

But I think once we start going down to that feed route, we are going to get a lot of other groups now chiming in saying: What about us? What about us? How come dairy is being taken care of? What about poultry? What about beef? What about the others that are experiencing the same type of cost increases? And then you are really talking about blowing the lid off of some of these other programs.

But all that I and others who are in support of this motion to instruct are asking is for the members of the committee to defend their work, defend the programs that passed the House last year, defend the funding level that came out of the House last year because of the vital importance that these programs have, not only to the individual land producers, but to the resources that are so precious to all of us in this country.

Now we see disturbing trends; because of the high commodity prices, great pressure to bring more highly erodible sensitive land back into production. And there will be adverse consequences from that, unless we can maintain a viable incentive based system with these conservation programs to deal with that additional pressure that producers are facing throughout the Nation.

I think there is a better way of dealing with the abuses that my friend from Pennsylvania highlighted under the conservation program. Certainly we can do more oversight and get more information with regards to whether individuals are milking the system. No one is in support of that. We want to clamp down on it. But let's work with USDA and NRCS and those agencies in charge of implementing it, rather than calling for a blanket payment limitation cap with crucial conservation funding. Because, again, I am afraid that without these incentives in place, I don't care how wealthy you are, there won't be much incentive for you to engage in these type of programs, which just doesn't benefit the landowner but the community and the watershed area and the wildlife at large. So we need to be careful what road we are going to go down.

And, hopefully, this isn't just a response to some of us who have been asking for meaningful payment limitations and means testing under the commodity program just to get back at those who have been very supportive of conservation funding.

I think there are reasonable means tests we can apply to the commodity title. The fact that LDP and counter-cyclical payments aren't going up today I think is a good thing. That means farm income is up and commodity prices are up.

Back home in Wisconsin, in the agriculture district that I represent, farmers for years have come up to me and said: You know, I'm not a big fan of these subsidy programs, but I just wish the market would give us a decent price so we wouldn't have to rely on

them. Well, that day has come. Now today I have got producers in corn and soybean coming up to me and saying: RON, why are we still receiving these direct subsidy payments when we are getting such a good price in the marketplace? And they are right. Farmers know how these programs are working.

I think we can be a little bolder and more courageous in the reforms that some of us have been advocating, find those savings, so we can deal with conservation, nutrition, world development, speciality crops, and having a good energy title to this farm bill, too. This can happen, and it can happen in a way that the President feels comfortable in signing. And that will truly be a good bipartisan day then in the United States Congress. I encourage my friends to support this motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Kind motion to instruct conferees and the need for increased conservation funding in the farm bill.

Our farmers are eager to share in the cost of protecting our environment, but currently two out of three farmers are turned away by the USDA due to insufficient funding when they apply to participate in conservation programs. As a result, we continue to lose thousands of acres of valuable farmland, grasslands, wetlands, and private forest lands. We also fall further behind schedule in our efforts to clean up rivers, lakes and streams.

We cannot and should not ask farmers to choose between their bottom line and smart, sensible preservation of the land they protect. The House-passed version of the farm bill contained a landmark increase of \$5.7 billion in authorized conservation funding. This money supports programs that protect our most sensitive and ecologically important lands, keeps soil and nutrient pollution out of our rivers, lakes and streams, and safeguards wetlands.

Since the conference committee is weighing various priorities as they try to bring the farm bill process to a close, it is important they know that Members of this House feel that conservation should be at the top of the priority list and that we maintain what the House has already passed.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this motion and to support the inclusion of the necessary conservation funding in this farm bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. STENY HOYER AND HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH MAY 5, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

May 1, 2008.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STENY H. HOYER and the Honorable CHRIS VAN HOLLEN to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through May 5, 2008.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

BLOCKING PROPERTY AND PROHIBITING CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS RELATED TO BURMA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-107)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") that takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13047 of May 20, 1997, and expanded in Executive Order 13448 of October 18, 2007.

In 1997, the United States put in place a prohibition on new investment in Burma in response to the Government of Burma's large scale repression of the democratic opposition in that country. On July 28, 2003, those sanctions were expanded by steps taken in Executive Order 13310, which contained prohibitions implementing sections 3 and 4 of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-61) (the "Act") and supplemented that Act with additional restrictions. On October 18, 2007, I determined that the Government of Burma's continued repression of the democratic opposition in Burma, manifested at the time in the violent response to peaceful demonstrations, the commission of human rights abuses related to political repression, and engagement in public corruption, including by diverting or misusing Burmese public assets or by misusing public authority, warranted an expansion of the then-existing sanctions. Executive Order 13448, issued on that date, incorporated existing designation criteria set forth in Executive