PART B AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

Page 23, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 29, line 7, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would add $5 million to the Natural Resources Conservation Service's Conservation Operations Account and subtract $5 million from the Farm Service Agency salaries.

More than 80 percent of the funds under the NRCS Conservation Operations Account provide technical support to help farmers and other landowners conserve and protect their land and resources. Currently, there is a significant backlog of requests for conservation assistance, and many farmers are turned away by the USDA when they apply to participate in conservation programs due to insufficient funding.

New Jersey, my home State, is one of the most densely populated States in the country, and more and more scarce land disappears every day. Our farmers are eager to share in the cost of protecting our environment, and we must ensure that they have the knowledge and the ability to do so in the appropriate manner.

So I would like to commend the chairwoman and the ranking member for their work in attempting to address this important issue. And while I do support very strongly the Farm Service Agency, their salaries and their expense account, under this bill it is slated for a $92 million increase, and with so many of our Nation's farmers struggling to conserve their land and with development rapidly eating up our cherished resources, I believe this is a priority.

I will close with this: More than 19 years ago, when I first ran for public office in my State, I believed we were not doing enough to preserve our open space and our farmlands. I believe that this amendment continues to move us now in the right way and towards that goal. I ask all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, though I plan to support the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. DELAURO. This amendment increases the funding for the Natural Resources Conservation Service Account by $5 million by decreasing the Farm Service Agency salaries and expenses.

While I am very supportive of the efforts of this amendment with regard to technical support and of easing the backlog, I must say that I do not think it is a good offset, but we did not write the language, and we will fix the offset in conference.

With that, I urge the adoption of the amendment and ask for a ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I appreciate that. I just have a question while we're on the floor, just for my edification. Are there other areas that you would suggest now where the offset should come from?

Ms. DELAURO. Well, what I would like to do is to see what the best opportunities are, but I have indicated my support for the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I understand. This is just for my edification.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 502(b) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987, as amended (7 U.S.C. 5101–5106), $4,000,000.

GRASSROOTS SOURCE WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out wellhead or groundwater protection activities under section 1240O of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–2), $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses involved in making indemnity payments to dairy farmers and manufacturers of dairy products under a dairy indemnity program, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such program is carried out by the Secretary in the same manner as the dairy indemnity program described in the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106–387, 114 Stat. 1549A–12).

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed farm ownership (7 U.S.C. 1922 et seq.) and operating (7 U.S.C. 1941 et seq.) loans, Indian tribe land acquisition loans (25 U.S.C. 488), boll weevil loans (7 U.S.C. 1989), direct and guaranteed conservation loans (7 U.S.C. 1924 et seq.), and Indian highly fractionated land loans (25 U.S.C. 488), to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, as follows: farm ownership loans, $1,892,990,000, of which $1,500,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and $392,990,000 shall be for direct loans; operating loans, $1,994,467,000, of which $1,150,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans, $144,467,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans and $700,000,000 shall be for direct loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans, $3,940,000; conservation loans, $150,000,000, of which $75,000,000 shall be for guaranteed loans and $75,000,000 shall be for direct loans; Indian highly fractionated land loans, $10,000,000; and for boll weevil eradication program loans, $100,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall deem the pink bollworm to be a boll weevil for the purpose of boll weevil eradication program loans.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: farm ownership loans, $21,584,000, of which $5,550,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans, and $16,034,000 shall be for direct loans; operating loans, $80,402,000, of which $26,910,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans, $20,312,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans, and $33,180,000 shall be for direct loans; conservation loans, $1,343,000, of which $278,000 shall be for guaranteed loans, and $1,065,000 shall be for direct loans; and Indian highly fractionated land loans, $793,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $326,093,000, of which $318,173,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses''.

Funds appropriated by this Act to the Agricultural Credit Insurance Program Account for farm ownership, operating and conservation direct loans and guaranteed loans may be transferred among these programs: *Provided*, That the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress are notified at least 15 days in advance of any transfer.

RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY

For necessary expenses of the Risk Management Agency, $80,325,000: *Provided*, That the funds made available under section 522(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(e)) may be used for the Common Information Management System: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1506(i).

CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

For payments as authorized by section 516 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1516), such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained, but not previously reimbursed, pursuant to section 2 of the Act of August 17, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 713a–11): *Provided*, That of the funds available to the Commodity Credit Corporation under section 11

of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714i) for the conduct of its business with the Foreign Agricultural Service, up to $5,000,000 may be transferred to and used by the Foreign Agricultural Service for information resource management activities of the Foreign Agricultural Service that are not related to Commodity Credit Corporation business.

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

(LIMITATION ON EXPENSES)

For the current fiscal year, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not expend more than $5,000,000 for site investigation and cleanup expenses, and operations and maintenance expenses to comply with the requirement of section 107(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9607(g)), and section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 6961).

TITLE II

CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, $774,000.

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–f), including preparation of conservation plans and establishment of measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures for soil and water management as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs and to control agricultural related pollutants); operation of conservation plant materials centers; classification and mapping of soil; dissemination of information; acquisition of lands, water, and interests therein for use in the plant materials program by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100 pursuant to the Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a); purchase and erection or alteration or improvement of permanent and temporary buildings; and operation and maintenance of aircraft, $869,397,000, to remain available until September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for construction and improvement of buildings and public improvements at plant materials centers, except that the cost of alterations and improvements to other buildings and other public improvements shall not exceed $250,000: *Provided further*, That when buildings or other structures are erected on non-Federal land, that the right to use such land is obtained as provided in 7 U.S.C. 2250a.

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out preventive measures, including but not limited to research, engineering operations, methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation, rehabilitation of existing works and changes in use of land, in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001–1005 and 1007–1009), the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–f), and in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, $20,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $12,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available for technical assistance.

WATERSHED REHABILITATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out rehabilitation of structural measures, in accordance with section 14 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1012), and in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, $40,161,000, to remain available until expended.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses in planning and carrying out projects for resource conservation and development and for sound land use pursuant to the provisions of sections 31 and 32 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1010–1011; 76 Stat. 607); the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–f); and subtitle H of title XV of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3451–3461), $50,730,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $3,073,000 shall be available for national headquarters activities.

TITLE III

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development, $660,000.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for carrying out the administration and implementation of programs in the Rural Development mission area, including activities with institutions concerning the development and operation of agricultural cooperatives; and for cooperative agreements; $195,987,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated under this section may be used for advertising and promotional activities that support the Rural Development mission area: *Provided further*, That not more than $10,000 may be expended to provide modest nonmonetary awards to non-USDA employees: *Provided further*, That any balances available from prior years for the Rural Utilities Service, Rural Housing Service, and the Rural Business-Cooperative Service salaries and expenses accounts shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

RURAL HOUSING SERVICE

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949, to be available from funds in the rural housing insurance fund, as follows: $7,325,932,000 for loans to section 502 borrowers, of which $1,121,488,000 shall be for direct loans, and of which $6,204,444,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; $34,412,000 for section 504 housing repair loans; $80,000,000 for section 515 rental housing; $129,090,000 for section 538 guaranteed multi-family housing loans; $5,045,000 for section 524 site loans; $11,448,000 for credit sales of acquired property, of which up to $1,448,000 may be for multi-family credit sales; and $4,970,000 for section 523 self-help housing land development loans.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: section 502 loans, $130,334,000, of which $40,710,000 shall be for direct loans, and of which $89,624,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; section 504 housing repair loans, $4,422,000; repair, rehabilitation, and new construction of section 515 rental housing, $21,792,000; section 538 multi-family housing guaranteed loans, $1,485,000; and credit sales of acquired property, $556,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated in this paragraph, $2,500,000 shall be available through June 30, 2010, for authorized empowerment zones and enterprise communities and communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones: *Provided further*, That section 538 multi-family housing guaranteed loans funded pursuant to this paragraph shall not be subject to a guarantee fee and the interest on such loans may not be subsidized: *Provided further*, That any balances for a demonstration program for the preservation and revitalization of the section 515 multi-family rental housing properties as authorized by Public Law 109–97 and Public Law 110–5 shall be transferred to and merged with the ''Rural Housing Service, Multi-family Housing Revitalization Program Account''.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $468,593,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Rural Development, Salaries and Expenses''.

RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For rental assistance agreements entered into or renewed pursuant to the authority under section 521(a)(2) or agreements entered into in lieu of debt forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Housing Act of 1949, $980,000,000; and, in addition, such sums as may be necessary, as authorized by section 521(c) of the Act, to liquidate debt incurred prior to fiscal year 1992 to carry out the rental assistance program under section 521(a)(2) of the Act: *Provided*, That of this amount, up to $5,958,000 shall be available for debt forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Act, and not to exceed $50,000 per project for advances to nonprofit organizations or public agencies to cover direct costs (other than purchase price) incurred in purchasing projects pursuant to section 502(c)(5)(C) of the Act: *Provided further*, That of this amount not less than $2,030,000 is available for newly constructed units financed by section 515 of the Housing Act of 1949, and not less than $3,400,000 is for newly constructed units financed under sections 514 and 516 of the Housing Act of 1949: *Provided further*, That rental assistance agreements entered into or renewed during the current fiscal year shall be funded for a one-year period: *Provided further*, That any unexpended balances remaining at the end of such one-year agreements may be transferred and used for the purposes of any debt reduction; maintenance, repair, or rehabilitation of any existing projects; preservation; and rental assistance activities authorized under title V of the Act: *Provided further*, That rental assistance provided under agreements entered into prior to fiscal year 2010 for a farm labor multi-family housing project financed under section 514 or 516 of the Act may not be recaptured for use in another project until such assistance has remained unused for a period of 12 consecutive months, if such project has a waiting list of tenants seeking such assistance or the project has rental assistance eligible tenants who are not receiving such assistance: *Provided further*, That such recaptured rental assistance shall, to the extent practicable, be applied to another farm labor multi-family housing project financed under section 514 or 516 of the Act.

MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING REVITALIZATION PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the rural housing voucher program as authorized under section 542 of the Housing Act of 1949, but notwithstanding subsection (b) of such section, for the cost to conduct a housing demonstration program to provide

revolving loans for the preservation of low-income multi-family housing projects, and for additional costs to conduct a demonstration program for the preservation and revitalization of multi-family rental housing properties described in this paragraph, $31,756,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $4,965,000 shall be available for rural housing vouchers to any low-income household (including those not receiving rental assistance) residing in a property financed with a section 515 loan which has been prepaid after September 30, 2005: *Provided further*, That the amount of such voucher shall be the difference between comparable market rent for the section 515 unit and the tenant paid rent for such unit: *Provided further*, That funds made available for such vouchers shall be subject to the availability of annual appropriations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, administer such vouchers with current regulations and administrative guidance applicable to section 8 housing vouchers administered by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development: *Provided further*, That if the Secretary determines that the amount made available for vouchers in this or any other Act is not needed for vouchers, the Secretary may use such funds for the demonstration programs for the preservation and revitalization of multi-family rental housing properties described in this paragraph: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $1,791,000 shall be available for the cost of loans to private nonprofit organizations, or such nonprofit organizations' affiliate loan funds and State and local housing finance agencies, to carry out a housing demonstration program to provide revolving loans for the preservation of low-income multi-family housing projects: *Provided further*, That loans under such demonstration program shall have an interest rate of not more than 1 percent direct loan to the recipient: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may defer the interest and principal payment to the Rural Housing Service for up to 3 years and the term of such loans shall not exceed 30 years: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $25,000,000 shall be available for a demonstration program for the preservation and revitalization of the section 514, 515, and 516 multi-family rental housing properties to restructure existing USDA multi-family housing loans, as the Secretary deems appropriate, expressly for the purposes of ensuring the project has sufficient resources to preserve the project for the purpose of providing safe and affordable housing for low-income residents and farm laborers including reducing or eliminating interest; deferring loan payments, subordinating, reducing or re-amortizing loan debt; and other financial assistance including advances, payments and incentives (including the ability of owners to obtain reasonable returns on investment) required by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall as part of the preservation and revitalization agreement obtain a restrictive use agreement consistent with the terms of the restructuring: *Provided further*, That if the Secretary determines that additional funds for vouchers described in this paragraph are needed, funds for the preservation and revitalization demonstration program may be used for such vouchers: *Provided further*, That if Congress enacts legislation to permanently authorize a section 515 multi-family rental housing loan restructuring program similar to the demonstration program described herein, the Secretary may use funds made available for the demonstration program under this heading to carry out such legislation with the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANTS

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 523(b)(1)(A) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490c), $45,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, $1,000,000 shall be available through June 30, 2010, for authorized empowerment zones and enterprise communities and communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones.

RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For grants and contracts for very low-income housing repair, supervisory and technical assistance, compensation for construction defects, and rural housing preservation made by the Rural Housing Service, as authorized by 42 U.S.C. 1474, 1479(c), 1490e, and 1490m, $45,500,000, to remain available until expended, of which $4,000,000 shall be for grants authorized by section 14204 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, $1,200,000 shall be available through June 30, 2010, for authorized empowerment zones and enterprise communities and communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones: *Provided further*, That any balances to carry out a housing demonstration program to provide revolving loans for the preservation of low-income multi-family housing projects as authorized in Public Law 108–447 and Public Law 109–97 shall be transferred to and merged with the ''Rural Housing Service, Multi-family Housing Revitalization Program Account''.

FARM LABOR PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, grants, and contracts, as authorized by 42 U.S.C. 1484 and 1486, $22,523,000, to remain available until expended, for direct farm labor housing loans and domestic farm labor housing grants and contracts.

RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, and grants for rural community facilities programs as authorized by section 306 and described in section 381E(d)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, $51,091,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $6,256,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be available for a Rural Community Development Initiative: *Provided further*, That such funds shall be used solely to develop the capacity and ability of private, nonprofit community-based housing and community development organizations, low-income rural communities, and Federally Recognized Native American Tribes to undertake projects to improve housing, community facilities, community and economic development projects in rural areas: *Provided further*, That such funds shall be made available to qualified private, nonprofit and public intermediary organizations proposing to carry out a program of financial and technical assistance: *Provided further*, That such intermediary organizations shall provide matching funds from other sources, including Federal funds for related activities, in an amount not less than funds provided: *Provided further*, That $10,000,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be to provide grants for facilities in rural communities with extreme unemployment and severe economic depression (Public Law 106–387), with up to 5 percent for administration and capacity building in the State rural development offices: *Provided further*, That $3,972,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be available for community facilities grants to tribal colleges, as authorized by section 306(a)(19) of such Act: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,000,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be available through June 30, 2010, for authorized empowerment zones and enterprise communities and communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the rural community programs described in section 381E(d)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act: *Provided further*, That sections 381E–H and 381N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act are not applicable to the funds made available under this heading: *Provided further*, That any prior balances in the Rural Development, Rural Community Advancement Program account for programs authorized by section 306 and described in section 381E(d)(1) of such Act be transferred and merged with this account and any other prior balances from the Rural Development, Rural Community Advancement Program account that the Secretary determines is appropriate to transfer.

RURAL BUSINESS—COOPERATIVE SERVICE

RURAL BUSINESS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of loan guarantees and grants, for the rural business development programs authorized by sections 306 and 310B and described in sections 310B(f) and 381E(d)(3) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, $97,116,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, not to exceed $500,000 shall be made available for a grant to a qualified national organization to provide technical assistance for rural transportation in order to promote economic development and $2,979,000 shall be for grants to the Delta Regional Authority (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.) for any Rural Community Advancement Program purpose as described in section 381E(d) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, of which not more than 5 percent may be used for administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That $4,000,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be for business grants to benefit Federally Recognized Native American Tribes, including $250,000 for a grant to a qualified national organization to provide technical assistance for rural transportation in order to promote economic development: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $8,300,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be available through June 30, 2010, for authorized empowerment zones and enterprise communities and communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the rural business and cooperative development programs described in section 381E(d)(3) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act: *Provided further*, That sections 381E–H and 381N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act are not applicable to funds made available under this heading: *Provided further*, That any prior balances in the Rural Development, Rural Community Advancement Program account for programs authorized by sections 306 and 310B and described in sections 310B(f) and 381E(d)(3) of such Act be transferred and merged with this account and any other prior balances from the Rural Development, Rural Community Advancement Program account that the Secretary determines is appropriate to transfer.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by the Rural Development Loan Fund (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)), $33,536,000.

For the cost of direct loans, $8,464,000, as authorized by the Rural Development Loan Fund (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)), of which $1,035,000 shall be available through June 30, 2010, for Federally Recognized Native American Tribes and of which $2,070,000 shall be available through June 30, 2010, for Mississippi Delta Region counties (as determined in accordance with Public Law 100–460): *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $880,000 shall be available through June 30, 2010, for the cost of direct loans for authorized empowerment zones and enterprise communities and communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan programs, $4,941,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Rural Development, Salaries and Expenses''.

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized under section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act, for the purpose of promoting rural economic development and job creation projects, $33,077,000.

Of the funds derived from interest on the cushion of credit payments, as authorized by section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, $43,000,000 shall not be obligated and $43,000,000 are rescinded.

RURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For rural cooperative development grants authorized under section 310B(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932), $30,636,000, of which $300,000 shall be for a cooperative research agreement with a qualified academic institution to conduct research on the national economic impact of all types of cooperatives; and of which $2,582,000 shall be for cooperative agreements for the appropriate technology transfer for rural areas program: *Provided,* That not to exceed $3,463,000 shall be for cooperatives or associations of cooperatives whose primary focus is to provide assistance to small, socially disadvantaged producers and whose governing board and/or membership is comprised of at least 75 percent socially disadvantaged members; and of which $18,867,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for value-added agricultural product market development grants, as authorized by section 231 of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note).

RURAL ENERGY FOR AMERICA PROGRAM

For the cost of a program of loan guarantees and grants, under the same terms and conditions as authorized by section 9007 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107), $20,000,000: *Provided,* That the cost of loan guarantees, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE

RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, and grants for the rural water, waste water, waste disposal, and solid waste management programs authorized by sections 306, 306A, 306C, 306D, and 310B and described in sections 306C(a)(2), 306D, and 381E(d)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, $546,230,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $497,000 shall be available for the rural utilities program described in section 306(a)(2)(B) of such Act, and of which not to exceed $993,000 shall be available for the rural utilities program described in section 306E of such Act: *Provided*, That $41,085,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be for loans and grants including water and waste disposal systems grants authorized by 306C(a)(2)(B) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act and for Federally recognized Native American Tribes authorized by 306C(a)(1): *Provided further*, That not to exceed $19,500,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be for technical assistance grants for rural water and waste systems pursuant to section 306(a)(14) of such Act, unless the Secretary makes a determination of extreme need, of which $6,000,000 shall be made available for a grant to a qualified nonprofit multi-state regional technical assistance organization, with experience in working with small communities on water and waste water problems, the principal purpose of such grant shall be to assist rural communities with populations of 3,300 or less, in improving the planning, financing, development, operation, and management of water and waste water systems, and of which not less than $800,000 shall be for a qualified national Native American organization to provide technical assistance for rural water systems for tribal communities: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $15,000,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be for contracting with qualified national organizations for a circuit rider program to provide technical assistance for rural water systems: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $12,700,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be available through June 30, 2010, for authorized empowerment zones and enterprise communities and communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the rural utilities programs described in section 381E(d)(2) of such Act: *Provided further*, That sections 381E–H and 381N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act are not applicable to the funds made available under this heading: *Provided further*, That any prior balances in the Rural Development, Rural Community Advancement Program account programs authorized by sections 306, 306A, 306C, 306D, and 310B and described in sections 306C(a)(2), 306D, and 381E(d)(2) of such Act be transferred to and merged with this account and any other prior balances from the Rural Development, Rural Community Advancement Program account that the Secretary determines is appropriate to transfer.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by section 305 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 935) shall be made as follows: 5 percent rural electrification loans, $100,000,000; loans made pursuant to section 306 of that Act, rural electric, $6,500,000,000; 5 percent rural telecommunications loans, $145,000,000; cost of money rural telecommunications loans, $250,000,000; and for loans made pursuant to section 306 of that Act, rural telecommunications loans, $295,000,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $39,959,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Rural Development, Salaries and Expenses''.

DISTANCE LEARNING, TELEMEDICINE, AND BROADBAND PROGRAM

For the principal amount of broadband telecommunication loans, $400,000,000.

For grants for telemedicine and distance learning services in rural areas, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 950aaa et seq., $34,755,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary may use funds under this heading for grants authorized by 379(g) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act.

For the cost of broadband loans, as authorized by section 601 of the Rural Electrification Act, $28,960,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the cost of direct loans shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

In addition, $17,976,000, to remain available until expended, for a grant program to finance broadband transmission in rural areas eligible for Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program benefits authorized by 7 U.S.C. 950aaa.

TITLE IV

DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD, NUTRITION AND CONSUMER SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, $623,000.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

In lieu of the amounts made available in section 14222(b) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, for necessary expenses to carry out the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.), except section 21, and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.), except sections 17 and 21; $16,799,584,000, to remain available through September 30, 2011, of which $10,051,707,000 is hereby appropriated and $6,747,877,000 shall be derived by transfer from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c): *Provided*, That of the total amount available, $5,000,000 shall be available to be awarded as competitive grants to implement section 4405 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law No. 110–246).

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

For necessary expenses to carry out the special supplemental nutrition program as authorized by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786), $7,541,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2011: *Provided,* That, notwithstanding section 17(h)(10)(A) of such Act, only the provisions of section 17(h)(10)(B)(i), section 17(h)(10)(B)(ii), and section 17(h)(10)(B)(iii) shall be effective in 2010: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this account shall be available for the purchase of infant formula except in accordance with the cost containment and competitive bidding requirements specified in section 17 of such Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided shall be available for activities that are not fully reimbursed by other Federal Government departments or agencies unless authorized by section 17 of such Act.

SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), $61,351,846,000, of which $3,000,000,000, to remain available through September 30,

2011, shall be placed in reserve for use only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary to carry out program operations: *Provided*, That funds provided herein shall be expended in accordance with section 16 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be subject to any work registration or workfare requirements as may be required by law: *Provided further*, That funds made available for Employment and Training under this heading shall remain available until expended, as authorized by section 16(h)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading may be used to enter into contracts and employ staff to conduct studies, evaluations, or to conduct activities related to program integrity provided that such activities are authorized by the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008.

COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out disaster assistance and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program as authorized by section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note); the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983; special assistance for the nuclear affected islands, as authorized by section 103(f)(2) of the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–188); and the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program, as authorized by section 17(m) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, $255,570,000, to remain available through September 30, 2011, of which $5,000,000 shall be for emergency food program infrastructure grants authorized by section 209 of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983: *Provided*, That of the amount provided, $5,000,000 is to begin service in six additional states that have plans approved by the Department for the commodity supplemental food program: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be available to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities donated to the program: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective with funds made available in fiscal year 2010 to support the Seniors Farmers' Market Nutrition Program, as authorized by section 4402 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, such funds shall remain available through September 30, 2011: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under section 27(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)), the Secretary may use up to 10 percent for costs associated with the distribution of commodities.

NUTRITION PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

For necessary administrative expenses of the Food and Nutrition Service for carrying out any domestic nutrition assistance program, $147,801,000.

TITLE V

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service, including not to exceed $158,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Act approved August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1766), $177,136,000: *Provided*, That the Service may utilize advances of funds, or reimburse this appropriation for expenditures made on behalf of Federal agencies, public and private organizations and institutions under agreements executed pursuant to the agricultural food production assistance programs (7 U.S.C. 1737) and the foreign assistance programs of the United States Agency for International Development: *Provided further*, That funds made available for the cost of agreements under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 and for title I ocean freight differential may be used interchangeably between the two accounts with prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE I DIRECT CREDIT AND FOOD FOR PROGRESS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the credit program of title I, Public Law 83–480 and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, $2,812,000, to be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses''.

PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE II GRANTS

For expenses during the current fiscal year, not otherwise recoverable, and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under the Food for Peace Act (Public Law 83–480, as amended), for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad under title II of said Act, $1,690,000,000, to remain available until expended.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION EXPORT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the Commodity Credit Corporation's export guarantee program, GSM 102 and GSM 103, $6,820,000; to cover common overhead expenses as permitted by section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act and in conformity with the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of which $6,465,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Foreign Agricultural Service, Salaries and Expenses'', and of which $355,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses''.

MCGOVERN-DOLE INTERNATIONAL FOOD FOR EDUCATION AND CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAM GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 3107 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1736o–1), $199,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to provide the services, facilities, and authorities for the purpose of implementing such section, subject to reimbursement from amounts provided herein.

Ms. DELAURO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 56, line 14, be considered as read.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI

RELATED AGENCY AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Food and Drug Administration, including hire and purchase of passenger motor vehicles; for payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92–313 for programs and activities of the Food and Drug Administration which are included in this Act; for rental of special purpose space in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; for miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, authorized and approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on the Secretary's certificate, not to exceed $25,000; and notwithstanding section 521 of Public Law 107–188; $2,995,218,000: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $578,162,000 shall be derived from prescription drug user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379h shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended, and shall not include any fees pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 379h(a)(2) and (a)(3) assessed for fiscal year 2011 but collected in fiscal year 2010; $57,014,000 shall be derived from medical device user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j, and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended; $17,280,000 shall be derived from animal drug user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j, and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended; and $5,106,000 shall be derived from animal generic drug user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379f, and shall be credited to this account and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That fees derived from prescription drug, medical device, animal drug, and animal generic drug assessments for fiscal year 2010 received during fiscal year 2010, including any such fees assessed prior to fiscal year 2010 but credited for fiscal year 2010, shall be subject to the fiscal year 2010 limitations: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used to develop, establish, or operate any program of user fees authorized by 31 U.S.C. 9701: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated: (1) $782,915,000 shall be for the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition and related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (2) $873,104,000 shall be for the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research and related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (3) $305,249,000 shall be for the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (4) $155,540,000 shall be for the Center for Veterinary Medicine and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (5) $349,262,000 shall be for the Center for Devices and Radiological Health and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (6) $58,745,000 shall be for the National Center for Toxicological Research; (7) not to exceed $115,882,000 shall be for Rent and Related activities, of which $41,496,000 is for White Oak Consolidation, other than the amounts paid to the General Services Administration for rent; (8) not to exceed $168,728,000 shall be for payments to the General Services Administration for rent; and (9) $185,793,000 shall be for other activities, including the Office of the Commissioner; the Office of Scientific and Medical Programs; the Office of Policy, Planning and Preparedness; the Office of International and Special Programs; the Office of Operations; and central services for these offices: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be used to transfer funds under section 770(n) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379dd): *Provided further*, That funds may be transferred from one specified activity to another with the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

Page 57, line 8, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $373,000,000)''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak on behalf of my amendment to the fiscal year 2010 Agriculture Appropriations bill.

This amendment would simply maintain funding for the Food and Drug Administration at the same level as last year. It would save taxpayers $373 million. As American families struggle to tighten their fiscal belts and spend less, I believe Congress should stop spending so much.

Tragically, many of my colleagues were not allowed the opportunity to bring their amendments up for debate today. Because Democratic leaders have changed the traditional process, American families have missed over 70 opportunities to reduce wasteful programs and to fix what's broken here in Washington, the outrageous spending that we're doing.

You would think in these difficult times that Congress would be willing to restore the people's faith in the way that we spend their money. I think most people would like for us to be more frugal. For my part, I also tried to offer an amendment to reduce the bill's funding level by half of a percent, 0.5 percent, a reduction of just half a penny out of every dollar spent, but that amendment was not allowed to be offered on the floor today, as well as were many others that I offered.

Other amendments I offered would have saved hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars by eliminating double dipping, maintaining other programs at the 2009 levels, and preventing the purchase of new Federal lands, but these amendments were not allowed either.

Mr. Chairman, as the House conducts one of its most important tasks, the appropriation of funds, we owe it to the American families and people to have an open debate, to allow all ideas to be heard, and to work towards real fiscal constraint here in Washington. We can do that in a bipartisan manner, but we're not allowed to do so by the leadership. In fact, the Democrats should be as outraged as I am that their voice is not heard either. Debate is being stifled, and it's not right. It's not fair not only to us, but it's not fair to the American people.

We have to stop this outrageous spending that we're doing. I urge my colleagues to support my modest and simple amendment.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I strongly oppose this amendment.

This amendment would take away the entire increase over 2009 that is provided in this bill for the Food and Drug Administration. That increase will allow the agency to increase staffing, including staffing devoted to inspections and other field activities, make real improvements in FDA's work to ensure the safety of foods and medical products. For example, in the foods area, FDA will be able to conduct 1,150 more foreign and domestic food inspections and do 20,000 more examinations of imported food products. In the medical products area, FDA will conduct 3,300 more examinations of imported drug products and 4,400 more examinations of imported medical device products.

The FDA will also be able to update its labs with new equipment, will allow it to do a faster analysis of examples. This is especially important during food-borne illness outbreaks. And we have watched what's happened in food-borne illness outbreaks not only in terms of the public health, but we have left industry out there to be exposed and to be able to lose their share, whether it is leafy greens, whether it's tomatoes, whatever it is, if we cannot allow these laboratories to function and to find out what's going on.

The investments reap benefits in the next several years. New inspectors hired with funds in this bill are fully trained, bringing significantly more domestic and foreign inspections and import field exams and other activities by increases in the bill.

We can do research on Salmonella and E. coli biomarkers, new methods of rapid detection of decontamination, improved ability to collect and analyze data on food-borne illnesses. And if you can't understand, when you listen to a mother who says my child of 2 years old died from E. coli contamination—

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Would the gentlelady yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I am happy to have you speak again. You reserved time.

You know, we have just seen an E. coli outbreak in cookie dough. It highlights the importance of what these additional funds can help us to do. The E. coli bacteria lives inside animals, and that's why E. coli outbreaks are often associated with meat products. How, then, does E. coli get into cookie dough? Additional research on E. coli can help determine how it happened and results could prevent future outbreaks.

In addition to the work on food safety, the increased funds will help the FDA work on new screening tests for blood-borne disease to better understand the adverse events related to medical devices that are used in pediatric hospitals.

Another important tool that the additional funds will provide is to allow the FDA to make substantial investments in information technology for both foods and medical products. This allows the agency to receive and to better analyze adverse events electronically, support electronic submission of applications, and access old data for safety analyses.

□ 2100

I strongly urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, maybe the gentlewoman doesn't know that I'm a physician. I'm concerned about people's health. And my amendment won't do a thing to cut all those programs that you're accusing me of trying to cut. And I resent the fact that you're accusing me of trying to cut that because I'm not trying to hurt people. I'm not trying to harm folks. I'm not trying to stop research. And my amendment wouldn't do that.

My amendment would simply put the funding at the current level. We are stealing our grandchildren's future by spending so much money, by creating a huge debt. I'm not picking on the FDA. What I'm trying to do is I'm trying to save my grandchildren's future. And what we have right now with this bill is a 14 percent increase in funding over last year. That's outrageous. And I resent the fact that you're saying that I'm going to cut all these programs, because my amendment will not.

And, frankly, I just don't understand this kind of emotional debate because it's not debate and it's not correct. The thing that I want to do is I want to save my grandchildren's future by stopping this outrageous, egregious spending that we're doing here. We don't have the money.

Let's keep all these programs. I would love to see us have continuing resolutions for all these appropriations bills across the board, freeze the spending for at least a year.

The people in my district are suffering. Most counties have a 13 to 14 percent unemployment rate. And what we are doing is we are increasing the budget for this bill, for this appropriations bill, by 14 percent. That's outrageous.

And I tell you, the American people should be outraged. They should be calling every single congressional office and saying ''no'' to these spending bills that are just basically stealing our children and grandchildren's future.

We have got to stop this spending. It's absolutely ridiculous. It's going to bankrupt this country, if we're not already bankrupt. And I'm just trying to save spending the taxpayers' dollars. It's absolutely critical that we do that.

The budget that was presented by our President increases the debt over the next 5 years more than every single President since George Washington. I

hear your side keep talking about the debt President Bush created. I wasn't here during that time. I voted against all the bills that we have had since I've been up here, and I think George Bush was wrong in creating that much debt. But your President and my President is creating more debt than George Bush and every other President in history.

We need to stop this spending.

Ms. DELAURO. First of all, it's an 11 percent increase, not 14 percent. I'm trying to save your grandchildren's lives and other grandchildren's lives and my own as well.

We have watched over the last several months and the last couple of years, and the ranking member of this committee understands this and knows this, and we inspect 1 percent of the food that comes into this country from overseas, 1 percent. And the cry has been that there have not been enough inspectors to be able to do that. We are unable to trace back what happened with regard to lettuce, to tomatoes, and others, all of which are putting our families at risk. Your cut, in fact, would put this agency back in jeopardy where it has been for the last several years.

I resent the fact that you as a physician do not understand the value of what the Food and Drug Administration does and that it is responsible for lives. These are not roads. These are not bridges or parks. This is an agency that has authority over people's lives and the public health.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Members are advised to direct their comments to the Chair.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In addition, mammography user fees authorized by 42 U.S.C. 263b, export certification user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 381, and priority review user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 360n may be credited to this account, to remain available until expended.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of or used by the Food and Drug Administration, where not otherwise provided, $12,433,000, to remain available until expended.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, and the rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $160,600,000, including not to exceed $3,000 for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That $14,600,000 of the total amount appropriated under this heading shall not be available for obligation until the Commodity Futures Trading Commission submits an expenditure plan for fiscal year 2010 to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and the Committees approve the whole of the plan.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $54,500,000 (from assessments collected from farm credit institutions, including the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses as authorized under 12 U.S.C. 2249: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to expenses associated with receiverships.

TITLE VII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS AND TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 701. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, appropriations and authorizations made for the Department of Agriculture for the current fiscal year under this Act shall be available for the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for, of not to exceed 204 passenger motor vehicles, of which 170 shall be for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles.

SEC. 702. New obligational authority provided for the following appropriation items in this Act shall remain available until expended: Food Safety and Inspection Service, Public Health Data Communication Infrastructure System; Farm Service Agency, salaries and expenses funds made available to county committees; Foreign Agricultural Service, middle-income country training program, and up to $2,000,000 of the Foreign Agricultural Service appropriation solely for the purpose of offsetting fluctuations in international currency exchange rates, subject to documentation by the Foreign Agricultural Service.

SEC. 703. The Secretary of Agriculture may transfer unobligated balances of discretionary funds appropriated by this Act or other available unobligated discretionary balances of the Department of Agriculture to the Working Capital Fund for the acquisition of plant and capital equipment necessary for the delivery of financial, administrative, and information technology services of primary benefit to the agencies of the Department of Agriculture: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without the prior approval of the agency administrator: *Provided further*, That none of the funds transferred to the Working Capital Fund pursuant to this section shall be available for obligation without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act or made available to the Department's Working Capital Fund shall be available for obligation or expenditure to make any changes to the Department's National Finance Center without prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress as required by section 712 of this Act.

SEC. 704. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 705. No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to pay negotiated indirect cost rates on cooperative agreements or similar arrangements between the United States Department of Agriculture and nonprofit institutions in excess of 10 percent of the total direct cost of the agreement when the purpose of such cooperative arrangements is to carry out programs of mutual interest between the two parties. This does not preclude appropriate payment of indirect costs on grants and contracts with such institutions when such indirect costs are computed on a similar basis for all agencies for which appropriations are provided in this Act.

SEC. 706. Appropriations to the Department of Agriculture for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans made available in the current fiscal year shall remain available until expended to disburse obligations made in the current fiscal year for the following accounts: the Rural Development Loan Fund program account, the Rural Electrification and Telecommunication Loans program account, and the Rural Housing Insurance Fund program account.

SEC. 707. Of the funds made available by this Act, not more than $1,800,000 shall be used to cover necessary expenses of activities related to all advisory committees, panels, commissions, and task forces of the Department of Agriculture, except for panels used to comply with negotiated rule makings and panels used to evaluate competitively awarded grants.

SEC. 708. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to carry out section 410 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 679a) or section 30 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 471).

SEC. 709. No employee of the Department of Agriculture may be detailed or assigned from an agency or office funded by this Act to any other agency or office of the Department for more than 30 days unless the individual's employing agency or office is fully reimbursed by the receiving agency or office for the salary and expenses of the employee for the period of assignment.

SEC. 710. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Agriculture or the Food and Drug Administration shall be used to transmit or otherwise make available to any non-Department of Agriculture or non-Department of Health and Human Services employee questions or responses to questions that are a result of information requested for the appropriations hearing process.

SEC. 711. None of the funds made available to the Department of Agriculture by this Act may be used to acquire new information technology systems or significant upgrades, as determined by the Office of the Chief Information Officer, without the approval of the Chief Information Officer and the concurrence of the Executive Information Technology Investment Review Board: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be transferred to the Office of the Chief Information Officer without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress: *Provided further*, That none of the funds available to the Department of Agriculture for information technology shall be obligated for projects over $25,000 prior to receipt of written approval by the Chief Information Officer.

SEC. 712. (a) None of the funds provided by this Act, or provided by previous Appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in the current fiscal year, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by

this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds which—

(1) creates new programs;

(2) eliminates a program, project, or activity;

(3) increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted;

(4) relocates an office or employees;

(5) reorganizes offices, programs, or activities; or

(6) contracts out or privatizes any functions or activities presently performed by Federal employees; unless the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided by this Act, or provided by previous Appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in the current fiscal year, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure for activities, programs, or projects through a reprogramming of funds in excess of $500,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that: (1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities; (2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or activity, or numbers of personnel by 10 percent as approved by Congress; or (3) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel which would result in a change in existing programs, activities, or projects as approved by Congress; unless the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress before implementing a program or activity not carried out during the previous fiscal year unless the program or activity is funded by this Act or specifically funded by any other Act.

SEC. 713. None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who prepare or submit appropriations language as part of the President's Budget submission to the Congress of the United States for programs under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Subcommittees on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies that assumes revenues or reflects a reduction from the previous year due to user fees proposals that have not been enacted into law prior to the submission of the Budget unless such Budget submission identifies which additional spending reductions should occur in the event the user fees proposals are not enacted prior to the date of the convening of a committee of conference for the fiscal year 2011 appropriations Act.

SEC. 714. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to close or relocate a Rural Development office unless or until the Secretary of Agriculture determines the cost effectiveness and/or enhancement of program delivery: *Provided*, That not later than 120 days before the date of the proposed closure or relocation, the Secretary notifies the Committees on Appropriation of the House and Senate, and the members of Congress from the State in which the office is located of the proposed closure or relocation and provides a report that describes the justifications for such closures and relocations.

SEC. 715. None of the funds made available to the Food and Drug Administration by this Act shall be used to close or relocate, or to plan to close or relocate, the Food and Drug Administration Division of Pharmaceutical Analysis in St. Louis, Missouri, outside the city or county limits of St. Louis, Missouri.

SEC. 716. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to carry out an environmental quality incentives program authorized by chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa et seq.) in excess of $1,180,000,000.

SEC. 717. None of the funds made available in fiscal year 2009 or preceding fiscal years for programs authorized under the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1691 et seq.) in excess of $20,000,000 shall be used to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the release of eligible commodities under section 302(f)(2)(A) of the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust Act (7 U.S.C. 1736f–1): *Provided*, That any such funds made available to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation shall only be used pursuant to section 302(b)(2)(B)(i) of the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust Act.

SEC. 718. No funds shall be used to pay salaries and expenses of the Department of Agriculture to carry out or administer the program authorized by section 14(h)(1) of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1012(h)(1)).

SEC. 719. Funds made available under section 1240I and section 1241(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 and section 524(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1524(b)) in the current fiscal year shall remain available until expended to disburse obligations made in the current fiscal year.

SEC. 720. Unless otherwise authorized by existing law, none of the funds provided in this Act, may be used by an executive branch agency to produce any prepackaged news story intended for broadcast or distribution in the United States unless the story includes a clear notification within the text or audio of the prepackaged news story that the prepackaged news story was prepared or funded by that executive branch agency.

SEC. 721. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any former RUS borrower that has repaid or prepaid an insured, direct or guaranteed loan under the Rural Electrification Act, or any not-for-profit utility that is eligible to receive an insured or direct loan under such Act, shall be eligible for assistance under section 313(b)(2)(B) of such Act in the same manner as a borrower under such Act.

SEC. 722. Of the unobligated balances under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, $52,000,000 are hereby rescinded.

SEC. 723. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to establish or implement a rule allowing poultry products to be imported into the United States from the People's Republic of China.

SEC. 724. None of the funds made available to the Department of Agriculture in this Act may be used to implement the risk-based inspection program in the 30 prototype locations announced on February 22, 2007, by the Under Secretary for Food Safety, or at any other locations, until the USDA Office of Inspector General has provided its findings to the Food Safety and Inspection Service and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the data used in support of the development and design of the risk-based inspection program and FSIS has addressed and resolved issues identified by OIG.

SEC. 725. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and until receipt of the decennial Census in the year 2010, the Secretary of Agriculture shall consider—

(1) the city of Lumberton, North Carolina, and the city of Sanford, North Carolina (including individuals and entities with projects within the city), eligible for loans and grants funded through the Rural Community Facilities Program account;

(2) the unincorporated area of Los Osos, California (including individuals and entities with projects within the cities), eligible for loans and grants funded through the Rural Water and Waste Disposal Program account; and

(3) the city of Nogales, Arizona (including individuals and entities with projects within the city), eligible for loans and grants funded under the housing programs of the Rural Housing Service.

SEC. 726. There is hereby appropriated $2,500,000 for section 4404 of Public Law 107–171.

SEC. 727. There is hereby appropriated:

(1) $1,408,000 shall be for a grant to the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection, as authorized by section 6402 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note);

(2) $1,000,000 shall be for development of a prototype for a national carbon inventory and accounting system for forestry and agriculture, to be awarded under full and open competition;

(3) $1,000,000 for the International Food Protection Training Institute; and

(4) $200,000 for the Center for Foodborne Illness Research and Prevention.

SEC. 728. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Natural Resources Conservation Service shall provide financial and technical assistance through the Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations program to carry out—

(1) the Alameda Creek Watershed Project in Alameda County, California;

(2) the Hurricane Katrina-Related Watershed Restoration project in Jackson County, Mississippi;

(3) the Pidcock-Mill Creeks Watershed project in Bucks County, Pennsylvania;

(4) the Farmington River Restoration project in Litchfield County, Connecticut;

(5) the Lake Oscawana Management and Restoration project in Putnam County, New York; and

(6) the Richland Creek Reservoir in Paulding County, Georgia.

SEC. 729. Section 17(r)(5) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766(r)(5)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''the District of Columbia and'' after the first instance of ''institutions located in'';

(2) by striking ''ten'' and inserting ''eleven'';

(3) by striking ''eight'' and inserting ''nine''; and

(4) by inserting ''Connecticut,'' after the first instance of ''States shall be''.

SEC. 730. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purposes of a grant under section 412 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998, none of the funds in this or any other Act may be used to prohibit the provision of in-kind support from non-Federal sources under section 412(e)(3) in the form of unrecovered indirect costs not otherwise charged against the grant, consistent with the indirect rate of cost approved for a recipient.

SEC. 731. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salaries or expenses of personnel to—

(1) inspect horses under section 3 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 603);

(2) inspect horses under section 903 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 1901 note; Public Law 104–127); or

(3) implement or enforce section 352.19 of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 732. The Secretary of Agriculture may authorize a State agency to use funds provided in this Act to exceed the maximum amount of reconstituted liquid concentrate infant formula specified in 7 CFR 246.10 when issuing liquid concentrate infant formula to participants.

Ms. DELAURO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 74, line 15 be considered as read.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 733. Of the unobligated balances provided pursuant to section 16(h)(1)(A) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, $11,000,000 is hereby rescinded.

SEC. 734. Of the prior year unobligated balances provided for the purpose of section 306D of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, $25,008,000 is hereby rescinded.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 1 offered by Mrs. BLACKBURN:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 5 percent.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, tonight I rise in support of the American taxpayer.

Like a lot of my colleagues, I was home last week. I spent a lot of my time talking with constituents and listening to them and to their concerns. And it seems like wherever I went and whomever I spoke with, one concern overrode all of the others. They talked to us a lot about how astounded they were with cap-and-trade and they talked about their fears of what the liberal proposals were going to do to health care.

But the one thing that overrode them all, the commonality of concern, was with spending, the deficit, and national debt. Many times they used the term ''I am dumbfounded'' by what we are spending. Where is this money coming from? Is it coming from China? Is it coming from India? Are we just continuing to roll up the debt? And over and over they said, Tell me what we can do to stop this excessive spending.

Well, Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a good first step, and it is a way that we can begin to slow the Federal spending.

The approps bill before us represents nearly a 12 percent spending increase over last year. And if you add all the stimulus spending, which was $26.5 billion, and the emergency spending, which was $7.9 billion, these programs have benefited from about a 125 percent increase over the past 3 years. So can any of us say that spending 125 percent more than we did on these programs last year in this economic climate is responsible? Look at what that growth has been over a 3-year period of time.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking my colleagues to agree with me to give back just one nickel out of every dollar that is being appropriated and given to the bureaucracy, one nickel out of every single dollar.

As my colleagues all know, I am probably the proudest grandmother here on Capitol Hill. I have two adorable grandsons. My oldest grandson is barely a year old, and he and his brother, his 3-week-old brother, are each already in debt to the tune of about $70,000 to the Federal Government.

I know that there are thousands of grandparents that are out there just like me. They are incredibly concerned about what they see happening. They fear that the exploding debt and the deficit will compromise and will cap the opportunity of those precious children and that we will trade their bright future for one that is limited by a national debt that makes this Nation so sluggish that the best and the brightest opportunities are going to end up going elsewhere. And where are we getting the money? We are getting the money from our grandchildren.

So I urge support of my amendment. Cut 5 percent across the board. Cut a nickel from every dollar. And require today's bureaucracy to find a way to do what the American taxpayer is doing, to tighten the belt and save that nickel out of a dollar for our future.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment, which would cut all the agencies and the programs in the bill by 5 percent. I understand. I have three beautiful grandchildren, and they are the light of my life. And for that reason, I'm opposed to this amendment.

This would represent a cut of $1.1 billion from the bill. Now, this is exactly the wrong time to cut funding for critical programs under the bill that protect the public health, bolster food nutrition assistance programs, invests in rural communities, in agriculture research, strengthen animal health and marketing programs, and conserve our natural resources.

While the bill received a relatively large increase over 2009, it is important to understand that the large majority goes to fund just three priorities: $681 million for higher WIC participation and for food costs, $560 million for International Food Aid programs, and $299 million for the Food and Drug Administration to better protect our public health. At the same time, the bill made cuts in a number of programs below 2009 totaling $274 million. We also rejected $735 million in increases in the budget request.

So rather than using targeted, precision cuts, as we have done with this bill, an across-the-board cut would hurt core programs, would increase the investment deficits our communities across the country have had to overcome in the past years regardless of the value of the program.

These increases are needed to support vital services and priorities, vital and effective programs which, quite frankly, have broad bipartisan support. The increases in these areas are needed to ensure adequate funding to support the food nutrition safety net for families that serve an estimated 10.1 million women and children in 2010, strengthen even more of America's commitment to meet humanitarian food aid needs, to enhance the FDA's capabilities to ensure the safety of our food and medical products.

The bill also uses a portion of the increase to make up for cuts to farm bill conservation programs. We did not accept the cuts to priority farm bill conservation programs that the 2010 budget proposed. That budget made significant cuts to wetlands research programs, farmland protection, wildlife habitat programs, all effective programs with backlogs of applications from farmers and from ranchers. All told, the committee bill provides hundreds of millions in funding above the 2010 budget for farm bill conservation programs. Thus the bill uses a significant portion of the increase to make up for the cuts.

In conclusion, I want to note that the increases in this bill are not based on the belief that we should just throw money at the challenges that we face. The increases are about meeting the Federal Government's obligations. Again, I think we need to take a look at core programs, whether it's USDA or FDA. The gentlewoman's amendment would force all of these agencies that cover rural development, food and drug safety, WIC, food stamps to seek drastic cuts in a time of acute need. I think this amendment is fiscally irresponsible. It will further harm our rural communities and our public health, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman mentioned fiscal irresponsibility. I think that growing programs by 12 percent when they have already seen enormous, enormous increases is irresponsible.

We are asking to curtail the growth 5 percent. Curtail that growth 5 percent.

You know, the States have been a great lab of experimentation in this. And many States, including mine of Tennessee, have had across-the-board cuts, and they have used that to rein in the bureaucracy and say tighten your belts. Times are tough. Tighten your belts. And, Mr. Chairman, that is what we should do.

Priorities. She talked about priorities. How about the priority of the American taxpayer? How about the priority of the American farmer who writes that check to Uncle Sam every year and turns to his child and says, Guess what, you're not going to go to the university; you're going to go get another job and work another year before you can go.

□ 2115

These are priorities that are set aside while they meet our obligation to us. It is our responsibility to be good stewards of that dollar. And giving egregious raises—listen to this. McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program grants, an increase of 99.5 percent; FDA salaries and expenses—and, trust me, Energy and Commerce, we've been after them for a long time—14.6 percent.

The list goes on and on.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. DELAURO. How much time is available?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 1½ minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I would just like to say that this bill addresses the plight of the American farmers, rural America. And I don't come from rural America. I come from the Northeast. But I have farms.

I'm watching dairy farmers go out of business. That's happening all over the country. And watching the technical assistance programs with backlogs that are not addressing the needs of the American farmer.

This bill addresses those issues.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. If the gentlelady will yield.

Ms. DELAURO. I just have 1½ minutes left—and less than that now.

This bill is looking at how we can in fact meet the obligations that we have in a time of fiscal and economic crisis and economic insecurity all over this country. Under the jurisdiction of this bill is rural development. In addition to that, it protects the public health, which we're obligated to do. And when you see nine people die from peanut-based products because we cannot trace back, we cannot analyze, we do not have—

Mrs. BLACKBURN. If the gentlelady will yield, we have done plenty—

Ms. DELAURO. We do not have the tools that are necessary in order to be able to understand what happened. This bill addresses—

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Money doesn't solve that problem.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman will suspend. The gentlewoman from Connecticut controls the time.

Ms. DELAURO. Across-the-board cuts apply a meat ax and don't have a precision cut and make a difference. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

PART E AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, amendment No. 6.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part E amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service—Salaries and Expenses'' shall be available for the National Biodiversity Conservation Strategy project, Kiski Basin, Pennsylvania, and the amount otherwise provided under such heading is hereby reduced by $200,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. This is an amendment that would strike an earmark, better known as pork barrel spending. Specifically, $200,000 requested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) for the Natural Biodiversity of Johnstown, Pennsylvania, for conservation strategy at the Kiski Basin.

If one goes to the Web site of Natural Biodiversity, they will learn that ''they control invasive, nonnative plants.''

''Holistic habitat management techniques are being used to restore riparian buffers on sites throughout the Kiski-Conemaugh and upper Juniata drainages.'' I hope I pronounced those properly.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to put this amendment into a broader context. Clearly, the national priority has got to be job growth, economic growth. And, by any standard, the economic policies of this Democratic Congress, the economic policies of this administration have been an abject failure: 2.6 million jobs lost since February—467,000 jobs lost last month alone; 9.5 percent unemployment throughout the land—the highest unemployment in a quarter of a century.

Mr. Chairman, what do we have to show for it? Nothing but debt. Mountains and mountains of debt in spending for our children and grandchildren, already. $9,810 per household to fund a $1.13 trillion government stimulus plan; $3,534 per household to fund a $410 billion omnibus; $31,000 per household to fund a $3.6 trillion 2010 budget.

Tripling, tripling the Federal debt in 10 years. More debt in the next 10 years than in the previous 220; billions for Chrysler; billions for GM; billions for AIG. Borrowing 46 cents on the dollar, borrowing it from the Chinese, sending the bill to our children and grandchildren. That's the context, Mr. Chairman.

So I ask one and only one thing. Here's an opportunity. Here's an opportunity for the taxpayers to maybe save $300,000. Not to borrow that money from the Chinese.

Now I have no idea—I have no doubt, I have no doubt that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is sincere. I'm sure good things can be done with this money by the Natural Biodiversity and their holistic habitat management program. I have no doubt that good things could be done with that money.

But let me tell you other good things that can be done with the money. That money could be used to go against the deficit so we don't borrow money from the Chinese, so we don't send the bill to our children and grandchildren. And if we're going to spend it, Mr. Chairman, maybe we ought to spend it on small businesses—small businesses that are capitalized with $25,000, on average, according to the SBA. We could save eight small businesses in America.

But, most importantly right now, we could tell America that we know what the priorities are—and it's not weed management by Natural Biodiversity in the Kiski River Basin. I have no idea how this became a national priority.

I'm sure, again, that important things can be done with the money, but is it worth borrowing the money from the Chinese and sending the bill to our children and our grandchildren? I think not.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Though the gentleman who sponsored this project could not be here tonight, he has provided me with the following information.

This is a conservation project for a not-for-profit volunteer program. Natural Biodiversity was initiated in response to citizens' concerns for invasive plant problems in the 1,887 square mile Kiski-Conemaugh drainage portion of the Allegheny River and Ohio River Basin.

Subsequent work has been expanded the geographic area to include the Juniata watershed of the Chesapeake Bay, the State of Pennsylvania, and a much larger mid-Atlantic region.

Invasive plant management work has led to innovative approaches, including

native plant restoration and comprehensive land stewardship practices. Some of their early achievements have been the early detection and rapid response to noxious weeds and 32 invasive plant locations; education and outreach to 10,000 people, with a potential audience of 500,000 each year; development of a management plan for the 1,000-square-mile Raystown branch of the Juniata River.

So, again, it is a not-for-profit volunteer program that is dealing with a concern and a large area about invasive plant problems. And I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, it was an interesting discussion, Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure it's worthy of borrowing $200,000 dollars from the Chinese and sending the bill to our children and grandchildren.

I'm sorry that the gentleman from Pennsylvania couldn't make it here tonight. I know he is busy with many, many earmarks. According to the April 19 edition of the Washington Post, MURTHA, dubbed the King of Pork by critics, consistently directs more Federal money to his district than any other Congressman—$192 million in the 2008 budget.

I don't know what the unemployment rate is in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, but around the rest of the Nation it's averaging 9.5 percent. And if he would choose not to spend $200,000 dollars for weed-whacking along this river basin, maybe we could have more jobs in the rest of America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I was just going to make one comment, and that's about fiscal responsibility. I am delighted that the gentleman has gotten religion on fiscal responsibility. As I recall, he spent the last 8 years here witnessing the kinds of tax cuts that have provided the tax breaks for the wealthiest people in this Nation and now has brought this Nation to this fiscal crisis that we have and the indebtedness that we have. I think he must have been missing in action for these 8 years where we experienced this.

This indebtedness did not occur overnight. I once again urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I'd be happy to yield.

Mr. KINGSTON. I just wanted to say on behalf of the minority members I had planned to oppose this amendment and do believe that this research can be very helpful and know that many of the earmarks that have been in this bill have increased food safety and increased food supply and created jobs along the way and reduced food costs.

And so there are a lot of things that do kind of catch the eye that sometimes there is more to it than you can get out in a quick debate on it. But I do plan to oppose this, and wanted the chairwoman to know that.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. Fifteen seconds.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I think it's very interesting to get a lecture from the gentlelady on fiscal responsibility, since she just voted for a budget that will triple the national debt over the next 10 years. When the deficit was $300 billion and falling, the majority leader STENY HOYER called it fiscal child abuse. Here's an earmark to add $200,000 to fiscal child abuse.

We ought to cut it out. And I urge adoption of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

PART C AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part C amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''National Institute of Food and Agriculture—Research and Education Activities'' shall be available for the special grant for Specialty Crops in Indiana, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for special grants) are each hereby reduced by $235,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would eliminate a $235,000 earmark for Specialty Crops in Indiana, and reduces funding in the overall bill by that amount. According to the statement from the sponsor of the earmark, the gentleman from Indiana, this earmark of the Specialty Crops Research Extension and Training Center at the Southwest-Purdue Agricultural Center would go to increase their staff and upgrade equipment for the center.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sure—and I expect we will hear from the gentleman from Indiana—and I'm sure that he will talk about what he believes the benefits of this program or this center or the additional equipment that this earmark would buy is going to be to that center.

But, Mr. Chairman, as has been mentioned by the previous several speakers, and I'm sure will be mentioned by others, we are in a period of great fiscal strain, where we have a $2 trillion deficit running this year, another $1 trillion deficit every year for as far as the eye can see, and 46 cents of every dollar we spend on the floor of this House, 46 of every dollar this year will be borrowed.

□ 2130

Even the Congressional Budget Office just 2 weeks ago said that the current budget and the current budget trajectory is ''unsustainable.'' Mr. Chairman, given the situation that we're in, given the deficits we're running, given the debt we're building up, given the amount of money that we're borrowing, given the spending that we're going through, shouldn't we be limiting what we're spending now to true national priorities, true things that are really those things that we must do and can only do right now rather than things that are designed for a specific district, specific area or a specific industry? Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that this particular earmark is one of those things and does not rise to that level of national and critical importance that we should borrow another $108,000 from, as was said before, the Chinese, the Indians, whomever in order to fund this particular earmark.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the distinguished chairwoman of the subcommittee for yielding.

I would like to thank her and her colleagues on the Agriculture appropriations subcommittee for not only approving this this year but also last year, and I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chair, I got home from Afghanistan 2 days ago; and while I was there in the Khost province, I was fortunate enough to visit with the Indiana National Guard. And besides their soldiering duties, some of other things they were doing was helping the Afghanistan agriculture farmers to better their practices of farming in Afghanistan. I would guess that if I asked the 14,000 farmers in Indiana in my district and if Mr. CAMPBELL asked the 132 farmers in his district, according to the 2007 agriculture census, and I have 9,000 farms in my district and Mr. CAMPBELL has 72 farms in his district, according to the same document, that if we asked those farmers in our two respective districts, Should we spend money in Afghanistan on their agriculture or spend

it right here in the United States, I'm just going to take a guess that they might say, let's spend some of it here. And that's what this amendment would try to preclude.

I'd like to take this opportunity, as Mr. CAMPBELL said, to defend this program because it was fully funded last year, and I'd ask that it would be funded this year again. This is the Specialty Crops Research, Extension, and Training Center at the Southwest-Purdue Agricultural Center. This project is a collaboration between Purdue University and Vincennes University. It is housed in Vincennes, Indiana. This farmland in Knox County, Indiana, is particularly well suited for growing fresh fruits and vegetables, and the Southwest-Purdue Agricultural Center provides an important resource for farmers to improve crop quality and yields and decrease pesticide use.

The request I submitted to the Appropriations Committee would direct funds, as Mr. CAMPBELL said, to the center for upgrades to their equipment and in personnel. Mr. Chair, they do a lot of great things there. This is critical for conducting research on crops in our area. I also will remind you that where I live in midwest Indiana is within a day's drive of 40 percent of the American population. Indiana is proud. We are proud of our farmers, and we're proud to supply food to the Midwest and across our country. And because approximately 40 percent of the Nation's population live within a day's drive of that area, we think it's extremely important to explore all of the possibilities of that area. And no one does it better than this extension and this agriculture center.

We all know the value of adding fresh fruits and vegetables to our diets, and Americans are struggling right now with obesity and related health issues. Proper diet and nutrition habits are critical components to making this country healthier. New expanded fruit and vegetable production is extremely critical. I think it's important to note that this is not new funding. This is in the USDA's appropriated funds. So who's better to say where this money might be spent, the Congressman who drives the streets and the roads and the highways and on the farms and talks to the farmers and the ranchers in southern Indiana or a bureaucrat sitting in a booth somewhere in Washington, D.C., that says, ''These people get this and these people get that''? I think it's the Congressman and the farmers from Indiana.

Ms. DELAURO. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, as I said, I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana's eloquent defense of this, and I understand his point. But there are roughly 400 earmarks in this bill; and at some point, Mr. Chairman, we've got to stop. And one of the things the gentleman mentioned was that we're helping farmers in Afghanistan farm and should we do this or do that? But the fact is, we're doing both. And the fact is that many times in this Chamber we decide to spend money on everything. Let's spend money on this farm here and this farm here, and this crop here and this crop there, and this State here and this State there, and this country here and this country there. And it's that kind of spending where we aren't making the choices to spend on some things and not on others, where we aren't making the decision to spend within our means, where we aren't deciding that, we're not going to borrow the money, we're not going to tax them more money. We're going to take what we have, and we're going to it allocate that as efficiently as we can to the places we think are the most important and not just do it to everything has got stop, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest to my friends on the other side of the aisle, I understand that perhaps you think this is important, but what's more important is $2 trillion in additional debt this year, $13 trillion in debt overall, 46 cents on every dollar being borrowed, and most of it being borrowed from foreign nations and that it doesn't ever stop. According to the President's budget, it goes on and on and on. We have got to stop that.

I would just suggest that maybe we start with things like this. It isn't about whether the bureaucracy spends this or not. This bill would save that $235,000 and not borrow any more money. Whether it's here or somewhere else, at some point, Mr. Chairman, we have to begin to control the spending and not borrow and deficit spend so much. I just hope if we can't start tonight, let's start tomorrow.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. How much time do I have?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. My colleague Mr. ELLSWORTH talked about this project and has defended it more than adequately. But considering the openness and the scrutiny that has gone into the process this year, I would urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and continue the good efforts of the proposal that Mr. ELLSWORTH has made and the whole issue of specialty crops. I share that interest in specialty crops coming from the State of Connecticut where, in fact, that is what we do; and the importance of the research in that area is critical. Support his effort, and oppose the gentleman from California's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

PART D AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part D amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''Agricultural Research Service—Salaries and Expenses'' shall be available for the Foundry Sand By-Products Utilization project in Beltsville, Maryland, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading is hereby reduced by $638,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, I know that it's a custom to address the Chair. I see the Speaker of the House is in the Chamber. If I could address her directly, what I would implore her to do is to—when we have the defense bill on the floor later this month, please make an open rule. Allow us the opportunity to challenge earmarks in the defense bill and then not limit us to just one or two or three. That defense bill will include literally hundreds and hundreds of earmarks that are no-bid contracts to private companies. And unless we have the ability to challenge them, they will go virtually unvetted because we know from sad experience they have not been vetted by the Appropriations Committee in the past.

I will just draw your attention to a headline in today's Roll Call, ''Justice Department this week filed criminal charges against a defense contractor who has received millions of dollars worth of earmarks.'' There will be another headline tomorrow and likely again the following day. We have investigations swirling outside. We have to be able to challenge these earmarks and to point out why it's wrong for this body to allow Members to earmark to their campaign contributors.

So while the Speaker is in the Chamber, I would just implore her—if I could speak to her directly—to allow an open rule, allow more debate on this subject.

But to the merits of the challenge to this earmark, this amendment would remove $638,000 in funding for the Beltsville, Maryland, Agricultural Research Center and reduce the overall cost of the bill by a commensurate amount.

According to the report accompanying this bill, this earmark is described as the, quote, Foundry Sand By-Products Utilization in Beltsville, Maryland.'' But if you look at the table that is in the report for this bill, it says that that research project that is going to the Foundry Sand By-Product Utilization is actually completed. So

it's a bit confusing as to what this earmark is actually for. There is a little different language in the certification letter and in the table that accompanies this bill. So I would ask the sponsor of this earmark to explain why we're earmarking funds seemingly for a project that has already been completed.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Although the gentleman could not be here tonight, he has provided me with the following information:

This amendment seeks to eliminate funding for a research project at the Environmental Management and Byproduct Utilization Laboratory at the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center. This amendment would deprive taxpayers of the expertise acquired by Federal researchers and scientists. I just want to reiterate here. These are Federal employees at a federally owned research center. The effort is to study the potential reuses of one industrial byproduct—sand used in metal casting. The experts have enabled us through research currently being reviewed by their peers to discover ways to deal with the over 7 million tons of foundry sands that are estimated to be disposed of in our landfills annually. I think we need to continue to use their expertise.

There is considerable need for ongoing funding to study the beneficial uses of other industrial byproducts in agriculture. This includes discovering ways to prevent phosphorous from reaching our waterways, to improve soil characteristics and in sequestering carbon. The research also helps us to find ways to create new products from direct agricultural waste materials. Scientists, for example, as I understand this, have found a way to take carotene from chicken feathers, an example of a poultry byproduct to make high-quality biodegradable plastics for the horticultural industry. Finding these new uses not only would benefit American agricultural producers, it assists the American public and the environment by avoiding increasingly expensive options of sending these materials to a landfill. We need to allow these funds to be flexible as opposed to being directed at one specific material. For example, foundry sands. Since we cannot always be aware in advance of potential new beneficial uses of various industrially and agriculturally derived materials. I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. The gentlelady mentioned that these are Federal employees in a Federal institution and a Federal facility that would be receiving these earmarks and has great trust that they will do the right thing in executing this earmark. I just find that curious that the main reason that we have earmarks, supposedly—we continually are told—is because we're not going to let these faceless bureaucrats at Federal agencies decide where to spend our money. Yet we're saying that they can't make those decisions but they can carry out the earmark. I can tell you why it's done and why you will have both the minority and the majority in this House today on the Appropriations Committee oppose this amendment. It's because if you look in the ag amendments this year, 64 percent of the money, of the share of earmarks, 67 percent of the dollar value are going to either appropriators or powerful Members, either chairmen or ranking minority members of committees.

□ 2145

This is fairly consistent across all the appropriations bills we will do this year. It is a spoils system. That may be a pejorative way to say it, but I don't know how else to say it when 64 percent of the earmarks in this legislation will go to about 24 percent of the Members in this body. We continually say, like I said, that these faceless bureaucrats shouldn't be deciding where our money goes. If you are a rank-and-file Member in this House, I would take my chances with a faceless bureaucrat because you would probably fare better than you would before the Appropriations Committee. And this is how it is year after year after year.

Gratefully, we know it now because we have enough transparency where we know who is requesting the earmark. But this isn't right, and there are other worthy projects that might deserve this funding, but because a powerful Member is able to request it, then it goes there. And this is, I think, the fourth time that money has been appropriated for this project, which, according to the Web site of the requesting Member, the project has been completed. So I'm not sure exactly where the money is going if the project has been already completed. I guess it is starting again.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. How much time remains, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 2½ minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. The funding, just to address that, enables those who have worked on the project to continue their successes. Look, I do not pretend to be a scientist, and I would not pretend to tell the scientists how to pursue their research. Quite frankly, coming from the subcommittee in which I serve on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, where we do provide funding for the National Institutes of Health, we do not—again, I'm not a scientist. We do not tell them how, where, and what to focus the resources on or a particular illness.

As is often the case, research will uncover other discoveries. Look, I will give you a very good example. There is research that has been done with Taxol, which is at the NIH, which was presumed to be effective in helping women who were suffering fourth-stage ovarian cancer, which is a time when it is almost irreversible. But as researchers began to develop research on Taxol, they began to find that its properties were also useful for breast cancer and other types of cancers. So what research does is it opens up a whole variety of avenues, and that is where discoveries are made.

I think we should leave these kinds of efforts to the scientists. This project is producing, and it will continue to produce with the aid of this funding, peer-reviewed research. My colleague and I believe this will be of great benefit.

Once again, as I say, we have been very open. There has been a great deal of scrutiny that has gone into this process this year. There have been new requirements that Chairman OBEY put into practice to continue our efforts to ensure that the appropriations process is open, that it is transparent, and that it is worthy of the public's trust. In terms of vetting each request with the agency under whose jurisdiction the earmark would fall, there has been public disclosure on Members' Web sites, and the committee made earmark lists available after the subcommittee consideration on the bill on June 11, nearly 4 weeks ago. And as indicated in our report, the funding earmarks in the Agriculture appropriations bill in 2008, 2009, were well below 2006.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired. The gentleman from Arizona has 30 seconds.

Mr. FLAKE. I agree with the gentlelady when she says there is more transparency in the system now. That is true. That is a good thing. But we haven't drained the swamp. We simply know how deep the mud we are now in is. That is the problem. And the problem is when we trust the Federal agencies to carry out an earmark like this but we don't trust them to direct it.

We should set parameters. We should tell the Federal agencies, Here is how you should distribute the money, instead of saying, All right, I'm a powerful member of the Appropriations Committee or of leadership and I'm going to direct that money to my district.

I urge support of the amendment, and I yield back.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

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

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

PART D AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part D amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''National Institute of Food and Agriculture—Research and Education Activities'' shall be available for the special grant for the Agriculture Energy Innovation Center in Georgia, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for special grants) are each hereby reduced by $1,000,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would remove $1 million from the University of Georgia's Agricultural Energy Innovation Center, located in Tifton, Georgia, and reduce the overall cost of the legislation by a commensurate amount. According to the sponsor's Web site, this funding would be used to advance farm efficiencies by coupling advanced information communication and control technologies with improved plant materials, byproducts use and energy capture and conversion techniques.

That sounds pretty impressive. I'm sure a lot of that is going on. The sponsor states this earmark is a good use of taxpayer dollars because the research and the demonstration project will facilitate the rapid advancement of new tools to increase the net production of energy from agriculture.

There is a lot of this going on around the country. We have appropriated a lot of money in a lot of bills to do this kind of thing, and it just strikes me as folly to, in a bill like this, just to be able to direct money for a Member to say, All right, the university in my district is going to get this research money. They won't have to compete for it on merit. They won't have to compete for it because I'm going to earmark it, and they are going to get it when maybe a university elsewhere, the University of Nebraska, the University of Minnesota or University of Arizona, might want to compete for that project but they can't because the money is earmarked and it goes specifically to this university.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment to the floor. As one who is very involved in this earmark, I now have the opportunity to discuss it in detail. This is a program that works on future food production and technology by decreasing the cost of production and looking at ways to have some fuel independence. But what I wanted to emphasize to the gentleman, as he doesn't seem to have a problem with the merit of the project as much as the process of directing it to the University of Georgia, and I want to point out that the University of Georgia is a land grant university with one of the oldest agricultural colleges in the country. And they do compete for competitive grants on a regular basis, and they do get competitive grants. When they have put skin in the game, Congress has, in fact, not just for the University of Georgia, but for a lot of universities, put some matching money in it.

Now, in this case, the money is really not matching as the college itself has already put in about $5 million. And they have been working on this over the years, but they have gotten $500,000 from private foundations in 2010 and 2011. They will get $800,000 from private foundations. And then they have State money, and then they have university money in it. So it is not something where the $1 million is a new start-up for a program that is not out there. It is something that they have been going after.

Here is something from the State of Georgia, the Agriculture Energy Innovation Center, which we call GEFA. It is a letter in support of it, and of course, we do have something from the university itself supporting that the goal is in line with what colleges of agriculture and land grant universities do. But that is why the money went to the University of Georgia, and the Tifton campus is where they do much of their agricultural research.

I would invite the gentleman to come down and visit sometime and let me explain why the good people of Arizona should fund something like that in the State of Georgia, because often it is, well, why should everybody in the country support something that is going to a particular State? But when the end product is something that will help the whole Nation, that is what happens.

It is precision agriculture. One of the problems we have right now down on the farm is that you've got a lot of groups who are saying, All right, you're causing too much pollution. You're overfertilizing. You're using too much energy.

So, what we have here is a land grant university addressing those very issues which will not be proprietary in their results. It will be something that is shared throughout the Nation for other farmers to say, Now, look, here is how you can do it using high technology, using precision agriculture, saving lots of money and utilize those techniques all over the country.

With that, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. According to the Georgia Department of Economic Development, Georgia currently has over $2 billion worth of active renewable energy-related products and is a leader in the bioenergy revolution. I have no doubt that that is true. And because that is true and because if this Agriculture Energy Innovation Center truly has merit, then they should be able to compete for these grants with other land grant colleges, with other universities, and with other organizations that are doing this same research.

My question is why, if you have such a deserving, respectable program like this, why do we need to earmark these dollars at all? Surely they can compete for it and do well. But why do we circumvent the process of competition simply because we are on the committee or we are a powerful chairman or a ranking minority member or somebody who can get this funding and earmark it so that nobody else can compete for it? That simply doesn't make sense.

If we don't like the way that the agencies are disbursing this money, then, by golly, we ought to address it. That is our job as Members of Congress. We have the power of the purse. But, instead, to say we don't like how that faceless bureaucrat is going to direct the spending so we are going to create a parallel process in Congress where we can just circumvent the process and earmark that money for our own university, that is simply not right, and it has gotten out of hand in this Congress.

Some people will point out that this year earmarks are down in this bill. That is a great thing, but they are not down far enough. We need a process that is competitive, that is based on merit and not based on the spoils system.

Again, I repeat, in this bill, 24 percent of the Members of this body will control more than two-thirds of the money that is directed through earmarks. Now, that is not because there is more merit in those programs. It is because we have powerful Members in those positions. And you can't make the argument that, oh, this is a land grant college or this is a deserving institution. If they were, they could compete for those dollars. But instead, we are circumventing that process of competition and awarding by earmark through the political process. Particularly when we have the kind of deficit that we have today, this legislation would strike this funding and reduce the cost of the bill by a commensurate amount.

How can any fiscal conservative say that we don't want to do that in this year when we are running a deficit that could reach $2 trillion? I would say it is time. And if we can't do it here, where will we do it?

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time is left?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 90 seconds remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Very quickly, I just want to tell the gentleman from Georgia that I will join him in urging a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentlewoman.

And I want to say to my friend, number one, I am working on a number of amendments that we have offered in the subcommittee and in the full committee. Some were accepted, some were not. I have one that we will be discussing in a few minutes, a $400 million reduction in the spending in this. And I have to say, it kills me to say this just about, but I have to hand it to the Democrats. In 2006, this bill had $865 million worth of earmarks. Today's bill has $219 million. And I know the gentleman will say that is still too many, but one of the things that is real important is that there has been a reduction in earmarks.

In 2008, this bill had 623 earmarks, now it has 321. And it is still too much, but one of the things we still hear often is the proverbial Defense Department's $500 hammer. Well, that is because there are so many problems in defense procurement. But it is the same in all branches of government. So I don't think that Congress should just blindly turn everything over to bureaucracies who are going to come up with competitive grant programs. I do think it is proper for Congress to have a role in congressionally directed spending. But I want to emphasize that of a $5 million project, the University of Georgia has come up with $4 million, so they have put their skin in the game.

With that, I will yield the balance of my time.

□ 2200

Mr. FLAKE. May I inquire as to the time remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLAKE. I am glad to hear the gentleman is introducing an amendment later that will save $400 million. I will gladly vote for the gentleman's amendment. I hope we will vote for mine.

We need to not only save $400 million; we need to save another million here. Why not, if it will reduce the cost of the bill by a commensurate amount, why wouldn't we take every opportunity to lower the deficit that we have and to pay down the debt?

We are in an awful fix here, and we are digging deeper and deeper with a bill like this that increases the overall spending by, I think, 12 percent from last year to this. Why not take every opportunity to cut the spending.

This is an opportunity. I plan to vote for every amendment that will cut any funding from this bill. But, please, if we have an opportunity here to cut $1 million, I would hope that we would do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

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

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

PART D AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk designated as part D No. 12.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part D amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''National Institute of Food and Agriculture—Research and Education Activities'' shall be available for special grants for Potato Research in Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading (and the portion of such amount specified for special grants) are each hereby reduced by $1,037,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. This amendment would remove slightly more than $1 million for potato research in Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and it would reduce the overall cost of the bill by a consistent amount.

Now, if you like earmarks, then this spud's for you, I guess. But if you don't, and if you think that we need to save some money somewhere, then I would urge support for this amendment.

According to one of the sponsors of the earmark, the potato industry generates about $3.4 billion throughout the State of Washington. In Idaho, the potato industry contributes nearly half a billion dollars in wages. Potato sales equal about $7 billion annually.

According to the USDA, last year potato farmers received nearly $3.9 billion for their crop. Now, how is it that this industry that receives billions of dollars a year isn't expected to invest in its own research? I know that it does some, but why are the taxpayers year after year ponying up more money to a $7 billion industry? This is a drop in the bucket to the industry, but a million dollars is a lot of money to the average American family.

According to one of the sponsors' Web sites, every dollar invested in potato research yields a $39 return. I would submit that for those of us who believe in the free market, that any dollar invested that yields a $39 return, then private industry will do well investing in its own research. We don't have to ask the taxpayer to pile on.

Potatoes were first introduced in the United States in the 1600s. They are now the fourth largest food crop in the world. They have sustained nations in time of famine due to their ability to survive in many climates, and they are inexpensive to harvest. Seventy-nine percent of U.S. households consume potatoes at least 1.8 times a week. I am included in that number.

I just don't know why we are asking, again, the taxpayer, to fund research over and over and over again for an industry that can clearly support itself here.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. With that, I will yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I do admire my friend from Arizona. His persistence on this is absolutely incredible, and I share a lot of the goals that he is trying to accomplish.

I really think that the gentleman's problem is not so much with individual programs and maybe his problem is with the Ag-Research Service, and maybe the gentleman ought to introduce a bill to get rid of the Ag-Research Service, and that would probably take care of all the underlying problems.

But the point is the Ag-Research Service has been involved in research of a number of crops, including potatoes, for a number of years. This does go to the Northwest. Fifty percent of the potatoes that are grown in the United States are grown in Idaho, Washington and Oregon. There are three State universities that are involved. University of Idaho, Washington State University and Oregon State university submit funds for this research with these matching dollars.

In addition, the potato commissions in each of those respective States match those dollars. And as a result, we have developed varieties of potatoes now that are more disease resistant. I think the tonnage, for example, in the last 50 years has increased greatly in Washington State because of the new varieties, potatoes they have brought on the market. In fact, 100,000 acres are these new varieties that people may or may not like.

And, again, the issue is, okay, maybe we shouldn't have any research at all in government funded. That's another debate. And the gentleman had mentioned that only powerful Members of Congress, you know, get these earmarks. I would mention to the gentleman, before I came to Congress 15 years ago, this program was in existence and the funding this year is precisely level with last year. This is not new funding.

So I would suggest to the gentleman that in this case, with potatoes, they are not a program crop.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. When potato farmers go out and plant their crops, they are probably the biggest gamblers in the world. And yet they don't mind putting some of their hard-earned cash when they make a profit into this research, because that may make them an even bigger gambler next year with one of their varieties.

So I respect the gentleman with what he is trying to do, but his issue may not be with individual crops. And this amendment goes to an individual crop in my area. Maybe his issue is with Ag-Research Service in general, that's a matter for another debate.

Mr. FLAKE. My issue is with overall spending, one; two, is with the need to earmark. If this funding is receiving earmarks, basically, about a million dollars a year, when clearly you have an industry that is capable of funding its own research, now, I agree with the gentleman's point about this isn't one of the program crops; it's not wheat not corn. It's not a crop that gets massive subsidies under the farm bill. We shouldn't be doing those subsidies.

But two wrongs don't make a right. We shouldn't say, well, hey, we are subsidizing those, so we ought to bring some subsidy over here as well. The truth is we can't afford either of them now. We have a deficit of nearly $2 trillion this year. When I came to this institution just 8 years ago, our entire Federal budget was just around $2 trillion. Now we are going to have a deficit that equals that amount.

Can't we in this year at least say, you know, maybe we ought to cut back on potato research just a little. Maybe we ought to cut back on other earmarks in this bill because we are simply adding to the debt, adding to the deficit more than we can take.

So it's not just that I have an issue with agricultural research spending, but I do have an issue with the way it's allocated. Because, as I have already demonstrated, this is awarded based on a spoils system.

When just 14 percent of the Members in this body, those who are represented on the Appropriations Committee, direct more than half of the earmark spending in this bill, you have got a spoils system. I don't know what else to call it.

And that's one issue with this bill and why I am offering these amendments. And, two, if we don't like the way the Federal agencies are doing it, then we should direct them to do it differently. We should set parameters, but we shouldn't set up a parallel system and say, you award it that way, but we are going to direct ours this way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. I thank the gentleman.

And the reason why the gentleman from Arizona's amendment makes no sense at all is because the free market underinvests in public goods, public goods like education, like roads and research. The market will not put enough money into research, and the potato research program that Mr. FLAKE's amendment intends to cut has been highly successful in a multi-State effort in order to develop new commercial potato varieties.

The potatoes released from this program account for about 16 percent of current production. And the program not only creates new potato varieties for consumers; it also improves the nutritional value of potatoes and increases crop yields. In addition, this project provides significant environmental benefits, including reduction in the need for pesticides, water and fertilizer; and it fits into our overall goal of reducing energy consumption and increasing our production of the goods and services that we need.

Mr. FLAKE. I find it a curious assumption that the free market will not invest in research when one of the sponsors' Web sites, as I mentioned, states that every dollar invested in potato research results in a $39 return.

Now, any, any hedge fund, any investor of any type.

Mr. WU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. You bet, sure.

Mr. WU. The reason why the free market will underinvest, even though given that rate of return, it's whoever pays for the research doesn't reap the benefits. It's a public good. It's a basic of capitalist economic theory which the gentleman should understand.

Mr. FLAKE. I don't understand. I am sorry. If the return on investment, if the potato industry gets a return on an investment of $39 for every dollar returned, then it does reap some of the benefits. Yes, that potato is a public good, but it's also a private profit, unless we have socialized potato farming here, and I don't think we have.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLAKE. I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS).

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding and I do want to speak in opposition of this amendment, although I do support the gentleman from Arizona's effort to shine the late of day on spending, and I think that these debates are very important as we are making these decisions.

As has been mentioned, the funding in this bill does go for ongoing agricultural research, potatoes specifically in this amendment, and it does have a significant impact on the economy for the State of Washington and the Pacific Northwest. The ability of potato farmers to keep potato crops healthy and disease free, especially given the constant change in weather conditions and the arrival of new pests and disease, is an ongoing battle.

Yet through breeding research and variety development, potato growers have access to critical research that enables them to identify the strongest varieties for growth, production, storage and processing. Like most of us here, I am concerned about out-of-control spending. But I am also concerned about these tough economic times, and we should support measures that are going to grow the economy. This research does exactly that.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

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

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

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. KINGSTON

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. KINGSTON:

Page 74, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer, or pay the salary or expenses of personnel for the administration of, the provision of broadband loans or loan guarantees made using authorities under this Act on or before September 15, 2010.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 609, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, for many years the funding level for broadband programs or Rural Loan Program was handled by the Rural Utility Service in the Department of Agriculture. That funding was about $400 million. With the stimulus package that we passed in February, $790 billion package, there was about $7 billion for broadband grants and loan programs.

Two and a half billion of that money went to the Department of Agriculture, and the rest went to a brand-new program which really did the same thing and duplicated what is done in the Department of Agriculture. It all should have gone there. But if you think about a program going from 400 million to about 7 billion, that's not a plus-up. That's winning the lottery.

Now, I can only focus on $2.5 trillion, and you can't even do that because that's already in the stimulus bill already passed into law, but we can't focus on the $400 million.

□ 2215

What this amendment does, and frankly if I could have offered a cleaner amendment, I would have just had a straight cut of the $400 million. But what this does, it is similar; it says you can't use the $400 million that is in this until we have used the $2.5 billion that has already been passed into law.

The reason why that is important is when the stimulus bill was passed, there was so much talk about we are going to use this money immediately, shovel-ready projects, jobs will be created. And as we know, that was when the unemployment level was 8 percent and now it is nearly 10 percent. It has not stopped the bleed and job loss. But the fact is that $2.5 billion is still sitting there, and yet we are coming along now and giving another $400 million.

What this amendment says is we can't use the $400 million until the $2.5 billion is paid down. I urge support of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, rural broadband connects people and communities, gives them access to information on everything from health and housing and education to public safety and economic development. It also gives people access to opportunity.

As the Internet continues to grow and develop, and as it plays a larger and larger role in driving our 21st century economy, we simply cannot afford to let rural areas languish behind the rest of the country.

An earlier generation of leaders used Federal investment to help wire rural areas for electricity. What we are trying to do is give citizens in rural areas the tools they need to compete and excel in this economy.

By prohibiting funds from being used to administer or pay the salary of personnel who would administer USDA's broadband loans, the gentleman's amendment would gut this critical program at a time when we need to redouble our efforts in this area.

Let's be clear. In proposing to stop the administration of loans, the gentleman is also asking Congress to stop critical oversight and monitoring of existing borrowers, functions that the government cannot afford to lose, especially if we are to ensure that taxpayers' dollars are well spent.

No one can deny the need to expand access. The United States is currently 15th in the world in providing broadband service. Only 38 percent of those living in rural America now have broadband at home, compared to 55 percent of all adult Americans. In rural communities, 24 percent of dial-up users said broadband wasn't available where they lived, more than 7 times those in cities.

This is not a partisan issue. There is unanimous support for increased broadband service to rural communities. Few people disagree. Expanding broadband is the type of Federal program that cannot only connect rural areas to the global community, but also generate great growth in rural America and pay very big dividends for our Nation.

The bill makes important investments in rural broadband, provides $418 million for broadband loans and grants. It includes an appropriation of $81.6 million, an increase above $18 million of the amount available for 2009.

It includes distance learning. The funding is there for distance learning and telemedicine grants, for broadband telecommunications loan subsidy. This is an investment that requires national leadership, which is why we included a significant amount in the recovery program. It was $2.5 billion to rural utility services and more than $7 billion in total. There is already a substantial demand for the funding. The funding increases in this legislation help to build on the investment that was made in the Recovery Act, and it will help us to realize a strong economic return. For every dollar invested in broadband, the economy sees a tenfold return on that investment.

As the Farm Bureau noted regarding new investments in broadband, the $7.2 billion allocated for broadband will help rural communities participate in a recovering economy, while modernizing rural education and health care. It creates an economic opportunity for rural Americans, allows farmers and ranchers to take advantage of the technology to help them remain profitable and competitive.

I do not think this is the time to be gutting this program, particularly given the delicate state of our economic recovery. We need to do everything we can right now to promote rather than stifle economic innovation in small towns. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Kingston amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my friend, the chairwoman of the committee, that is a very eloquent argument for the use of a broadband loan program, but it has nothing to do with this amendment because the broadband loan program is not under trial here.

But let me explain it this way to the Members who are not on the committee. I love going to Ryan's, and they probably have Ryan's in Connecticut, but Ryan's is one of those all-you-can-eat buffets. You go through the line and there is fried chicken and there is fried fish, and fried catfish, probably imported, who knows? There are all kinds of vegetables and desserts. You go through and you fill your plate up, and then you are allowed for the $8 price to go back and get some more food.

Well, let's just think going through the line was the stimulus program, Mr. Chairman. We filled up our plates, and I often found myself as a father of four saying to my kids, you can't go get more food until you finish what is on your plate. It just makes sense. Go ahead and eat the four pieces of fried chicken that you got before you go and grab another one that you don't have and you don't need. That is all this amendment is. It is not a trial of broadband. Broadband is funded by $2.5 billion under the RUS in the USDA under existing law, period. So $2.5 billion.

And all I am saying to the oftentimes gluttonous government here in Washington, D.C., is, don't go back through the buffet line until you have consumed what you've got. And when you have emptied that plate, then you can go back and get that fifth piece of fried chicken in the form of $400 million for broadband loans. At that point I don't know who we will be loaning the money to because, as I said earlier, there is another $3.5 billion in another program in another department. But that, too, is a matter of law, and that is not under scrutiny either.

The only thing I am saying is what I have said to my four children over the years when we would go to the Ryan buffet: Don't get more food on your plate until you finish what you've got. I urge support of this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would be very much against the interest of rural America. There is no community in this country that will have a decent economic future if they cannot be competitive by being attached to modern technology, and that certainly includes broadband.

The gentleman has mentioned the economic recovery package and the funds that have been appropriated there, and he has made much of the fact that that money has not gone out. We are only 4 months into a program that is supposed to last 30 months, and so I urge the gentleman to wait a few months to see what happens on that project. I think you will see money moving out.

The only other point I would make is this: If you think there is too much money for broadband in the budget, the worst place in the world to take it out of is the USDA. When this program was first proposed in the stimulus package, the Obama administration proposed putting all of the money in the Commerce Department. People like me objected because we know the history of rural America. We understand why REAs had to be created to go into rural areas because the big power companies wouldn't bother, because they couldn't make enough money going into rural areas. It's the same score now. Your big companies don't want to go into rural areas without subsidy on broadband. The fact is you can trust the Agriculture Department to focus

much more on the needs of rural America than you can the Commerce Department. That's why we put the additional money in. And to take $400 million out of the Agriculture Department now would be a major mistake if you care about the future economic health of rural America.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman.

You know, I think this is truly about the economic revitalization of a part of the country that has been so sorely lacking, and the application process—

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 seconds to my friend to finish her sentence.

Ms. DELAURO. Well, I was just saying that the process on the economic recovery package, the application process is underway. It began at the beginning of this month. That money is going out. The demand is up for broadband. Let's give rural America a fighting chance.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say this, representing a very rural district, a district where you can't get cell phone coverage, and a lot of the wireless technology is in already, I support what is going on. I agree with the chairman; it would have been nice for all of the money to go into RUS and not the Department of Commerce because it was an existing infrastructure for making this loan program.

The only thing I am saying is you don't get the new money until you have spent the existing money.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

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

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. KOSMAS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SNYDER, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2997) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PAGE BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 88b–3, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the House of Representatives Page Board:

Mr. KILDEE, Michigan

Ms. DEGETTE, Colorado

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, Republican Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 2, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 88b–3, amended by section 2 of the House Page Board Revision Act of 2007, I am pleased to re-appoint the Honorable Rob Bishop of Utah and the Honorable Virginia Foxx of North Carolina to the Page Board. Both Mr. Bishop and Mrs. Foxx have expressed interest in serving in this capacity and I am pleased to fulfill their requests.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Republican Leader.

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PAGE BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 88b–3, amended by section 2 of the House Page Board Revision Act of 2007, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's and minority leader's joint reappointment of the following individuals to the House of Representatives Page Board for a term of 1 year, effective July 8, 2009:

Ms. Lynn Silversmith Klein of Maryland

Mr. Adam Jones of Michigan

HEALTH CARE DEBATE

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUNT. As we approach this debate on health care, there are Republican principles that have been out there a long time that are going to be followed this week by legislation. One of those principles is to ensure that medical decisions are made by patients and doctors, not by government bureaucrats.

I am going to insert in the RECORD an article from yesterday's Wall Street Journal. The title is ''Of NICE and Men,'' NICE being the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence in Great Britain. And this article talks about what happens when you have rationed care.

Great Britain has one of the lowest survival rates in Europe from cancer. And in Europe generally, if you compare Europe to the United States, breast cancer survivors, 84 percent in the United States, 73 percent in Europe; prostate cancer survivors, 92 percent in the United States, 57 percent in Europe.

People need to have more choices, not less choices. We need a more competitive marketplace, not a less competitive marketplace. A government competitor will drive away all other competitors. That will be a critical part of this debate.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 7, 2009]

OF NICE AND MEN

Speaking to the American Medical Association last month, President Obama waxed enthusiastic about countries that ''spend less'' than the U.S. on health care. He's right that many countries do, but what he doesn't want to explain is how they ration care to do it.

Take the United Kingdom, which is often praised for spending as little as half as much per capita on health care as the U.S. Credit for this cost containment goes in large part to the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, or NICE. Americans should understand how NICE works because under ObamaCare it will eventually be coming to a hospital near you.

The British officials who established NICE in the late 1990s pitched it as a body that would ensure that the government-run National Health System used ''best practices'' in medicine. As the Guardian reported in 1998: ''Health ministers are setting up [NICE], designed to ensure that every treatment, operation, or medicine used is the proven best. It will root out under-performing doctors and useless treatments, spreading best practices everywhere.''

What NICE has become in practice is a rationing board. As health costs have exploded in Britain as in most developed countries, NICE has become the heavy that reduces spending by limiting the treatments that 61 million citizens are allowed to receive through the NHS. For example:

In March, NICE ruled against the use of two drugs, Lapatinib and Sutent, that prolong the life of those with certain forms of breast and stomach cancer. This followed on a 2008 ruling against drugs—including Sutent, which costs about $50,000—that would help terminally ill kidney-cancer patients. After last year's ruling, Peter Littlejohns, NICE's clinical and public health director, noted that ''there is a limited pot of money,'' that the drugs were of ''marginal benefit at quite often an extreme cost,'' and the money might be better spent elsewhere.

In 2007, the board restricted access to two drugs for macular degeneration, a cause of blindness. The drug Macugen was blocked outright. The other, Lucentis, was limited to a particular category of individuals with the disease, restricting it to about one in five sufferers. Even then, the drug was only approved for use in one eye, meaning those lucky enough to get it would still go blind in the other. As Andrew Dillon, the chief executive of NICE, explained at the time: ''When treatments are very expensive, we have to use them where they give the most benefit to patients.''

NICE has limited the use of Alzheimer's drugs, including Aricept, for patients in the early stages of the disease. Doctors in the U.K. argued vociferously that the most effective way to slow the progress of the disease is to give drugs at the first sign of dementia. NICE ruled the drugs were not ''cost effective'' in early stages.

Other NICE rulings include the rejection of Kineret, a drug for rheumatoid arthritis; Avonex, which reduces the relapse rate in patients with multiple sclerosis; and