleman from California’s amendment, but I think this amendment, if it were adopted, would threaten to destroy the carefully constructed efforts that we have endeavored to engage in. I may not agree with the gentleman from California’s amendment, but I think this amendment, if it were adopted, would threaten to destroy the carefully constructed efforts that we have endeavored to engage in. I may not agree with the gentleman from California’s amendment, but I think this amendment, if it were adopted, would threaten to destroy the carefully constructed efforts that we have endeavored to engage in.
to move more able-bodied people into work and into training. While the gentleman’s motivations are certainly fine in this regard and he is attempting to get at the right thing, we think that the amendment, if it were adopted, would actually destroy the carefully constructed effort that we have done to try to encourage work and responsibility.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Chairman, 42, 23, 69, 206, and 3. These numbers stand out for me. Forty-two million people will be impacted by the SNAP changes; 23 hearings; 89 witnesses, who didn’t recommend the proposals that we are seeing today; $200 million spent on 10 pilot programs, of which we won’t get the results in five; and 3 years old, the age that we are reducing down from 6 for parents to go to work.

These numbers just don’t add up. And one of my concerns is that great proposals might be put on the floor right now, but we had a process, and the process has been flawed, and now we have a flawed product.

So, again, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to come back together in the tradition of the Agriculture Committee and work on a bipartisan piece of legislation that moves Americans into work—meaningful work.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the right to close.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my colleague on the House Budget Committee.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank again the gentleman from California for bringing forth this amendment and the gentleman from Texas for all of the work that he did on the bill.

I think sometimes, rather than have hearings, you find out a lot more about these Federal programs and particularly the SNAP program if you talk to the local clerks at the convenience stores, grocery stores, the income maintenance workers in the counties or the people who manage the low-income housing to find out what really is going on there.

I will bring to light one in particular of the four provisions in the amendment that I think they will tell you that, whatever the official Federal law is, SNAP is routinely used by people who are not here legally.

I think by requiring E-Verify for the training programs, we begin to go through the process of making sure that people who are in this country illegally are not taking advantage of taxpayer-funded programs.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I ask support in opposing this amendment from my friend and colleague from California.

To my friends across the aisle who keep asking for bipartisan opportunity, you blew the first one. That was in subcommittee, where we could have amended the bill, and we are not seeing amendments from Members here. So there has been plenty of opportunity for bipartisan work.

I do appreciate the recommendations that my Democratic friends made in writing to both the ranking member and the chairman. All of those points and all the titles, I believe, were—I know in the nutrition title they were all incorporated into the base bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting Chair 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. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of H.R. 2 in Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 900, amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115–679 may be considered out of sequence.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 900 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2.

Will the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) kindly resume the chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

Mr. FORTEBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER AMENDMENT NO. 7 OUT OF SEQUENCE DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2 in Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 900, amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115–679 may be considered out of sequence.

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

There was no objection.

Page 187, after line 10, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly):

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is in the national interest of the United States to advance food security in developing countries and open new markets for agricultural trade through programs that leverage the unique capabilities and resources of Federal departments and agencies, and improve coordination between donors, beneficiaries, and the private sector.

(2) ROLE OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.—The Department of Agriculture plays an important role in establishing trade between the United States and other nations and should enhance its role in facilitating the transfer of knowledge, skills, and experience of American farmers, land-grant universities, and extension services through the