

(1) COUNTY.—The term “County” means Dolores County, Colorado.

(2) WEST FORK FIRE STATION CONVEYANCE PARCEL.—The term “West Fork Fire Station Conveyance Parcel” means the parcel of approximately 3.61 acres of National Forest System land in the County, as depicted on the map entitled “Map for West Fork Fire Station Conveyance Parcel” and dated November 21, 2017.

(b) CONVEYANCE OF WEST FORK FIRE STATION CONVEYANCE PARCEL, DOLORES COUNTY, COLORADO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of a request from the County and subject to such terms and conditions as are mutually satisfactory to the Secretary and the County, including such additional terms as the Secretary determines to be necessary, the Secretary shall convey to the County without consideration all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the West Fork Fire Station Conveyance Parcel.

(2) COSTS.—Any costs relating to the conveyance under paragraph (1), including processing and transaction costs, shall be paid by the County.

(3) USE OF LAND.—The land conveyed to the County under paragraph (1) shall be used by the County only for a fire station, related infrastructure, and roads to facilitate access to and through the West Fork Fire Station Conveyance Parcel.

(4) REVERSION.—If any portion of the land conveyed under paragraph (1) is used in a manner that is inconsistent with the use described in paragraph (3), the land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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 county 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 forestland, 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.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in part C of House Report 115-677.

Mr. THORNBERRY. 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 601, after line 26, add the following new section:

SEC. 11105. REGIONAL CATTLE AND CARCASS GRADING CORRELATION AND TRAINING CENTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish not more than three regional centers, to be known as “Cattle and Carcass Grading Correlation and Training Centers” (referred to in this section as the “Centers”), to provide education and training for cattle and carcass beef graders of the Agricultural Marketing Service, cattle producers, and other professionals involved in the reporting, delivery, and grading of feeder cattle, live cattle, and carcasses—

(1) to limit the subjectivity in the application of beef grading standards;

(2) to provide producers with greater confidence in the price of the producers’ cattle; and

(3) to provide investors with both long and short positions more assurance in the cattle delivery system.

(b) LOCATION.—The Centers shall be located near cattle feeding and slaughter populations and areas shall be strategically identified in order to capture regional variances in cattle production.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—Each Center shall be organized and administered by offices of the Department of Agriculture in operation on the date on which the respective Center is established, or in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies or academic institutions.

(d) TRAINING PROGRAM.—The Centers shall offer intensive instructional programs involving classroom and field training work for individuals described in subsection (a).

(e) COORDINATION OF RESOURCES.—Each Center, in carrying out the functions of the Center, shall make use of information generated by the Department of Agriculture, the State agricultural extension and research stations, relevant designated contract markets, and the practical experience of area cattle producers, especially cattle producers cooperating in on-farm demonstrations, correlations, and research projects.

(f) PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTION.—Funds made available to carry out this section shall not be used for the construction of a new building or facility or the acquisition, expansion, remodeling, or alteration of an existing building or facility (including site grading and improvement, and architect fees). Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the Secretary may use funds made available to carry out this section to provide a Center with payment for the cost of the rental of a space determined to be necessary by the Center for conducting training under this section and may accept donations (including in-kind contributions) to cover such cost.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on October 1, 2018.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to commend the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. CONAWAY, for his work not only in formulating this bill but in promoting and protecting the interests of rural America. I think it is a great tribute to him dealing with a number of complex issues, and I appreciate very much a job well done.

Mr. Chairman, when we go to the grocery store, we make decisions about what type of beef and what grade of beef we are going to purchase. The challenge is that the grades are different from place to place because there is not a uniform grading system across the country.

My amendment requires USDA to set up three training centers to train graders so that there can be more standardization. If you are going to buy a prime or a choice steak in one place, it should be roughly the same as a prime or choice steak in another place.

This will benefit consumers. It will benefit the beef industry, and I hope our colleagues will support it.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIPTON) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEBER of Texas, 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

**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.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1515

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. THORNBERRY) had been disposed of.

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 RATES.—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) SUGARCANE.—The Secretary shall make loans available to processors of domestically grown sugarcane at a rate equal to—

“(1) 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) SUGAR BEETS.—The Secretary shall make loans available to processors of domestically grown sugar beets at a rate equal to 128.5 percent of the loan rate per pound of raw cane sugar for the applicable crop year under subsection (a) for each of the 2018 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. 7272(f)) is amended—

(1) in the 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) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Section 156(i) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(i)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”.

SEC. 1302. FEEDSTOCK FLEXIBILITY PROGRAM FOR BIOENERGY PRODUCERS TERMINATION.

Section 9010 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8110) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

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

SEC. 1303. ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS.

Part VII of subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359aa et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“PART VII—SUGAR

“SEC. 359. ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—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.

“(b) 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.

“(c) TRANSFER OF QUOTA SHARES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations that—

“(A) promote full use of the tariff-rate quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugar and ensure adequate supplies for cane refiners 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.

“(2) 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.

“(3) LIMITATIONS ON TRANSFERS WITH RESPECT TO FISCAL YEAR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any transfer under this subsection shall be valid only for the duration of the fiscal year during which the transfer is made.

“(B) FOLLOWING FISCAL YEAR.—No transfer under this subsection shall affect the share of the quota allocated to the transferor or transferee for the following fiscal year.

“(d) 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

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 requirements 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 for over a generation. The 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 supports 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 three 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 it. Our government is transferring wealth to these processors. It shifts cost onto our Nation's manufacturers and consumers by almost \$4 billion annually.

We are going to hear that the amendment subjects farmers to some new exposure to foreign imports. What they will fail to tell you is that, between our government's suspension agreements, import quotas, and tariffs, our government already regulates every single ounce of foreign sugar coming into our market. Will our amendment weaken the ability of the USDA to regulate these imports? Not in the slightest. We simply give USDA more flexibility.

We are going to hear arguments about candy bars, candy companies, and lots 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 hates sunshine. It hates 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 extreme 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 the 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, of whom I am a great customer, 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. They admitted they 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 some amount 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 gentleman 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 billionaires still qualify for agriculture subsidies under the current bill?

Why do those earning over \$500,000 in adjusted gross income get subsidies under this 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 nephews, 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?

You go down to Brazil. 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 vinasse, 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 gentleman 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?

□ 1530

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 timeframe.

Mr. Chair, 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 we are defending 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 candy bars. 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 area. 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-

man of the committee and the Democratic ranking member of this committee both oppose this amendment, for good reason.

It is a simple question: Do we want to support local growers like the 900 families that I represent who, collectively, through a co-op, own their processing facility?

This notion of mega producers is really a story of 900 families that collectively bound together in a co-op to own the production facility to deal with the sugar that they, themselves, grow.

This is a question of local growers or foreign-subsidized sugar using child labor. That is the simple question before us.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which will create some fairness for more than 600,000 workers across our country who are in small businesses and manufacturing facilities that use sugar as an ingredient in the products they make. Over 91,000 of those jobs and 2,300 of those businesses are in my home State of California.

This amendment would make the sugar program fairer for taxpayers, manufacturers, and American consumers. By removing the many unnecessary government interventions that have kept sugar prices excessively high, manufacturers will create jobs and American consumers will no longer be on the hook for \$4 billion per year in hidden sugar costs.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, the U.S. is the third largest importer of sugar in the world, and virtually all of that comes in duty free.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, not long ago, President Trump successfully negotiated an agreement with Mexico to stop them from dumping illegally subsidized sugar onto the U.S. market. This amendment would undo the President's good work by reopening the floodgates to other foreign countries to send us their subsidized sugar at below their costs of production, further depressing the prices that my farmers receive.

Vote "no" on this amendment.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, when other militaries challenge the United States' military might, we invest more dollars, just like we did a few months ago in our military.

When the Panama Canal was widened and deepened, we invested more dollars in our ports so we would remain competitive. When other countries have lowered tax rates, we lower ours to

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 against 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. We are now spending 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 that utilize, very responsibly, our natural resources, and I think it is only reasonable to continue a policy that is not generally a cost to taxpayers.

I urge opposition to this amendment. Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. 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 levels 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.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, do I have the right to close or does the gentleman from Texas have the right to close?

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 gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 savings 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. So prices will not go down.

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 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 the unfair, unlevel playing field, unlevel 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.

□ 1545

We are not there. We are not even headed there. We need to defeat this amendment, protect those hardworking farmers out there across this country. Say "no" to Foxx.

Mr. Chair, I yield back 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. Chair, 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. 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 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 4 through 8.

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 "bachelor's".

Page 224, line 22, strike “; and” and insert “a semicolon”.

Page 225, line 13, strike “, and” and insert “; and”.

Page 225, line 15, strike “member.” and insert “member; and”.

Page 228, line 18, strike “enactment of” and insert “enactment of the”.

Page 232, line 5, add “and” at the end.

Page 233, line 4, strike “and” and insert “or”.

Page 237, line 24, strike “Section 5” and insert “Effective October 1, 2020, section 5”.

Page 238, strike line 5, and insert the following:

(B) by striking “, supplemental security”

Page 241, line 18, insert “or disabled” after “elderly”.

Page 241, line 23, insert “or disabled” after “elderly”.

Page 242, line 5, insert “or disabled” after “elderly”.

Page 242, line 8, insert “or disabled” after “elderly”.

Page 246, line 11, insert “(including volunteer work that is limited to 6 months out of a 12-month period)” after “work”.

Page 248, strike line 10.

Page 248, line 17, strike the period and the close quotation marks.

Page 248, after line 17, insert the following:

“(iv) a program of employment and training for veterans operated by the Department of Labor or the Department of Veterans Affairs, and approved by the Secretary.”, and

Page 248, line 25, strike “paragraph” and insert “paragraphs (4) and”.

Page 249, line 2, strike “(D), and (C)” and insert “(C), and (D)”.

Page 251, line 2, insert “and with the approval of the chief executive officer of the State,” after “agency”.

Page 251, line 22, strike “6” and insert “7”.

Page 251, line 24, insert “most recent 24-month period for which Department of Labor unemployment rates are available, nor earlier than the” after “the”.

Page 253, line 14, strike “15-PERCENT” and insert “PERCENTAGE”.

Page 254, line 11, strike “; and” at the end, and insert a period.

Page 254, strike lines 12 and 13.

Page 254, strike lines 19 through 22, and insert the following:

“(iii) 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”

Page 255, after line 7, insert the following:

“(iv) FISCAL YEAR 2026 AND THEREAFTER.—Subject to clauses (v) and (vi), for fiscal year 2026 and each fiscal year thereafter, a State agency may provide a number of exemptions such that the average monthly number of the exemptions in effect during the fiscal year does 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 such other factors as the Secretary considers appropriate due to the timing and limitations of the survey.”

Page 255, line 8, strike “(iv)” and insert “(v)”.

Page 255, line 17, strike “(v)” and insert “(vi)”.

Page 258, line 19, strike clause (iv) and redesignate succeeding clauses accordingly.

Page 258, beginning on line 22, strike “unpaid or volunteer work that is limited to 6 months out of a 12-month period” and insert “other work experience”.

Page 259, line 3, add “and” at the end.

Page 259, line 5, strike “and” at the end.

Page 259, strike lines 6 through 8.

Page 259, 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 259, line 16, strike “(D)” and insert “(E)”.

Page 259, 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 follows 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)(iv)(III)(dd) by striking “(4)(F)(i), or (4)(K)” and inserting “(4)(A)(ii), (4)(E)(i), or (4)(J)”.

Page 260, 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 class and satisfy the requirements of paragraph (4); and”.

Page 262, 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 263, line 1, strike “(C)” and insert “(D)”.

Page 263, line 3, strike “(D)” and insert “(E)”.

Page 263, beginning on line 22, strike subsection (g).

Page 264, line 10, strike “(h)” and insert “(g).”

Page 264, 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. 3029(b) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “6(d)(1)” and inserting “6(d)(1)(B)”, and

(ii) by striking “or (F)” and inserting “(F), or (G)”, and

(B) in paragraph (4) by striking “sixteen” and inserting “18”.

Page 266, strike lines 1 through 6, and insert the following:

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

Page 266, after line 6, insert the following:

(h) EQUITABLE TREATMENT OF HOUSEHOLDS.—Section 11(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)), as amended by section 4001, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(27) that the State agency may, for purposes of ensuring equitable treatment among all households (including those containing a married couple), request earned income data from the Internal Revenue Service relevant to determining eligibility to receive supple-

mental nutrition assistance program benefits and determining the correct amount of such benefits at the time of household certification.”.

Page 269, line 5, strike the comma at the end and insert a semicolon.

Page 269, strike lines 6 and 7.

Page 269, line 25, strike “and” at the end.

Page 269, 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 270, line 1, strike “(VII)” and insert “(VIII)”.

Page 271, line 1, strike “PROCESSING” and insert “PROHIBITED”.

Page 271, line 10, insert “(as defined in subsection (j)(1)(H))” after “switching”.

Page 273, line 16, strike “independent” and all that follows through “means” on line 17, and insert the following: “independent sales organization” means”.

Page 291, line 5, strike “B Russell” and insert “B. Russell”.

Page 296, after line 13, insert the following:

(C) in paragraph (3)(B) by inserting “, other than those incurred by State agencies in preparing State plans pursuant to subsection (c)(2) and notifying applicants, participants, and eligible individuals pursuant to subsection (c)(4),” after “this section”,

Page 296, line 14, strike “(C)” and insert “(D)”.

Page 296, line 16, strike “(D)” and insert “(E)”.

Page 297, line 6, strike the close quotation marks and the comma at the end.

Page 297, strike line 7 and 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 299, strike lines 19 through 23, and insert the following:

(7) in section 17(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(aa) by striking “3(n)” and inserting “3(m)”.

Page 300, after line 10, insert the following:

SEC. 4037. 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:

“(j) 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 or oversight 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 continued authorization, any application for authorization, or any request to withdraw the authorization of any facility or entity referenced in subsections (o)(2) and (k)(3) of section 3 based on a determination that residents of any such facility or entity are residents of an institution prior to—

“(A) the submission of the report described in paragraph (1)(D); or

“(B) 3 years after the date of enactment of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2018; whichever is earlier.”.

Page 301, after line 2, insert the following:

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 paragraph, the term ‘certification period’ means the period that a participant in the commodity supplemental food program may continue to receive benefits under that program without 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) verifies the address and 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 4104.

At the end of subtitle C of title IV, add the following:

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. 4088 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 school nutrition personnel 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.) or the school breakfast program established by section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773); and

(3) maintain healthy meals for students.

Page 327, line 4, strike “health” and insert “health”.

Page 327, line 11, add a period at the end.

Page 343, line 12, strike “road mile” and insert “road-mile”.

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

Page 361, after line 13, 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 Assistant Secretary to assist in the verification of eligibility of the broadband loan and grant programs of the Department of Agriculture. In providing assistance under the preceding sentence, the Assistant Secretary shall make available the broadband assessment and mapping capabilities of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

(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) to serve an area with respect to which another entity has received an award under a broadband loan or grant program of the Department of Agriculture.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, the Commission, and the Assistant Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on how best to coordinate federally supported broadband programs and activities in order to achieve the following objectives:

(1) Promote high-quality broadband service that meets the long-term needs of rural residents and businesses, by evaluating the broadband service needs in rural areas for each decade through 2050.

(2) Support the long-term viability, sustainability, and utility of federally supported rural broadband infrastructure, by analyzing the technical capabilities of the technologies currently available and reasonably expected to be available by 2035 to meet the broadband service needs of rural residents identified under paragraph (1), including by analyzing the following:

(A) The real-world performance of such technologies, including data rates, latency, data usage restrictions, and other aspects of service quality, as defined by the Commission.

(B) The suitability of each such technology for residential, agricultural, educational,

healthcare, commercial, and industrial purposes in rural areas.

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

(D) The costs associated with online platforms, specifically the resulting constraints on rural network bandwidth.

(3) Identify and quantify the availability of broadband service and ongoing 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 in rural areas.

(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 601(b)(3) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

Page 364, line 14, strike “tribes” and insert “Tribes”.

Page 374, line 1, strike “(U.S.C.)” and insert “U.S.C.”.

Page 379, line 24, strike “by striking” and all that follows through “and inserting” on line 25, and insert the following: “by striking ‘maintained under section 313(b)(2)(A)’ and inserting”.

Page 390, line 16, strike “and inserting” and all that follows through “; and” on line 17, and insert the following: “and inserting ‘305 or’; and”.

Page 394, line 8, strike “tribes” and insert “Tribes”.

Page 414, line 2, strike the extra space before the closed quotation mark.

Page 436, after line 11, insert the following: (b) PRIORITIES.—Section 412(h)(1) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7632(h)(1)) is amended by striking “multi-institutional” and inserting “or multi-institutional”.

Page 436, line 12, strike “(b)” and insert “(c)”.

Page 436, line 20, 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 Administrator;” and insert “The Administrator”.

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: “of paragraph (1)”.

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

pay administrative costs incurred by the Secretary" after "10409B".

Page 598, line 10, insert "of such paragraph" after "(B)".

Page 598, 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 progress 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 retailers, markets, 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 assure little abuse in a system currently rife with loopholes and gimmicks.

We have also heard from our conservative stakeholders that workfare is an important tool for EP participants. Based on their feedback and explicit examples of where this has been implemented correctly, this amendment includes establishment of that.

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 H.R. 2. Well, in addition to the provisions of H.R. 2 that has permitted State-based veteran workforce programs to count toward the work requirement, this amendment expands to include programs for veterans run by the Department of Labor and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, that would have been a terrific amendment for my colleagues 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 makes sense 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 in 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. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I just want to say for the record that both Feeding America and Feeding Texas oppose this farm bill because they believe it will increase hunger in America, and I include the letter from Feeding Texas in the RECORD.

FEEDING TEXAS,
April 17, 2018.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CONAWAY AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Regretfully and despite years of hard work, we are writing to oppose the farm bill proposed by Chairman Conaway, as we believe it will increase hunger and make it harder for struggling Texans to succeed.

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

Hunger 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 employ 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 increased need. Across Texas, our 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 better employment outcomes for recipients. 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 or details.

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,

Celia Cole, CEO, Feeding Texas; Zack Wilson, Executive Director, High Plains Food Bank; Theresa Mangapora, Executive Director, Brazos Valley Food Bank; Bea Hanson, Executive Director, Coastal Bend Food Bank; Dennis Cullinane, CEO, East Texas Food Bank; Robin Cadle, President/CEO, Food Bank of the Golden Crescent; 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; Alma Boubel, Executive Director, South Texas Food Bank; Libby Campbell, Executive Director, West Texas Food Bank; Derrick Chubbs, 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, Galveston County Food Bank; Allison Hulett, President/CEO, Montgomery County Food Bank; Eric Cooper, President/CEO, San Antonio Food Bank; David Weaver, CEO, South Plains Food Bank; Bo Soderbergh, 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 a complete mess. This manager's amendment is longer than most bills that we consider in this House.

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 somewhere. 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.

Here is the best 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 product. It should be reflective of bipartisan concerns. It should help farmers, and it should help those struggling in need to put food on the table. This bill doesn't do enough to help farmers, and it certainly doesn't do anything to help people struggling with hunger. In fact, this bill makes hunger worse in America, and that is shameful.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 2 and the accompanying manager's amendment.

I appreciate the chairman's leadership on this effort, not only in the underlying bill but the amendment to improve upon it. I thank the gentleman for including my food access liaison provision in the amendment.

Just briefly: This individual will be tasked with coordinating USDA programs aimed at improving Americans' access to quality food and providing technical assistance to community leaders who are working to improve the lives of those living in food deserts. This is a small measure of progress that we can all be proud of and continue our work to ensure folks have access to healthy and nutritious foods.

However, I would be remiss if I didn't mention that access to healthy and nutritious food relies on the food security system, the strong food security system provided by this farm bill. And I thank the chairman for his leadership in that regard.

As we will soon vote on amendments, I urge my colleagues to remember the importance of a strong food security system for all of our commodities, whether that be under the ARC program or the PLC program for crops

such as rice, soybeans, and corn or the current sugar program. If we pick apart our commodity programs one by one, we will create giant holes in our Nation's food security system. This compromises our national security and hinders our ability to provide healthy, nutritious food, not just to rural communities that produce the food but to urban areas and, in fact, the entire Nation and beyond.

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, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3½ 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 meals programs. By politicizing 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. Research shows that children are now 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 on what is best for 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, may I inquire how many more speakers the gentleman from Texas might have.

Mr. CONAWAY. 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 1¾ 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 of people who are food insecure or hungry. We have an obligation here in this 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 a bigger bang for their buck 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 ACRES.—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 subsection:

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

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “2018” and inserting “2020”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

- “(5) 16.88 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2021 crop year;
- “(6) 15.01 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2022 crop year;
- “(7) 13.14 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2023 crop year;
- “(8) 11.27 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2024 crop year;
- “(9) 9.4 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2025 crop year;
- “(10) 7.53 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2021 crop year;
- “(11) 5.66 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2027 crop year;
- “(12) 3.79 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2028 crop year; and
- “(13) 1.92 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for the 2029 crop year.”

(2) **SUGAR BEETS.**—Section 156(b)(2) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(b)(2)) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2029”.

(3) **TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVE PERIOD.**—Section 156(i) of the Federal Agriculture Im-

provement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(i)) is amended—

(A) by striking “2018” and inserting “2029”; and

(B) by adding 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 ALLOTMENTS 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 ALLOTMENTS.**—Section 359b(b)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359bb(b)(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—

“(A) for crop year 2021, 76.5 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;

“(B) for crop year 2022, 68 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;

“(C) for crop year 2023, 59.5 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;

“(D) for crop year 2024, 51 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;

“(E) for crop year 2025, 42.5 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;

“(F) for crop year 2026, 34 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year;

“(G) for crop year 2027, 25.5 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year; and

“(H) for crop year 2028, 17 percent of the estimated quantity of sugar for domestic human consumption for such crop year.”

(3) **TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVE PERIOD.**—Section 359l(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359l(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking “2018” and inserting “2029”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The authority to carry out this part shall terminate on September 30, 2029.”

Page 85, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 86, line 2, and insert the following:

(3) **ELECTION OF PRODUCTION HISTORY COVERAGE PERCENTAGE.**—Section 1406(a)(2) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9056(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) a percentage of coverage, in 5-percent increments, not exceeding, with respect to the production history of the participating dairy operation—

“(A) for calendar year 2019 and 2020, 90 percent;

“(B) for calendar year 2021, 81 percent;

“(C) for calendar year 2022, 72 percent;

“(D) for calendar year 2023, 63 percent;

“(E) for calendar year 2024, 54 percent;

“(F) for calendar year 2025, 45 percent;

“(G) for calendar year 2026, 36 percent;

“(H) for calendar year 2027, 27 percent;

“(I) for calendar year 2028, 18 percent; and

“(J) for calendar year 2029, 10 percent.”

Page 90, line 25, strike “2023” and insert “2029”.

Page 579, after 2, insert the following new sections:

SEC. 10006. PHASE OUT OF CROP INSURANCE PREMIUMS.

(a) **PHASE OUT OF PREMIUMS.**—Section 508(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and (7)” and inserting “(7), (9), and (10)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(9) **PHASE OUT OF PREMIUMS.**—Beginning with reinsurance year 2021, in determining the amount of premium to be paid under paragraphs (2), (6), and (7), the Corporation shall multiply the amount specified in subparagraphs (B)(i), (C)(i), (D)(i), (E)(i), (F)(i), (G)(i), and (H)(i) of paragraph (2), subparagraphs (A)(i), (B)(i), (C)(i), and (D)(i) of paragraph (6), and subparagraphs (A)(i), (B)(i), and (C)(i) of paragraphs (7), by—

“(A) in reinsurance year 2021, 0.9;

“(B) in reinsurance year 2022, 0.8;

“(C) in reinsurance year 2023, 0.7;

“(D) in reinsurance year 2024, 0.6;

“(E) in reinsurance year 2025, 0.5;

“(F) in reinsurance year 2026, 0.4;

“(G) in reinsurance year 2027, 0.3;

“(H) in reinsurance year 2028, 0.2; and

“(I) in reinsurance year 2029, 0.1.

“(10) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority to make payments under this subsection shall terminate on the first day of reinsurance year 2030.”

(b) **PHASE OUT OF ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATING COST REIMBURSEMENTS.**—Section 508(k)(4) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(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.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning with reinsurance year 2021, in calculating the rate established by the Board to reimburse approved 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)(ii) by—

“(I) in reinsurance year 2021, 0.9;

“(II) in reinsurance year 2022, 0.8;

“(III) in reinsurance year 2023, 0.7;

“(IV) in reinsurance year 2024, 0.6;

“(V) in reinsurance year 2025, 0.5;

“(VI) in reinsurance year 2026, 0.4;

“(VII) in reinsurance year 2027, 0.3;

“(VIII) in reinsurance year 2028, 0.2; and

“(IX) in reinsurance year 2029, 0.1.

“(ii) **TERMINATION.**—The authority to make reimbursements under this paragraph shall terminate on the first day of reinsurance year 2030.

“(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 508B(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1508b(a)) is amended by striking “the Corporation shall” and inserting “the Corporation may”.

(b) **PEANUT REVENUE CROP INSURANCE.**—Section 508C(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 that the Company may offer and market 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 and approve applications from all eligible producers.

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. Chair, farm subsidies, essentially 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, not to small 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 \$20 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 \$3.7 billion a year in higher sugar prices. That adds about \$30 more to their grocery bills.

Subsidies hurt taxpayers, they hurt consumers, and they even hurt farmers in the long run. The decline in farm economy since the last farm bill ought to warn us we are doing something wrong.

Prices are signals sent by consumers over what they want to buy and the amount that they are willing to pay. If left alone, they tell producers what consumers want more of and what they want less of. If consumers want less soybeans and sugar 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 sugarcane and more wheat and cabbage, unless—unless—the government distorts those price signals through subsidies. Producers end up planting 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 enterprise. The higher the risk, the more expensive the insurance.

By subsidizing crop insurance, we once again corrupt the price signals that farmers need to make rational decisions. If crop insurance for soybeans is expensive, the market is warning farmers not to rely on soybeans. If taxpayers subsidize the cost of that insurance to lower its price, we are encouraging very risky behavior by masking the cost of that risk.

Once again, that produces bad outcomes for taxpayers, for consumers, and ultimately the farmers themselves because they have been led toward higher risk by distorted price signals.

Nor is subsidized insurance necessary for farm loans. Bankers loan to other

non-subsidized parts of the farm economy without subsidized insurance. There are no good arguments for continuing these subsidies. Most farmers don't get them right now. Those who do tend to be major corporations and not family farmers.

□ 1600

Now, my amendment preserves subsidies for the next 2 years and then gradually phases them out over the next 10 years, assuring that producers who have grown dependent on these subsidies have plenty of time 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 needs of consumers rather than to the whims of government bureaucrats.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

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 in 1996 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 few people farm 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—I think he said it this way—who buys retail, sells wholesale, and pays freight both ways.

So 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 it worth it to us as a nation 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, what we spend 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 of their 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 chairman 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 will always have a sufficient supply of the highest quality food 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 coast, 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 series of subsidies to it. Experience is important to heed.

New Zealand has four times more dependency 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 love it or hate 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 America works 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, for goodness' sake. 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 products. Now, 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. They want to compete in the cash market. That is where they want to make their money. This amendment would strip them of the ability to do that. We would go to foreign-imported food coming at us with standards that are not remotely close to ours, labor that is not closely protected the way ours is.

Let's defeat this McClintock amendment, show the American farmer and rancher out there, who works as hard as anybody in this world, who thinks a 20-hour workweek is something they do in their second or third job in order to keep the farm going, let's show them that we support them. Let's show them that we have got their back.

A "yes" vote for McClintock says: Never mind, we don't care about you. A "no" vote on McClintock says exactly the message we want to send, and I am hopeful this is a stunningly large vote so that American producers out there, who are some of the hardest working, best people on the face of the Earth, can understand that this Congress understands the unfair foreign competition that they are competing with.

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) UPDATED 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 other periodic reporting requirements applicable to such producer, as determined by the Secretary.

(d) REGULATIONS REVISED.—The Secretary shall—

- (1) issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section; and
- (2) revise section 1412.41 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 would streamline a burdensome regulatory requirement currently in place for two USDA programs. The first is the Agriculture Risk Coverage, or ARC, and the Price Loss Coverage, or PLC. My amendment changes the signup process from an annual signup process to a one-and-done process for the duration of the 5-year farm bill.

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 program and programs that allow our farmers to be 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 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.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 115-679.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. 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 113, line 5, strike "inserting a semicolon" and insert "inserting 'and'".

Page 113, strike lines 7 through 16 and insert the following:

"(F) each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, no more than 24,000,000 acres.";

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, though I plan to withdraw this amendment, I seek to enter into a colloquy with my good friend, Chairman CONAWAY, regarding the Conservation Reserve Program and to express concern with the number of acres authorized in the CRP program in H.R. 2.

Chairman CONAWAY has been a strong chairman and a leader for America's farmers, and for that I would like to thank him.

CRP is a well-intended program that has a place in protecting sensitive lands; however, the program should not be expanded beyond levels currently authorized in the Agriculture Act of 2014.

The Agriculture Act of 2014 reduced the national CRP acreage cap from 32 million acres to 27.5 million acres in 2014 and to 24 million acres in 2018. H.R. 2 would then increase this cap by 1 million acres each year to a maximum enrollment of 29 million acres by 2023.

USDA's Farm Service Agency's CRP enrollment data reveals that, for the 2016 fiscal year, 23.9 million acres were enrolled in CRP, representing approximately 7 percent of the U.S. cropland. Rental rates and leases offered by the Federal Government are often much more lucrative than farming would be.

While congressional directives and a favorable farm economy in prior years led to lower CRP enrollment, nearly one-quarter of all land enrolled in CRP has been enrolled for more than 20 years, including 2.7 million acres, or 12 percent, enrolled for more than three decades since the inception of the program. During the 2016 fiscal year, payments for CRP lands totaled \$1.7 billion.

As our Nation's farmers and ranchers face the challenge of meeting the increasing demand for food and fiber in the U.S. and abroad, I ask the chairman: Should America's producers be forced to continue competing with Federal programs for access to farmland?

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and

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, such as capping 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 concerns 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

□ 1615

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. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

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.

The Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 (16 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.) is amended—

(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 "and 2016" and inserting "and 2016, and 2022";

(3) in section 7—

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

(B) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "and 2017" and inserting "and 2017, and 2022";

(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 the environmental and economic effects of conservation practices, develop the science base for managing the agricultural landscape for environmental quality and sustainable productive 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 data collection, 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.

"(3) MONITORING AND PROGRAM EVALUATION.—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.

"(b) MONITORING AND PROGRAM EVALUATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a comprehensive monitoring and program evaluation process to assess progress in reaching natural resource and environmental objectives identified in accordance with subsection (a) and the contribution of individual programs and initiatives, as well as the programs and initiatives collectively, to that progress.

"(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 the Secretary 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 PROCESS.—

"(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 will be aggregated at the landscape or 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 activities, the differing times for conservation effects to be realized, and other related measurement challenges.

“(C) PUBLIC RESEARCH.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to facilitate implementation of the monitoring and evaluation process, the Secretary shall make available conservation activity and program data to cooperators and researchers engaged in public research and evaluation activities to improve conservation outcomes under this subsection, provided that—

“(i) adequate assurances are provided to the Secretary that any resulting research or information will be made publicly available and in a form that protects personally identifiable information; and

“(ii) the National Technical Committee finds that any such research is likely to generate information that furthers the purpose of this section.

“(4) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may implement the monitoring evaluation process in part through cooperative or contribution agreements with Federal, State, and local agencies, universities and colleges, nongovernmental organizations with requisite expertise, as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the National Technical Committee.

“(5) NATIONAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE.—

“(A) COMPOSITION.—The monitoring and evaluation process shall be administered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service with assistance from a national technical committee appointed by the Secretary and composed of individuals with relevant technical and scientific expertise representing—

“(i) the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture;

“(ii) the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture;

“(iii) the Farm Service Agency of the Department of Agriculture;

“(iv) the Forest Service;

“(v) the National Institute for Food and Agriculture;

“(vi) the United States Geological Survey;

“(vii) State and tribal agencies;

“(viii) land grant university natural resource research programs;

“(ix) nongovernmental organizations with expertise in the full array of conservation issues and measurement and evaluation of conservation outcomes; and

“(x) such other agencies, institutions, or organizations as the Secretary may determine appropriate.

“(B) FACA EXEMPTION.—The national technical committee shall be exempt from the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

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

“(6) 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 by the Secretary.

“(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to

carry out this subsection, for each fiscal year, the amount that is equal to one percent of the total annual funding from the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation made available in the preceding fiscal year for the conservation programs established under subtitles D and H of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, excluding the conservation reserve program.

“(C) REPORTING.—

“(1) REPORT ON OBJECTIVES AND METHODS.—Beginning in the fiscal year that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, and periodically thereafter, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary shall submit to Congress, and make publicly available, a report that includes—

“(A) a description of conservation outcome objectives that are, to the maximum extent practicable, quantifiable, measurable, and time-bound 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;

“(B) a description of the approaches, tools, and methods used to measure or model the conservation outcomes and results and to estimate the cost-effectiveness of each such program; and

“(C) guidance to the conservation project partners working to implement conservation programs within a landscape-level project that provides a description of the approaches, tools, and methods the partners might consider using to measure and model the conservation outcomes and results of their projects.

“(2) REPORT ON OUTCOMES.—In conjunction with each of the reports to Congress pursuant to section 7, the Secretary shall submit to Congress, and make publicly available, a report that includes—

“(A) an assessment of progress made towards achieving conservation program objectives and anticipated outcomes and results for each conservation program established under subtitle D or H of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as well as for such programs collectively, and the landscape conservation initiatives developed by the Secretary;

“(B) an evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of each such conservation program and initiative; and

“(C) recommendations, in light of the assessment and evaluation, to improve program implementation and improve the scientific and economic tools (including any new or revised conservation practices, conservation enhancements, or conservation planning tools) used to achieve stated natural resource conservation and environmental objectives.

“(3) COORDINATION.—The Secretary may coordinate the reports required under paragraphs (1) and (2) with any reports developed as part of the conservation effects assessment project authorized by section 8, whenever such coordination is feasible and warranted, as determined by the Secretary.”

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

These provisions 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 important resource 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 provisions 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.

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.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 115-679.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. 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:

Beginning on page 250, strike line 25 and all that follows through line 13 on page 253.

Page 253, line 14, strike “(G) 15-PERCENT” and insert “(F) 5-PERCENT”.

Page 254, line 25, strike “15 percent” and insert “5 percent”.

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 who is responsible for a dependent 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:
 “(iii) 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).”, and

Page 260, strike lines 24 and 25, and insert the following:

- (1) in subsection (e)—
- (A) in paragraph (5)—
- (i) in subparagraph (A) by striking “age 6” and inserting “age 3 or of an incapacitated person”, and
- (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:
 “(9) is a married 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).”, and

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 this population—20 percent. This amendment would boost the work participation rate to 70 percent of able-bodied adults in the program. It does so by imple-

menting 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 I offer 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 above 6 percent. 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 this 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 obeying our laws and are legally in this country. This requirement is essential to the enforcement of our immigration laws. Otherwise, we are spending taxpayer money to train illegal immigrants whom Federal law prohibits from being employed.

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 single 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 claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to

the amendment by my good friend and colleague from California. I do that respectfully.

H.R. 2 includes a substantive, enforceable, and supportive work requirement for work-capable adults 18 to 59. That is 20 percent of the population, 6 million individuals.

Waivers and exemptions were modified and even tightened to ensure that only the most vulnerable work-capable adults were waived from the requirement. Waivers take into consideration those areas with excessively high rates of unemployment, while exemptions assist those who need short-term reprieve because of temporary hardship.

Allowing for married couples to fulfill one requirement disengages recipients from the workforce. Work is more than just a paycheck. It provides dignity, social impact, opportunity, and creates the only path to self-sufficiency. One spouse fulfilling a 20-hour-per-week requirement does not lead to self-sufficiency. It does the exact opposite; it creates a lifetime dependency trap.

H.R. 2 provides equitable treatment to all households when promoting work, including those that house cohabiting adults or married adults.

Currently, 42 States choose not to use education and training funds to invest in childcare, which is an allowable investment. Reducing the age of the child from 6 to 3 is an undeniable barrier that disincentivizes employment more so than the current programming.

Requiring education and training providers to use E-Verify on all participants who depend on them for services is just plain cruel. SNAP has eligibility standards in place, and illegal immigrants are not eligible for benefits. This is simply a means to shut out the very organizations and entities that provide these necessary supports for individuals in need.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. 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 in the committee to create something that was realistic and achievable.

Lowering the age from 6 to 3 will make it much more difficult for many SNAP families to comply with the work requirements, and reducing the ability of a State to have a waiver of up to 15 percent of the population will also make it extremely difficult, by reducing that number down to 5 percent.

So I think what the committee did was have a finely balanced effort to try

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 made 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, 89, 200, 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 time; 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 great 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 and the grocery stores and the income maintenance workers in the counties or the people who manage the low-income housing to find out what really is going on here.

I will bring to light one in particular of the four provisions in the amendment: the idea that participants in training programs have to go through E-Verify.

It has been said that you have to be a citizen to get SNAP anyway. I would suggest talking to some of the income maintenance workers or some of the people who talk to some of the people who use the SNAP program, and 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.

□ 1630

I really wish we had more information on this topic, but, again, it is my belief that the average clerk in an average convenience store knows a lot more about the SNAP program than most Ph.D.s in sociology.

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 amendments, 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

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 the 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 the Committee of the Whole House 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.

□ 1632

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. SIMPSON (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, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 115-679 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. 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 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 interests 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 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 the knowledge, skills, and experience of American farmers, land-grant universities, and extension services through the