PERMISSION TO REDUCE TIME FOR ELECTRONIC VOTING DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2419

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that, during further consideration of H.R. 2419 pursuant to House Resolution 574, the Chair may reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting under clause 6 of rule XVIII and clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

FARM, NUTRITION, AND BIOENERGY ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 574 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. 2419.

□ 1149

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. 2419) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. SCHIFF (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendments en bloc by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in part B of House Report 110–261.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 21 offered by Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

In section 1102(b)(6), strike ''$0.0667'' and insert ''$0.06''.

In section 2104 strike subsection (b) and insert the following new subsection:

(b) ENROLLMENT OF ACREAGE.—Subsection (b)(1) of section 1238N of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838n(1)) is amended by striking ''2,000,000 acres'' and inserting ''2,224,000 acres''.

In section 2401, insert after subsection (c) the following new subsection (and redesignate subsequent subsections accordingly):

(d) GRASSLAND RESERVE PROGRAM.—Section 1241(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(5) For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012, the grassland reserve program under subchapter C of chapter 2.''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 574, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, let me start by thanking Chairman PETERSON and Ranking Member GOODLATTE for their hard work on this important piece of legislation. I will be very proud to support the bill on final passage.

While clearly this reform legislation, and I want to underline this is reform legislation, is a positive step forward in ag policy, I believe my amendment improves the bill. It is a win-win for ranchers and the environment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is modest and very simple. It would make a small reduction in the direct payment rate for cotton, just two-thirds of a cent. That savings, which would be $127 million, would be used to fund additional enrollment in the Grassland Reserve Program. The Grassland Reserve Program is a jointly administered program by the National Resources Conservation Service and the Farm Service Agency. It uses long-term rental agreements and easements to help landowners and producers restore and protect grasslands while maintaining them in a condition suitable for grazing.

This investment of Federal dollars also helps to leverage State and local monies to expand these preservation areas. The reserves that I am speaking of provide habitat for diverse wildlife, including prairie chickens, grassland birds, game species, and prairie plants. Unfortunately, it was underfunded in the previous farm bill. There remains, therefore, a significant backlog for those wanting to access the program.

According to data from the United States Department of Agriculture, the 2006 backlog of unfunded applications totaled more than $1.1 billion, or 11 million acres, and interest continues to grow.

Now, the Agriculture Committee has made great strides to enhance this grasslands program, but their hard work will be for naught unless there is additional funding to ease the backlog of program applicants. We really cannot wait to make this investment because much of America's grassland continues to be converted to row crops, and other grasslands throughout the west are being developed and subdivided.

According to CRS, between 1982 and 2003, we have lost more than 10 percent of our pastureland, which is over 10 million acres.

The amendment would reduce total direct payments in the bill by less than one-tenth of 1 percent. Direct payments are not the only support for cotton producers in the bill. As the committee report notes, there are important changes in the loan program to make American cotton more competitive and move stocks out of storage. The bill also allows the Department of Agriculture to continue to pay for upland cotton storage until 2012.

So the amendment doesn't cause real great hardship for cotton producers, but it would help many of our ranchers. I urge the House to support the amendment.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I have to oppose the gentleman's amendment. Not that I don't support the Grassland Reserve Program, but the provisions of the commodity title were worked out by the committee very carefully in an effort to balance all of the various commodities' needs in that process. We don't think that it is fair to single out one commodity for changes even though it is for a worthwhile purpose. Cotton has already seen major changes with the bill's termination of the storage payments and also major reforms in payment limitations.

Additionally, the bill provides 1,340,000 acres to be enrolled in GRP, a substantial increase. I know that the gentleman from Colorado has been a leader in the coalition that has been advocating this program, and I appreciate his efforts and leadership in this area. Unfortunately, targeting any single commodity, in this case, cotton, for further reductions in their safety net is unwarranted and unfair. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in strong opposition to the Udall amendment. This amendment singles out one commodity for reduction in order to increase an unrelated program.

This bill already increases funding to enroll nearly 1 million new acres in the Grassland Reserve Program. That is a significant amount of land.

Some might think this is a small change in direct payment. It doesn't seem like much; however, this bill does not make changes in any of the current direct payments, and this would single out only one commodity, that being cotton, for reduction in direct payments.

The House Agriculture Committee has already made significant changes to cotton. The bill reduces cotton target prices and eliminates cotton loan storage credits. In addition, payment limit changes are more likely to affect cotton farmers than any other commodity.

If you want to increase the grasslands program, the offsets should not come from one commodity that is already taking a fairly major change in this bill. Let's treat all commodities the same and oppose the Udall amendment.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the General Farm Commodity Subcommittee that deals with this issue, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, as you've heard, this commodity has already taken a major hit, a major change in the whole list of that commodity. It is really unfair to single out cotton.

I agree with the gentleman from Colorado; we have done some things in conservation and wish we could have done more and wish we had more money. You have already heard how we have been strapped for cash, but the truth is this amendment is unfair. And I will oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I would encourage my colleagues to oppose it as well.

We will continue to work with him as the bill moves forward to try and help, but it is absolutely unfair, once we have reached this very delicate balance within the bill, to reach in and single out one commodity that has already been hit harder in terms of cuts than any other commodity within all of the commodity titles.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for giving me a quick minute.

I, too, rise in opposition to the Udall amendment, not because I am opposed to conservation of grasslands, but simply because hard choices were made to craft a bill that was as balanced as we can get it. If you were on the living end of the commodity program and cotton, you know already the dramatic changes that are going to be in the offing if this bill does pass. To come in now and ask for one more change, one more reduction, is inappropriate, and I would oppose that and hope that our good colleagues who support conservation would understand this is a very difficult process. We have set priorities, and I think the finely tuned bill that came out of the committee is one we ought to support and not make this change. I respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado has 2 minutes. The gentleman from Minnesota has 1 minute.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I think that the other gentlemen have eloquently stated the case, and I want to reiterate that this is not a fair process to single out one commodity.

I want to take the balance of my time to recognize the tremendous efforts of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) in working with us on this farm bill. And also, if he were here, he would be speaking out very strongly on this amendment as well. We oppose this amendment and encourage our colleagues to support us in that regard.

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As I close my arguments for this important amendment, I would again like to thank the chairman and ranking member for a bill that truly is about reform. That is the theme I would like to strike here. This amendment would take us further down the path of reform.

This is less than one-tenth of 1 percent to expand the Grassland Reserve Program. I would note for the record that a number of organizations that are highly respected in the States of Texas and Minnesota and all over the country support the amendment. The American Farmland Trust, Environmental Working Group, Republicans for Environmental Protection, the National Wildlife Federation, the American Bird Conservancy, Defenders of Wildlife, the Trust for Public Land all think that this amendment makes real sense.

It is $127 million, less than one-tenth of 1 percent out of the direct payments program to preserve these important legacy areas, our grasslands, in the great American west. I urge an ''aye'' vote. This is an important amendment that would help strengthen the bill.

□ 1200

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

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

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. PUTNAM

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in House Report 110–261.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 25 offered by Mr. PUTNAM:

At the appropriate place in the conservation title, add the following new section:

SEC. 2___. ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME LIMITATION REGARDING PAYMENTS UNDER CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.

Section 1001D(b)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a(b)(1)), as amended by section 1504 [and the manager's amendment, pages 34 and 35], is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) SPECIAL RULE FOR CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), in the case of covered benefits described in paragraph (2)(C), an individual or entity shall not be eligible to receive any benefit described in such paragraph (2) during a crop year if the average adjusted gross income of the individual or entity exceeds $1,000,000, unless not less than 75 percent of the average adjusted gross income of the individual or entity is derived from farming, ranching, or forestry operations, as determined by the Secretary.''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 574, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, we have a number of speakers on this so I want to be brief.

One of the common misperceptions about the farm bill that didn't used to be a misperception, it used to be a reality and was very frustrating to taxpayers, was that professional athletes and broadcasters and people like that could game the system to receive conservation payments. And to the chairman and Mr. GOODLATTE's credit, this bill does make significant strides towards improving the commitment to conservation. However, there is a change in the bill that is disturbing which lowers the AGI limit for eligibility for conservation payments.

The effect of that is that it takes out what had been a requirement that 75 percent of your income be farm income, and in the process of doing that, it eliminates many of the most successful farmers who are doing their best to take advantage of government-matching dollars to improve their operations from an environmental perspective. It eliminates their ability to do so.

And setting aside the family farm narrative, if you are truly a family farm, where you have multiple generations operating, then for sheer survival you have to grow in order to feed grandpa and dad and two brothers and their families who are all in the dairy business or in the livestock business.

If this language were to remain in the bill as is, the Florida Department of Agriculture reports unofficially that roughly half of Florida producers would be ineligible for conservation payments. Many of the producers on the Chesapeake watershed, we've heard a lot today about the Chesapeake, the Everglades watershed, irrigation projects in the American West would be ineligible for these matching dollars because of this new AGI limitation.

And I would urge Members to review this carefully and adopt this amendment so that these conservation payments would find their way to the farmers that are doing the best job, that are the most successful and are full-time. These are not hobby farmers. These are full-time agricultural producers in America who are feeding this country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my fellow cosponsor from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY).

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend and colleague from Florida. I'm proud to cosponsor this important amendment with the gentleman, as he and his family are champions of Florida agriculture.

One recurring theme we've heard throughout this debate is that although this farm bill is historic for American agriculture, it does not give everyone what they wanted.

In the case of conservation programs, I believe it's a mistake for this bill to further restrict the American farmers' access to important conservation programs by lowering the adjusted gross income limits.

This is bad policy because it hurts farmers that produce high-value crops from accessing conservation programs. In Florida, we are fighting to protect our environment. We've spent billions to preserve the Everglades. These new, more restrictive limits will disincent Florida ranchers and growers from investing with the Federal Government to preserve our lands and clean our waters.

I urge my colleagues to use common sense. This amendment provides real farmers, not millionaires, access to critical conservation programs.

I urge my colleagues to take an important step in keeping our rural lands green, to protect our wetlands, and to support our national agricultural heritage.

This is a good amendment, and it deserves your support.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, we had a debate similar to this not too long ago, and I'll say it again, that while we've added several billion dollars to the conservation baseline, we still have backlogs in most of those programs.

And the question to me is the same: if large farms shouldn't be eligible for title I payments, why should they be eligible for title II payments? If these operations are diversified enough to have problems with farm income exemption, same question, do they really need Federal payments?

So I'd like to hear the arguments against because, to me, a strong title I is necessary to even carry out our conservation programs. If the farmers don't have a strong safety net, that work on conservation is going to be the first thing that's sacrificed. So with limited Federal funds for conservation, we need to make priorities, and providing funds for larger producers and folks with lots of off-the-farm income is a tough choice; but it's a choice we have to make.

I'd just like to say that one of the most important reforms that people have pointed to in this bill is that we have finally put a hard cap on adjusted gross income, and this has caused a lot of pain for a lot of people. So it just is not right to have a hard cap on the commodity title and not have a hard cap on conservation.

So I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman have additional speakers opposed to the amendment?

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I guess we have no further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PUTNAM. How much time is remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has yielded back.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate, while this has a major impact on specialty crop and dairy and livestock States like California and Florida, it is a national issue because under current law, if 75 percent of your income is from farms, then you are eligible for this higher AGI. By taking that out, you are redirecting conservation dollars from people who are full-time farmers, full-time producers, presumably the people that the farm bill is intended to benefit, and directing it to hobby farmers, people who are enjoying their gentlemanly estates in the suburbs of Washington or New York or other metropolitan areas, where they enjoy the bucolic lifestyle, while the people who get up before dawn every morning and go to bed after dark every night, and live and die by the vagaries of the marketplace and pests and disease will be ineligible for the additional conservation help.

So you either drive them out of business because of the impact on watersheds, or you will pay for it out of a different program; but one way or the other you will either drive agriculture out of the Chesapeake, drive agriculture out of the Glades, drive agriculture out of the prairie potholes, out of the Dakotas, out of the flyways, or we can make this minor amendment to let the people who farm full time eligible for the green payments that recognize the social benefits that come from their activities.

I urge the adoption of this amendment, and I thank my friend from Florida for his assistance.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. COOPER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 110–261.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 27 offered by Mr. COOPER:

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

TITLE XII—CROP INSURANCE

SEC. 1201. CONTROLLING CROP INSURANCE PROGRAM COSTS.

(a) ADMINISTRATIVE FEE FOR CATASTROPHIC RISK PROTECTION.—Section 508(b)(5) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(b)(5)) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) BASIC FEE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), each producer shall pay an administrative fee for catastrophic risk protection in an amount which is, as determined by the Corporation, equal to 25 percent of the premium amount for catastrophic risk protection established under subsection (d)(2)(A) per crop per county.

''(ii) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The total amount of administrative fees for catastrophic risk protection payable by a producer under clause (i) shall not exceed $5,000 for all crops in all counties.''.

(b) PAYMENT OF PORTION OF PREMIUM BY CORPORATION.—Section 508(e)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''67 percent'' and inserting ''62 percent'';

(2) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking ''64 percent'' and inserting ''59 percent'';

(3) in subparagraph (D)(i), by striking ''59 percent'' and inserting ''54 percent'';

(4) in subparagraph (E)(i), by striking ''55 percent'' and inserting ''53 percent'';

(5) in subparagraph (F)(i), by striking ''48 percent'' and inserting ''46 percent''; and

(6) in subparagraph (G)(i), by striking ''38 percent'' and inserting ''36 percent''.

(c) REDUCTION IN PORTION OF THE PREMIUM PAID BY THE CORPORATION.—Section 508(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) PREMIUM PAYMENT INCENTIVE.—The Corporation may increase payment of a part of the premium from the amounts provided under subsection (e)(2) by not more than 5 percent for a policy or plan of insurance that is not based on individual yield to provide an additional incentive to create broader use of such policies.''.

(d) SHARE OF RISK.—Section 508(k)(3) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(3)) is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) SHARE OF RISK.—The reinsurance agreements of the Corporation with the reinsured companies shall require the reinsured companies to cede to the Corporation 22 percent of its cumulative underwriting gain or loss.''

SEC. 1202. CROP INSURANCE PROGRAM COMPLIANCE.

(a) USE OF UNUSED FUNDING TO IMPROVE PROGRAM INTEGRITY.—Section 522(e)(3) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(e)(3)) is amended by striking ''the Corporation may use'' through the end of the paragraph and inserting the following: ''the Corporation may use—

''(A) not more than $10,000,000 for each fiscal year to improve program integrity, such as

''(i) increasing the number of compliance personnel;

''(ii) increasing compliance related training;

''(iii) improving analysis tools and technology related to compliance;

''(iv) identifying, utilizing, and expanding innovative compliance strategies and technology; and

''(v) developing and maintaining the information management system developed pursuant to section 10706(b) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8002(b)); and

''(B) any excess amounts to carry out other activities authorized under this section.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT REGARDING VIOLATION OF HIGHLY ERODIBLE LAND CONSERVATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1211(a)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3811(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (C);

(2) by inserting ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (D); and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

SEC. 1203. REAUTHORIZATION OF, AND INCREASED ENROLLMENT AUTHORITY FOR GRASSLAND RESERVE PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION AND FUNDING.—Section 1241(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(5) For each of fiscal years 2002 through 2013, the grassland reserve program under sub chapter C of chapter 2.''.

(b) ENROLLMENT GOALS.—Section 1238N(b)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838N(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''2,000,000 acres'' and inserting ''5,000,000 acres''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 574, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, everyone should be able to support the upcoming Cooper amendment, whether you're for or against the farm bill. It really doesn't make any difference because my amendment doesn't affect 99 percent of what's in the farm bill, but it does affect 1 percent.

And what is that? It's called the crop insurance industry, a little known curious part of the insurance world that is completely dominated by 16 fabulously rich companies. These companies, at taxpayer expense, made $2.8 billion in profits, underwriting gains, in the last 5 years. I don't begrudge anyone big profits out in the real world; but when it's at taxpayer subsidy expense, I get a little worried.

So what my amendment would do is two things. Number one, it would reform that industry and reform it in the way that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has recommended, and I'm proud that they strongly support my amendment.

But it also does something else, and we only found this out yesterday, and this is very important because it could well not only save the bill, it could save the reputation of many of our colleagues in the House because there is a provision in the bill today that I'm sure was unintended. I have no idea how it got in there, how it found a place on page 668 of the bill. It just happens to enrich forever these 16 crop insurance companies.

Now, what does that little slender provision do which the Bush administration has already said allows them to collude to raise prices for consumers and the government? That little provision allows them an antitrust exemption, an antitrust exemption that, of course, was never referred to the Judiciary Committee. No one on the Judiciary Committee knows about it. I haven't found anybody on the Agriculture Committee who knew about it, but it's a long-sought goal of the crop insurance industry so that they can collude to price-fix, to bid-rig in their negotiations with the government so they can get even more subsidies, because apparently $2.8 billion in profits in the last 5 years was not enough.

So my amendment is the only way to cut out that provision. Unless some of our colleagues are not attuned to antitrust laws, these antitrust obligations are not just wrong. Talking in contract negotiations is supposed to be an open-bidding process, a real free market competition. This sort of behavior is not just wrong; it is criminal, criminal.

So unintentionally and apparently unbeknownst to most folks on the committee, we are giving them a license to conduct what would otherwise be criminal antitrust behavior. This is wrong. This is so wrong it should not be part of any of this bill, and I am sure that no one intended it, although it just happens to benefit these 16 companies.

Now, these are not bad people who work for these companies; but it's a rotten system, and it doesn't need to be destroyed, but it does need to be reformed; and we need to follow the guidelines of the Bush administration in reforming it because I haven't found anybody else who's willing to take on this task.

But surely this can bring us together in a bipartisan fashion to cure this flaw in the bill.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. COOPER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, in order to discourage this illegal criminal behavior, I ask unanimous consent for a modification of my amendment so that it can be handled properly according to parliamentary fashion.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 27 offered by Mr. COOPER:

The amendment as modified is as follows:

In section 2104 strike subsection (b) and insert the following new subsection:

(b) ENROLLMENT OF ACREAGE.—Subsection (b)(1) of section 1238N of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838n) is amended by striking ''2,000,000 acres'' and inserting ''2,500,000 acres''.

In section 2104, add at the end the following new subsection:

(f) FUNDING.—Section 1241(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(5) For each of fiscal years 2002 through 2013, the grassland reserve program under subchapter C of chapter 2.''.

At the end of subtitle A of title XI, add the following new section:

SEC. 110___. ADDITIONAL CROP INSURANCE AMENDMENTS.

(a) EXPECTED LOSS RATIO.—

(1) PROJECTED LOSS RATIO.—Section 506(o)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1506(o)(2)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''1998'' and inserting ''2007'';

(B) by striking ''1998'' and inserting ''2007''; and

(C) by striking ''1.075'' and inserting ''1.00''.

(2) PREMIUMS REQUIRED.—Section 508(d)(1) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(d)(1)) is amended by striking ''1.1'' and all that follows through ''October 1, 1998'' and inserting ''1.00 on and after October 1, 2007''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect on September 30, 2007.

(4) ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Risk Management Agency will report annually, by March 1st, in the Federal Register—

(A) the projected loss ratio upon which premiums are based for the coming reinsurance year; and

(B) the projected loss ratio of the Corporation for the coming reinsurance year that excludes the portion of the premium paid by the Corporation.

(b) CONTROLLING CROP INSURANCE PROGRAM COSTS.—

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE FEE FOR CATASTROPHIC RISK PROTECTION.—Section 508(b)(5) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(b)(5)) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) BASIC FEE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), each producer shall pay an administrative fee for catastrophic risk protection in an amount which is, as determined by the Corporation, equal to 25 percent of the premium amount for catastrophic risk protection established under subsection (d)(2)(A) per crop per county.

''(ii) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The total amount of administrative fees for catastrophic risk protection payable by a producer under clause (i) shall not exceed $5,000 for all crops in all counties.''.

(2) PAYMENT OF PORTION OF PREMIUM BY CORPORATION.—Section 508(e)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)(2)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''67 percent'' and inserting ''62 percent'';

(B) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking ''64 percent'' and inserting ''59 percent'';

(C) in subparagraph (D)(i), by striking ''59 percent'' and inserting ''54 percent'';

(D) in subparagraph (E)(i), by striking ''55 percent'' and inserting ''53 percent'';

(E) in subparagraph (F)(i), by striking ''48 percent'' and inserting ''46 percent''; and

(F) in subparagraph (G)(i), by striking ''38 percent'' and inserting ''36 percent''.

(3) REDUCTION IN PORTION OF THE PREMIUM PAID BY THE CORPORATION.—Section 508(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) PREMIUM PAYMENT INCENTIVE.—The Corporation may increase payment of a part of the premium from the amounts provided under subsection (e)(2) by not more than 5 percent for a policy or plan of insurance that is not based on individual yield to provide an additional incentive to create broader use of such policies.''.

(4) SHARE OF RISK.—Section 508(k)(3) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(3)) is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) SHARE OF RISK.—The reinsurance agreements of the Corporation with the reinsured companies shall require the reinsured companies to cede to the Corporation 30 percent of its cumulative underwriting gain or loss.''

(5) REIMBURSEMENT RATE.—Section 508(k)(4)(A) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(4)(A)) is amended by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

''(ii) for each of the 2008 and subsequent reinsurance years, 15 percent of the premium used to define loss ratio.''.

(c) RENEGOTIATION OF STANDARD REINSURANCE AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 508(k) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(8) RENEGOTIATION OF STANDARD REINSURANCE AGREEMENT.—The Corporation may renegotiate the financial terms and conditions of each Standard Reinsurance Agreement not more frequently than once every 3 years. Crop insurance companies are not allowed to collude during the renegotiation of financial terms of the Standard Reinsurance Agreement.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Sections 536 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 1506 note; Public Law 105–185) and section 148 of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1506 note; Public Law 106–224) are repealed.

(d) CROP INSURANCE PROGRAM COMPLIANCE.—

(1) USE OF UNUSED FUNDING TO IMPROVE PROGRAM INTEGRITY.—Section 522(e)(3) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(e)(3)) is amended by striking ''the Corporation may use'' through the end of the paragraph and inserting the following: ''the Corporation may use—''

''(A) not more than $10,000,000 for each fiscal year to improve program integrity, such as

''(i) increasing the number of compliance personnel;

''(ii) increasing compliance related training;

''(iii) improving analysis tools and technology related to compliance;

''(iv) identifying, utilizing, and expanding innovative compliance strategies and technology; and

''(v) developing and maintaining the information management system developed pursuant to section 10706(b) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8002(b)); and

''(B) any excess amounts to carry out other activities authorized under this section.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT REGARDING VIOLATION OF HIGHLY ERODIBLE LAND CONSERVATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1211(a)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3811(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (C);

(B) by inserting ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (D); and

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

''(E) crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.);''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the reading). Without objection, the reading is dispensed with.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this is ridiculous. We have an Agriculture Committee. The Agriculture Committee has under it the jurisdiction of the crop insurance program. The crop insurance program's largely governed by the crop insurance law which is going to be up for reauthorization in the next Congress. We are close to completing a farm bill. The gentleman, who is not on the committee but participated in a hearing in the Government Oversight Committee, has developed a keen interest in the crop insurance program. He has advanced an amendment which has been made in order. It would have substantial consequences to the crop insurance program, and it has not had a hearing in the Agriculture Committee.

But beyond that, as with all amendments, there are timelines to submit to the Rules Committee, printed in the RECORD. Everyone has a chance to evaluate precisely what the gentleman is saying.

□ 1215

Well, that's not enough, because this morning, he comes to the floor and says that he has discovered, almost like a Grisham novel, discovered, on page 668, language. It's not just wrong, it's criminal, and if we only followed this man, we can alleviate ourselves of wrongdoing that must be criminal and save the reputation of our House and Members in it. Oh, what drama is unfolding here. What nonsense is purported by the gentleman asking for this unanimous consent request.

I will assert objection to the unanimous consent request. This is not accidental language. It didn't fall from the sky. It's part of a complete plan on crop insurance and the structure of a public-private partnership.

I look forward to working with the gentleman in an ongoing effort to really dig to the bottom of the gentleman's questions. But I will tell you something, none of us, certainly not me, is so doggone smart that after a hearing I go off and do a little more study, write a bill totally undoing vital risk protection to our farmers, and if that's not enough, come to the floor of the House and ask for unanimous consent to try and further rewrite this program right here as we go, without even having printed language before us.

Mr. Chairman, I assert the objection to the unanimous consent request.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The amendment is not modified.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who just spoke knows that we discussed this precise matter at dinner last night. He was not caught unawares at all. We discussed it at some length at dinner.

Second, it is the prerogative of any Member of this House to defend the honor of this institution. I am personally extremely disappointed that our provision allowing what would otherwise be antitrust violation, wrongful, possibly criminal behavior, would be allowed to be inserted in this bill, apparently without the knowledge of anyone on the committee, certainly not of anyone on the Judiciary Committee.

I regret his objection. But my intention is clear. We need to reform crop insurance in America. I only found out about this issue, as the gentleman said correctly, because I am fortunate enough to be a member of the Government Reform Committee.

Under the hearings led by HENRY WAXMAN, we did more to uncover abuse in this area than the Agriculture Committee ever did. In fact, when I attended the agriculture hearing, only four members of that committee were present to hear the government witnesses to describe the ongoing abuse in the crop insurance industry, witnesses from the GAO and USDA IG.

This is important information that every Member of the House deserves to have, because we should not be party to handing out free antitrust exemptions without anybody knowing about it.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition and yield the customary 2½ minutes to the ranking member from Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT), a member of the committee.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia may control 2½ minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) whose intentions are certainly well meaning, here is the situation. This was never brought before our committee. We spent hour after hour, most times till 1:00 or 2:00 in the morning, working on a variety of these issues.

Now, if there are charges that he is speaking of, and they appear to be serious, they belong in the jurisdiction of the Justice Department, not in the Agriculture Committee.

That is where this argument needs to be taken, but not at this late hour at a time when it has not been brought before our committee. And, as he said, he might have mentioned it to the gentleman, Mr. POMEROY, at dinner, but that's a hue and a cry from having this discussion in the full Agriculture Committee.

The other point is that there are 16 companies who provide crop insurance. If this rather draconian amendment were even adopted, it would severely wreak havoc in the crop insurance industry as we know it and provide fewer choices for our farmers.

Again, it is beyond the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committee.

I respectfully ask that we oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the committee bill makes significant reforms to the Crop Insurance Program. The bill reduced the statutory loss ratio to an actuarially sound 1.0. By doing this, we were able to include a provision by Mr. NEUGEBAUER that makes additional crop insurance available, which has to be paid for, which will lessen need for disaster assistance.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER's provision is similar in many respects to the administration's crop insurance plan. The committee bill increases premiums for the catastrophic level of coverage.

We authorize the USDA to renegotiate the standard reinsurance agreement every 5 years. The committee bill specifically authorizes data mining to ensure compliance with rules of the program. The committee bill also reduces the reimbursement rate by 2 percentage points. These are significant changes that make the program more actuarially sound and make the program more responsible with taxpayer dollars.

Additionally, the committee-passed bill authorized an additional 1 million acres in the GRP land to protect sensitive grasslands in this country. While we all would like more money for many programs, this is a carefully balanced approach. I think we have done a good job of balancing the needs of both commodity producers and those that would like to preserve native grasslands.

I strongly oppose this amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have the highest respect for the gentleman and for all the members of the Agriculture Committee. I am sure this was not intentional. That's why I am trying to correct the problem.

When I looked into it, 84 percent of the savings that are in the agriculture bill from crop insurance happened only in year 5. Nothing happens in year 1, 2, 3, 4. Year 5 is the year in which the next agriculture bill will be drafted. It's very unlikely that those cuts will ever occur, when 84 percent of them are back-loaded in year 5. So that was my concern about those cuts.

But the larger provision, allowing these collusive discussions and negotiations with the government, surely the gentleman is disturbed by those.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Reclaiming my time from the gentleman, let me just say that these changes are real, they are legitimate, they will be put into effect. The chairman has committed to holding additional hearings and investigation into the matter. We will do that.

But to pull the safety net out from under American farmers and ranchers by doing something in a precipitous fashion is not a good idea.

Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Some quick facts: the insurance industry operates in this country under an antitrust exemption. It was passed into law in 1945 in the McCarron-Ferguson Act. But for a relatively recent interpretation of the Department of Justice, in constant negotiation, the Federal Government to the private sector partner has always been conducted under the way anticipated under the bill.

Twenty years ago I was a State insurance commissioner. At that time there were more than 60 companies writing crop insurance. Now they are down to 16. Why is that? Because there is so doggone much money here? Heck, no. It's because it's a tough line of business to work.

I am not saying that we don't need to look at it, but the committee takes out $2.9 billion, and now we got a guy that thinks he knows we can take out billions more. I tell you, you take out billions more, my farmers don't have the vital risk protection they need when crops fail and they need to make the payment back to the banker on their loans. So this is serious stuff. This isn't an academic exercise. This is vital risk protection for the farmers.

Vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, we have already held three hearings this year. The chairman has indicated that the committee is going to hold more hearings. We are going to look into this deeper. I think that's appropriate. To make this kind of change on the floor of the House at the 11th hour is unfair to the farmers of America.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment and would ask the Members of this body to do the same. Let it go back to the committee so we will have the opportunity to do it at committee level where it should be done.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 110–261 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 7 by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. RANGEL of New York.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. BOEHNER of Ohio.

Amendment No. 19 by Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

Amendment No. 25 by Mr. PUTNAM of Florida.

Amendment No. 27 by Mr. COOPER of Tennessee.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 422, noes 3, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 748]

AYES—422

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Christensen
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon

Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—3

Gohmert
King (IA)
Weldon (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Castor
Clarke
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Emanuel
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Hastert
Issa
Kucinich
LaHood
Slaughter

□ 1249

Mrs. CAPPS and Messrs. CANTOR, BARROW, CAMPBELL of California, FRANKS of Arizona and FEENEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 748 I voted "no." I meant to vote "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 245, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 749]

AYES—182

Abercrombie
Allen
Baird
Baldwin
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Camp (MI)
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson
Castle
Christensen
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Harman
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Poe
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—245

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Bordallo
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ellsworth
Engel
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Higgins
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Keller
Kennedy
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pallone
Pascrell
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothman
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Clarke
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Emanuel
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Hastert
Issa
Kucinich
LaHood

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that they have 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1255

Mr. HODES changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. BOEHNER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 153, noes 271, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 750]

AYES—153

Allen
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bean
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Castle
Chabot
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Hall (TX)
Harman
Heller
Hensarling
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Israel
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCaul (TX)
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moore (WI)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Myrick
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reichert
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Shuler
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Space
Stark
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Wamp
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—271

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baker
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Bonner
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Camp (MI)
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
Kingston
Klein (FL)
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Broun (GA)
Clarke
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Emanuel
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Hastert
Issa
Kucinich
LaHood
Maloney (NY)
Sali

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1259

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 144, noes 282, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 751]

AYES—144

Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Castle
Chabot
Christensen
Clay
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Doggett
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
English (PA)
Eshoo
Ferguson
Flake
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gordon
Gutierrez
Heller
Hensarling
Higgins
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kanjorski
Keller
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Langevin
Lee
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
McCarthy (NY)
McKeon
Mitchell
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Regula
Reichert
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stark
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Wamp
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Westmoreland
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—282

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Bachmann
Baker
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Bonner
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castor
Chandler
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kagen
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pastor
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Clarke
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Emanuel
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Hastert
Issa
Kucinich
LaHood
Saxton

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members have 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1303

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, on July 27, 2007, I inadvertently voted "aye" on Davis Amendment to H.R. 2419 (rollcall No. 751). I intended to vote "no" on the amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 251, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 752]

AYES—175

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boucher
Boyda (KS)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capps
Carney
Castle
Chabot
Clay
Cleaver
Cooper
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dreier
Ehlers
Ellison
English (PA)
Eshoo
Ferguson
Flake
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gordon
Green, Al
Hall (NY)
Harman
Heller
Higgins
Hinchey
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McNerney
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Putnam
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
Reynolds
Rohrabacher
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tancredo
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Walsh (NY)
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—251

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Duncan
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Filner
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
Kingston
Klein (FL)
Lampson
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Ortiz
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Poe
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Salazar
Sali
Sarbanes
Schmidt
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Turner
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)

Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Clarke
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Edwards
Emanuel
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Hastert
Issa
Kucinich
LaHood

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1309

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. WYNN, Mr. TOWNS, and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. PUTNAM

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 252, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 753]

AYES—175

Abercrombie
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boyd (FL)
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Costa
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Doolittle
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Granger
Green, Gene
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kind
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Langevin
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Nunes
Paul
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—252

Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Bonner
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Chandler
Christensen
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Cuellar
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ellsworth
Emerson
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Fattah
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shadegg
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Clarke
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Emanuel
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Hastert
Issa
Kucinich
LaHood

□ 1313

Mr. POE changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. COOPER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 250, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 754]

AYES—175

Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Baird
Baldwin
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boucher
Buchanan
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Christensen
Cohen
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
English (PA)
Eshoo
Faleomavaega
Ferguson
Flake
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Harman
Hensarling
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Israel
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McNulty
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Reichert
Rogers (MI)
Rothman

Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Stark
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—250

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carney
Carson
Carter
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Edwards
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Gilchrest
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Jackson (IL)
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
Kingston
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lampson
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Loebsack
Lucas
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sarbanes
Schmidt
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Turner
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Gingrey

NOT VOTING—11

Clarke
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Emanuel
Fortuño
Frank (MA)
Hastert
Hunter
Issa
Kucinich
LaHood

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are reminded they have 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1318

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment today to give pollinator protection and the concern of Colony Collapse Disorder a prominent presence in H.R. 2419, the Farm Bill Extension Act of 2007. This amendment reflects the contributions of countless organizations and a bi-partisan coalition of Members of Congress who share a common concern for pollinator decline.

When issues like Colony Collapse Disorder and pollinator decline threaten one-third of American agriculture, they must be taken seriously. I commend Chairman PETERSON and the Committee on Agriculture for their tireless work on provisions in the current Farm Bill Extension Act to address pollinator research. However, my amendment demonstrates the need to clarify that significant research and conservation programs will play an important role in combating Colony Collapse, Disorder and North American pollinator decline in years to come. If we want our children to enjoy food grown in this nation in the coming years, then we must save bees and other pollinators.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds a section to the bill authorizing $86.5 million over 5 years for facilities improvement and research grants to combat Colony Collapse Disorder and North American native/managed pollinator decline. These funds would be authorized through a combination of initiatives at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA, including the Agricultural Research Service, ARS, the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, CSREES, and the Animal Plant and Health Inspection Service, APHIS. This section of the amendment is very similar to my legislation H.R. 1709, the Pollinator Protection Act, which has the bi-partisan support of 50 cosponsors. This amendment also incorporates welcome adjustments to the Pollinator Protection Act which I collaborated with Senator BARBARA BOXER to develop in the companion legislation, S. 1694, the Pollinator Protection Act of 2007.

My amendment also clarifies the importance of native and managed pollinators in vital conservation programs of USDA. This component of the amendment reflects the content of H.R. 2913, the Pollinator Habitat Protection Act of 2007, which Representative EARL BLUMENAUER and I recently introduced, similar to S. 1496 introduced by Senator MAX BAUCUS. On the Senate side, this similar legislation has received vast bi-partisan support from 33 cosponsors.

Mr. Chairman. Moments like this truly demonstrate the collaborative capacity of this great Congress to meet a dire need with thoughtful policy that truly engages stakeholders and impacted communities.

I thank Members of Congress that worked with me in both chambers of Congress in this effort to save American agriculture. I also thank the many scientists and organizations for their endorsement of this amendment, namely: the American Beekeeping Federation, Inc., American Honey Producers Association, American Farmland Trust, California Farm Bureau Federation, California State Beekeepers Association, Center for Biological Diversity, Coevolution Institute, Defenders of Wildlife, Environmental Defense, Florida Farm Bureau Federation, National Wildlife Federation, Partners for Sustainable Pollination, Sonoma County Beekeepers Association, Sustainable Agriculture Coalition, Wild Farm Alliance, and the Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation.

I thank Chairman PETERSON for his support and I urge my colleagues support this vital amendment.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to continuation of a failed farm policy that takes from the poor to give to the rich. Although the Farm Bill, H.R. 2419 before us is being sold as a reform package, it is little more than a dressed up version of previous ''Farm Bills'' that have paid over $1 billion to dead farmers and $1.3 billion to individuals who do not farm.

Our so-called ''farm policy'' overwhelmingly benefits the wealthiest landowners at the expense of small farmers. The top 10 percent of recipients collect 60 percent of all payments. Large landowners receive the most subsidies, which allows them to purchase the best land from smaller farmers. This drives many farmers out of business and increases the price of land.

This bill does lower the income cap and prohibits individuals with more than $1 million in annual income from receiving direct payments. Unfortunately, there are numerous loopholes in this provision, which led the Bush Administration's own Agriculture Department to estimate that as few as 3,000 out of the 1.5 million individuals receiving direct payments will be cut off. This bill therefore does little to end the corporate welfare that has become the hallmark of our agriculture policy.

Congressmen KIND and FLAKE are offering real reform. I support their Fairness in Farm and Food Policy Amendment because it creates a meaningful income limit to make sure no subsidies go to farmers with a yearly income over $250,000. It gradually reduces direct payments and reforms the bloated crop insurance program. These savings are then invested into conservation, minority farmers, fruit and vegetable production, and a $5.6 billion boost to vital nutrition programs. This is the new direction in which America's farm policy should be headed.

I applaud the efforts of my many colleagues who worked hard to include additional funding for the Food Stamps program and the McGovern/Dole International Food program. Their efforts

will help millions of hungry families in this country and around the world. However, this bill, does not go far enough to provide food for the hungry and looks to the wrong place to pay for the limited funding it does provide. If we are truly concerned about our Nation's hungry and poor, we could stop subsidizing agri-business and put the money we recoup from eliminating current subsidies to feed our neighbors and support family farms.

I urge my colleagues to vote for meaningful reform, support the Kind/Flake amendment, and oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, during debate tonight on the Fairness in Farm and Food Policy Amendment to the farm bill I offered with my colleagues Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RYAN, and others, a false claim was made regarding the budgetary impact of the amendment, and I would like to correct the record to reflect the truth. While the error, to the best of my knowledge, was not intentional and the false statement was not made knowingly, I believe it is important that I make the accurate information known.

Tonight, Chairman PETERSON stated that the savings claimed by the reforms made by the amendment were not realized, and he questioned, therefore, the validity of these reforms. Unfortunately, the statement was based on inaccurate information. After consulting with the Congressional Budget Office, it appears the Chairman was basing his comments on a comparison with current law rather than a comparison to H.R. 2419, which was how our amendment was drafted. The official CBO score shows that our amendment would have, in fact, saved the government billions of dollars during both the five- and 10-year windows in relation to the bill as reported by the Agriculture Committee.

It is unfortunate this mistake was made on the House floor tonight and was not corrected at the time. When writing policy that affects every single American, it is important that we base our decisions on timely and accurate information. I appreciate this opportunity to provide the real facts on our amendment.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of section 10404 of the 2007 Farm Bill, which would provide $35 million in funding over the next five years for farmers' markets through the Farmer Marketing Assistance Program. This provision also designates that 10 percent of the funding will be used to support the use of Electronic Benefits Transfer, EBT, technology at farmers' markets. I want to thank Representative KAGEN for his leadership and his amendment to the bill that strengthens our nation's farmers' markets and provides much needed resources for food stamp recipients to use their benefits at farmers' markets. I also appreciate his working with me on this issue.

As someone who regularly shops at a farmers' market in my hometown of Evanston, IL, I have seen first hand that farmers' markets are a positive force wherever they crop up, providing consumers with fresh food options, preserving family farms, increasing health and nutrition and connecting urban and rural Americans. Direct marketing of farm products has ballooned in recent years from 1,755 farmers markets in 1994 to over 4,385 in 2006. These markets average $245,000 per year in revenue, with the typical farmer netting about $7,108. Even though farmers' markets are highly seasonal, 25 percent of vendors rely on them as their sole source of farm-based income.

Even as farmers' markets are expanding to unprecedented numbers, the 2006 USDA Farmers' Market Survey found that only 6 percent of these markets have implemented EBT technology. In my home city of Chicago, we only have one farmers' market that can accept EBT cards: the Logan Square market became the first farmers' market in Illinois just last month. However, at a time when obesity, food insecurity and chronic illnesses impact millions of low-income Americans, most still cannot use their food stamp benefits to purchase nutritious food at farmers' markets.

This past May, I participated in the Food Stamp Challenge and lived on the national average food stamp benefit for one week. Even though the $3 per day allotment was inadequate, I had the good fortune of access to nearby grocery stores. Millions of Americans, however, have no grocery stores near their homes and live in what are known as ''food deserts.'' In fact, a 2004 study by Mississippi State University found that in the midwest, 34 percent of Americans live in food deserts, with this percentage approaching 50 percent in western States. Investments in farmers' markets are a low-cost solution to the crisis of food deserts and provide new options for Americans who currently have limited access to healthy food.

In 2006, USDA received over $15 million in grant applications from farmers' markets across the country under the Farmer Marketing Assistance Program and with only $1 million in available funds, it was only able to meet a fraction of the need. That represents a tremendous missed opportunity to improve the health of Americans. Today's raising of funding of the Farmer Marketing Assistance Program to $35 million over 5 years will help us get closer to meeting the need we know is out there. I urge my colleagues to pass the 2007 Farm Bill, which includes the Kagen Amendment, and to retain this important measure in Conference.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2419, the Farm, Nutrition, and Bioenergy Act, because I recognize its value to rural America and the promise it brings for renewing our national commitment to agriculture, nutritional research and food safety, and alternative energy and conservation.

I recognize that this legislation has been carefully crafted by a committee chaired by our highly respected colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. PETERSON. I commend him for his leadership. This legislation sets Federal farm policy and will be the basis for agricultural governance over the next 5 years. Importantly, it takes into account in several respects, the needs and priorities of farmers and ranchers residing in the territories.

The bill earns my support because it provides a reliable safety net for commodity crops, buttresses, in many respects, core conservation programs, and will now strengthen important domestic and international food nutrition programs.

Within this bill is a renewed and increased commitment to specialty crops. Specialty crops are important to the farmers and ranchers and consumers in the territories. Mr. Chairman, in the territories, we live and share the experiences of everyday life in rural America. We have much in common with our fellow Americans living and working in the small States and in the heartland of the U.S. mainland. We are economically challenged and strong Federal-local partnerships are the backbone of our ability to grow and diversify our economies.

Conservation in the islands is achieved through such partnerships. This bill presents a means through which such partnerships can be continued and strengthened. Historically, the Government of Guam has sought and utilized loans and programs under the Rural Development umbrella of the United States Department of Agriculture, USDA, to build its public works and infrastructure. Our utilities have largely and historically been constructed with Rural Development support. The continuation of authority for the range of Rural Development programs administered by USDA through Title VI of H.R. 2419 is one reason why I lend my support to this bill. These programs will be relied upon as a means to help our community of Guam meet additional and projected needs associated with the rebasing of Marines from Okinawa to Guam and realignment of defense forces in the Pacific Rim.

The bill carries other provisions of unique interest to me and to my colleagues from the territories. In particular, I am grateful for the accommodations made and the support received from Chairman PETERSON and the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE, for two specific provisions.

First, now within the research title of the bill, as a result of the amendment I sponsored with the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, the gentleman from American Samoa, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and the gentleman from Puerto Rico, Mr. FORTUÑO, that was packaged into the en bloc amendment offered by Chairman PETERSON, USDA will have authority to award grants to the land grant institutions in the territories for facilities improvements, construction, and equipment acquisition and repair.

Congress designated the University of Guam and the University of the Virgin Islands as land grant institutions by an Act passed in 1972. That Act was amended by Congress in 1980 to designate American Samoa Community College, the Northern Marianas College, and the College of Micronesia, as land grant institutions.

The land grants colleges and universities in the territories are a unique set of institutions with special needs and challenges within the national land grant college and university family. Our institutions are known informally as the 1972 community, and like the 1890 and 1994 communities, are an underserved set of institutions that USDA has authority to support in key areas.

The new authority under this bill for a grants program in support of facilities improvements and equipment acquisition will strengthen the institutional capacity at the land grant institutions in the territories to sponsor research and execute extension activities of national value. This is a $40 million authorization across 5 years. We have requested that this authority be included within the bill to complement USDA resources to support research and extension and instruction capacity building in the territories. Our land grant institutions are vital to our success in the islands—economically,

agriculturally, scientifically, and environmentally. Our institutions have limited resources, but these institutions and the territorial governments meet the matching requirements under the Hatch Act each year because these programs are so important to our communities.

The bill also extends the authorization for two grants programs authorized by the 2002 farm bill. These are the resident instruction and distance education grants programs for the territories.

Second, is an amendment that we proposed and that was placed into the bill to amend the definition of ''State'' in the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004 to include American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Virgin Islands of the United States, as eligible recipients of block grant funding that stands to be reauthorized by this bill. The inclusion of this provision is a significant victory for the territories. I am grateful for the support received from the gentleman from California, Mr. CARDOZA, for its inclusion in the bill.

Our farmers have invested in harvesting many traditional and tropical fruits, nuts, and horticultural specialties. Avocados, bananas, beans, betel nuts, breadfruits, coconuts, cucumbers, grapefruit, guavas, limes and lemons, mangoes, oranges, papayas, peppers, pineapples, squash, sweetsops, tangerines, tomatoes, and watermelons, are, for example, several of the specialty crops harvested in the territories whose market competitiveness stands to be improved now as a result of this bill.

The inclusion of the territories in this block grant funding will help our local Departments of Agriculture increase the capacity of our farmers to competitively farm and sell specialty crops. On Guam alone, the market value of specialty crops sold was estimated in 2002 by the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) at $3.4 million. We hope this new funding will result in increased production of fresh vegetables and local fruits and make Guam's market prices competitive.

It is for these reasons, and others, that I support H.R. 2419. As the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, I recognize the value the bill presents for conservation. I support it because of its conservation provisions. I look forward to working with the leadership to protect the provisions important to the territories and to national conservation by the conference committee.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bipartisan Farm Bill, and, in particular, section 4302. This section includes language directing the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake training, guidance, and enforcement of current Buy American Statutory requirements. I applaud the Agriculture Committee for including this important provision in the Farm Bill.

Congress has time and time again expressed its desire that taxpayer dollars be used to purchase domestically produced goods. We have consistently stated, through public law and senses of the Congress, that American-made goods should be given top priority.

Despite the repeated efforts of Congress, however, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) has chosen not to enforce the law. Schools, if they are even aware of the Buy American requirement, need training and assistance in how to incorporate the requirement into their bid solicitations.

Some companies blatantly disregard the requirement. A year ago, at a national school food conference, a food company marketed their peaches to school foodservice authorities. However, these peaches were clearly marked: ''peaches from China, packed in Thailand.'' If a school foodservice authority were to purchase this product for use in the national school lunch and breakfast programs, it would be an outright violation of Federal law.

After this was brought to the attention of USDA, a letter was issued to the conference host. No additional guidance, no additional training, no attempt to bring awareness to the issue. Obviously, the problem has not been adequately dealt with. A year later, at the same national school food conference, held just a week ago, the same product was exhibited: ''peaches from China, packed in Thailand.'' Evidently, nothing has changed. USDA needs to take responsibility to fulfill its duty to implement the law.

We produce, and should be promoting, plenty of high quality fresh, canned, and frozen product in the U.S. There is no reason to violate the law and purchase foreign goods. Now, more than ever, when our farmers need support, when we are facing food imports of questionable safety, it is vital that we ensure our school children are eating products produced by American Agriculture.

I applaud the Agriculture Committee for including this important language.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Farm Bill.

I commend Chairman PETERSON and Ranking Member GOODLATTE for producing a fair compromise that will go a long way in sustaining our agricultural system as well as supporting vital nutrition, conservation and research programs.

I would also like to thank the Chairman for including language directing the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study of waste water infrastructure along the U.S.-Mexico border.

Many rural communities along the border are living with inadequate waste water treatment plants and sewer management systems.

Without improved infrastructure and access to clean water these communities face significant public health threats.

This study will determine what steps the Federal Government can take to bring inadequate waste water systems in rural border communities up to date.

In my district alone I have heard from the communities of Sabinal, Clint, Fort Stockton, Presidio and Fort Hancock, Texas, all of which are in desperate need of assistance with their waste water management systems.

I represent over 600 miles of the U.S.-Mexico border and when I travel through my district I hear over and over again that these communities need help.

Our rural and underserved populations need our support in addressing the health hazards that come with insufficient water management systems and this study is a critical first step.

Current programs at the USDA Rural Development agency provide for loan/grant awards for rural infrastructure needs.

More often than not, the loan portion is 75 percent or more of the award. As we all know, waste water systems can range from $5 to $10 million or more. Rural communities do not have the revenue or tax base to take on loans for millions of dollars.

If these programs are the only assistance we have to offer, then we need to reevaluate these programs.

It is my hope, that this GAO study will shed some light on this issue and will provide a critical first step to bring adequate waste water systems to our rural communities on the border.

Again, I thank the Chairman for his work on the Farm Bill and for the inclusion of this important language.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to commend Chairman PETERSON and the members of the Agriculture Committee for completing the difficult task of bringing this bill to the floor in a bipartisan fashion.

I supported the 2002 farm bill, which has served Michigan farmers well. The agricultural sector in this country is strong, and it is a good time to take a look at our farm support system and figure out how we can make it better for small farmers and specialty crop farmers.

We must recognize that farming is an inherently risky enterprise; producers are exposed to both production and price risks. Therefore, it is incumbent upon our government to be there for farmers when markets fail. We cannot afford to turn our back on America's farmers and our farm policy should be structured so that those who produce the safest and most abundant food supply in the world have an adequate safety net. We should also promote research to find new uses for the agricultural products grown in our fields and to promote these products in the global marketplace. However, it is not our responsibility to give cash payouts to millionaires, dead farmers or suburbanites who have no involvement in farming but just happened to purchase a house located on farmland.

In 2005, 92 percent of the total farm payments last year went to just five crops. Michigan has the second-most diverse agriculture base in the Nation and I am glad to see that for the first time, the farm legislation before us today guarantees a historic $1.5 billion in funding for fruit and vegetable programs, including the school fresh fruit and vegetable program, the farmer's market promotion program, specialty crop block grants and research and organic food programs—all of which provide valuable support for the fresh fruit and vegetable growers in Michigan.

The legislation before us today strengthens incentives for farmers to conserve valuable natural resources and protect the environment. Currently, three out of four farmers are turned away from conservation programs due to lack of funding. It is unacceptable for farmers who are trying to do the right thing for the environment to be rejected because we have not allocated enough resources to help them. H.R. 2419, the Farm, Nutrition, and Bioenergy Act of 2007, adds $4.3 billion more to preserve farm and ranchland, improve water quality and quantity, and enhance soil conservation, air quality, and wildlife habitat on working lands.

I support the Fairness amendment offered by my colleague RON KIND not because I am dissatisfied with H.R. 2419 but because I believe that it goes one step farther towards curbing taxpayer subsidies by reforming our farm payment system to direct aid to those who need assistance. Make no mistake, the Fairness amendment does not dismantle the

safety net—it just modernizes the program so that it works better for family farms and 348 Congressional Districts, including Michigan's 15th District, which would gain $6 million under the Kind proposal.

The Fairness amendment does not weaken any of the commendable nutrition or conservation provisions in H.R. 2419—rather, it makes them better by adding $2 billion for nutrition programs and $3 billion for conservation programs. Moreover, it does all of this without requiring spending offsets or new taxes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2419 contains no legislative text expressing a view on whether manure should be deemed a hazardous substance pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, CERCLA, or the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act, EPCRA. The absence of any such text is proper both for parliamentary and policy reasons.

The report that accompanies this legislation, however, references a ''sense of the committee'' amendment that farm animal manure should not be deemed a hazardous substance pursuant to CERCLA and EPCRA.

I strongly disagree with these sentiments, which would create a blanket exemption from important environmental laws for those large concentrated animal feeding operations that pollute public drinking water supplies with phosphorous and emit more than 100 pounds per day of ammonia and hydrogen sulfide into the air.

Manure is not at risk of being deemed a ''hazardous substance'' or ''hazardous waste.'' That is misinformation put forth by some. Phosphorous, however, is a ''hazardous substance'' under CERCLA and the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, has determined that both ammonia and hydrogen sulfide are ''extremely hazardous substances'' for the ''reportable quantity'' reporting requirements of EPCRA.

Congress clearly intended that the Superfund program deal with the improper and excessive application of fertilizer that pollutes drinking water supplies or damages natural resources. This is manifestly clear because Section 101 (22) of the Superfund statute creates an exemption from the definition of release for ''the normal application of fertilizer.'' If substances such as phosphorous that emanate from the excessive application of manure fertilizer are exempted, the only people being protected are the bad actors.

These large concentrated animal feeding operations produce huge amounts of animal waste. For example, an animal feeding operation with 2 million hogs produces a volume of manure equal to the solid waste stream of a U.S. city of about 2.7 million—a city similar in size to Chicago's 2.8 million population.

The Environmental Protection Agency has found that large-scale concentrated animal feeding operations present significant human health and environmental risks. Let me quote EPA's findings:

''Significant human health and environmental risks are generally associated with large-scale Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations, CAFOs. Improper handling of manure from feedlots, lagoons and improper land application can result in excessive nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorous); pathogens (i.e., fecal coli form); and other pollutants in the water. This pollution can kill fish, cause excessive algae growth, and contaminate drinking water. In addition, emissions of air pollutants from very large CAFOs may result in significant health effects for nearby residents.''

A blanket exemption from CERCLA for excessive application of manure fertilizer would also shift the costs onto community water systems and their ratepayers for additional treatment to make water potable. I attach the July 23, 2007, letter from the Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies that highlights the serious consequences that any such an exemption would have for the quality our Nation's drinking water supplies.

Mr. Chairman, the Farm Bill Extension Act also makes changes to the Rural Utilities Service broadband loan and loan guarantee program. While this program is in dire need of reform, I am concerned about several provisions in the measure as drafted.

The measure wisely limits loans and loan guarantees in areas where consumers already have broadband service available to them. I am deeply concerned, however, that it describes those areas where broadband is available too broadly, so that applications to provide broadband to large areas of a community that currently have no broadband service at all would be denied.

The bill also prohibits support in areas where more than 75 percent of households have access to broadband. National satellite broadband providers can in theory reach close to 100 percent of households. However, while satellite-delivered broadband is a rapidly-improving and valuable service, particularly in remote areas, today it is often not comparable to terrestrially-delivered broadband. It typically cannot reach the same speeds and is more expensive and subject to outages in heavy rainstorms and other severe weather. While I appreciate the bill's commitment to technological neutrality, if satellite-delivered broadband is not excluded from the 75-percent requirement, there may be few areas that would be eligible for loans.

When it comes to broadband service, speed is critical, and the measure could also be improved by giving priority to applications that, other things being equal, propose to offer higher broadband speeds to consumers.

I also strongly disagree with creating within the Department of Agriculture a National Center for Rural Telecommunications Assessment to increase broadband penetration and develop assessments of broadband availability in rural areas. These are matters that fall squarely within the expertise of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and should be left to that agency's expertise. Likewise, any report describing a comprehensive rural broadband strategy should be developed by the FCC rather than by the Department of Agriculture. I applaud the goal of working toward universal broadband availability and urge my colleagues to ensure that we attain that goal by allowing the FCC, the agency with the most expertise, to spearhead that effort.

ASSOCIATION OF
METROPOLITAN WATER AGENCIES,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2007.

Subject: Oppose CERCLA Animal Waste Exemption in Farm Bill.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: As the House of Representatives prepares this week to consider legislation to reauthorize the Farm Bill, we urge you to reject language that would exempt components of animal waste from designation as a hazardous substance pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). Enactment of such an exemption would bring about serious consequences for the quality of America's drinking water supplies.

During last week's markup of the legislation, the Agriculture Committee adopted an amendment expressing the ''sense of the committee that farm animal manure should not be considered as hazardous substance'' under CERCLA. This follows the introduction earlier this year of legislation in the House and Senate that would specifically exempt animal waste and its components from the law.

As representatives of community drinking water systems, we believe it is important to note that animal manure itself is not currently considered a hazardous substance, pollutant or contaminant under CERCLA. Moreover, the law already contains an exemption for the normal application of fertilizer that includes manure.

However, phosphorus and other CERCLA-regulated hazardous substances that are known to compromise the quality of drinking water are commonly present in animal manure. If Congress were to provide a blanket CERCLA exemption for animal waste, consolidated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) would be free to discharge manure containing such hazardous substances into the environment without regard to its impact or liability for its damages. As a result, the costs of additional treatment to make water potable would be forced upon community water systems and their ratepayers, unfairly shifting the burden of cleanup away from polluters.

Later this year, Congress will celebrate the 35th anniversary ofthe Clean Water Act, landmark legislation modeled on the belief that all Americans must share the responsibility of maintaining the health of our nation's water supply. Exempting CAFOs from their fair share of this duty not only threatens to reverse the water quality gains that have been realized over the recent decades, but would also set a dangerous precedent encouraging other polluters to seek waivers from our environmental laws.

Again, we urge you to oppose a blanket exemption for animal waste and its components from the important requirements of CERCLA.

Sincerely,

DIANE VANDEHEI,
Executive Director.

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, during debate on H.R. 2419, the Department of Agriculture Appropriations bill, the issue of school nutrition came before the House. As the Chairwoman of the Committee on Education and Labor's Subcommittee on Healthy Families and Communities, ensuring our Nation's youth have access to healthy school lunches and understand the importance of a healthy lifestyle is of vital importance to me.

As a nurse, I have seen first hand the importance of a balanced diet. Many health issues can be avoided by simply maintaining a balanced diet. Unfortunately, our Nation's youth do not always have healthy options. The high sugar snacks they see advertised on television provide no nutrition and are a major factor in weight gain. It is important that our Nation's youth have healthy options that taste good and are appealing to them.

Obesity is a major problem facing our Nation's youth. Childhood diabetes is also on the rise. Type II diabetes, which only used to be seen in older adults is now becoming prevalent in children. These issues clearly extend

beyond children to the whole family and the community in which they live. One way Congress can help reduce these numbers is by providing healthy school lunches.

Although meals provided in schools are required by law to follow nutrition standards in accordance with the ''Dietary Guidelines for Americans'', a child with the money available can just as easily avoid nutrition and grab a soda and a bag of chips down the hall in the vending machines. These items, although bad for one's health, often taste better to students and there are no guidelines for schools on healthy living and eating.

Another issue facing school nutrition is the reduced price meal program. This is a vital program that helps low-income families afford meals for their children. Unfortunately, for many families, the cost is found to be a challenge. It breaks my heart to read that families struggle to afford the 30 cents for breakfast and 40 cents for lunch which is the charge for the reduced price meals.

Families cannot afford less than $1 a day to have two solid, nutritious meals provided to a child. This is a travesty, and I support study to see the effects of using the WIC income guidelines as the free meal guidelines,

As Chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Healthy Families and Communities, I understand the importance of a healthy lifestyle, and as a parent I know that we must teach our children the value of nutritious food and healthy living. We cannot ignore the factors outside the classroom that contribute to the education of our youth. They are the future of our Nation.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2419, the Farm, Nutrition, and Bioenergy Act of 2007 and urge my colleagues to pass this meaningful legislation.

I want to thank Chairman PETERSON for crafting this legislation and I also want to again thank the Chairman for visiting my district and talking and listening with my farmers and ranchers on the Central Coast of California.

I am glad the Chairman got to experience the rangelands of South County Monterey and the mile after mile of nutritious fresh produce as we drove through the Salad Bowl of the World, the Salinas Valley.

As the number one agriculture State in the union, California for too long has been the stepchild of farm policy. My own district grows more than 85 crops commercially with a value of more than $4 billion.

Our region leads the nation in the production of artichokes, broccoli, brussels sprouts, cauliflower, celery, garlic, several varieties of lettuce, spinach, strawberries, flowers and foliage.

The Central Coast contains some of the most fertile and productive farm land in the world. It's a combination of soil, climate, and private risk capital because for too long specialty crop growers in California have sat on the sidelines as other commodities received the largess of Federal assistance.

H.R. 2419 takes farm policy in a new direction, for the first time in the history of the Farm Bill we have a package that has something for everyone.

Specialty crop growers finally will get the investment of mandatory funds for vital research, technical assistance, pest detection, market promotion, and much needed produce food safety will all receive mandatory funding.

With this influx of money we can go beyond new farm policy, we can promote health policy as part of the farm bill.

This great health debate is taking place in American homes, in the medical community, and in schools. For the first time we now have a link from farm programs to healthy nutritious fruits and vegetables.

Here we are as a society, talking constantly about obesity and diets, and yet until now our farm policies were not structured to encourage the kind of diet that the food pyramid suggests we should adopt.

I have said it many times—if people would eat more of what California grows we would be healthier for it. Specialty Crops are now taking its rightful place at the center of the debate on how to solve the problem.

The Agriculture Committee's version provides funding for important conservation programs, nutrition programs, and a strong farm safety net to protect America's farm economy.

H.R. 2419 includes additional funding for conservation programs, $350 million to expand the fruit and vegetable snack program to schools throughout the country, $365 million to fund the specialty crop block grant program, funding for pest exclusion activities, $215 million for specialty crop research, and $30 million for organic research.

I want to make special note of the $25 million in mandatory spending for the produce food safety grants included in this bill. As ground zero for the spinach E. Coli outbreak last year I understand all too well what happens when the food system breaks down.

I am thankful for the $25 million investment in mandatory research grants so we can gain the needed knowledge and understanding so we never have to go through this kind of outbreak again.

All of these provisions provide significant benefits to California's specialty crop growers, who make up the majority of California agriculture.

Ms. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Farm Bill Extension Act of 2007 not because it is a perfect bill but because of the many good things that it does for poor people and minorities in our country.

I want to begin by commending Chairman PETERSON and Subcommittee Chairman CARDOZA for their willingness to work with me and other members to address concerns we had with the bill.

I am especially pleased that the bill includes language to correct an apparent oversight in the 2004 Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act that defined a State to exclude the Virgin Islands or any of the other smaller territories; which meant that my district, the Virgin Islands has been denied any specialty crop block grant funding by the USDA.

Mr. Speaker, the Virgin Islands once had a significant history of agricultural production. A substantial portion of our current agricultural production now consists of vegetables (e.g., cucumbers, lettuce, and tomatoes), fruits (e.g., bananas, mangoes and papayas) and horticultural specialties, including ornamental plants. The Government of the Virgin Islands and in particular our Department of Agriculture, believes that there are considerable opportunities to expand production of these specialty crops.

As an island economy, we must import a large portion of its fruits and vegetables for its own residents and for the 2 million tourists who visit the Islands each year. We see great opportunity to increase local production of fresh specialty crops to serve both its residents and visitors. The eligibility for us to receive specialty crop block grant funding would greatly assist us in our efforts to expand and enhance specialty crop production in the Virgin Islands.

The bill before us provides $365 million in mandatory funding to expand the specialty crop block grant program, meaning that our farmers will not have to rely upon annual renewal of the program through the appropriations process.

I am also very pleased the Farm Bill Extension offers significant improvements to the Food Stamp Program, 1890 land-grant institutions, and improved access to programs for Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers, including language and funds to address outstanding claims from Pigford v. Veneman.

Mr. Chairman, as I noted at the outset, this bill is not a perfect bill. But as the old saying goes, we should not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. This is a good bill for the American people and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chairman and rise to offer an amendment to help farmers in regions across the country simultaneously meet the goals of continued production and environmental protection.

My amendment would establish a Conservation on Muck Soils program that would provide conservation assistance tailored to the specific needs of farmers who grow crops on what is known as muck soil.

In politics I know we hear a lot about wallowing in the partisan muck or muckraking, but I'm sure that some of my colleagues are scratching their heads and asking, ''What exactly is muck soil?'' Well, muck is a special type of dirt that develops a thick organic layer of topsoil that is highly vulnerable to erosion when the lands are exposed to air. It's extremely fertile, loose soil in which farmers grow crops like onions, potatoes, lettuce, celery, and other specialty crops.

Mr. Chairman, I am very supportive of the conservation programs administered by the USDA. They make an important contribution by making it economically feasible for farmers to manage their land while being environmentally responsible. In States like my home of New York, they are critical to making sure that farmers aren't penalized for doing the right thing. I'm extremely pleased by the increases in conservation program levels under this bill, and I'm sure that they'll make these programs more accessible and effective.

However, they are broad programs built to accommodate a wide array of conditions. Because of muck's special characteristics, existing conservation programs don't necessarily provide support to growers on these lands in the most efficient, effective way possible. My amendment would attempt to acknowledge the nature of this soil with a tailored approach that improves on the current application of the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program.

The CREP program is a good program. It attempts to further the important goals of preventing soil erosion and protecting water quality through a voluntary retirement program. In order to obtain conservation payments, the CREP program requires farmers to enter into 10–15 year agreements to remove qualifying land from agricultural production.

As I said, this is a good program but it does not always present an adequate conservation solution, particularly for farmers who want to prevent soil erosion or runoff pollution without foregoing production.

At times, this aspect of the program has created unintended consequences, including the retirement of specialized, productive soil from farming and a lack of land maintenance leading to weed and pest threats on neighboring lands.

My amendment would address these concerns and help muck soil farmers remain viable by providing support for conservation activities on working lands.

In addition to being actively involved in farming on muck soil, in order to qualify farmers would have to have a spring cover crop planted with the primary crop to prevent soil erosion, maintain a winter cover crop to prevent off season soil loss, have surrounding ditch banks seeded with grass on a year round basis to stave off runoff and erosion.

These are practices specifically designed to prevent erosion, runoff, and water pollution. By doing so, it would not force farmers to make the choice between conservation and cultivation.

Mr. Chairman, the COMS program would provide a unique opportunity to support active farmers and protect the environment. That's why it has been endorsed by the New York Farm Bureau and the National Farmers Union. I urge support for the amendment.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Farm Bill, with great appreciation for the many challenges it presented to Chairman COLLIN PETERSON, and respect for the Chairman's skill in meeting a multitude of complicated and often competing demands. I want to say a word about a small change in the bill that nevertheless rises to historic dimensions. I thank Chairman PETERSON and his staff for providing equal treatment in the bill for the University of the District of Columbia, UDC, the only all urban 1862 Land Grant Institution in the United States. The University performs valuable urban agricultural research and extension services. The fact that the provisions the Chairman has included were in the Congressional Black Caucus farm bill package underscores the UDC changes as necessary to afford the University equality under the law. The changes end the disparate treatment of UDC by removing obligations not required of other land grant institutions, particularly mandatory local matching funds.

By statute, UDC has been left out of funding opportunities granted to other land grant institutions. For example, the University is required to provide 100 percent matching funds for its Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Programs, EFNEP, the only 1862 Land Grant Institution required to do so. Under the bill, this inequitable requirement will be removed, putting UDC on par with all other 1862 institutions, and like other small land grant institutions, UDC will qualify to have matching requirements for Hatch Act programs and extension programs reduced or waived. We particularly appreciate access to grants to significantly enhance the University's teaching and research capacity building and its ability to upgrade its research, teaching and extension facilities.

We still require clarification on one issue related to Smith-Lever Act funds. We will seek to clarify this issue during conference. However, the substance of the changes we requested is in this bill. We are grateful for the historic breakthroughs in the equal treatment for the country's only all urban land grant institution.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I submit the following information for the RECORD.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, July 26, 2007.

Hon. CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RANGEL: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on Ways and Means' jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2419, the Farm, Nutrition, and Bioenergy Act 2007.

I appreciate your willingness to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, with the understanding that it does not prejudice your Committee's jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I will submit a copy of your letter and this response as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your support of H.R. 2419 and your cooperation as we work towards enactment of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

COLLIN C. PETERSON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2007.

Hon. COLLIN PETERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing regarding H.R. 2419—the Farm Bill Extension Act of 2007—which was ordered to be reported by the House Agriculture Committee on July 19, 2007, and is expected to be on the House Floor this week.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over import matters, such as the administration of tariff-rate quota programs like sugar. Accordingly, some provisions of H.R. 2419 fall under the Committee's jurisdiction.

There have been some very productive conversations between the staffs of our committees. Our understanding is that your staff has conceded the Ways and Means jurisdiction over the issues listed above. In order to expedite this legislation for Floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill and will not oppose its consideration on the House Floor. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this, or similar legislation in the future.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming our understanding with respect to H.R. 2419, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the RECORD.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, July 26, 2007.

Hon. JAMES L. OBERSTAR,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN OBERSTAR: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's jurisdictional interest in HR 2419, the Farm, Nutrition, and Bioenergy Act 2007.

I appreciate your willingness to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, with the understanding that it does not prejudice your Committee's jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I will submit a copy of your letter and this response as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your support of H.R. 2419 and your cooperation as we work towards enactment of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

COLLIN C. PETERSON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, July 26, 2007.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I write to you regarding H.R. 2419, the ''Farm, Nutrition and Bioenergy Act of 2007''.

H.R. 2419 contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I will not seek a sequential referral of the bill. However, agreeing to waive consideration of this bill should not be construed as the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure waiving its jurisdiction over H.R. 2419.

Further, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation on provisions of the bill that are within the Committee's jurisdiction.

I look forward to working with you as we prepare to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. OBERSTAR, M.C.,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, July 25, 2007.

Hon. JOHN DINGELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DINGELL: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on Energy and Commerce's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2419, the ''Farm, Nutrition, and Bioenergy Act of 2007''.

I appreciate your willingness to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, with the understanding that it does not prejudice your Committee's jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation. I would support your request for conferees should a House-Senate conference be convened on this or similar legislation.

I will submit a copy of your letter and this response as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your support of H.R. 2419 and your cooperation as we work towards enactment of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

COLLIN C. PETERSON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 25, 2007.

Hon. COLLIN C. PETERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I am writing with regard to H.R. 2419, the Farm, Nutrition, and Bioenergy Act of 2007. The Bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I support passage of the bill, and I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring it up on the House floor in an expeditious manner. The Committee did not send a letter to the Speaker seeking a sequential referral of the bill. This decision was based on my understanding that you have agreed that the inaction of the Committee with respect to the bill does not in any way serve as a jurisdictional precedent as to our two committees.

Further, as to any House-Senate conference on the bill, the Committee on Energy and Commerce reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees for consideration of portions of the bill that are within the Committee's jurisdiction. It is my understanding that you have agreed to support a request by the Committee with respect to serving as conferees on the bill (or similar legislation).

I request that you send a letter to me confirming our agreements as to jurisdiction, including with respect to conferees, and that our exchange of letters be inserted in the Congressional Record as part of the consideration of the bill.

The portions of the reported bill that are of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Energy and Commerce include sections 2105, 6002, 6006, 6007, 6012, 6022, 6023, 6024, 6028, 6029, 6030, 6031, 7203, 7403, and 7410, and portions of title IX.

I look forward to working with you on this important legislation. If you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact me.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, July 25, 2007.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MILLER: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding regarding the consideration of H.R. 2419, the ''Farm, Nutrition, and Bioenergy Act of 2007,'' which was reported on June 23. I am aware that the Committee on Education and Labor has a jurisdictional interest in several provisions contained within H.R. 2419, as reported.

Due to the importance of expediting this legislation, I respectfully request that the Committee on Education and Labor forgo requesting a sequential referral of H.R. 2419. My request should not be construed as my asking the Committee to relinquish its jurisdictional interests and prerogatives in this bill or other similar legislation, and should not be construed as setting a precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Education and Labor in the future.

Please send me, at your earliest convenience, a letter of exchange, and I will ensure that both letters are included in the Congressional Record during the consideration of this bill. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to call me. I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

COLLIN C. PETERSON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC, July 25, 2007.

Hon. COLLIN PETERSON,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PETERSON. I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding regarding consideration of H.R. 2419, the ''Farm, Nutrition, and Bioenergy Act of 2007,'' which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and reported to the House on June 23. As you know, the Committee on Education and Labor has a jurisdictional interest in several provisions in the bill.

Given the importance of moving this bill forward promptly, I will not request the sequential referral of H.R. 2419 to the Committee on Education and Labor. However, I do so only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice this Committee's jurisdictional interests and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Education and Labor in the future.

I appreciate your cooperation working with us in advance of your Committee's markup of this bill and your commitment to include a copy of our exchange of letters in the Congressional Record during its consideration on the House Floor. In addition, the Committee on Education and Labor reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and looks forward to your support if such a request is made.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to call me. I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MILLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, July 25, 2007.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Ford HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Thank you for your recent letter regarding the Committee on Homeland Security's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2419, The Farm, Nutrition, and Bioenergy Act of 2007. Section 10401 repeals section 421 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (P.L. 107–296) and restores import and entry agricultural inspection functions to the Department of Agriculture.

Although this provision was removed from H.R. 2419 in the Manager's Amendment, I would support your request for conferees from the Committee on Homeland Security should a House-Senate conference to be convened on this or similar legislation which contains such a provision.

I will submit a copy of your letter and this response as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your support of H.R. 2419 and your cooperation as we work towards enactment of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

COLLIN C. PETERSON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2007.

Hon. COLLIN C. PETERSON,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I am writing regarding the Committee on Homeland Security's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2419, the Farm Bill Extension Act of 2007. I appreciate your willingness to work with me to address a concern in H.R. 2419, in advance of its consideration by the Full House of Representatives.

As I expressed to you, section 10401 in the Horticulture Title would have a significant impact on the organization and administration of the Department of Homeland Security. Under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, legislation impacting the organization and administration of the Department of Homeland Security fall within the committee on Homeland Security's jurisdiction. Like both H.R. 1706 and H.R. 2629, this provision would repeal section 421 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (P.L. 107–296) and would nullify the March 2003 transfer of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) inspectors from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Homeland Security. I am pleased that though we may disagree about this policy question, you agreed to strike the provision. I am also pleased to work with you in order to ensure consideration of this important legislation on the House floor later this week.

Should the provision at issue or any matter related to the operations of the Department of Homeland Security find its way into H.R. 2419 or companion legislation, I request your support for any effort I undertake to secure an appropriate number of conferees in a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation.

As a former member of the Agriculture Committee, I have watched my fair share of farm bills work their way through the legislative process. I believe you should be commended for shepherding this wide-ranging bill, as Chairman, in a very effective manner.

Finally, I request that a copy of this letter, together with your response, be inserted in the Congressional Record when the legislation is considered by the House later this week.

Thank you, again, for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mr. SCHIFF, Acting Chairman 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. 2419) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 574, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GOODLATTE. Yes, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Goodlatte of Virginia moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2419 to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the same back to the House promptly with the following amendments:

Strike the two titles designated as title XII in the amendments contained in part A of House Report 110–261 and adopt such amendments as may be necessary to comply with the Committee on Agriculture allocation under H. Con. Res. 99 of the 110th Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the members of the Agriculture Committee on both sides of the aisle, and the staff of the Agriculture Committee for working in a bipartisan fashion to write a good farm bill.

This farm bill has a lot of things in it I don't like, a lot of things I do. I think the chairman would say the same thing about the bill. But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this legislation because of what happened after this bill left the Agriculture Committee and came to this floor with a tax increase added in the middle of the night with no hearings in the Ways and Means Committee and no markup in the Ways and Means Committee.

This is the wrong way to maintain bipartisan comity in this House, and to force the American people and the Members of this House to choose between tax increases and the farm bill that America's farmers and ranchers need.

I yield to the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MCCRERY.

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker, the tax proposal in the farm bill is directly aimed at international companies that invest in the United States, where they support more than 5 million jobs. These are well-known and well-respected companies: Honda, Bridgestone, Toyota, BASF, Panasonic. They're not tax dodgers. The jobs they create here are good, high-paying jobs. By raising taxes on these businesses by more than $7 billion over the next decade, we will make America a less attractive place for them to invest.

The majority keeps asserting that the Treasury Department supported this provision back in 2002. I want to set the record straight on that. It is true that Treasury wrote a report then that income-stripping and earning-stripping is a potential problem, but since that 2000 report, the Treasury has worked to update our tax treaties, inserting strong ''limitation of benefits'' language that prevents abuse by denying treaty benefits to companies headquartered elsewhere but who establish a shell company in the treaty country.

The Treasury has never, never embraced the sort of ham-handed policy that the majority is proposing in this bill. And Secretary Paulson made that clear to me yesterday in a letter me sent to me.

Another contention is that, ''Oh, the President's own budget contained this proposal.'' Wrong. The President's budget contained a targeted proposal that would raise over 10 years $2.6 billion.

Mr. DOGGETT's proposal, which is in the farm bill, raises $7 billion over 10 years. Is that the same proposal? Of course not. It's more than double. It's huge. It's broad. It's ham-handed. It will discourage investment in the United States, and we ought to reject it in this bill. It's bad policy; never should have been added to the farm bill; should have come through the Ways and Means Committee, where it's supposed to come, so we could have a good hearing and Mr. DOGGETT and I could debate it. But that didn't happen. We should vote against this bill.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Reclaiming my time, this motion to recommit is very straightforward. It takes out the tax increases in this bill, sends it back to the Agriculture Committee. And we would be delighted to work with the leadership that did not work with us before to find a pay-for that works for this.

We went to the Budget Committee at the start of this process in a bipartisan fashion and pointed out that the reforms in this bill cost money, and asked for that money to be forthcoming. It was not.

Now, based upon previous experience, I would not be at all surprised to see a cameo appearance in a moment from the majority leader saying that, because this bill is sent back to committee to report back promptly, that we're killing the bill. We are doing no such time thing. We are doing what is necessary to make sure that this bill is treated in a bipartisan fashion and that the bill is paid for in a way that adjusts our budget fairly to make sure that agriculture and America's farmers and rangers got treated the way they should have been treated at the outset of this process when $60 billion was lost because of the baseline in agriculture.

And then we're asked to make reforms, many of which I support, but this, mark my words, is a tax increase that is not fair to the American people. It puts pressure on companies investing in this country. It will increase taxes on those workers. It will also call into question the credibility of the United States for future investment in this country if we violate treaties, 58 treaties that we have negotiated. And finally, it will cause retaliation against American investment overseas as well.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit. Send it back. Do the right thing. Do not put America's workers against America's farmers and ranchers. Support this motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, in my time remaining, I would point out that this is a tax increase because the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, when he came to the floor last night, said it was a tax increase. The tax experts I've spoken to say it's a tax increase. Not withstanding what anybody says, it's a tax increase. Don't support it.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL, for such time as he may consume.

Mr. RANGEL. So, ''the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said that this was a tax increase.'' What is this, Taxes 101? When you and other people come to me and say that we need to get this great bipartisan agriculture bill out, you didn't go to the chairman of the Transportation Committee. You didn't go to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. You went to the tax-writing committee.

Now, when you say you want revenue enhances, when you say you want to raise the money to pay for food stamps, it means you have to get it from somewhere. If you're lucky enough, if you work hard enough, you will find that certain people are not paying their fair share of taxes. And you would find that they go out of their way to go to foreign countries in order to avoid paying the United States obligation.

I would be less than honest if I didn't tell you that as far as those people who don't pay any or little taxes, oh, yes, they will consider this a tax increase. Give me some language that I can call it something else. But I'm saying that equity and fair play means if you're not paying what you should pay and we catch up with you, you can run to your accountant and say, ''We gotcha.''

Now, I can understand how philosophically you don't like to talk about taxes. But just, Mr. Ranking Member, when your time expired yesterday, you said on the floor that none of us ever came to you and asked for the money. Now, I don't know where you thought,

when you asked me where do you go to get the money, when I say ''you,'' I mean you by name.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RANGEL. I agree with you. But anyway, let me thank all of you that thanked me for making it possible for you to get a bill out. And if something happened on the way to the floor, believe me, politically, I understand it. But for all of you who thanked me, we did the best we could. We catch the devil for it. But if you take a look at foreigners that are avoiding taxes and hardworking farmers that deserve a better break, you explain it; we don't have to.

□ 1330

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for that statement. I want to alert the Members of the body that this motion to recommit has the word ''promptly'' in it. What that means is if this goes back to the committee, this kills this bill. It kills the reform that we have done in this bill. It kills the additional nutrition that has been put into this bill, the energy, all the other hard work of this committee.

Now, I am a CPA, and I used to do taxes for a living. I agree with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee: this is not a tax increase. This is doing what is right for this country.

What we ought to be looking into is why we are having the taxpayers of this country fund people in the Treasury Department and fund people in the State Department to go out and make treaties with other countries so we can have foreign corporations come to this country and avoid taxes.

That is what this is about. If you have a straight-up deal between the United States and Germany, this does not affect you. It only affects you if you set up a corporation in another country that doesn't have a tax rate and go through that process.

Mr. Speaker, you can call this whatever you want. But the truth of the matter is that if you send the bill back to the Agriculture Committee, we do not have the offsets in the Agriculture Committee to do what is in this bill. So you are, in effect, killing this bill. I just want everybody to understand that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that throughout this debate not one company anywhere in America has come forward and said ''if you pass this bill, you raise my taxes,'' because the vast majority of foreign companies and no American companies are impacted whatsoever.

Today, we must choose who to stand with. We choose to stand with the farm and ranch families that need this assistance and the small American businesses that are paying their fair share of taxes. We reject the notion that the only way you can lure a foreign company to come to America is to tell the foreign company that they should pay less taxes than Americans. It is a clear choice.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry, a point of clarification.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that if indeed this motion passed, that this bill could be reported back to the respective committee from which it was assigned and passed out, and that the bill could be reported back to the House tomorrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot say what the Committee on Agriculture might do or speculate about possible proceedings anew in the committee. The pending motion proposes to take the pending bill from the floor without reaching the question of passage today.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to get a point of clarification from you. The parliamentary inquiry is, is it true that this bill could be reported back to the committee and reported back to this House on the next legislative day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot speculate.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry. Is there any rule that would preclude a bill going back to committee and the committee reporting it back the next legislative day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not respond to hypothetical questions.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I am not talking about any bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, is it true that this bill, this bill, if this motion passes to this bill and this bill is promptly reported back to the committee, is it possible under the rules of this House that this bill could be reported back to this House the next legislative day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, that would require an interpretation of the committee's rules. The Chair is not in a position to speculate.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, are there any parliamentary impediments to this bill being reported back on the next legislative day after being promptly reported to the committee of jurisdiction?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may need to review the rules of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. No, Mr. Speaker. I am asking, under the rules of the House, are there any parliamentary impediments?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair has responded to the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe you misunderstood my parliamentary inquiry. My parliamentary inquiry was, under the rules of the House, are there any parliamentary impediments to having this bill considered on the next legislative day if it is promptly reported to the committee of jurisdiction?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Repeatedly the Chair has said, and says again, that the Chair cannot speculate.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 223, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 755]

AYES—198

Aderholt	Camp (MI)	Ferguson
Akin	Campbell (CA)	Forbes
Alexander	Cannon	Fortenberry
Altmire	Cantor	Fossella
Bachmann	Capito	Foxx
Bachus	Carter	Franks (AZ)
Baker	Castle	Frelinghuysen
Barrett (SC)	Chabot	Gallegly
Bartlett (MD)	Coble	Garrett (NJ)
Barton (TX)	Cole (OK)	Gerlach
Biggert	Conaway	Gilchrest
Bilbray	Cooper	Gillmor
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Gingrey
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Gohmert
Blackburn	Davis (KY)	Goode
Blunt	Davis, David	Goodlatte
Boehner	Davis, Tom	Granger
Bonner	Deal (GA)	Graves
Bono	Dent	Hall (TX)
Boozman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hastings (WA)
Boustany	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hayes
Brady (TX)	Doolittle	Heller
Broun (GA)	Drake	Herger
Brown (SC)	Dreier	Hobson
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Duncan	Hoekstra
Buchanan	Ehlers	Hulshof
Burgess	Emerson	Hunter
Burton (IN)	English (PA)	Inglis (SC)
Buyer	Everett	Jindal
Calvert	Fallin	Johnson (IL)
	Feeney	Johnson, Sam

Jordan
Keller
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—223

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hensarling
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Klein (FL)
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Clarke
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Emanuel
Frank (MA)
Hastert
Issa
Kucinich
LaHood
Sali
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in the vote.

□ 1354

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SALI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 755. I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 191, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 756]

AYES—231

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Klein (FL)
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—191

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)

Stark	Turner	Weller
Stearns	Upton	Westmoreland
Sullivan	Walberg	Wicker
Terry	Walden (OR)	Wilson (SC)
Thornberry	Walsh (NY)	Wolf
Tiahrt	Wamp	Young (AK)
Tiberi	Waxman	Young (FL)
Tierney	Weldon (FL)	

NOT VOTING—10

Clarke	Frank (MA)	LaHood
Cubin	Hastert	Tancredo
Davis, Jo Ann	Issa	
Emanuel	Kucinich	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in the vote.

□ 1402

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2419, FARM, NUTRITION, AND BIOENERGY ACT OF 2007

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2419, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references and to make other such technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2070

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2070. He was added by mistake.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1, IMPLEMENTING RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 9/11 COMMISSION ACT OF 2007

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 567 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 567

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1) to provide for the implementation of the recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

I also ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to myself, I yield to the gentleman from New York for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. MCNULTY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of both the rule and the conference report.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 567 provides for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1, to provide for the implementation of the recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and its consideration.

This is a typical rule for a conference report and was reported out by the Rules Committee by a bipartisan voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, when Americans decided last November that they were tired of the way business was being done in Washington, they elected Democrats to the majority.

We promised them that we would implement the recommendations of the 9/11 commission, and today we are fulfilling that promise in bipartisan fashion. We are showing that compromise can, indeed, yield good policy. Democrats have shown with this bill that that compromise can indeed be positive for America.

There were many who did not want to see Democrats succeed in completing work on this bill. They preferred political posturing over protecting the American public. For them, inaction is an acceptable solution, and obstructionism their plan to get back into the majority.

The American people should take great comfort in knowing that we will not allow them to succeed.

I commend my good friends, the distinguished chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, BENNIE THOMPSON, and the ranking member for their tireless work on this conference report. It was not an easy job, but their diligence and commitment to protecting America persevered.

This product takes significant steps to further protect the American people. Democrats are leading in delivery while fixing the shortcomings in our homeland security network highlighted by the 9/11 Commission.

First, this conference report places a priority on providing homeland security grants based on risk and not political preference. This is especially important to my constituents, as south Florida has seen its recent homeland security grant allocations decreased as political consideration has increased in the process.

When it comes to first responders, the conference report includes $1.6 billion for a first responder interoperability grant program.

The report also invests in rail, transit and bus security, authorizing more than $4 billion for these crucial grants.

Further, this report requires the screening on all passenger air cargo within 3 years. This is, without doubt, the furthest that Congress has ever gone to ensure that the flying public is safe and protected.

Within the next 5 years, the conference report requires the screening of all container ships as they leave foreign shores and head to the U.S. This, too, was another of the 9/11 recommendations.

If America is going to be safe, Mr. Speaker, then Congress must do everything in its power to ensure that cargo coming into our ports has been screened and checked. As someone who represents a district which is within just miles of three major international seaports, I'm pleased that the committee included this provision in the bill. The safety and security of south Florida literally depends on it.

I'm also pleased that the Homeland Security Committee and the House Intelligence Committee, of which I'm a proud member, were able to reach an agreement regarding the public disclosure of total spending in the intelligence community. This was another key recommendation from the 9/11 Commission, and Democrats are again keeping their promise to turn those recommendations into law.

It is a new day in the House of Representatives. With honesty and transparency as our guiding principles, Democrats are working to strengthen and restore faith in our intelligence community. Even more, we are sending the message to the American people that this Congress will no longer allow the intelligence community to operate without proper oversight.

This conference report is another installment of how Democrats are working to protect the American people and hold the Bush administration accountable for its failures and shortcomings.

This is a good conference report and a good rule. I urge my colleagues to support both.

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