United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 2013 No. 88

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I continue to be disappointed in the House leadership in that we are not looking into this issue of the CIA giving tens of millions of dollars to Karzai, the corrupt leader of Afghanistan. We don't hold any hearings about it, we're spending money there, and kids are still dying. In fact, we had four American soldiers killed yesterday in Afghanistan.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Senator CORKER from Tennessee for taking the lead on Monday and writing a letter to the Secretary of State, John Kerry, and demanding an explanation of the secret payments by the CIA. I fully agree with the Senator's decision to place a hold on U.S. funding for Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, we're still having kids killed in Afghanistan, severely wounded, and yet there is no full debate on the floor of the House. That to me is a tragedy. We should be debating the issue of Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, to make things worse, yesterday in The New York Times, Karzai's office made the following statement:

> In view of the contradictions between acts and statements made by the United States of America in regard to the peace process, the Afghan Government suspended negotiations currently under way in Kabul between Afghan and the U.S. delegations, on the bilateral security agreement.

Mr. Speaker, it would be my wish that we would just totally scrap the bilateral security agreement. That means that America would be there for 10 more years after 2014 with a semblance of a military presence and also spending money that we don't have. This is just another failed policy that we in the Congress continue to support.

Karzai will not last as the leader of Afghanistan. What will happen is the Taliban will eventually take over. They are the Pashtuns that make up the majority of the Taliban. They are the largest tribe in Afghanistan, and they will eventually lead Afghanistan.

I do not understand why the Taliban that we're fighting today, who will probably be the leaders in the next 2 or 3 years of Afghanistan, why we're going to support them with finances and with young men and women. There's something wrong here, and I hope that the House of Representatives, the leadership in both parties, will come together and say we're going to debate the policy in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, this cartoon that I have that I've been handing out in a flyer to members in my district, it's got Mr. Karzai standing in front of a CIA ATM machine. He's got a little card. I guess it's paid for by Uncle Sam. He's taking money out, and you can see bags of cash at his feet. Karzai says: ''I'm just making a quick withdrawal.'' But the sad thing about it is that a soldier standing behind him says: ''I would like to make a quick withdrawal from Afghanistan.''

I hope the American people will put pressure on the House and Senate to stop spending money we don't have in Afghanistan if for no other reason than to save the lives of our young men and women who are dying over there each and every week. And I will continue to ask how a Nation that is financially broke can continue to pay a corrupt leader to stay in power when he criticizes us in the paper almost every other week.

It's time for Congress to meet its responsibility based on the Constitution and have a debate on this war in Afghanistan.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God in His loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I ask God to bless the House and the Senate, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God. I ask God to please bless the President, that he will do what is right in the eyes of God. And I close three times by saying God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

SNAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Last week I went shopping. I wouldn't exactly call it a spree. What I did was I went to one of the lowest cost grocery stores in the Eugene-Springfield area where I live to try and purchase a week's worth of food for $31.50. That's the average SNAP benefit for a single individual.

There are those on the other side of the aisle with regard to the FARRM Bill that will come up later today and say, This is the first place to cut: food assistance to hungry people, to kids, to seniors, to the unemployed, the disabled. That's where they want to cut first.

Printed on recycled paper.

I wonder how many of them have ever tried to budget for themselves or for their spouse and child at $31.50 per person for a week. It doesn't go too far. In fact, I ended up a little bit over because we miscalculated on weighing some apples. I had three apples, but I had to put one back and would have had to cut back a little bit more on the pasta to make the $31.50 budget limit.

There are these incredible stereotypes out there about the SNAP program, the food assistance program formerly called food stamps, that all these people are on welfare. No. Actually, 92 percent of the people getting SNAP benefits are not on welfare. Half of them are children and 22 percent are on Social Security or Social Security Disability. So they're either seniors or disabled. The rest are unemployed or underemployed. And at $31.50 a week—a benefit that the other side of the aisle wants to cut—many of these people now can't make it through the month. This is pretty paltry stuff if you look at it and you think about doing this week in and week out.

Most people in Oregon—and Oregon is a lower cost State than many for food—run out sometimes in the third week of their benefits and they have to get emergency food assistance. Our food banks provided 1 million boxes of emergency food assistance last year. Yet, those on that side of the aisle would begrudge these people, their children, these seniors, these disabled an adequate budget for a very minimal diet.

□ 1010

It's extraordinary to me.

My State—and most people don't think of us this way—we are the fourth highest per capita in terms of food stamp utilization. Fourth highest per capita, because outside of our major urban areas, the economy has not recovered from the collapse that Wall Street caused in housing and other areas. We had recreational vehicles; that industry is gone. We had some high tech; that's moved on. We had a lot of construction, home building, wood products—pretty well decimated. The rural areas I have in my rural counties—real unemployment of 20 percent. People are struggling to make ends meet, and we're going to cut their benefits? They want to work. Some of them are working, and we even have a higher minimum wage than most States, but it still won't get you through to the end of the month for your family. This is just outrageous.

There are ways to cut this bill. We're going to stop paying—finally, at last, we're going to stop paying people not to grow things. But now we're going to have a new program of crop insurance. And some estimates are that this program—which goes to anybody with an unlimited income in this bill, that is, if you're a corporate farm and you earn $2 million a year, the government is going to pay for 80 percent of your crop insurance cost. Eighty percent subsidy from the taxpayers. Why is that?

We could cut back on the eligibility, and this would be a pretty big income for any farmer I know of. If you earn over a quarter-million dollars a year, go buy your own crop insurance. I think it even could be a little lower than that in my State and in most States. That would save as much money as they're going to save by eliminating food assistance to hungry kids, seniors, unemployed and underemployed, and disabled Americans. These are the cruelest cuts possible.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment later today which would restore these benefits.

U.S. ARMS SYRIAN REBELS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is a war going on in Syria. Some call it a civil war. It may have started out as a civil war, but it has escalated. The Government of Syria, is ruled by the dictator Assad. He's a bad guy; no question about it. Several rebel groups, and we're still not sure who all these people are, are trying to remove him from power. World powers seem to be taking sides in this battle.

You have the Syrian Government supported by Iran and Russia. There's also this little terrorist group called Hezbollah supporting the regime. But on the other side, you've got the rebels, numerous groups, including al Qaeda, a terrorist group. You've got Saudi Arabia; Qatar; you've got the Muslim Brotherhood from Egypt supporting the rebels. Turkey is concerned, and even Great Britain has weighed in on this, a former colonial power in the region. And so more and more groups and nations are lining up in this war in Syria that's been going on for 2 years; 100,000 people have been killed by both sides. Refugees are leaving the country and going to other countries.

I recently was in Turkey on the border of Turkey and Syria, and I saw a refugee camp that had 150,000 Syrians that had escaped the war in Syria. No question the U.S. should help with humanitary aid.

And finally now the United States, after 2 years, we've decided we're going to take sides. The President has said we're going to give arms to the Syrian rebels and that they're going to be vetted so we make sure that we're not giving those to other terrorist groups. I don't know if we're going to do a universal background check on the rebels, or what; but small arms for the rebels?

Here's what the President said:

> We're not taking sides in this religious war between Shia and Sunni. Really, what we are trying to do is take sides against extremists of all sorts.

Well, it seems to me what we are really doing is taking both sides and we're arming extremists at least on one side. And I ask the question: What is the national security interest of the United States to be involved in somebody else's war? There isn't one. We don't have a national security interest to be involved in this war. The United States seems to have a habit of getting involved in other people's business; and once again, we have made the problem in Syria our problem by being involved and supporting the rebel groups.

What is the goal of the United States's involvement? This war is not going to be easily won by the rebels. Are we going to then add more military power to the rebels? What's the end game? What is the goal here, to put another rebel group in power in another country?

You know, we've kind of forgotten what we did in Libya. There's Muammar Qadhafi, the bad guy of Libya. No question about it, a horrible person. So what does the United States do? We support the rebels who overthrow the Libyan President, the Libyan dictator. We sent small arms. And you know, Mr. Speaker, those small arms are still in North Africa, and they've spread all over North Africa. We don't know what has happened to those weapons that the United States gave to those rebels. Only time will tell.

So this is not our war; yet we seem to be very interested in supporting this, as the President correctly said, a religious war. You've got the Shia's and you've got the Sunnis. They've been at each other since the year 630, and they haven't resolved their conflicts and yet here a century and a half later, another conflict is involved. It's a religious war between two groups in the Middle East. It is escalating. The United States' national interest is not at stake. What the United States should do and work toward is a political solution to this problem, not a military solution to this problem, and do what we can to resolve it politically and help really both sides resolve it.

This is not our war, Mr. Speaker. We have no national security interest. There's no American goal. We don't know the goal. We don't know the end result, and we don't even know who we are arming as those rebels. They could be made up of criminals, patriots, al Qaeda. We ought not be involved in this war that has no national security interest for the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

IN SUPPORT OF SUGAR REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express support for the Pitts-Davis-Goodlatte-Blumenauer amendment to the agriculture bill. Our amendment to H.R. 1947, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, will not repeal the sugar program; it only seeks to reform it. We have farm programs for wheat, corn, cotton, and many other crops. These programs give direct assistance to farmers and allow market prices to

be set by supply and demand. Farmers receive help, but not at the expense of workers and consumers.

The sugar program is different. It helps sugar producers by hurting other people, and that's just not right. There are other ways sugar farmers who may need help could receive assistance without embracing an outdated system of strict government controls that cost consumers $3.5 billion per year in higher prices and over 112,000 lost jobs in the sugar-using industries in the last decade.

During fiscal year 2011, the wholesale price for U.S.-refined beet sugar averaged 55.8 cents per pound. This is considerably higher than the average recorded cost during the 5-year period covered by the 2002 farm bill provisions for FY 2003 through FY 2007, which was 27.6 cents per pound. Last month, the average price for U.S.-refined beet sugar was 26.3 cents per pound, whereas the average world-refined sugar price was 21.9 cents per pound. Historically, our sugar program keeps our markets higher regardless of demand and/or supply compared to world prices for sugar.

The U.S. manufacturers who use sugar as an ingredient to produce processed foods and drinks are having to always pay more domestically than manufacturers overseas. This is the exact reason why candy companies are moving to countries like Canada, Mexico, and other offshore places.

□ 1020

We need an industry that is subject to capital market forces without government intrusion, that places quotas on the amount of sugar that can be grown in the United States, and restricts access to foreign-grown sugar.

The current sugar program benefits 4,714 sugar farmers in the United States, while threatening the jobs of 600,000 workers in sugar-using industries and, thus, imposing a hidden tax on every American consumer. The Pitts-Davis-Goodlatte-Blumenauer amendment would lower the price-support loan rate in accordance to historic levels and reduce taxpayers' liability for keeping prices high, save taxpayers money, allow more sugar imports, and provide the U.S. Department of Agriculture more flexibility to modify domestic marketing allotments.

Making changes to the sugar program will help level the playing field and provide sugar-based manufacturers much-needed resources to keep people employed and modernize their production facilities.

Let's not help the few at the expense of the many. Vote ''yes'' for the Pitts-Davis-Goodlatte-Blumenauer amendment.

THE FARRM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the FARRM Bill is now before us. It's a measure originating in the House of Representatives, whose majority was elected on a clear mandate to stop wasting money. Yet all this bill does is continue to waste money.

Yes, it tightens up a little on automatic eligibility for food stamps, and that's a good thing. Yet this modest reform is a poor substitute for the complete overhaul that is desperately needed.

The food stamp program, now called SNAP, was originally intended to provide basic commodities to the truly needy. Yet I cannot count the number of constituents who have complained to me over the last several years about standing in a grocery line and watching the person in front of them use SNAP cards to buy luxuries that these hardworking taxpayers could not themselves afford.

But it is the corporate welfare provisions that this bill continues, and in some case expands, that I find the most offensive.

Yes, the bill shifts us away from direct payments to farmers; but it, instead, grossly expands taxpayer-subsidized crop insurance programs, eating up about three-quarters of the savings the supporters purport to achieve. The practical effect is to guarantee profits to farmers, while shifting their losses to taxpayers.

We're told that if the bill fails, these wasteful programs will continue with no reform. Well, actually, many of the most wasteful programs would expire, like the $150 million to advertise farmers markets.

But the fine point of it is this: If this bill is defeated, the House can take up real reform at any time. If it is passed, we kick that can another 5 years down the road.

To those who say this is a small step in the right direction, I would agree, it is a very small step. It makes tiny and modest changes to an utterly atrocious program. According to the CBO, it would save all of 3.4 percent from the baseline over the next 5 years, hardly a crowning achievement for fiscal reform.

But there's no blinking at the fact that these programs are fundamentally unfair and grossly wasteful, and this bill locks them into law for another 5 years. If the supporters of this bill were actually serious about incremental reform, this would be a 1-year authorization with additional reforms planned next year. It most decidedly is not.

Let me explain clearly what this bill means to an average, hardworking, taxpaying family in my district. That family must struggle and scrimp to keep their shop open. They bear the entire financial risk of failure; and their profits, if there are any, are heavily taxed.

A portion of that family's taxes goes to the agriculture industry for the express purpose of inflating the prices that that family must pay at the grocery store. As a result, when the family goes grocery shopping, it must scrimp again in order to bear these artificially higher prices that have been forced up by their own high taxes.

As that family stands in the checkout line with their ground chuck for the barbecue tonight, they watch SNAP cards used by others to pay for premium steaks that family can't afford for itself, but paid for by that family's own high taxes.

If the economy sours, that family bears its own losses, while it also pays to cover the losses of the same agricultural interests responsible for their pain at the grocery store.

The bill before us continues this travesty for another 5 years, with soothing assurances from its supporters to cheer up, things could be worse. Well, actually, things couldn't be much worse, and they could be a whole lot better.

This bill, for example, could be defeated and replaced with genuine reform. The government could be withdrawn from its corrupt interventions in agricultural markets. The food stamp program could be restored to its original purpose, to provide basic commodities to the truly needy, and individual consumers could be free to determine the price of their groceries by the decisions that they make every day over what to spend at the grocery store, and not on the basis of what deals were cut in Congress.

The Roman writer Phaedrus summed up this bill rather neatly 20 centuries ago. He said:

> A mountain was in labor, sending forth dreadful groans, and there was in the region the highest expectation. After all that, it brought forth a mouse.

THE IMPACTS OF CONGRESSIONAL DYSFUNCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the damage from Congress' inability to do its job and pass a budget, and the unreasonable lengths that folks have to go to cover for the reckless policy of sequestration.

As I said the very first time I spoke in this Chamber, Congress should be doing all it can to replace the across-the-board cuts caused by sequestration with a balanced, bipartisan, long-term budget. Cutting across the board is not a strategy. In fact, it's anti-strategic.

Unfortunately, this Congress has been stuck in ''park'' when it comes to working toward a long-term budget. In fact, Congress has only passed 13 bills in 6 months, none of them dealing with jobs, and none of them working to replace these nonstrategic cuts.

Congress needs to understand the impacts of its dysfunction. In my district, we see those consequences every day.

I'm a member of the House Armed Services Committee, and I'm proud to represent several military installations, including Naval Base Kitsap and

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, and I represent many men and women who work at Joint Base Lewis-McChord. The Navy, in fact, is the largest employer in my district.

I'm frequently copied on emails from civilian Navy workers who are resigning because of the disarray caused by Congress, the threat of furloughs, and the loss of cost-of-living adjustments. Workers often choose those jobs, despite lower salaries, because they love their country and they want to protect it. Also, government offers stability that the private industry often can't.

But these workers no longer feel valued; and thanks to Congress, working at the shipyard doesn't even offer stability anymore. It's affecting the morale of our workers and the ability of our shipyard to execute its mission.

Here's a direct quote from a manager who contacted me. He wrote:

> We will have problems retaining professionals if this fiscal environment continues. We will have trouble accomplishing our current workload, let alone providing any level of increased engineering support.

Mr. Speaker, this will only cost us more in the long run. This dysfunction in Congress is directly responsible for good workers walking away and is threatening the mission of the United States Navy.

It also affects the local contractors and small businesses in my district that support these missions. They're already facing sweeping layoffs and tremendous uncertainty.

Here's another example: Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, in my district, while mostly spared from furloughs under sequestration, still is limited in its ability to fill jobs made vacant by attrition. The hiring freeze went into effect right as they were planning on adding 600 workers.

The shipyard has the work. Our region needs the jobs. They've only recently announced that they can slowly hire to cover for some attrition.

□ 1030

Because of these constraints, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard has resorted to asking anyone—upper level staff, anybody who has carried a tool bag or used a wrench—to help deliver three submarines and an aircraft carrier back to the fleet. That's a testament to the lengths people are going to to cover for such an insane policy like sequestration.

We have seen the same thing at Joint Base Lewis-McChord, where 10,000 civilian employees have received notice of furloughs. We have seen it affect military training where we've seen rotations to the National Training Center cancelled. General Brown at Joint Base Lewis-McChord told our paper:

> It's a huge impact on training. Where is the fine line where you go from being the best in the world to second best?

It's not right that Congress doesn't have their backs on this. We have got to stop this policy. From my perspective and from the perspective of the folks who have to deal with this damaging policy every day, it doesn't matter who's to blame for the idea of sequestration. All that matters is that both parties work together to stop it.

Every day that this Congress doesn't work on coming together on a balanced, long-term budget is another day that folks around the country have to cover for Congress' dysfunction. Democrats and Republicans need to work together on this. This doesn't make sense for the folks in my district who face losing up to 20 percent of their pay or for the folks in my district who can't apply for an open job because of our budget uncertainty.

It doesn't make sense for the kids in Head Start programs who are hurt by sequestration. We should stop these across-the-board cuts for them, too.

The right solution is for Congress to replace these cuts altogether with a balanced, long-term budget. I am ready to work with both parties to get this done for our national security, for our economy, and for the American people who deserve better.

150 REASONS TO LOVE WEST VIRGINIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, we began the ''150 Reasons to Love West Virginia'' project to honor our State's 150th birthday, which is tomorrow. We asked West Virginians to send us what they love about the Mountain State, and they delivered.

Many people cited West Virginia's strong heritage and rich history as reasons to love our State. We all know that West Virginia is rooted in the values of hard work and the respect of our neighbors. I love how West Virginia friends are for a lifetime. My family's history is deeply rooted in the State of West Virginia, and I love that. I love the State's nicknames, ''Wild and Wonderful'' and ''Almost Heaven.''

David J. Stoffel said:

> We are a collection of communities joined by a common trust, respect, love, and willingness to help our neighbor. Once you are a Mountaineer, you will always be a Mountaineer.

Anita Keaton wrote that small, quaint towns throughout West Virginia like Thomas and Thurmond are the ''heart and soul of our great State.''

It all began in June in 1861, when a group of pro-Union Virginians met in Wheeling, West Virginia. Together, they created the Restored Government of Virginia, which sought to rebuild ties with the Union. On April 20, West Virginia became the only State in the Union to acquire its sovereignty by proclamation of the President of the United States, and that President was Abraham Lincoln. And on June 20, 1863, 150 years ago tomorrow, we formally joined the Union.

As a community flourishes, it gives birth to local myths and legends. We tell stories to our children so they can someday tell those stories to their children. West Virginia has its fair share of true stories and legends. We have Mothman, and we also have a tale of the Hatfield and McCoy feud, which is a story of family honor, justice, and vengeance. We have very well respected West Virginians who are here today with us: Chuck Yeager, Jerry West, Mary Lou Retton, Jessica Lynch, Jennifer Garner, and a gentleman who shares my hometown, a very small town of West Virginia, Glen Dale, Mr. Brad Paisley.

''Pioneer stories'' like the Hatfields and McCoys have been passed down from generation to generation, as noted by Deb Walizer. These legends bring the people of West Virginia together. They allow us to put aside our differences and share a common bond in our heritage.

That strong-knit community is also built through events like the one I've attended many times—and one time with President Bush—the Fourth of July celebration parade in Ripley, West Virginia. As Tracy Wolford Kelley mentioned, she loves the parade in Ripley, Symphony Sundays or the Forest Festival or attending a Mountaineer football game on a crisp fall evening. All victory is welcome.

West Virginia is not only rich in history, but it is rich in natural beauty. From ''trout fishing the Cranberry and Williams River,'' as Jo Belcher noted, or West Virginia's ''beautiful vistas of tree-covered mountain,'' as mentioned by Emmett Pepper of Charleston, there are many reasons to love and enjoy our State's scenic beauty. West Virginia is a peaceful place.

These images and places make the changes in season particularly beautiful, which Robin Barnette says looks like ''God's coloring book.'' They also bring families and friends together, as Connie Sherman of Moorefield, West Virginia, mentioned talking about the Trough River.

Whether it's simple things like West Virginia pepperoni rolls or the coal fields and natural gas that power our economy, there is so much to love about the State we call home. For 150 years, its country roads have provided the men and women who have traveled them with a sense of comfort and pride.

And no matter where we are in the country or around the world, we all do like to sing the John Denver song ''Almost Heaven, West Virginia,'' which, by the way, my granddaughter can sing from front to back.

While these anecdotes about why we love West Virginia only touch on what makes our State so great, I want to thank you and the folks of West Virginia for celebrating with me. There will be celebrations all throughout the State over the next several days.

I love West Virginia, and I'm honored to serve the citizens of an outstanding State. So from me to you, happy 150th birthday, West Virginia.

THE SAN GABRIEL WATERSHED RESTORATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. I rise today to introduce the San Gabriel Watershed Restoration Act of 2013. This bill could revitalize a California urban river by directing the Army Corps of Engineers to prepare a study analyzing the current state of the San Gabriel River Watershed and how it can be transformed into a destination for Los Angeles County.

We have such incredible resources right in our backyard in the San Gabriel Valley, and at the heart is the San Gabriel River. That is why we must do all that we can to revitalize and protect this space.

My communities are desperate for more open space to run, play, and explore. The L.A. area is one of the most park poor in the country. The San Gabriel River, only steps from our homes, used to be a green, lush paradise. The local Gabrielino tribespeople used to canoe down its waters out to the sea, but today, in its current state, it feels more like an abandoned waterway than the majestic river it once was. There are so few places for families to sit and enjoy or to swim in its cool waters on unbearably hot summer days in the urban valley cities.

The San Gabriel River also performs essential flood protection, drinking water recharge, and storm water conservation functions. But it is inaccessible to local residents for recreation and lacks many natural and riparian ecosystems. Additional provisions for flood control and water quality control are also sorely needed.

Increasingly, residents have expressed the desire to rediscover the river and offer more of its benefits to all the communities along its route. That's why I introduced this bill in the 111th Congress to study how we can improve the river and expand its use, and that is why I'm introducing this bill again.

The study created in this bill would look at the best ways to revitalize the watershed, focusing on ecosystem restoration, outdoor recreation enhancements, and ways to conserve rainwater and keep our water clean. This vital project is a first step—that is long overdue—toward creating more outdoor space within the highly urbanized watershed communities so that people can enjoy this beautiful resource in a safe and sustainable way.

A similar study and demonstration project were critical steps in the effort to revitalize the Los Angeles River, and it was so successful that now there are regular kayaking trips on the L.A. River, a place many thought of as only a concrete wasteland. People can actually enjoy this little bit of nature again. This is a powerful testament to the potential and growing success of river revitalization efforts.

□ 1040

My communities have a vision: to create an Emerald Necklace, a 17-mile loop of multi-benefit parks connecting 10 cities along the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel Rivers. This bill is a critical part of realizing this dream, and I call on my colleagues in Congress to support this bill and help make their vision a reality for generations to come.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, as we come to the House floor this morning, many communities across the West suffer from severe wildfires, and they're having a more devastating impact due to extreme drought conditions this year. In my home State of New Mexico, firefighters have bravely worked to battle a number of blazes, and I extend my sincerest thanks for their tireless efforts.

With global climate change contributing to drier and hotter summers and more intense fire seasons, it is critical that we take steps to address the root causes of climate change before it gets too late. And while we should focus on the steps we must take to reduce greenhouse gases and encourage energy conservation, we must also ensure that we're preparing for the drought conditions that will continue to impact our communities in the years to come. The National Integrated Drought Information System is an important tool in this effort. This program collects and consolidates drought-related data and information. It operates regional drought early warning system pilot projects across the country.

Authorization for this program is currently scheduled to end this year. That is why I'm working in a bipartisan effort to reauthorize the National Integrated Drought Information System for another 4 years. This will enable the Federal Government to further develop regional drought early warning systems and identify research, monitoring, and forecasting needs that can help farmers and firefighters alike. Because whether it's growing crops or raising livestock or battling wildfires in the West, drought conditions in the coming years will continue to pose challenges for our communities, and we will need to do all we can to assist those whose lives and livelihoods are impacted by climate change.

Mr. Speaker, today I'm also offering an amendment to be able to provide grant authorization to many small, predominantly Hispanic communities across northern New Mexico that are in these areas where these waterways have been carved through our mountains, through our watersheds to provide opportunity to small farmers, rural communities all across New Mexico called acequias.

For many years, local farmers in New Mexico have been asking for an amendment that would allow acequia and community ditch associations to access EQIP funds. An acequia is a centuries-old irrigation structure that is still in use today, providing opportunities for many private land owners all across New Mexico and southern Colorado.

The board of private land owners, also called an acequia and community ditch association, is in charge of administering maintenance of the irrigation infrastructure which often requires work on sections of the ditch of the acequia on private land. These small community ditch associations do not have the authority to levy taxes. That's why I'm asking for Members to please consider and offer your support on this amendment today.

Members who are watching and tuning in to C–SPAN this morning, as well as offices, please take a look at this amendment. We need your help in New Mexico, and our farmers would certainly appreciate the kind support of Members of Congress.

So thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. We have a lot of work to do. Let's make sure we can get this done on behalf of people who are struggling and working all across America today.

WEST VIRGINIA'S 150TH BIRTHDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from the State of West Virginia in celebrating our State's 150th birthday tomorrow. We invite the rest of the Nation to join in our revelry and reflection.

Ours is a proud history of doing our part, and then some, in service to this great Nation of ours. West Virginia was born of war, and West Virginians understand full well the price of service and sacrifice to defend our shores. In times of war, the Mountain State's sons and daughters have answered their country's call faithfully, honorably, and nobly. And in times of peace, we have continued to serve our Nation from our mountains and our hollows.

Geologists tell us our ancient mountains' sharp peaks, in ages long past, were rounded and smoothed through the forces of nature over the eons of time. The result satisfies the soul.

Thanks to the U.S. Postal Service, the world can get a glimpse of our majestic mountains on a new stamp commemorating our 150 years. Based on a photograph taken in Pocahontas County, West Virginia, that stamp stands as a testament that our bragging about being ''Almost Heaven'' is every inch legitimate.

Those same mountains, Mr. Speaker, have honed and hewn a people for whom the phrase ''Mountaineers are always free'' is more than a State motto; it is a way of life.

West Virginians may be somewhat stubborn when it comes to asking for help for themselves, even if life itself depends on it; but they are the first in line to offer help and assistance to their neighbors. And in West Virginia, Mr. Speaker, we go a step further. I doubt we have ever known a stranger in any of our 55 counties. If you need help, West Virginians are there for you.

The charitable spirit of West Virginia is built on rock-solid principles. First and foremost, you will find an abundance of faith among those who dwell in our mountains, faith in the Almighty. Families form the core of our lives, with West Virginia parents and grandparents putting their children and grandchildren first. You figure in that a big dose of loyalty to our hills and hollows, our family traditions, our common heritage, and our many unique histories, and you begin to see why hard times cannot keep us down.

Like most of America, West Virginians are in the midst of a transitional economy, but a new dawn is breaking. We have harnessed positive change while holding on to much that makes West Virginia unique, enabling us to attract new and promising ventures.

Witness the 100-year commitment of the Boy Scouts of America's almost half-billion-dollar investment in a Fayette County scouting reserve adjacent to the largest federally protected system of rivers east of the Mississippi. Recently, Wayne Perry, the Boy Scouts' national president, when commenting on our rugged but inviting mountain venue, said, ''We think God made West Virginia for the Boy Scouts of America.''

Mr. Speaker, I have news for my colleagues and their constituents: we have more room at the inn. This may be our 150th birthday celebration, but West Virginia is still wild and even more wonderful than ever before. So I say to all, come and visit us soon.

To my fellow West Virginians, may I say a happy 150th. And be assured, as long as there is still one Mountaineer heart beating, there will always be a West Virginia.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues in the House of two very important words for the American people: unfinished business. The American people, by their voices that we hear as we go back to our district, challenge us in unfinished business.

Two days ago, I stood with mothers that demand action in my district, to stand with their children, their babies in strollers—these mothers who love America, who are patriots—to stand alongside of the mourning families of Sandy Hook and to read the names of the 26 who died more than 6 months ago, to ask for the passage of universal background checks; and to ask the question why the Armed Citizens Project needed to arm citizens in Houston. We know that the area that they are arming is an area where they felt intimidated—not by their government to take over, but because of crime.

I look forward to meeting with those citizens to be able to address the issue of crime in their neighborhood. But we stood against the kind of arming citizens as a response to gun violence. I have no qualms of standing against that and working with my neighbors to ensure the safety of their neighborhoods, but to move forward on sensible gun legislation to prevent gun violence—unfinished business.

And then the question of the National Security Agency and the phone calls and numbers of our American citizens.

□ 1050

We in Congress must be challenged to rein that in and balance it with the need for national security, which I promote and support as a member of the Homeland Security Committee.

I will be introducing legislation to assess the use of outside contractors—70 percent of Federal dollars going to that in the intelligence community—and reduce those numbers by 2014; establish more openness on the FISA court, but making sure that we don't interfere with operations and operatives that are making our country secure. And to be able to say to Mr. Snowden, I won't call you a name, but I know what you did in certain instances is wrong, and you must stand up under the laws of this Nation.

Then to be able to say that, today, as we go forward on the farm bill, to be able to ask the question: Why are we taking $20 billion away from the supplemental nutrition program, from seniors, from young children, from babies, when this is a lifeline for those in the United States military who are on food stamps?

I also want to say to my community that we need to get ready to enroll in health care, which is going to be a major step in making America healthy.

To the small business community, this is going to help you provide your employees—your one employee, your two employees—health care. That is unfinished business.

Then I want to thank the U.S. Postal Service—the letter carriers, the people who put our mail through—who help small businesses. We've got to fix this problem with the U.S. Postal Service, make sure that they're stable, financially able. The rural post offices, let's not close any more. This is the infrastructure of America. It's a job creator.

And then to our students, many of them who have graduated, we have got to fix the problem of the increasing, or the major increase, in student loan interest rates that are going to burden our parents and students, 6.8 percent by July 1. Congress can do better. We need to be able to join in the legislation that I've signed on to, to be able to keep that interest rate at 3.4 percent. Unfinished business, Mr. Speaker.

The American people want jobs. They don't want sequestration. They want the right kind of comprehensive immigration reform that has reasoned border security but not to criminalize those students who wanted to do nothing else but to go into the United States military, called ''DREAM children,'' who wanted to be able to serve the Nation, who wanted to work and give back to this country. Let us not go down that pathway. Let's have the kind of value-based comprehensive immigration reform and border security legislation that was passed out of the Homeland Security Committee, of which I was proud to be an original cosponsor, coming out of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security. Unfinished business.

Guns. Preventing gun violence.

Reining in the issue of intelligence, balancing it with civil liberties, putting back in the supplemental nutrition some $20 billion, making sure that Americans are enrolled in health care under the Affordable Care Act, supporting the Postal Service. And, Mr. Speaker, finally, supporting our students. Unfinished business. It's time to get to work creating jobs in America.

JOBS NOW ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON of Florida) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people are now in the 899th day of a scandal that is truly ''worse than Watergate.'' Yet, this scandal has nothing to do with Cincinnati or the AP or Benghazi or even NSA. It is the scandal of this Republican Congress failing to bring a single serious bill to address our unemployment crisis to the floor for a vote.

The tens of millions of people affected by this scandal are not constantly on television drawing attention to their plight; they're too busy looking for work. They're not hiring lobbyists to press for change; they're too busy figuring out how they're going to pay for their next meals, for the roofs over their heads, or for their children's college tuition.

Mr. Speaker, this scandal, unlike so many other scandals in history, is one that you can end instantly. You have the power to bring the Jobs Now Act to the floor for a vote. It deserves a vote.

Mr. Speaker, the only scandal that matters to the American people right now is this Congress' failure to address unemployment. Our mantra should be: jobs, jobs, jobs for the American people.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend James Rehder, Pilgrim Lutheran Church, Bellevue, Washington, offered the following prayer:

Lord, You are our strength. Grant that we may become a people united in love and peace.

Grant favor to all who hold office in our land, especially President Obama and Vice President BIDEN, this Congress, Governors, legislatures, all who make and administer our laws. May all be high in purpose, wise in counsel, firm in good resolution, and unwavering in duty.

Holy Spirit, we commend to You our schools, those who learn and teach, that our children may thrive in safe havens and bring forth the fruit of their lives and dreams.

Grant our Armed Forces personnel and families courage and success, and us, for whom they sacrifice, our unending respect and gratitude.

Receive our thanksgiving for those who serve, protect, labor, farm, care, heal, create, and lead. Thank You for this abundant land. Give us calm compassion to live as one nation under You.

In Jesus' name, amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FOXX led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND JAMES REHDER OF PILGRIM LUTHERAN CHURCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to rise to welcome my good friend, the Reverend James Rehder and his daughter, Mele, who is with him today. Jim and I have known each other since our college days at Concordia Lutheran University in Portland, Oregon, before he went on to receive his Master of Divinity from Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri.

Reverend Rehder was ordained into the Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church at Our Redeemer Evangelical Lutheran Church in Honolulu, Hawaii, and is currently a pastor at Bellevue Pilgrim Lutheran Church and Preschool in Bellevue, Washington.

His passion for service extends far beyond the four walls of his home church. He has been a committed volunteer and supporter of causes like the Northwest Lutheran Ministry Services, the Emergency Feeding Program of Seattle, the Sophia Way Women's Shelter, and the Free Burma Rangers.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Reverend Rehder for being with us here today, and I thank him for his dedication in serving others.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

WE NEED A RESPONSIBLE FARM BILL

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a fourth-generation farmer, I know firsthand how important the farm bill is for farmers. I believe that we need a farm bill, but I also believe we need a responsible farm bill.

Unfortunately, the bill passed out of the Rules Committee last night is a farm bill in name only, with 80 percent of the spending going toward food stamps. This isn't the solution American taxpayers deserve.

Washington's unholy alliance of farm policy and nutrition policy has spun out of control, and now we will consider a massive trillion-dollar spending package called a farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, we must have an up-or-down vote to split the farm bill into a true farm-only farm bill and a separate food stamp bill. The American people deserve an honest conversation about how Washington spends their money. We've made progress ending direct payments, but there's more work ahead.

Let's do our work in the full light of day by splitting this bill and having serious debate on both farm and welfare policy. Without that debate, I cannot in good conscience vote for a welfare bill passed on the backs of hardworking American farmers.

CELEBRATING JUNETEENTH

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate Juneteenth. Each June 19, we observe Juneteenth to commemorate the end of slavery in the United States. Juneteenth is observed in 42 States, including my home State of New York. In Buffalo, we are proud to have the third-largest Juneteenth celebration in the Nation.

In Buffalo, we are also proud to have a rich history in the anti-slavery movement. The Michigan Street Baptist Church hosted abolitionist Frederick Douglass at an anti-slave gathering in 1843 and Booker T. Washington in 1910. Nearby, Buffalonian Mary Talbert opened her home to prominent African American leaders in the early 1900s and founded the Niagara Movement, which was a forerunner of the NAACP.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to honor Juneteenth to honor the strength of our Nation's African American heritage and to celebrate the promise of an even stronger future.

SECURING OUR FUTURE IV

(Mr. REICHERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, our country remains in a state of economic stagnation. Nearly 12 million of our fellow Americans are out of work, and 4.4 million people have been out of work for 6 months or more. We deserve better. America deserves better. We deserve more than the political posturing with which Washington Democrats continue to respond to the problems facing our Nation.

House Republicans offer real solutions. We have passed a long-term student loan fix to keep rates from doubling this summer, a plan that is similar to the President's plan, but yet the Democrats and the Senate cannot even get that bill passed.

It's time to get past politics here. We need to create jobs, we must grow our economy and secure the future for all Americans. That's what hardworking

taxpayers deserve, and that's what House Republicans offer.

WOMEN'S HEALTH

(Ms. TSONGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, since assuming control of the House of Representatives, Republicans have brought 10 bills to the floor to limit a woman's constitutionally protected right to make choices regarding her own health. In January, we were told that the Republican majority was going to ''rebrand'' and refocus on the economy.

Yet, this week, my Republican colleagues once again ignored the pressing problems of many American families and brought a bill to the floor that would reverse decades of progress for women's health. H.R. 1797, muscled through by an all-male Republican panel, would upend Roe v. Wade and contains only the narrowest of exceptions for women who are victims of rape or incest.

I received an email Monday from a constituent that I think best sums up the problems in the bill. In this email, the constituent, who is an abuse victim and incest survivor, urged me to stop this dangerous bill from becoming law and threatening the health of women who, like her, are in the most desperate and tragic of circumstances.

While the bill passed the House yesterday, I am happy to say that it will not be acted upon in the Senate. I urge my colleagues to stop these dangerous games with women's health and confront the true problems that are facing the country.

□ 1210

STUDENT LOANS AND THE ECONOMY

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, just this morning I met with student leaders from North Carolina who are visiting the Capitol as part of the 2013 Electric Cooperative Youth Tour. One student asked me a question about what the House of Representatives is doing to advance education and job creation. It was a perfect question given our House Republican plan for jobs and leadership to keep Federal student loan interest rates from doubling on July 1.

Almost 12 million Americans are struggling to find work; 4.4 million have been out of work for more than 6 months. Young people and recent college graduates looking for jobs are disproportionately impacted in this economy. Washington shouldn't be adding additional stress to students' job hunts. But on July 1, if the President fails to lead and the Democrat Senate fails to act, student loan interest rates will double for student borrowers.

The House agrees with students, #Don't Double My Rates, and we have acted to stop the increase.

It's time for the Senate to do its job. Students are depending on them.

SNAP

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against the cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program in the FARRM Bill on this Juneteenth 2013.

As the Nation's most important antihunger program, SNAP offers nutrition assistance to 46 million low-income Americans and provides economic benefits to communities. SNAP also allows families to more easily set aside a portion of their resources for food and to prioritize a healthier, more consistent diet without compromising on obligations such as rent, utilities, and transportation.

The proposed FARRM Bill would cut $20.5 billion from the SNAP program and leave over 66,000 Texans without any assistance. We cannot allow the budget to be balanced on the backs of the poor and the most vulnerable in our country.

I did the SNAP challenge. I lived on $4.50 for 1 day, and I can tell you that is not easy, especially if you're trying to eat healthy. We need to find ways to fund federally funded nutrition incentive programs that will help hard-working taxpayers save money on health care costs in this country.

For many Americans, SNAP is the only form of income assistance they receive. I join my colleagues in supporting the McGovern amendment, which eliminates the draconian cuts to ensure that 46 million people who rely on this program will have food on their dinner table each night.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

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

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 50th anniversary of National Small Business Week.

A lot of people think of small business and think, Well, what's the big deal? What difference does that really make?

Here's the reality: sixty percent of the jobs created in the last 20 years were created by small business.

I'm honored to represent the great State of Utah, especially as a former small business owner. With over 57,000 small businesses that have employed more than half a million people in my State, it's clear to me that small business is the backbone of our economy.

Forbes magazine recently named Utah the best State in the Nation for business and careers and for small businesses for the third consecutive year. Utah has reached that high-caliber status through supporting a probusiness environment. It offers a low corporate and a low personal income tax rate. Our cost of energy is 27 percent lower than the national average. Pro-business policies like this in Utah help to spur our economy and create jobs, and they contribute to one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country.

Being a small business owner, I recognize the amount of hard work that is required to run a small business. I congratulate the small business owners and wish them a successful Small Business Week.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 50th anniversary of National Small Business Week.

Small businesses are a vital part of our Nation's fabric and a big source of opportunity, pride, and good-paying jobs in the communities that I serve.

Here's what I'm doing in California for my district and my small businesses:

We're connecting our small businesses to the power of the ports to help export their goods to new markets overseas;

We're helping to clear away the misinformation and uncertainty about what the Affordable Care Act really means for small businesses;

We're providing resources and information to expand their access to capital to help them grow and get more customers coming in their door.

Small businesses are the backbone of our economy. When our small businesses are strong, our Nation is strong.

All Americans should take the opportunity this week to shop at a small business.

RECOGNIZING MONTANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSIONER CHAIRMAN BILL GALLAGHER

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend, Montana Public Service Commissioner Chairman Bill Gallagher, who was recently diagnosed with early-stage pancreatic cancer. Cindy and I join the people of Montana in keeping Bill and his family in our prayers during this most difficult time.

Sadly, this is a disease that affects all too many Montanans. Yesterday, I met with Abby Brown, a Pancreatic Cancer Action Network volunteer from my home town of Bozeman, who recently lost her dad to pancreatic cancer. She shared stories about her dad's fight, as well as other Montanans like

Gallatin County District Judge Mark Guenther, who was also a friend of mine.

Abby also told me of the importance of regular checkups and healthy living as key preventative measures in lowering one's chances of being diagnosed with higher risk cancers.

Unfortunately, cancer has affected each and every American in some way. I hope all Montanans will work to promote cancer awareness, and even more importantly, take preventive measures to prevent cancer and increase early diagnoses.

Know it. Fight it. End it.

CUTS TO SNAP

(Mr. CÁRDENAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MCGOVERN for his leadership on an amendment to the FARRM Bill.

This farm bill will have a serious and devastating impact. It will damage the lives of millions of vulnerable, struggling, hardworking Americans. They are scraping by on the worst economy since the Great Depression.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say 47 million Americans on food stamps is too many. I agree. Forty-seven million Americans on food stamps means too many Americans unemployed; it means too many underemployed living in poverty.

Rather than pointing the finger at these people, we need to point it at ourselves. What has the Republican-led House done to repair our economy? What bills have they passed to support our industries and create middle class jobs?

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Keep food on the table of struggling American families. That's what we should be doing, and we should support this amendment.

OBAMA VACATION

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the military has taken $500 billion in budget cuts this year; Congress has slashed its budget by 11 percent in the last 3 years; and this year, at the President's command, several government agencies have cut vital programs and employees due to mandatory spending cuts.

Everyone across the country is being asked to do more with less—families, businesses, the military, and government agencies—but the President is sending Americans another message: you pay while he plays.

That's right. The Obama family is taking an extravagant summer vacation to Africa, costing taxpayers an estimated $100 million. That is obscene, and Americans should be outraged. This money could keep the public White House tours funded—which the President canceled due to budget constraints—for 26 years. It could pay for an additional 22,000 college degrees for soldiers enrolled in the Army's Tuition Assistance program. It could reverse the potential $90 million in cuts for Border Patrol agents and border security. In fact, it could fund the entire Houston Astros' payroll times four.

Mr. Speaker, instead of asking everyone but himself to make enormous sacrifices, it's time for the President to make his and put the people first.

HONORING CHIEF MASTER SERGEANT DENISE JELINSKI-HALL ON HER RETIREMENT

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I'm very proud to honor today someone who is a great servant leader and who I'm honored to call my friend, Chief Master Sergeant Denise Jelinski-Hall. She will be retiring later this month after serving nearly 30 years in the United States Air Force, where she earned the distinction of being the first female and the first Air National Guard member to serve as the National Guard Bureau's Senior Enlisted Leader. This is the highest enlisted rank in the National Guard that one is able to hold.

While she is originally from a small town in Minnesota and has served everywhere from Nebraska to Qatar, I'm especially proud of the tremendous impact that she has made on her nearly 20 years that she spent serving in the Hawaii National Guard.

Chief Jelinski-Hall is happiest when she is spending time with soldiers and airmen, and has done so in all 50 States and around the world as she leads by example, encouraging troops to focus on personal growth and education. She should serve as an inspiration to young men and women across the country through her great work ethic and leadership by example.

Congratulations and thank you very much—mahalo nui loa—to Chief Jelinski-Hall on her incredible, long, accomplished career in service to our country.

□ 1220

FARRM BILL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Agriculture Committee, I strongly support the FARRM Bill we are considering today and the reforms that it brings.

The EPA has been implementing what is known as a ''total maximum daily load'' on the Chesapeake Bay watershed. The TMDL is often described as a pollution diet because it mandates water quality standards and nutrient discharges into the watershed.

Aside from the great cost, one of the concerns I have had is the science behind the TMDL. EPA's model is substantially different from USDA's. As such, I have been a strong advocate for EPA utilizing the USDA's data and agricultural expertise while implementing this mandate.

This is why I am offering an amendment to the FARRM Bill which will require USDA to provide such data and consultation to EPA while ensuring privacy of farmers.

The Chesapeake Bay is a national treasure. It needs and deserves our attention. However, these restoration activities, which require taxpayer dollars, should include the best science available to continue the great strides we are already making with the health of the bay.

SNAP CUTS

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, in this, the richest country in the world, it is unconscionable that the farm bill we are debating today cuts nearly $21 billion from SNAP, our Nation's most important anti-hunger program.

Today, one in seven Americans depends on the SNAP program to put food on the table. The draconian cuts in this bill will remove many from this program and increase hunger from millions of Americans already struggling to survive. Hardest hit will be children, who in addition to suffering the agony of hunger will be at risk of having a disability because studies have shown that the SNAP program is a critical buffer for preventing developmental challenges.

Our vulnerable senior population, for which SNAP is a vital safety net, also will be put at risk because it can make the difference between having food or going hungry.

Mr. Speaker, there are better alternatives to reducing our deficit. While it is true that the FARRM Bill is an important bill that regulates and protects our food industry, it is also true that it is tragic that in the United States of America this bill, as introduced, will increase the pain and suffering of hunger which already shamefully exists in our country.

YELLOW RIBBON CEREMONY AT CAMP RIPLEY

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, as you can see, I am wearing a yellow ribbon here today. I do so to recognize the newest Minnesota Yellow Ribbon Networks being officially proclaimed at the National Guard Camp Ripley, near the community of Little Falls in north

central Minnesota, which is also in my district.

Yellow Ribbon is a truly remarkable program that eases the transition of our soldiers to civilian life by providing job training, counseling, and all kinds of support for servicemembers, veterans, and military families.

So I want to say a special thanks to Morrison and Crow Wing Counties in Minnesota—and to the communities of Little Falls, Motley, Royalton, Swanville, Sobieski, Harding, Buckman, Upsala, Randall, Pierz, Bowlus, Elmdale, and Lastrup, all in my district—for supporting our returning servicemen and -women as Yellow Ribbon communities.

We thank and honor all our military for their service to our great Nation.

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, unless Congress acts, in less than 2 weeks, the interest rates on federally subsidized Stafford loans will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent for more than 7 million students.

In my home State of Rhode Island, which is home to more than 40,000 borrowers of federally subsidized Stafford loans, this means that higher education will become less attainable for more and more young people who depend on financial aid. As we work to get our economy back on track, we should be making it easier, not more difficult, for young people to access higher education.

Once again, the House Republican leadership is failing to act in the best interest of the American people. Rather than working towards a commonsense solution on student loan interest rates, we are spending this week voting on a $20 billion cut to children's nutrition programs and a bill that would severely restrict reproductive health care for women.

This has gone on long enough. In the interests of our constituents, Republicans and Democrats should set aside our differences and get back to solving the problems that our country faces. The Republican leaders in the House should bring bills to the floor for a vote that focus on protecting students from interest rate increases and getting Americans back to work.

SUGAR REFORM IS NEEDED

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, the current United States sugar program is a clear example of government intrusion into a market. Nowhere is there a larger gap between the U.S. Government's free-trade rhetoric and its protectionist practices than in our sugar policy.

The most prominent argument I hear from the other side is this program is of no cost to the taxpayers. That simply isn't true. It was reported yesterday the USDA intends to purchase sugar off the domestic market, costing taxpayers nearly $38 million. The government then plans to sell this sugar at a loss to ethanol companies. And who is ultimately footing the bill for this not-so-sweet deal? The taxpayers.

But the most egregious point is that other countries actively try to lure U.S. companies to relocate. An official Canadian Government brochure states:

> Canadian sugar users enjoy a significant advantage—the average price of refined sugar is usually 30 to 40 percent lower in Canada than the U.S.

When a government program becomes a recruitment technique to lure away our manufacturers and move U.S. jobs abroad, I believe reform is not only necessary but essential.

ONGOING VIOLENCE IN SYRIA

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, since March of 2011 in Syria, 90,000 people have been killed, millions have been displaced internally, hundreds of thousands have fled, and between 100 and 150 people have been murdered by Bashar al-Assad's chemical weapons.

We can debate what we should do and how far we should go, but there is one thing that we can all agree on, and that is legislation that my colleague from Oklahoma, Congressman TOM COLE, and I have introduced on a bipartisan basis that would bring Bashar al-Assad to the International Criminal Court where he will be prosecuted for war crimes and crimes against humanity. This is an example of bipartisan cooperation and accord on a challenging foreign policy crisis.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Cole-Israel resolution and pass it immediately.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1947, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 271 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 271

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes. No further general debate shall be in order.

SEC. 2. (a) In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committees on Agriculture and the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-14, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

(b) No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(c) Each amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by its proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Agriculture or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I make a point of order against consideration of the rule, House Resolution 271.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the point of order prescribed by section 425 of that same Act. House Resolution 271 states:

All points of order against amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

Therefore, I make a point of order pursuant to section 426 that this rule may not be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. I do thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I would first like to voice my support for the gentleman's particular amendment, actually, that he has before us—and will later on today—that restores the unfair SNAP cuts. I thank the gentleman for his amendment, for his courage and for his very, very good idea of restoring those cuts when it comes to the underlying bill.

Later today, I will offer an amendment to ensure farmers and rural small businesses have continued access to a critical tool to pursue investments in energy technologies and to meet their energy needs in an affordable and sustainable way.

Currently, the Rural Energy for America Program supports farmers and rural small businesses in pursuing sustainable and value-added energy project investments, including wind power, biofuels, solar, or anaerobic digestion. These projects put people to work, they create entrepreneurial opportunities, and they have created new value-added opportunities for our farmers, for rural small businesses, and for our communities.

I have heard from Iowans about the importance of this energy and economic development tool, and my amendment ensures farmers and rural businesses have continued access to it.

I am strongly opposed to the changes made in the underlying bill, which weaken essential energy initiatives that create jobs and boost our economy. Because of these initiatives, thousands of jobs have been created in rural communities in recent years. In Iowa alone, over 1,600 rural energy projects were initiated between 2003 and 2012, mainly stemming from farm bill energy programs.

My amendment stresses the importance of farm bill energy programs to job creation and our rural economies, and allows one of our best resources—our farmers—to play a critical role in our domestic energy production, and I urge support for it. As I said at the outset, I also urge support for the amendment of my colleague from Massachusetts to restore the SNAP cuts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the point of order and in favor of the consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. The question really before us today, Mr. Speaker, is plain and simple, and that is: Should the House now consider H. Res. 271?

I have great respect not only for the gentleman from Iowa but for the gentleman from Massachusetts. Yesterday, we sat through a very, very long committee hearing in which we considered over 200 amendments that were presented to the Rules Committee.

I believe that what we have done with the rule that is in reference and is being questioned here on the floor is not only a very fair and bipartisan approach, but we took this actually from the Ag Committee, from the gentleman from Minnesota—the ranking member—and the chairman of the committee, from Iowa, both of whom have not only extensive farm backgrounds but also extensive service here in the House, both as chairmen of the Agriculture Committee, to the people of the United States.

The bill was brought to the Rules Committee on a bipartisan basis. We talked about the amendments that the committee felt were worthy. We worked extensively with the committee and with other committees of jurisdiction. We had Member after Member come to the Rules Committee in a fair and open process. We deliberated. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows that he, in some sense, got some satisfaction with how the process worked.

So, today, what we are here for is, yes, to talk about the amendments—some that were made in order and some which changed policy—but the essence of this is: Are we going to put a point of order against the bill? I think that the resolution waives all points of order against amendments printed in the Rules Committee Report, yes, and the Committee on Rules is not aware of any violation of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

I think this is simply an opportunity for my friends to come to the floor in order to allow for more discussion and time—and I respect that. I respect that the gentleman from Massachusetts has very strong feelings as a member of the Agriculture Committee and as a senior member of the Rules Committee, and I respect also those Members of the Democratic Caucus who have strong feelings about some changes that are taking place.

I admire my colleagues. I disagree. I do not believe in any way that there should be any point of order against the bill. I think it's open. I think it's fair. I think it's inclusive. I think it includes a wide-ranging group of ideas and thoughts that are directly germane to the appropriateness of the Agriculture Committee and other committees that have jurisdiction. I think the Rules Committee did an awesome job. I think we did this in a fair and open process. I think our product is good.

□ 1240

How would I characterize it? I think this is a fair rule that made 103 amendments from both sides of the aisle with 53 Democratic amendments and 50 Republican amendments in order. There were a number of bipartisan amendments. It's a fair rule that comes from a good process.

In order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, I encourage us to keep moving.

I thank the gentleman and respect the gentleman, and he knows this. We have been dear friends for many years on this committee. I know he wants more time, and I respect that.

I urge all Members to vote ''yes'' on the question of consideration of the resolution if necessary, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman from Texas.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

(Ms. MOORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MOORE. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me these couple of minutes.

I would hope that we would listen to the point of order that's been raised by Mr. MCGOVERN. For one thing, this bill criminalizes poverty. People with felony records won't be allowed to get food stamps. There will be work requirements in order to get food stamps.

These kinds of amendments and additions that we're going to see in this bill really add to the fallacious arguments that we have heard about the gargantuan cuts that are made to the SNAP program: that SNAP is run inefficiently, that these cuts won't hurt anyone, that these cuts don't serve the most vulnerable.

Let me just reiterate the facts:

SNAP is effectively targeted at our most vulnerable populations, primarily serving children, seniors, and the disabled in the poorest communities, people who cannot work, people who don't have felony records;

In my own State of Wisconsin, 47.2 percent of SNAP households include children, 15.4 percent include the very elderly, 21.7 percent include a disabled person. 84.3 percent of those receiving SNAP in my State are children, elderly, and disabled;

Nationwide, 76 percent of SNAP households are composed of those who are children, seniors, or disabled persons;

There is a rate of 68.7 percent of SNAP households that have a gross income at or below 100 percent of the poverty level.

Let me just say going forward that as soon as this bill is enacted, as soon as we take away the categorical eligibility, 200,000 children will lose free lunch.

I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 1947. Why?

850,000 needy households would see their SNAP benefits cut by an average $90 per month. That's real food that these families will no longer afford to be able to put on the table. Last time I checked, the prices at the grocery store were not going down and wages were not going up!

2 million individuals would lose their eligibility entirely.

And just in time for the new school year in the fall, 200,000 low-income kids who are eligible and are currently enrolled in the school meals programs will be disenrolled because of the changes in this bill.

These are kids who we designed and create the school meals program to serve. And we are tossing them out for what reason . . . Mr. Speaker this just doesn't make sense.

The bill would also cut funding for nutrition education that helps SNAP households maximize the value of the meager SNAP benefit by teaching them how to shop and cook nutritious food on a budget.

The average SNAP benefit in Wisconsin is just $1.29 per person per meal, hardly enough to afford a nutritious diet.

This all comes on top of the reduction in SNAP benefits that all SNAP households will experience later this year when the ARRA increase expires.

On November 1, the average family of 3 on SNAP will lose $20–25 in monthly benefits.

That may not sound like much to you, but that's the equivalent of a gallon of low-fat milk $3.79, a box of corn flakes $2.99, and a half dozen bananas $1.80; a loaf of wheat bread $1.79 and some deli ham $2.49; and a box of spaghetti $1.00, sauce $2.89, and some ground beef $6.99 total $23.74.' In other words, that's several days' worth of food for a struggling family.

There is a myth going on that these changes will not really hurt people or that those being dislodged aren't low-income, do not have real and significant food needs that are not being met, and will be easily able to make up any gaps in access to food created by these changes as if they have secret Swiss bank accounts available.

Listen to the stories from my district . . .

How ridiculous. The people on SNAP are the poorest, most vulnerable, (kids, seniors, disabled).

My colleagues seem to be astonished about why in a middle of the Great recession SNAP rolls would have grown. Why, when food insecurity in our country is at record highs, we should see a surge in Americans seeking the safety net protections of this program.

Food insecurity is high. Nationally 50 million Americans live in households that struggle to put food on the table. In Wisconsin, there are 744,410 food insecure individuals, including 270,150 children.

An Institute of Medicine report released earlier this year found that the SNAP allotment is inadequate to improve food security and access to a nutritious diet and needs to be updated

Many Americans remain out of work. Those who are lucky enough to be back at work may be working for lower wages than before the recession.

SNAP is effectively targeted at our most vulnerable, primarily serving children, seniors, and the disabled in the poorest households. In Wisconsin, 47.2 percent of SNAP households include children, 15.4 percent include elderly, and 21.7 percent include a disabled person. Nationally, 76 percent of SNAP households included a child, senior, or disabled person.

I hear a lot about making sure SNAP goes to those who "truly need it." Perhaps we need a reminder about just how poor SNAP participants really are. In Wisconsin, 68.7 percent of SNAP households have gross income at or below 100 percent of the poverty line $19,530 for family of 3 in 2013.

I will remind you that federal law sets a maximum for gross income of 130 percent of the federal poverty line. seven out of ten in the Wisconsin fall well below that threshold and I know the story is the same throughout our country.

The families on SNAP are in real need. No wonder that 90 percent of SNAP benefits are used by the 21st day of the month.

This myth that SNAP benefits are not going to those in need is dead wrong and dangerous.

Cuts to SNAP would only increase demand on already over-strapped charitable food providers. An increase in TEFAP commodities as provided in the bill is critical to our nation's food banks and hunger-relief charities but it won't come close to meeting the needs created by the SNAP cuts in the bill.

A need that even these generous and kind hearted groups know they cannot come close to meeting. No wonder they almost unanimously oppose the SNAP cuts in this bill.

Charity groups alone cannot feed everyone who's hungry.

Food benefits provided by charity groups in 2011 totaled approximately $4.1 billion according to Bread for the world.

These groups supplement the work that the federal government is doing to combat hunger. They cannot replace it but the bill would throw millions more of hungry families their way nonetheless.

The Harford Institute for Religion and Research estimates that there are 350,000 religious congregations in the U.S. and each would have to spend approximately $50,000 every year for the next ten years to feed those who would lose benefits or face reduced benefits under the Republican Budget Resolution approved in the House last year.

As the recession took hold in our country, SNAP was not the only safety net that stood in the gap to help combat growing hunger across America. Our nation's food banks also saw a 46 percent increase in clients served during the recession. Those needs have not abated and will only get worse if this Farm bill passes in its current form.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this unbalanced bill which seems to provides a safety net for everyone else but the most vulnerable and hungry in our country.

PERSONAL SNAP STORIES FROM THE DISTRICT

Name	Age	SNAP is important to me because:	Cutting my SNAP would mean:
Earline	63	It allows me to eat on a fixed income	That I won't be able to eat nutritious meals
Michelle	36	So I can feed my family	We won't eat!
Moria	26	My income is not enough to support my children with food	I would not have the proper funds to provide food for my children
Debbie	33	Because it is hard to buy food. I don't get enough cash to buy food.	
Leiela		Don't have enough money to pay rent and food.	
Jesele	18	Don't have enough money to pay for food for me and my son	We don't eat.
Babette	50	We are a one income family! Just my social security. Without FoodShare me and my family would die. I already can't afford my household bills if I had to pay all the bills and food I would be out—lights, gas, toiletries.	If FoodShare is cut, I might as well die. I would not be able to feed my family, and that would make me feel useless and less than human; down right degrading.
Jessica	25	It helps me provide for my children. I have 7 children and even though I work 2 jobs I still need assistance with food and other bills.	It would make it harder on me as a single mother, not only will I have to worry about food, but then shelter for my children and more hours at work and that's more time I'm not able to spend with them.
Solomon	20	Some people are less fortunate and need the benefits	people like me would starve on the streets
Temera	18	It is important to me because I'm homeless and this is the ONLY thing that feeds me and gets me by.	I would be homeless and hungry with NO type of help.
Felicia	38	It's a lot of people out here that does work and they don't make enough to buy food. They need food stamps.	It will be a lot of children without food to eat, I work, but I can't even get any stamps.
Anchea	27	Because at times like this when my hours are being cut I might only make enough for my child to eat and just supply a roof over her head.	A lot because it is very important to the community we all live in.
Rayshanda	21	That is how I provide my groceries and my job money is for bills	That I would have to pay rent and light bills so all my personal money would be gone. I need stamps—how would we eat?
Brooks	43	Because FoodShare allows me to provide nutritional food for my children, instead of junkfood	Taking away nutritional food items, such as fruits and vegetables that would be otherwise easily obtainable.
Katie	27	I am able to feed my children. I am using this program as a stepping stone to where I want to be. I just graduated college and am looking for a full time job to where I can actually provide for my children on my own.	My children and I would not be able to eat healthily. With our SNAP we eat very healthy and without it would mean having to cut back and buy cheap processed fatty foods.
Khinh	20	FoodShare is important to me because it is enough for me to take care of my kid. I am having twins and the income I make is not enough for me to take care of them.	It's not going to be enough for me to take care of my kid. And I just make a little bit of income every month.

Ella is 57 and has been sick for a while. Her doctor put her on a strict diet of Ensure, her limited income and medical bills make it extremely hard for her to afford the drink. She applied for FoodShare and was able to buy what she needed to stay healthy.

Harry—retired lawyer who's practice went under during the recession. He is too young for Social Security benefits and his disability ran out. His $200 worth of FoodShare has helped him greatly.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is correct. There is an amendment that was presented at the Rules Committee that has been made in order that essentially does what the gentlewoman says, and she'll have a

chance to vote for it or against it. What it says is the amendment ends eligibility of food stamps for those convicted who are rapists, pedophiles, and murderers.

So the gentlewoman and every Member of this body today will have a chance to say on record that it's okay if you're a convicted rapist, pedophile, or murderer, that it's okay for you to be eligible for food stamps in a program that does compete against mothers and children who, in these difficult times, you're seeing the Agriculture Committee try and set priorities about who should receive this government assistance.

This amendment has not been accepted yet, but every Member of this body will be able to help prioritize; and the amendment that the gentlewoman speaks of is about whether we will let rapists, pedophiles, and murderers, who are convicted felons, continue to receive food stamps. The gentlewoman is right. And today she will get her chance to help us prioritize these government programs about who should be receiving food stamps in America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, first let me commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and his leadership for 18 years on fighting for the needs of SNAP assistance for our most vulnerable citizens.

I rise and stand with Mr. MCGOVERN against this procedural rule and in support of the underlying amendment that Mr. MCGOVERN, myself, and other Members have. This amendment will prevent cuts to the SNAP funding program.

The Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 includes $20.5 billion in cuts to the SNAP program. That will come on top of an expiration of a benefits boost from the Recovery Act of 2009.

SNAP provides food assistance to approximately 46 million Americans in need, and it is estimated that at least 353,000 Nevadans will feel the impact of the upcoming double whammy of SNAP cuts from the FARRM Bill and the expiration of the Recovery Act boost.

The bottom line is that the SNAP program is our Nation's most important antihunger program. It kept 4.7 million people out of poverty in 2011, including 2.1 million children.

I had a community conference call with my constituents and families in my district who count on SNAP. Many of them live in food deserts. The benefits they receive right now aren't enough for a healthy meal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HORSFORD. Yet we are talking about cutting these benefits even further while we continue subsidies to big industries that are well-off. Those priorities are backwards.

For the mother in my district who is expecting another child and who counts on SNAP, for the disabled family that stands in line for hours at the food bank, and for the elderly who rely on SNAP to get the food that they need, for everyone who made their voice heard by calling my office, I refuse to accept that we should cut $20.5 billion in vital food assistance programs, and I will continue to work with Mr. MCGOVERN and my colleagues until we can restore these funds.

Today's rule will allow for a number of amendments to be considered. I urge all of my colleagues to support an amendment offered by Mr. MCGOVERN, myself, and other members. Our amendment will prevent cuts to SNAP funding.

The Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 includes $20.5 billion in cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (or SNAP). That will come on top of an expiration of a benefits boost from the Recovery Act in 2009.

Without the Recovery Act's boost, SNAP benefits will average about $1.40 per person per meal. If the Farm Bill passes the House as it is currently written, the average benefit may drop even lower.

SNAP provides food assistance to approximately 46 million Americans in need and it is estimated that at least 353,000 Nevadans will feel the impact of the upcoming double whammy of SNAP cuts from the Farm Bill and expiration of the Recovery Act boost.

The bottom line is that SNAP is our nation's most important anti-hunger program. It kept 4.7 million people out of poverty in 2011, including 2.1 million children. And SNAP has cut the number of children living in extreme poverty in half.

I had a community conference call with families in my district who count on SNAP. They live in food deserts. The benefits they receive right now are not enough for a healthy meal. And yet, we are talking about cutting these benefits even further while we continue subsidies to industries that are well-off. Those priorities are backwards.

So for the mother in my district who is expecting another child who counts on this program, for the family that stands in line for hours at the food bank, and for elderly who rely on SNAP to get the food they need, for everyone who made their voice heard by calling my office, I refuse to accept that we should cut $20.5 billion in vital food assistance.

Extra points: According to the USDA's Economic Research Service: Each $1 billion of retail generated by SNAP creates $340 million in farm production, and 3,300 farm jobs; every $1 billion of SNAP benefits also creates 8,900–17,900 full-time jobs; an additional $5 of SNAP benefits generates $9 in total economic activity.

These programs are not handouts. They are a hand up. And they help stimulate the economy.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentleman for coming down to the floor, and I want to respond to the gentleman that what this bill is about is trying to make decisions about what we're going to do in difficult times.

There are 25 million people unemployed and underemployed as a result of the policies that President Obama has placed on this country. Millions of people cannot find work today. There are millions of people across this country who are denied opportunities because the job market out there is not growing. We're seeing rules and regulations. What is known as ObamaCare is causing employers to back away from hiring people. There is the President's inability to make a decision about a simple, most publicized and most looked-at pipeline that would employ thousands of people in this country and us use energy from our friends.

The President's inability to lead is what is causing this country to have massive unemployment and a GDP rate of about 1.5 percent. It is a nightmare for people.

So I do understand that we have those in our midst who are in trouble. I don't think this bill is ever aimed at, and we shouldn't try and say that it would be aimed at, the disabled or mothers with children. That's not what we're trying to accomplish here.

What we're trying to accomplish is to end the eligibility of food stamps for rapists, pedophiles, and murderers, those that compete against needy families. That's why you see members of the Democratic Party coming down here today saying we're going to take it away from other people. No. Rapists, pedophiles, and murderers.

□ 1250

Furthermore, under the current law, people who receive as little as $1 in energy benefits, $1 in State benefits, automatically qualify for SNAP payments.

This legislation that we're talking about today says if you're going to give away a Federal benefit, the State has to have some skin in the game. You can't just give away something that comes from somewhere else. This legislation closes the costly loopholes that have been out there. And without reform, you're going to continue to see dead people, illegal immigrants, lottery winners, and others who are still eligible for SNAP. That is what we are doing as we reform this bill today. We are doing this because we believe it is the right thing to do to save the system.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 1½ minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I support the point of order that the gentleman has raised against the rule, and I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for raising that point of order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and to the proposed cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program in the underlying farm bill.

In the wealthiest nation in human history, it is simply unconscionable that every American cannot afford life's basic necessities. SNAP helps millions of Americans living in poverty put food on the table. Eighty percent of the households receiving SNAP earn below the Federal poverty level, making it a vital form of assistance for million of working families.

Yesterday, I proudly joined a group of my Democratic colleagues in taking the SNAP challenge, a commitment to living on no more than $4.50 in daily food costs. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress should experience what it's like to subsist on such a paltry sum and should understand how the decisions we make affect the lives of hardworking Americans.

When we take food off the plates of hungry children, we have a moral obligation to fully comprehend the consequences of those actions. Under this bill, 2 million people will lose their eligibility, and many more will see reduced nutritional assistance.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this rule, and I encourage Members to vote against these unnecessary and harmful cuts. We can do better. We can put that funding back into this farm bill and make it a bill that we can all support.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise to support the point of order and in strong opposition to the bill that would cut more than $20 billion from critical nutrition programs, especially those that serve our Nation's most vulnerable children. In my home State of Rhode Island, it is estimated that nearly 67,000 children rely on support from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP.

The bill before us today would devastate funding that these and millions of children and families all across our country depend on each and every day. Because of the way this funding is structured, it would be especially devastating for States like mine, where families are struggling in a difficult economy, and where reductions in LIHEAP would be a grave hardship in long, cold New England winters.

In the next couple of days, we will consider a wide range of amendments. Some, like one offered by my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), of which I am a cosponsor, would restore this critical funding for nutrition programs. Others would impose additional burdens on families already struggling to get back.

The actions we take in this Chamber and the bills we enact into law should reflect our values as a country. We should not take actions that will make hunger worse in America, and this bill will do that.

I urge my colleagues to oppose these drastic cuts to nutrition programs and support the McGovern amendment so that we can continue to help improve the lives of millions of families and children across our Nation. America has always stood for the idea that we look after each other. We take care of the least fortunate among us. And most importantly, we protect our most treasured asset, the children of America.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any further speakers or if he believes that we have now gotten to the end of this opportunity?

Mr. MCGOVERN. How much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. And I believe I have the right to close. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is correct.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Let me thank my colleagues who have come to the floor to speak in support of an amendment that I and dozens and dozens of other Members have authored to repeal the SNAP cuts, to repeal the $20.5 billion worth of cuts in SNAP that will result in 2 million people losing the benefit, and hundreds of thousands of children losing a free breakfast or lunch at school. That cut is too much. It is too harsh. It is a deal breaker for many of us when it comes to the farm bill.

What we should be about in this House of Representatives is to improve the quality of life for people, lift people up, not put people down, and these cuts put people down. We can do much better.

Again, I thank my colleagues for coming to the floor and look forward to more debate on this.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts for furthering his feelings that he wants to talk about this. It is true, there will be people dropped off the rolls. We're having to make decisions based upon money. There's a vote today—it has not been decided—whether rapists, pedophiles, or murderers will be eligible. Also, whether we will have people have to qualify on their own as opposed to some other consideration maybe that a State would put. And we're going to take off those who are lottery winners, illegal aliens, and people quite honestly who should have the money to pay for these things. That's what we're doing today. So in order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business, which we're trying to do today, I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on the question of consideration of the resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues on the Democratic side for not only their vigorous support for the things that they believe in today on this important bill but also for their consideration, participation, and bipartisanship yesterday as the Rules Committee considered this important bill.

I believe it is important what we are doing in the House. I think doing our work on a bipartisan basis should draw the attention of the President of the United States, who has said he will veto this bill, veto the bill before we even see what it looks like. I think that we should understand that what we are trying to do is work together. So, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts, my very dear friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we've already had a lot of discussion about this awesome farm bill that comes to us today. H. Res. 271 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 1947. This rule provides for discussion and opportunities for Members of the minority and majority, both Republicans and Democrats who represent 700,000 people back home, to come together with their thoughts and ideas about how to make our farm policies and the things which are included in this bill even better, sustainable, and moving forward so that we can know that we have done our job.

This week, 230 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee. The rule before us today provides for consideration of 103 of those amendments, 50 Republican and 53 Democrat or bipartisan amendments.

□ 1300

Many of the amendments submitted were duplicative, some violated the rules of the House, and several were nongermane. Given the universe of the amendments the committee received, I believe that this rule allows the House to debate each and every important

issue contained in the bill and provides this body with an opportunity to work its will.

Despite the large number of amendments submitted, I believe the underlying legislation, H.R. 1947, is a strong and meaningful statement and measure that provides our Nation with agriculture and nutrition policy necessary to meet the needs of this country.

And I want to commend, in particular, the young chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (COLLIN PETERSON), who have worked together over the years, not just the time when Mr. PETERSON served as chairman of the committee, but also throughout the years that Mr. LUCAS has worked in a bipartisan basis together, the committee, to work on agriculture policy.

Their hard work over the past several years has led us to the point where we are today. Hard work, working together, thinking, talking about the policy that would be good for the country—that's where we are today.

We follow that up with an opportunity to make sure, on a bipartisan basis, that I work together with my colleague, my colleagues at the Rules Committee. Notwithstanding Ms. SLAUGHTER was busy on the floor a lot of the time yesterday, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) sat in, heard the amendments with the rest of the Rules Committee. We worked together, staffs, to try and make as many amendments in order that would create an opportunity to follow the leadership set by Mr. PETERSON and Chairman LUCAS.

So this year's FARRM Bill reforms our Nation's agriculture programs to provide American farmers with innovative risk management tools. It reforms our Nation's supplemental nutrition programs for the first time in nearly two decades, and it invests in meaningful conservation programs to ensure that future generations of Americans benefit from the same resources that we do today.

The bottom line is the top soil, that top soil that is in America, which is the greatest in the world, enables our farmers and ranchers to produce goods and services, food that serves the entire world. And I am proud of supporting those people who live a way of life in a rural area. I know them well, and I respect the hard work and what they do to make our country stronger and better.

Impressively, H.R. 1947 accomplishes all of this, while making difficult decisions on saving over $40 billion over the life of the bill. This legislation is common sense. This legislation is bipartisan.

This legislation allows us, through an amendment process, to make many tough and difficult decisions based upon representation of this House of Representatives about issues because we're re-looking at the entire FARRM Bill.

Most of all, I hope it's fiscally responsible for those. And we offer solutions, solutions to not only consumers, but also solutions to farmers about how we are going to keep their products and services, farmers and ranchers, families, rural communities and consumers all in a balance to where we know that, through the leadership of this House of Representatives, that we have done our job.

That is why we're here today. We're here to take on tough decisions. We're here to make this FARRM Bill better, and I am proud of the product that we present today.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I support the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the distinguished chairman, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking Chairman SESSIONS and thanking the staff on the Rules Committee, both the majority and the minority, for their hard work in trying to put this rule together.

I want to commend Chairman SESSIONS, in particular, I think, for making an honest attempt of trying to include as many amendments as possible. There are over 100 amendments that have been made in order, and I appreciate the fact that so many amendments were made in order, and many Democratic amendments were made in order.

Unfortunately, some important amendments were not made in order, which means that those of us on this side of the aisle, I think, will have to oppose this rule. And I certainly also want to make it clear that I oppose the underlying bill as it is now written.

But before I explain why I oppose the FARRM Bill, let me begin also by commending Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON and their staffs for all their hard work in crafting this legislation. It is no easy task, and they have done their best to thread a very small needle.

I'm honored to be a member of the Agriculture Committee, and I want to support a farm bill. I believe this Nation needs a farm bill. And, indeed, this bill contains a number of good things.

I'm pleased that the bill includes an amendment that I offered in committee to close a loophole in Federal animal-fighting laws that allow spectators at animal fights to avoid prosecution.

I support the dairy program in this bill and believe that it would be good for dairy farmers in the Northeast, who are such an important part of our economy.

But I cannot and I will not support this FARRM Bill as it is currently written. I cannot support a bill that cuts the SNAP program by $20.5 billion.

I cannot support a bill that will force 2 million Americans to lose their benefits.

I cannot support a bill that throws over 200,000 American children off the free school breakfast and lunch program. In short, I cannot support a bill that will make hunger in America even worse than it already is.

Right now, as we speak, as we gather here, there are 50 million hungry Americans; 17 million of them are children. Many of them work but do not earn enough to make ends meet. All of us, every single one of us in this Chamber, should be ashamed by those numbers.

Food is not a luxury; it is a basic necessity. But there isn't a single congressional district in America that is hunger-free.

Ending hunger in America used to be a bipartisan issue. To my Republican friends, I say, remember the work of people like Bob Dole and Bill Emerson, who dedicated themselves to this issue. Be proud of that legacy; don't dismantle it.

And to my fellow Democrats, I say, if we do not stand for helping the poor and the hungry, then what are we doing here?

There are all sorts of nice little deals in this bill for all sorts of people. Peanut growers get a nice deal; cotton growers get a nice deal. Even sushi rice producers get a really nice deal for some reason.

But poor people in America, hungry people, get a raw deal. It is a rotten thing to do to cut SNAP by $20.5 billion. It's a lousy thing to do to throw 2 million people off this program.

I will have an amendment later in this process to restore these cuts to SNAP in a way that not only reduces subsidies to big agribusiness, but actually reduces the deficit by an additional $12 million beyond the base bill. So I would urge any of my colleagues who are concerned about deficit reduction to support my amendment.

You know, we hear a lot of rhetoric about waste, fraud, and abuse in the SNAP program even though SNAP has an incredibly low error rate. I promise you that if our defense programs had the same error rate as SNAP, we would save billions and billions and billions of dollars.

I'm going to have more to say about my amendment during its consideration, but I would urge my colleagues to take a look at it and support it.

I'd also like to take a moment to ask my colleagues to support the amendment offered by House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL to provide modest, but important, reforms to our international food aid programs. This amendment will enable more people to benefit from our scarce U.S. dollars, while ensuring that U.S. commodity producers and shippers remain actively engaged in alleviating hunger around the world.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the rule makes in order several,

quite frankly, mean-spirited amendments that do nothing but demonize the poor and make their lives even more difficult. I urge my colleagues to oppose those amendments, oppose this rule, and oppose the underlying bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I can certify that at no time during this process have we vilified any poor people. We're here to help them. The Republican Party cares very much about families and children, moms who are trying to make a go of it.

We're the ones that are up here trying to lower taxes on everybody. We're the ones that are trying to make sure we've got jobs for people. We're the ones that are making sure that we're trying to take pedophiles and rapists and murderers off the rolls of government assistance so that it would serve those who need it the most.

We're trying to help prioritize and save this system. That is what Republicans are trying to do.

We would never vilify those that are disabled, or who are seniors, or who are men and women who richly deserve the opportunity for the government to help them.

□ 1310

But likewise, we believe that those who are able-bodied, those who really should be getting up during the day and trying to go find work do not take government assistance.

We are very concerned about the rights of seniors, about the rights of women, particularly women that have children, and about children and about the disabled. I work very extensively as a Republican with other Republicans and with Democrats on a bipartisan basis to make sure that we're looking at those needs of disabled people. So, I think it would be unfair to say, Well, this bill is aimed to vilify the people that we're intending to help, and that's why we are here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a gentleman who is from Gainesville, Florida, and was a large animal vet. He understands a lot, not just about agronomics, but also about the men and women who take care of this country in agriculture, people who spend their lives there, people who have to take care of their animals and, day in and day out, the needs that it takes to make sure that we have the best farms and ranches in America, animals who are safe and consumers that get a good deal.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, Dr. YOHO.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

This bill has been a long time coming. With over 3 years of reviewing every single USDA program, 11 audit hearings, and 2 markups, we've finally brought a farm bill to the house floor—and I need to remind everybody, with a lot of bipartisan support. This is hugely important for the stability and security of our Nation's food supply; and without that supply, a nation like ours cannot truly call itself secure.

I've worked in agriculture all my life, since I was 16 years of age, and I've seen the regulations that stood in the way of farmers and ranchers, and I've seen the regulations that have made sure our food supply is the safest in the world.

This legislation cuts through the red tape by eliminating and consolidating over 100 programs, while bolstering farm risk management programs so that our farmers can keep feeding America during the tough times.

I see a lot of theatrics and drama when we hear people talk about 50 million starving people in this country. I disagree with that. I think there are 330 million starving people at least three times a day. We call it breakfast, lunch, and dinner. But as far as 300 million nutritionally deprived people, I would beg to differ. The SNAP program does not take one calorie off the plate of anyone who qualifies for the program.

Let me repeat that. The SNAP program does not take one calory off the plate of those who qualify for the program. We simply close the loophole that allows States to sign people up into the program without the proper qualifications.

To have a secure nation, we must have a secure food source. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the rule and for passing the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself 10 seconds.

I would just say to the gentleman in response, the Congressional Budget Office—not me, but the Congressional Budget Office—says that these cuts would throw 2 million people off of SNAP and over 200,000 kids off the free breakfast and lunch program. I assure you that people will lose food over these cuts. This is not something we should do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member MCGOVERN and commend him for his work on this important rule.

I rise in opposition to this rule, but, frankly, I'm relieved to finally debate a farm bill in this country. This past year and a half has been marked by far too much uncertainty in our agriculture industry as a result of Republican leaders here refusing to even consider a farm bill in the last Congress. That has hurt economic growth in this country from coast to coast.

American agriculture is responsible for 1 in 12 jobs in our country, and it's vital to give confidence to the market and to give certainty to our agricultural enterprises that we move a bill forward. Thank goodness the other body did it and we are compelled to do it here.

But this bill cuts $20.5 billion in nutrition assistance that will cut over 2 million low-income people, starting with senior citizens in this country and with children who won't get school meals anymore. I don't know what the gentleman from Texas is talking about. I invited him to Ohio before, and I hope he accepts my invitation. Simply, these cuts are unconscionable.

Shockingly, the bill also has zero funding for the energy title. When American energy security is at stake and gas prices are hovering around $4 a gallon, to not invest in that is simply backwards thinking.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule, and hopefully we can improve the bill as it comes to the floor for a final vote.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to a leader on this issue, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying bill. It includes severe, immoral cuts to the food stamp program, slashing so deeply into nutrition support for hungry families at a time of great need all across this country. It is cruel, it is unnecessary, and it's an abdication of our responsibilities to the American people.

Over the past 30 years of policies aimed at debt and deficit reduction, the key programs that help the most vulnerable among us to get by have always been protected from deep cuts. Recent examples: Simpson-Bowles. This has been a bipartisan tradition for decades. But this FARRM Bill destroys that tradition.

This bill slashes food stamps by more than $20 billion. It hurts millions of Americans in our economy. It will force up to 2 million Americans to go hungry. It kicks roughly 210,000 children from the school lunch program, and it changes the relationship between the food stamp program and the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, which takes benefits away from seniors and from our families.

Let's make it clear: you cannot get food stamps unless you qualify for them. There is nothing automatic about it. Food stamps are our country's most important effort to deal with hunger here at home. Forty-seven million Americans are helped—half of them kids—and they are proven to curb hunger and improve low-income children's health, growth, and development. They have one of the lowest error rates of any government program. It's 3.8 percent.

I tell my colleague from Texas: Do you want to find money in this budget? Go to the crop insurance program, which is ripping off billions of dollars from U.S. taxpayers. That's where the money is, not where the program is to feed our kids.

Food stamps are good for the economy. They get resources into the hands of families who will spend them right away. And, most importantly, they are the right thing to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. Let me quote the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops:

> We must form a ''circle of protection'' around programs that serve the poor and vulnerable in our Nation and throughout the world.

Harry Truman said:

> Nothing is more important in our national life than the welfare of our children, and proper nourishment comes first in attaining this welfare.

Let's pursue a balanced approach. I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule. Vote against the underlying bill. Balancing the budget on the backs of hungry Americans, especially children, does not reflect the values of this great Nation, and it abdicates our moral responsibility in this Chamber.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentlewoman's coming down and speaking. She was at the Rules Committee yesterday and really sat for a long period of time in order to have her ideas taken up by the Rules Committee. As she knows, she's going to get a vote on what she spoke about today. It's not in there yet. She'll have a chance. This body will have a chance to determine whether we're going to go one direction or the other.

What drives the behavior of all this is very interesting. We're trying to work with, on a high level, something that's going to happen again soon in this next cycle starting at the end of September, and it is called sequestration—again, President Obama's idea of sequestration—which will cut $85 billion more across the board, and the entire government is struggling with how we're going to make these changes.

Our GDP is at less than 1 percent. Twenty-five million people are unemployed and underemployed. We're working with the policies of the Democratic Party that are bankrupting this country.

There are people who are hurting. There are people who need jobs, who need food, need to take care of their families, and need to take care of paying their student loans. This House of Representatives is on the mark of saying how we should solve each and every one of these problems.

□ 1320

They essentially go back to when Republicans had control of the House of Representatives, the United States Senate and the Presidency. For 60 straight months there was sustained, ongoing economic growth. Oh, my gosh, that was under George Bush. Well, that's right. President Bush and Republicans helped this country to achieve a doubling of GDP, of moving our country forward.

But there's also another model of success out there, and it was called President Clinton, who came and worked with the House of Representatives, who took Republican ideas, who took the ideas which we put and merged them with his own—probably called them his own—but moved this country forward. Instead, today we have leadership of our country that says no, no, no.

We've passed bipartisan legislation—cybersecurity. What's the President's answer? No. We've come today with bipartisan legislation from two stalwarts, men who have served this great Nation in the Agriculture Committee for years of service, bringing them together with the best ideas to try and formulate a policy.

Today, there will be examples of people who can control the destiny of these ideas. One is about trying to take rapists, pedophiles, and murderers off the rolls. Another that says we are not going to allow those that have won the lottery to be able to continue receiving food stamps. That's how this bipartisan bill is being crafted and worked together. And every Member of this body will have a chance to vote on the final direction that we go through amendments that were made in order by the Rules Committee.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear that the $20.5 billion worth of cuts in SNAP are not about taking rapists, pedophiles, and murderers off the rolls. This is about going after poor people. And it is curious that we have an amendment to go after rapists, pedophiles, and murderers who are not SNAP, but those who receive crop insurance, not those who receive agricultural subsidies. I mean, it's incredible what's going on here.

I'd also say to my colleague that it was the Republicans' idea to have sequestration; it was Republicans in this House that passed sequestration. But I'm going to give you credit that at least SNAP was exempted; it was exempted from sequestration and from Simpson-Bowles because it was thought that to balance the budget on the backs of poor people who have nothing was a rotten and cruel thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I rise in opposition to the rule and the bill because I am absolutely appalled by the proposed cuts to the SNAP program in the FARRM Bill.

Now, I know how important the FARRM Bill is to American ranchers and farmers and to New Mexico ranchers and farmers. I want to vote for the bill, but I cannot support it if these disastrous cuts remain.

For the past week, I've joined dozens of my colleagues in the SNAP challenge, to take a walk in the shoes of the over 442,000 New Mexicans—half of whom are children—who have to eat on less than $4.50 every day, to show just how devastating any cuts to the food program would be. Nearly one in three children in New Mexico is chronically hungry. It's the worst in the Nation. It's unconscionable, and these cuts make it worse.

In addition to the SNAP cuts, this bill also cuts funding for nutrition education programs that teach SNAP recipients how to stretch their dollars further and feed their families nutritious food.

New Mexico's farmers, ranchers, and consumers need and deserve a farm bill. But this cut, this bill is morally wrong, it's cruel, and it's reckless—harming children, seniors, the disabled, and veterans in the process.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Forty-five years ago, in a now famous film, Edward R. Murrow, for CBS, produced a program called ''Hunger in America.'' It described 100,000 residents of San Antonio—mostly Latino—who were ''hungry all the time'' and the indifference of some local leaders to their plight. This spring, with the inspirational leadership of Rod and Patti Radle, we rewatched that film, discussed the progress, and outlined the remaining challenges.

In one west side ZIP code, we still have 40 percent of the population in poverty and over one-third relying on SNAP. We cannot snap our fingers and snap away that poverty. But if we make these cuts five times larger than what the United States Senate approved, we will snap away food security from many needy families—people like Daniela, who lost her job and relies on SNAP to feed her young daughter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. In San Antonio and Austin, a public-private partnership, across this Nation, involves responsible corporate citizens, like HEB, working together with local entities to see that there's food security. But without SNAP, they cannot do their job.

This bill has very little to do with reform and everything to do with denying a vital lifeline to school children and to poor Americans across this country.

Let us reject it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind the young gentleman from Austin, Texas, that he'll have a chance to vote on this, and then we can make a determination. But it's pedophiles, murderers, rapists, those who should have enough money not to have government assistance, that's what we're trying to do here. And he'll have a chance to decide that today.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Taylorsville, Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), a member of the Ag and Transportation and Infrastructure Committees.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I will

say that my home town has no ''s,'' it's Taylorville. But, hey, Mr. SESSIONS has been there. So thank you very much for your time spent in that community and thank you very much for the time today.

I rise today in steadfast support of H.R. 1947, the FARRM Bill. Thanks to the leadership of Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON, we have crafted a farm bill that provides 5 years of certainty, cuts $40 billion, closes loopholes in the SNAP program, and preserves crop insurance as the key risk management tool for our producers.

Ag has been a bright spot for this economy. For every $1 billion in agricultural exports, it supports nearly 8,000 American jobs.

The district I represent is home to ADM, the University of Illinois, the Farm Progress Show, GSI, and Kraft Foods. From the farm to the classroom to the table, agriculture is a crucial economic driver in the 13th District of Illinois.

I'd also like to quickly highlight two amendments I authored, which were included in the FARRM Bill. The first one would provide the agricultural community with a place at the table when the EPA considers regulations impacting agriculture. This is how we stop regulations from coming to the table that want to regulate milk spills like oil spills from the Exxon Valdez. They don't make sense, and the Department of Agriculture deserves a seat at the table to tell them that.

I also had a bipartisan seed amendment that removes duplicative layers of EPA regulations at our ports to ensure that we don't face shortages of seeds in the Midwest.

Lastly, I want to talk about another vital title to this bill. The area that I represent has the University of Illinois. And those of us who are fortunate enough to represent land grant universities know that they are the bedrock of agricultural research. With this FARRM Bill, we are reauthorizing university research and continuing the Agricultural and Food Research Initiative within the National Institute for Food and Agriculture.

Research through AFRI benefits the entire world, and I'm proud of the research that the U of I has conducted through this program. Their cutting-edge research is aimed at improving food security, achieving more efficient crop production, and promoting animal health through livestock genome sequencing.

We have an opportunity to move the FARRM Bill forward this week and avoid the uncertainty of year-long extensions that reform nothing and spend more money.

This FARRM Bill is well thought out, contains critical reforms, and benefits all Americans. Vote ''yes'' on this FARRM Bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Rules Committee, and I appreciate his courtesies in the Rules Committee yesterday, but I have to object to the way he is kind of characterizing those people who are on SNAP. Demonizing and stereotyping people who are on SNAP as somehow rapists, pedophiles, and murderers is just plain wrong. It's just wrong. Please don't do that.

□ 1330

These are people who are law-abiding citizens, they are good people, and they've fallen on hard times. Millions and millions and millions of these people work for a living but they earn so little that they still qualify for SNAP. I have to interject that because these people don't deserve to be demonized, they deserve a helping hand.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter to the New York delegation from Governor Andrew Cuomo opposing these cuts in the farm bill.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, NY, June 13, 2013.

NEW YORK DELEGATION: It is well known that the importance of the Farm Bill goes beyond New York's agriculture industry and conservation efforts. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), within the Nutrition Title, is a program that helps struggling New York families put food on their table. SNAP is one of the most effective anti-poverty components of the nation's safety net. Approximately 3.1 million New Yorkers utilize SNAP to buy groceries. As the Farm Bill moves toward enactment, I urge you to fight to protect the integrity of SNAP, its current streamlined administrative requirements and program benefit levels.

Specifically, I urge you to maintain the successful ''Heat and Eat'' state option. In New York, more than 300,000 households currently participate in the program. In New York, when a SNAP household is also eligible for Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), the State deems that household eligible to have the Heating and Cooling Standard Utility Allowance (HCSUA) used in their benefit calculation, and usually results in a higher SNAP benefit for the household. It is critical to maintain the ability to predicate eligibility for the HCSUA on eligibility for and *anticipated* receipt of the LIHEAP benefit. Both the House and Senate bills restrict the states' ability by requiring SNAP households to be in actual receipt of the LIHEAP benefit. If the state option is restricted as written, these households will see their benefits decrease by roughly $90 per month. Congress should allow New York to continue this innovative strategy to deliver benefits, which reduces administrative costs, instead of increasing the administrative burden on the State, which ultimately requires more resources.

In addition, I urge you to preserve the Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility (BBCE) option that is slated for elimination in the House bill. Households which receive benefits through the Temporary Assistances for Needy Families (TANF) block grant, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), or a state-run low-income general assistance program are categorically eligible for SNAP. Since 2000, New York has been able to use BBCE to eliminate the duplicative and time-consuming requirement that households who already met financial eligibility rules in one specified low-income program go through another financial eligibility determination in SNAP.

Eliminating BBCE will force the state to revert back to requiring a separate asset limit for SNAP, with a threshold of $2,000 ($3,000 for elderly)—unchanged since 1986. This outdated threshold will disqualify applicants even though they meet the same extreme poverty requirements other safety net programs. Many low-income New Yorkers, particularly the elderly and working households, would no longer be eligible for SNAP.

These groups tend to have assets, such as a small savings account which, though putting over the asset threshold, is not a true indication of their poverty status. Eliminating BBCE will result in the elderly and children in low-income working families going without the food assistance upon which they depend.

Furthermore, BBCE is an example of good public policy that has both streamlined administrative requirements and reduced payment error rates to the lowest of any federal program. Without BBCE, states would be forced to waste critical resources in order to allocate staff time to duplicate enrollment procedures and incur the cost of modifying their computer systems, reprinting applications and manuals, and retraining staff.

In addition to the above cuts, the House bill would cut $11 million in funding from the SNAP Employment and Training program (E&T). The Senate bill would preserve the current $90 million funding level until FFY 2018, when it would cut the funding by $10 million. New York serves more than 150,000 individuals through SNAP E&T, which provides sorely needed job preparation and job placement services for SNAP participants. This funding is the only available targeted federal support to enable SNAP participants to engage in these services, which ultimately provides a path to employment, financial stability, and a reduction in SNAP costs for federal government.

The solution to lowering the cost of the SNAP program is not reducing enrollment numbers by restricting eligibility and cutting benefit levels. SNAP is a safety net program in the truest sense of the word; there is no other more fundamental human need than food. There is never a good time to cut SNAP benefits or pass burdensome unfunded mandates, but I respectfully suggest that doing so during a period of economic insecurity, it would be especially harmful to our most vulnerable citizens.

SNAP's low payment error rate—3.8 percent—shows us that benefits reach those who are truly struggling, and it is not a program filled with individuals ''gaming'' the system as many incorrectly proclaim. Cutting benefits and making the program more restrictive may help lower deficits in the short term, but it will prolong the struggle for the millions of New Yorkers who still feel the impacts of the worst recession since the Great Depression.

A Farm Bill is critically important to New York's recovering economy, but those still beaten down by the recession should not be denied basic food assistance. As a fellow New Yorker, I urge you to not support House and Senate Farm Bill provisions that will decrease benefit levels and limit future eligibility.

Sincerely,

ANDREW M. CUOMO,
Governor.

At this time, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me say, first of all, we used to have—or we have—in the part of the

city that I live in, a statement that says, ''Give us your poor, your hungry, your huddled masses yearning to be free.'' We have people here yearning for food.

Now, I have heard my very good friend from Texas talk about rapists and murderers, et cetera, but the Congressional Budget Office, it talks about 200,000 children who will be cut off from the school program. That's not Democrats talking about it. It is the Congressional Budget Office that is talking about it, and we as a country should be focused on the least of these.

I think you judge a country by how you take care of the poor. Here we have clear evidence from an impartial group of about 200,000 children and hundreds of thousands of elderly individuals who will go hungry if we cut this $20.5 billion. This is what this is all about.

We talk about the future of America. Well, somebody within that 200,000 children, who are hungry, who will not have the ability to learn because their stomachs will be crying out for some food, could be the person that could take us where we want to go as a Nation. But what are we doing? In the name of saving money, which we are not, we are turning our backs on these children, on the elderly who have worked hard, many of whom came in with the sign of giving us your young, your poor, and your hungry.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, if I could inquire about the time remaining on both sides, please, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from New York, who is a very dear friend of mine, spoke very eloquently about this bill.

I will tell you that the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, known as SNAP, is designed to ensure that the neediest Americans are able to help themselves with food for themselves and their families. I care very much about people who are disabled seniors and those who are having problems.

I think you would be hard-pressed to find any Member who did not think that reforming this program is also the right thing to do. This program was reformed in the Agriculture Committee. That's the text that we are bringing here today—Republicans and Democrats together working together, looking at the problem, and trying to make sure that prioritization is done.

They also recognize this: in the past decades, SNAP payments, otherwise known as food stamps, have increased by almost 300 percent; 300 percent is non-sustainable. A 300 percent increase puts huge responsibilities on public policy.

This is why Republicans have been offering ideas, and we continue to, about jobs and job growth. This is why Republicans see the terrible plight that the American family and the American people are having in trying to have jobs that are available in their hometown. And this goes to the responsibility of all elected officials, not just Members of Congress, but mayors and Governors and Senators and, Mr. Speaker, Presidents, people who are elected officials who need to understand that increasing food stamps by 300 percent over 10 years should be a national disgrace.

We're not trying to take advantage of those who are on it. They're on it because they cannot find work, they cannot find an opportunity because of public policies that make work harder to find because of rules and regulations out of this body and the Federal Government that are creating circumstances on employers to where they don't go employ people. We've talked about this for years. We said when we got into ObamaCare, this will cause a tremendous loss of jobs. The CBO—we're talking about this organization CBO—predicted the same thing.

Well, by golly, we can look ahead and see exactly where Europe is. Europe is going through what is a tragedy where young people cannot find jobs. It is an international disgrace. You see riots across Europe, and have.

Mr. Speaker, we better be smart enough to recognize that we better reform our policies, not just in agriculture policies but economic policies; economic policies that help people, sure, to get an education, but then a thriving marketplace, not just through trade but also through policies of this country.

Our leaders—Members of Congress, Governors, Vice Presidents, Presidents, and Senators—need to focus on this. We need jobs, we need job creation. We need the opportunity for every Member of Congress to understand how jobs are formulated, how jobs are then formulated, created, and then saved.

We've got a group of people that are in Washington that I think fail to look at the ramifications of long-term unemployment to our country. They, I think, are more interested in what we are going to do for people who are having tough times.

So I'm not here to vilify people. I'm here to say I suffer with you because I know them all over our country. I've seen them, not just in Taylorville, Illinois, but across this country.

What we are doing here today is bigger than just SNAP. It's larger than just the agriculture bill. It is how are we going to create a public policy that we involve all elected officials to understand about jobs, job creation, rules and regulations, and that we do not follow Europe; that we admit that Europe is the problem, not the answer; that we go back to the American Dream, the formulation of hard work, the formulation of creation of jobs and, yes, I'll say it, even people making money so they can employ more people and give more wages.

The free enterprise system, that's really the underpinning of what this whole argument is about today; a creation of a policy in this country that is about helping people that need help and about creating economic opportunity for a vast number of other people and making our country and the American Dream work. That's what the Republican Party is for. That's why we're here today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1340

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of points to some of the things the gentleman from Texas said.

He talked about the increased numbers of people who are on SNAP. The reason why is that we've had a difficult economy. We've had the worst recession since the Great Depression. Lots of people lost work, and lots of people are underemployed right now, so that's why. The CBO tells us that, as we look to the future and as the economy gets better, the number of people on SNAP will go down. So this is there for people who have fallen on hard times. That's why the numbers have increased, and they're going to go down.

The gentleman says that this bill somehow represents reform. This is not about reform. When you come up with reforms, we deliberate. In the Agriculture Committee, in the Subcommittee on Nutrition, do you know how many hearings there were on SNAP? Zero. None. In the full committee, do you know how many hearings there were on SNAP? Zero. None. Then the language appears in the bill that we have before us during a markup.

If you really want reform, you have to listen to people, and you have to deliberate. That's what hearings are for. We have to reach out and figure out how to make this program better. I'm all for making this program better, but that's not what this is about, so let's not have anybody be under the misimpression that this is about reform.

This really is about trying to find an offset to be able to pay for all of the other things and to try to use this to help kind of balance the budget. We're not going after the big agribusiness, and we're not going after crop insurance. What we're doing is going after poor people. They don't have super PACs, and they don't have big lobbyists down here, so there are no political repercussions. That's what this about.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to a leader on this issue, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend from Massachusetts.

I would like to just highlight a point that the gentleman just made that my friend from Texas and everyone understands, which is that, of course, SNAP payments increased during the recession. It is supplemental nutrition, and it's that supplemental nutrition assistance that kept people out of poverty.

The majority ruled out of order my amendment to the FARRM Bill, which would ensure families relying on SNAP could skip fewer meals and buy healthier food. Contrary to my colleagues' claims, SNAP is not too generous, and processed food from the dollar store can't replace fresh fruits, fresh vegetables, and the protein needed in a healthy diet.

So, as the Republican majority prepares to vote to kick 2 million Americans off of SNAP, let's remember what they are not voting for, what they are not voting for today and what they have not voted for on one single day in this Congress:

The GOP is not voting for jobs; they are not voting to raise the minimum wage so that full-time workers can actually feed their kids without SNAP; they are not voting to invest in education so that children have a better shot at success; they are not voting to create new jobs by investing in new ports and new bridges and new roads. In short, my friends on the other side of the aisle are not voting to reduce poverty; they are not voting to reduce hunger; they are not voting to build an economy in which working families can get ahead and don't have to scrape by on SNAP benefits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DEUTCH. What's the Democratic plan for reducing SNAP spending? Create jobs, build the economy, and stop punishing poor people.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN).

Ms. HAHN. I wasn't able to attend my usual congressional Women's Bible Study this morning, but I am still feeling the command of scripture. So, today, as we begin the consideration of the House FARRM Bill—the FARRM Bill that takes $20 billion from the hungry in cuts to SNAP, $20 billion from the plates of fellow Americans who are struggling to feed themselves even with this meager benefit—I am holding in mind the words of Jesus from the Gospel of Matthew:

> Truly I tell you, whatever you did not do for one of the least of these, you did not do for me.

In my communities alone, 145,000 people rely on this benefit. Over half of them are children. This bill takes food from their mouths.

I hope all of my colleagues will remember what that means and will join me in supporting the McGovern amendment, which will reverse these cuts, or else vote down this immoral bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of issues that the House will be considering today as a result of amendments, ideas, that have come to the committee—some that are in the bill and some that are amendments against the bill. I'd like to, if I can, speak on one of those amendments at this time.

This amendment is amendment No. 194, and it is offered by the gentleman who is the former chairman of the committee and who is now the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE). It is cosponsored by a number of Members of this House, including the gentleman Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CHRIS COLLINS of New York, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. LEE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ISSA, and me.

The essence of what this is all about is that it would repeal the Dairy Market Stabilization Program. This program serves as a supply-and-control mechanism which distorts the private markets through which government intervention takes place and which unnecessarily fixes prices. As a result, American families pay higher prices for milk products, and American dairy exports are unnecessarily limited.

This amendment which I speak of, No. 194, known as the ''Goodlatte amendment,'' would replace the stabilization program with a voluntary margin insurance program, allowing producers to effectively manage their risks without unnecessary government intervention. It is government intervention that will simply raise prices for consumers.

It's an important amendment, and it has drawn a lot of attention. I would like to stand up and offer my support since I will not be here probably for the discussion of the bill at the time that the amendment comes up. I lend my support because I think this is one of the most critical piece parts to putting the free market together with the opportunities for reducing cost, bettering the services and products that are available, and helping keep America in the export market to where we are more competitive in the world marketplace.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, free market amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a letter to the Congress from Massachusetts Governor Deval Patrick, which opposes the cuts that are contained in the FARRM Bill.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, MA, May 30, 2013.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADERS PELOSI, REID AND MCCONNELL: As you continue your work on the 2013 Farm Bill, I write to ask that you consider the importance of the following priorities, which, while not an exhaustive list, will help ensure that we continue to provide the most vulnerable Americans with access to healthy and affordable food, as well as strengthen our many diverse farms that are integral to the Commonwealth.

In Massachusetts, over 880,000 individuals are served by the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), 40 percent of who are children. SNAP helps lift families out of poverty and works to bridge the gap so that struggling Americans can put food on the table. I urge you to protect the overall integrity of SNAP and refrain from restricting eligibility, reducing benefits or funding for this critical program. Specifically, I urge you to protect the highly successful Heat and Eat state option. In Massachusetts over 125,000 households currently participate in this program and if it were eliminated they would see a decrease of about $70 per month in their SNAP benefits. Eliminating or placing new burdensome requirements and restrictions on this successful state option will simply lead to increased food insecurity for more of our most vulnerable residents.

In addition, households receiving benefits through a Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant are currently categorically eligible for SNAP. A proposal in the House bill would restrict this categorical eligibility. Many low-income individuals, particularly the elderly, would no longer be eligible for SNAP. This population is already under represented because they are either unaware they are eligible for SNAP benefits or too proud to apply. This change will result in many elders going without the food assistance they need and deserve.

I agree that program integrity is important for SNAP. Your committees can emphasize the importance of program integrity by increasing the percentage of administrative costs reimbursed by the federal government for those states, such as Massachusetts, that invest in efforts to improve program integrity, such as in data sharing and mining software designed to identify household composition, income, assets and participation in other public assistance programs.

As we continue to combat childhood obesity and the increased risk of diabetes, we should do all we can to promote and provide access to fresh fruits and vegetables for our SNAP families. I therefore also urge you to authorize appropriate funding to promote the acceptance of EBT in all farmers' markets and other non-traditional produce vendors.

Bay State farmers have averaged $490 million in cash receipts and employ over 12,000 workers across hundreds of thousands of acres of farmland in active production. In Massachusetts, approximately 80 percent of our farms are family-owned, making it all the more important to maintain an inventory of farmland for future generations. For this reason, I urge you to authorize robust funding for conservation programs in the 2013 Farm Bill, including the Farms and Ranchland Protection Program, which has helped the Commonwealth preserve and protect nearly 14,000 acres of farmland. I also urge you to provide adequate mandatory funding for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, which helps our farmers plan and implement conservation practices to improve soil, water, plant and related resources, as well as Conservation Innovation Grants, which have directly assisted the implementation of over 100 farm energy projects in Massachusetts, saving hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Further, programs funded under the Energy Title have been critical to helping Massachusetts farmers and rural business owners

lower their energy bills through renewable energy installments and energy efficiency improvements. I urge you to authorize robust funding for the Rural Energy for America Program to help our farms continue to make key energy improvements. Since 2009, REAP has helped to fund 44 biomass, solar, energy efficiency and wind projects in rural areas of Massachusetts.

The dairy industry generates over $50 million in cash receipts from milk and other dairy product sales in Massachusetts. Small dairy farms, which predominate in Massachusetts, are particularly vulnerable to changes in the dairy industry, such as the wide fluctuation in market prices of milk and animal feed. At times, such market fluctuations drive down the price of milk while simultaneously driving up the cost of production, often resulting in low or negative margins. To ensure that the dairy industry continues to sustain and improve in Massachusetts, long term solutions including supply management and margin protection are crucial. I therefore support the inclusion of the Dairy Production Margin Protection Program and the Dairy Market Stabilization Program in the 2013 Farm Bill.

Finally, Specialty Crops Block Grant funding is critical to our agriculture economy, as specialty crops, including our vibrant cranberry bogs, make up a majority of our food crops. With over 400 growers producing approximately 35 percent of the nation's cranberry supply, cranberries are the number one food crop in Massachusetts and have a crop value of $104 million. I respectfully request that you authorize yearly funding for the Specialty Crops Block Grant at the FY2013 $55 million level, at a minimum, to allow us to continue to enhance the competitiveness of our specialty crops.

As you continue your work on the Farm Bill, I urge you to protect these important programs and vital benefits in order to provide certainty and stability for low-income families, our farmers and rural small businesses.

Sincerely,

DEVAL L. PATRICK,
Governor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to another leader on this issue, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentleman, who has been such a tremendous leader and head of our Hunger Caucus in the House of Representatives.

Hunger in America—think of that. It ought to be a non sequitur. This is the richest country in the world, and yet one out of four of our children in this country is considered food insecure. That means that there are nights in this country when tens of thousands of children go to sleep hungry—American children.

So, despite what the gentleman from Texas may say about the compassion for these children, 2 million people will be cut off of the food stamp program. Not all of them are rapists and murderers—they are children; they are senior citizens; they are people who go to work every day and yet can't afford to eat.

I'm just finishing a week of living on the average food stamp, or SNAP, budget of $31.50 a week, $4.50 a day. You can spend $4.50 a day for one coffee at a Starbucks. It's not easy to live on that. That is the average food stamp benefit. It's just inconceivable to me that anyone has come to Congress with the idea that one would be willing to take food out of the mouths of hungry children—because it's not just the SNAP program. It's also school lunch programs and school breakfast programs, and 200,000 children are going to be cut off of those programs.

□ 1350

Are you kidding me? This is what we're going to do? This is what the majority is going to vote for to do in our country?

These are working people who often have overcome a rough time. I talked to a woman on SNAP who said she saw it as a trampoline. She was able to get over a rough spot in her life for herself and her children through the SNAP program.

Voting for this cut is immoral and wrong. We should be voting against this cut and against the FARRM Bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the more than 47 million Americans who rely on nutrition assistance and in strong opposition to the deep, unnecessary, and cruel cuts to these antihunger programs in the FARRM Bill.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program is one of our Nation's most effective tools for lifting children, seniors, and families out of poverty and helping vulnerable Americans put food on their table each day. SNAP is a lifeline for low-income and working Americans and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I speak in defense of the most basic elements of America's safety net, that regardless of circumstance, no American should go hungry. These deep and drastic cuts mean that 2 million Americans risk falling through the safety net. Some 210,000 children may go hungry throughout the school day; an additional 850,000 households will have less food on their tables. In my home State, nearly 1 million south Floridians don't know where their next meal will come from, and an astonishing 300,000 of them are children.

It is inexcusable for this Congress to try to balance the budget on the backs of hungry children and their families. We know that savings derived from these cuts are short-lived.

When Americans are food insecure, they are more likely to be anemic and have vitamin A and protein deficiencies, all of which lead to larger and more costly health issues, which we all pay for.

When needy children go off to school on empty stomachs, we dim their horizons and cripple their potential.

We are hurting our Nation's future through these severe burdens on needy families. This is not the way to find a balanced budget approach. Unfortunately, these cuts define the mindset of too many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

It is shameful for us to tell the American people that when they fall on tough times, they're on their own. With these cuts, we are limiting their potential, risking their health, and leaving our fellow Americans writhing with hunger. It is immoral. The authors of this bill should be ashamed.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the $20 billion in cuts to nutrition programs in this bill. Support the McGovern amendment that would restore this critical funding, and oppose the rule and the FARRM Bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida. I do resemble that remark. I helped put this bill together, and I'm proud of it. We did it on a bipartisan basis.

We also did it in a way to try and encourage a marketplace that will become more vibrant, that will ensure that farms and farmers and families and rural areas will not only survive tough times, but be able to see an advantage for working hard.

People who are farmers and ranchers get up early and go to bed late. They represent the people of our country. They are the bedrock of not just men and women and their children who go serve in our military, but they're people who care about basic American values.

In a larger sense, what this FARRM Bill is doing is trying to find a way in its place in all of the policy that we do to take care of people properly in this country who are the neediest, but to also ensure that we prioritize it.

There are a lot of people that are my friends that are Democrats that talk about how this country is a rich and powerful country. Well, we're not as rich or as powerful as we used to be. In the last 5 years, we've diminished not only in stature and power, but in employment. We are falling behind because of policies in Washington, D.C.

This bill is about empowering people that are in real live America. They call it flyover country. It's to help people—farmers, ranchers, communities—to deal with these issues. We're for job creation and job growth.

The larger message is that we need jobs in this country. Let's not just take this as just an isolated incident to say just the FARRM Bill, but also the creation of jobs and job creation. There are 25 million people unemployed and underemployed. The GDP is less than 2 percent, where literally our country is not growing to sustain the newest generations of Americans who go to school, who go to college or to technical school, who come out and want to have a bright future. We are becoming more like Europe. We're becoming where we're beholden to a government that's bigger and more powerful and

one which drives entrepreneurship and individual responsibility out of the way. It's some of these policies that have led to a 300 percent increase in people who are on food stamps over the last 10 years.

We're trying to deal with the problem. I think we're going to do it in a bipartisan way, and I have confidence this bill is on the right pathway. Some may oppose that, and some may not like the bill. I respect that. I respect the gentlewoman from Florida. But I do resemble that remark, and I think our product is good.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY).

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question and ''no'' on the rule.

I'm very disappointed my amendment was not made in order, a solution that was both simple and responsible. It would restore desperately needed SNAP funding, protect the vital programs ranchers and growers rely on, and end welfare for Big Oil and responsibly reduce the deficit.

By ending wasteful tax breaks for Big Oil, my amendment would help more than 68,000 families in Ventura County and families across the country struggling to keep food on the table without cutting programs that California ranchers and farmers depend on like agricultural research, disease and pest control, rural development, and conservation.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question and ''no'' on the rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time this morning, and I thank everyone who has been on the floor to talk about the unconscionable and unthinkable cuts to SNAP benefits. This will have a devastating effect on my home State as it will across the country.

I want to mention one other thing. Just over a week ago, Speaker BOEHNER promised a fair and open debate on the FARRM Bill and said:

> If you have ideas on how to make the bill better, bring them forward. Let's have the debate and vote on them.

Lots of people brought ideas forward, ideas that would help farmers in States like mine, but we aren't getting a chance to debate those ideas here today.

The biggest programs in this bill, the revenue loss program and the price loss program that benefit big farmers, they won't do anything for the farmers in my State or many others. They won't make them more vital, as the Chair on the floor has said today. That's not going to happen.

A bipartisan amendment that I submitted—and this is just one of the 117 denied consideration—would benefit diversified farmers in every State. This is an amendment that has zero cost and is supported by over 400 organizations from 46 States. It's an amendment that would help the tens of thousands of small businesses that did $5 billion in local food sales last year.

I'm glad we will get to vote on the amendment to roll back the outrageous SNAP cuts in this bill, but I am very disappointed that local food and sustainable agriculture has been left out of the farm bill debate.

This is not an open process, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against the rule.

□ 1400

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, in fact the gentlewoman is correct, the Speaker of the House, Speaker BOEHNER, did make a public statement, and he did indicate that we would be open for business at the Rules Committee. I have attempted to do everything necessary and proper to make sure that not only a fair hearing was held, but that all the people who would choose to come and make an amendment available, that the committee was available. We listened. We asked tough questions. We did. But we asked questions that I considered to be fair.

I don't think one witness was discouraged at all from taking all the time they needed but respected that we had some 200 amendments to go through. We did not rush. We took our time. We were very deliberative. We worked with the committee on a bipartisan basis. We consulted others, and we received feedback, and we have a model that I believe many people, if you came to the Rules Committee yesterday, would say they received a fair hearing. Good process.

I'm for this bill. I think it is fair. I think it is balanced. I think it is a good representation of what I'm willing to put my name on as a product to present to this House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I delighted to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his profound leadership on this issue.

You know, I rise in opposition to this rule because there are many amendments that were not made in order, but there's enough pork in this farm bill to make a dead pig squeal. I want to talk about just some of the silly things that are in this bill that were made in order as amendments for us to take up this afternoon, including pennycress as a research and development priority at the Risk Management Agency, or an amendment to direct the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture to conduct an economic analysis of the existing market for U.S. Atlantic spiny dogfish.

But an amendment I had that would have given veterans waiting for disability claims to be processed the opportunity for SNAP as a disabled person was not made in order.

And another amendment that would have made crop insurance subsidies that taxpayers in this country pay, some $9 billion a year, transparent—not in order. There are 26 companies in this country, agribusinesses, that are receiving more than $1 million apiece in crop insurance premiums, but we don't get to know who they are. That was an amendment I had that was not made in order, even though Grover Norquist thinks it should be made in order, U.S. PIRG thinks it should be made in order, and the Environmental Working Group thinks it should be made in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlelady.

Ms. SPEIER. But we're more interested in talking about the Atlantic spiny dogfish, or pennycress than dealing with issues around veterans accessing SNAP and whether or not the public has a right to know when we spend $9 billion a year on premium payments for crop insurance, just another name for what has historically been a farm subsidy.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I'm down to the bare minimum time I have left, and I'm going to reserve my time to close. I will close whenever the gentleman is prepared to do the same.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I will insert in the RECORD a letter that was sent to Members of Congress by dozens and dozens of organizations ranging from the AFL–CIO; The Alliance to End Hunger; Bread for the World; Feeding America; Food Research and Action Center (FRAC); Jewish Council for Public Affairs; Mazon: A Jewish Response to Hunger; MomsRising; and Share Our Strength. I can go on and on.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important debate we are having and will have on this farm bill. It is about our values. The question is, is it acceptable to try to balance the budget or pay for other programs to benefit wealthy special interests by cutting a program that benefits the poorest of the poor in this country, a program called SNAP.

The people on SNAP, I want to remind my colleagues, are good, decent, honest people. They are our neighbors. They are people who have fallen on hard times. They are people who are working, working full time and still not earning enough to be able to not qualify for public assistance. Those are the people we're talking about. Those are the people who would be adversely impacted with a $20.5 billion cut.

I would also say to my colleagues who say that we can't afford to support our social safety net, can't afford to support anti-hunger programs, I want

them to know that hunger costs America a great deal. The Center For American Progress did a study that said it cost us $168.5 billion a year in avoidable health care costs, disability, lost wages, reduced learning capacity.

Hungry children who go to school don't learn. That's why it's particularly cruel that over 200,000 kids will lose their access to free lunch and breakfast at school. Those kids will go to school hungry. You don't learn if you're hungry. We all talk about preparing the new generation and making sure our kids have all the opportunities. But food is as essential to learning as that textbook is. And here we are, we're going to embrace a bill that cuts 200,000 kids off the school breakfast and lunch program. Cutting SNAP will make hunger worse, and it will have long-term consequences.

Let me just finally say that we're going to have an amendment coming up shortly after we vote on the rule that I have sponsored along with dozens and dozens of other Members here in the House of Representatives to restore the cuts in SNAP. I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to think long and hard before you vote. We don't have to do this. The price of a farm bill should not be making more people hungry in America, but yet that's the price that's being exacted through this bill.

We are a better country than this. Let's not go down this road. This used to be a bipartisan effort. Bob Dole and Bill Emerson championed some of the anti-hunger programs that have kept people fed, that have invested in people who are now very successful. Don't turn your backs on that tradition.

And to my Democratic colleagues, I remind you that if we do not stand with people who are hungry, with people who are poor and vulnerable, then what the hell do we stand for? You know, this is about our values.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule because a lot of amendments that should have been made in order were not. I appreciate the courtesies that my colleague, Mr. SESSIONS, afforded to us in the Rules Committee. I know he tried very hard to include as many amendments as possible. I appreciate that very much. I appreciate my amendment being made in order, but I think we could have done a little bit better.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule. And please vote ''yes'' on the McGovern amendment. If that should fail, do not send a farm bill forward that will throw 2 million people off the rolls of SNAP and 200,000 kids off of free breakfast and lunch programs. We can do much better than that.

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

JUNE 19, 2013.

We, the undersigned, support Rep. James McGovern's amendment (#146) to restore the $20.5 billion/10 years cut to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) currently in H.R. 1947. As it stands, we oppose H.R. 1947 because it would increase hunger among millions of Americans—people with disabilities, children, seniors and struggling parents—those who work, as well as those who are unemployed or underemployed.

At a time when more than one in six Americans struggle to put food on the table, the cuts to SNAP proposed in the House farm bill are unconscionable and harmful. Specifically, the House bill would result in at least 1.8 million people losing SNAP benefits entirely, and another 1.7 million people seeing their benefits reduced by about $90 per month.

Our nation can ill afford to see SNAP weakened in the farm bill. Benefits are modest, averaging less than $1.50 per person per meal and are already scheduled to drop on November 1, 2013, with termination of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) benefit boost. This reduction, which will impact every SNAP beneficiary, will average about $25 per month for a family of three.

We support Rep. James McGovern's amendment (#146) to restore the $20.5 billion cut to SNAP and urge Members of Congress to vote YES when it comes up for a vote.

Advocates for Better Children's Diets (ABCD), AFL–CIO, Alliance for a Just Society, Alliance to End Hunger, American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), American Commodity Distribution Association (ACDA), American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees (AFSCME), American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, American Public Health Association, Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), Association of Jewish Family and Children's Agencies, B. Sackin & Associates, Bread for the World, Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP), Center for Women Policy Studies, Children's Defense Fund, Children's HealthWatch, Coalition on Human Needs (CHN), Community Action Partnership (CAP), Congressional Hunger Center (CHC), E S Foods, Environmental Working Group (EWG), Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Families USA, Family Economic Initiative, Feeding America, First Focus Campaign for Children, Food Research & Action Center (F–RAC), Friends Committee on National Legislation, International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), Jewish Council for Public Affairs, Legal Momentum, MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger, MomsRising, National Association of County Human Services Administrators, National Black Child Development Institute, National Center for Law and Economic Justice (NCLEJ), National Council on Aging, National CSFP Association, National Education Association (NEA), National Employment Law Project (NELP), National Health Care for the Homeless Council, National Immigration Law Center (NILC).

National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty, National WIC Association, National Women's Law Center, NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby, PolicyLink, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities Coalition (REHCD), RESULTS, Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law, School Food FOCUS National Office, School Nutrition Association (SNA), Share Our Strength, Sisters of Mercy of the Americas Institute Justice Team, Society for Nutrition Education and Behavior (SNEB), SparkAction, The Food Trust, Union for Reform Judaism, United States Conference of Mayors (USCM), Voices for America's Children, Voices for Progress, WhyHunger, Wider Opportunities for Women.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, is most kind. He is most kind in not only how he presented his ideas today, and perhaps even some opposition, and I respect that. I respect him for not only standing up almost every day I see him for not just what he believes in, but caring about people.

My party cares about people, too. The Republican Party cares very much for people, not only those who have fallen on tough times but those who are friends and neighbors, and those who we don't know who live in our communities who are hurting, who are actually having tough times feeding their kids, finding work, paying student loans, and getting things done in their community that will better their community, following the guidelines that they always have about how tomorrow will be a better day for America and Americans. These are tough times.

But what we've done, and our mission today, is to take a farm bill that passed out of the committee that is very equally divided 36–10. This committee that looked at not just the policy on farm policy but has held hearing after hearing around this country, some 40 hearings over the last few years on the farm bill, to get it prepared and ready for this floor, to prepare it for the Rules Committee where both Republican and Democrat members of that committee came and thoughtfully presented their ideas, offered support for the bill once again that passed 36–10 in committee, and moved new ideas and allowed new ideas to be debated on this floor.

□ 1410

Look, not every amendment was made in order. I admit that. Did I want that as a goal to get closer? You bet I did.

But we allowed the debate and the opportunity up at the Rules Committee and then are trying to craft a bill that is in line with what the crafters wanted from farm policy. They're the people that understand this best. They're the people that know the impact.

And so I'm proud of the product. I think we've bettered it. I think we made it better up in the committee. I think we made it better here. And the gentleman, Mr. MCGOVERN, is a part of that process.

As chairman of the Rules Committee, I have the authority and the responsibility to ensure that the mark that we make, that the presentation that we put on this floor and, most of all, that the legislation that allows full debate and content is important.

So, look, what we're going to do is try and worry about a new farm bill that we can move forward. I am supporting this bill. I hope we'll vote on the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question on the resolution.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of Jackson Lee amendment #94, which will be in the en bloc for H.R.

1947, the ''Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.'' My thanks to Agriculture Committee Chair FRANK D. LUCAS and Ranking Member COLLIN C. PETERSON for including the Jackson Lee amendment in the en bloc.

I appreciate the work of Rules Committee Chair MCGOVERN and Rules Committee members for managing the debate on amendments to H.R. 1947.

I offered amendments to H.R. 1947 for deliberation by the Rules Committee for approval for consideration by the Full House. Only one of my amendments was made in order and will be included in the en bloc for the bill.

Jackson Lee #94 will be included in the en bloc and is a sense of Congress that the Federal Government should increase business opportunities for small businesses, black farmers, women and minority businesses.

Small farm businesses, black farmers, women and minority agriculture related businesses could benefit from partnerships with federal office location in receiving support for farmers markets. This would assist with eliminating food deserts, which are urban neighborhoods and rural towns without easy access to fresh, healthy and affordable food. These communities may have no food access or are served only by fast food restaurants and convenience stores.

Other amendments, I request that the Rules Committee favorably consider included Amendment #1, the McGovern amendment, which was joined by over 80 members of the House. This important amendment would restore $20.5 billion in cuts in SNAP funding by offsetting the Farm Risk Management Election Program and the Supplemental Coverage Option.

Jackson Lee amendments not included in the Rule for the bill include:

Jackson Lee amendment #182 was a sense of Congress that the Federal Government should increase financial support provided to urban community gardens and victory gardens to heighten awareness of nutrition.

The knowledge shared with urban dwellers can have a long term benefit to the health of our nation by increasing awareness regarding the link between what we eat and health. This would also be a means of expanding the diet options for persons who live in areas where the cost of fresh fruits and vegetables can be prohibitive.

Jackson Lee #183 is a sense of Congress regarding funding for a nutrition program for disabled and older Americans. Accessible and affordable nutrition is especially important when dietary needs change or must accommodate life's changes. Older Americans and persons with disabilities often must live with restricted diets.

Jackson Lee Amendment #184 was a sense of Congress that encourages food items being provided pursuant to the Federal school breakfast and school lunch program should be selected so as to reduce the incidence of juvenile obesity and to maximize nutritional value.

This amendment passed the House by a substantial margin in the 110th Congress by a recorded vote of 422 to 3. The inclusion of this amendment in the Rule for 1947 would affirm congressional commitment to fight juvenile obesity and to maximize nutritional value. The amendment should have been made in order considering the epidemic of juvenile and adult obesity.

Finally, I sought support by the Rules Committee of an amendment offered by Congresspersons KILDEE, FUDGE, PETERS, TIM RYAN, and Jackson Lee amendment #53.

This amendment was not included in the final Rule for the bill. This amendment would have brought healthy food to those with limited access to fresh fruits and vegetables through a public-private partnership. It would increase funding for SNAP incentive programs for fresh fruits and vegetables by $5 million per year, which is offset by decreasing the adjusted gross income limit for certain Title and Title II programs.

Food is not an option—it is a right that all people living in this Nation must have to exist and to prosper. The $20.5 billion cuts in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program also known as SNAP would remove 2 million Americans from this important food assistance program, and 210,000 children would lose access to free or reduced price school meals.

The course of our Nation's history led to changes in our economy, first from agricultural to industrial and now technological. These economic changes impacted the availability and affordability of food. Today our Nation is still one of the wealthiest in the world, but we now have food deserts. A food desert is a place where access to food may not be available and certainly access to health sustaining food is not available.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture defines a food desert as a ''low-access community,'' where at least 500 people and/or at least 33 percent of the census tract's population live more than one mile from a supermarket or large grocery store. The USDA defines a food desert for rural communities as a census tract where the distance to a grocery store is more than 10 miles.

Food deserts exist in rural and urban areas and are spreading as a result of fewer farms as well as fewer places to access fresh fruits, vegetables, proteins, and other foods as well as a poor economy.

The results of food deserts are increases in malnutrition and other health disparities that impact minority and low income communities in rural and urban areas. Health disparities occur because of a lack of access to critical food groups that provide nutrients that support normal metabolic function.

Poor metabolic function leads to malnutrition that causes breakdown in tissue. For example, a lack of protein in a diet leads to disease and decay of teeth and bones. Another example of health disparities in food deserts is the presence of fast food establishments instead of grocery stores. If someone only consumes energy dense foods like fast foods, this will lead to clogged arteries, which is a precursor for arterial disease, a leading cause of heart disease. A person eating a constant diet of fast foods is also vulnerable to higher risks of insulin resistance which results in diabetes.

In Harris County, Texas, 149 out of 920 households, or 20 percent of residents, do not have automobiles and live more than one-half mile from a grocery store.

At the beginning of the third millennium of this Nation's existence we should know better. Denying a higher quality of life that would result from better access to healthier food choices is shortsighted—it is also economically unsound and threatens our national security.

Social stability is threatened when people's basic needs are not met—food, clean drinking water and breathable air are the least of the requirements for life. Denying access to sufficient amounts of the right kinds of food means people will become less productive, more prone to disease and will not be able to function as contributing members of society.

For one in six Americans hunger is real and far too many people assume that the problem of hunger is isolated. One in six men, women or children you see every day may not know where their next meal is coming from or may have missed one or two meals yesterday.

Hunger is silent—most victims of hunger are ashamed and will not ask for help; they work to hide their situation from everyone. Hunger is persistent and impacts millions of people who struggle to find enough to eat. Food insecurity causes parents to skip meals so that their children can eat.

In 2009–2010 the Houston, Sugar Land and Baytown area had 27.6 percent of households with children experiencing food hardship. In households without children food hardship was experienced by 16.5. Houston, Sugar Land and Baytown rank 22 among the areas surveyed.

In 2011, according to Feeding America:

46.2 million people were in poverty;

9.5 million families were in poverty;

26.5 million people ages 18–64 were in poverty;

16.1 million children under the age of 18 were in poverty;

3.6 million (9.0 percent) of seniors 65 and older were in poverty.

In the State of Texas:

34% of children live in poverty in Texas;

21% of adults (19–64) live in poverty in Texas;

17% of elderly live in poverty in Texas.

In my city of Houston, Texas the U.S. Census reports that over the last 12 months 442,881 incomes were below the poverty level.

In 2011:

50.1 million Americans lived in food insecure households, 33.5 million adults and 16.7 million children;

households with children reported food insecurity at a significantly higher rate than those without children, 20.6 percent compared to 12.2 percent.

Eighteen percent of households in the state of Texas from 2009 through 2011 ranked second in the highest rate of food insecurity—only the state of Mississippi exceeds the ratio of households struggling with hunger.

In the 18th Congressional District an estimated 151,741 families lived in poverty.

There are charitable organizations that many of us contribute to that provide food assistance to people in need, but their resources would not be able to fill the gap created by a $20.5 billion cut to Federal food assistance programs.

Food banks and pantries fill an important role by helping the working poor, disabled and the poor gain access to food assistance when government subsidized food assistance or budgets fall short of basic needs. Food pantries also help when an unforeseen circumstance occurs and more food is needed for a family to make it until payday or government assistance arrives. However, food pantries cannot carry the full burden of a community's need for food on their own.

During these difficult economic times, people who once gave to food pantries may now

seek donations from them. Millions of low income persons and families receive food assistance through SNAP. This program represents the Nation's largest program that combats domestic hunger.

For more than 40 years, SNAP has offered nutrition assistance to millions of low income individuals and families. Today, the SNAP program serves over 46 million people each month.

SNAP Statistics:

Households with children receive about 75 percent of all food stamp benefits.

23 percent of households include a disabled person and 18 percent of households include an elderly person.

The FSP increases household food spending, and the increase is greater than what would occur with an equal benefit in cash.

Every $5 in new food stamp benefits generates almost twice as much ($9.20) in total community spending.

The economics of SNAP food support programs benefit everyone by preventing new food deserts from developing. The impact of SNAP funds coming into local and neighborhood grocery stores is more profitable supermarkets. SNAP funds going into local food economies also make the cost of food for everyone less expensive and assure a variety and abundance of food selections found in grocery stores.

SNAP is the largest program in the American domestic hunger safety net. The Food and Nutrition Service programs supported by SNAP work with State agencies, nutrition educators, and neighborhood as well as faith-based organizations to assist those eligible for nutrition assistance. Food and Nutrition Service programs also work with State partners and the retail community to improve program administration and work to ensure the program's integrity.

Yes, more can be done to assure that food distribution from the fields to the tables of Americans in most need can be improved. The process of improving our nation's ability to more efficiently and effectively meet the food needs of citizens must begin with understanding the problem and acting on facts. I strongly support hearings on the subject and encourage all oversight committees to consider taking up the matter during this Congress.

However, we cannot ignore the safety process in place to prevent abuse or misuse of the program. The Federal SNAP law provides two basic pathways for financial eligibility to the program: (1) Meeting federal eligibility requirements, or (2) being automatically or ''categorically'' eligible for SNAP based on being eligible for or receiving benefits from other specified low-income assistance programs. Categorical eligibility eliminated the requirement that households who already met financial eligibility rules in one specified low-income program go through another financial eligibility determination in SNAP.

However, since the 1996 welfare reform law, states have been able to expand categorical eligibility beyond its traditional bounds. That law created TANF to replace the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program, which was a traditional cash assistance program. TANF is a broad-purpose block grant that finances a wide range of social and human services.

TANF gives states flexibility in meeting its goals, resulting in a wide variation of benefits and services offered among the states. SNAP allows states to convey categorical eligibility based on receipt of a TANF ''benefit,'' not just TANF cash welfare. This provides states with the ability to convey categorical eligibility based on a wide range of benefits and services. TANF benefits other than cash assistance typically are available to a broader range of households and at higher levels of income than are TANF cash assistance benefits.

Congress cannot afford to forget that by the year 2050, the world population is expected to be 9 billion persons. We cannot build our nation's food security on an uncertain future. Domestic food production and access to healthy nutritious food is essential to our Nation's long term national security.

Until we see the final farm bill, including the amendment adopted by the Full House, I cannot offer my support for the legislation as it is written.

The bill is too shortsighted about the realities of hunger in our Nation—the fact that it proposes to cut $20.5 billion from the SNAP program is of great concern. We should work to create certainty for farmers who run high risk businesses that are vulnerable to weather changes, insects or blight.

We should be equally concerned about providing long term food security for all of our Nation's citizens, which include rural, suburban and urban dwellers.

I thank the Agriculture Committee for including the Jackson Lee amendment in the en bloc for the bill. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the McGovern amendment to prevent the $20.5 billion in cuts to the SNAP program. I urge all members to vote in favor of the en bloc and the McGovern amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 271, if ordered, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 187, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 253]

YEAS—233

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—187

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng

Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Bonner
Clarke
Cleaver
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pallone
Poe (TX)
Rogers (KY)
Slaughter

□ 1435

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 177, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

AYES—239

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—177

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Bonner
Clarke
Cleaver
Cummings
Garcia
Gohmert
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Hudson
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pallone
Rogers (KY)
Slaughter

□ 1443

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 254, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 254, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 275, noes 139, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

AYES—275

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gibbs
Goodlatte

Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Horsford
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stutzman
Takano
Thornberry
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—139

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Benishek
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Foxx
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Hanna
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (IL)
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Langevin
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lewis
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
Meehan
Meeks
Miller, George
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nugent
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Sewell (AL)
Sires
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—19

Bass
Bonner
Cleaver
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
King (IA)
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pallone
Rogers (KY)
Schakowsky
Scott, David
Simpson
Slaughter

□ 1450

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 1947, pursuant to House Resolution 271, amendment No. 55, printed in part B of House Report 113–117, may be considered out of sequence.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be allowed 5 legislative days to add additional material.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 271 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1947.

Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1453

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, with Mr. WEBSTER of Florida (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, June 18, 2013, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 271, no further general debate shall be in order. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committees on Agriculture and the Judiciary, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–14, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 113–117. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

H.R. 1947

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definition of Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE I—COMMODITIES

Subtitle A—Repeals and Reforms

Sec. 1101. Repeal of direct payments.
Sec. 1102. Repeal of counter-cyclical payments.
Sec. 1103. Repeal of average crop revenue election program.
Sec. 1104. Definitions.
Sec. 1105. Base acres.
Sec. 1106. Payment yields.
Sec. 1107. Farm risk management election.
Sec. 1108. Producer agreements.
Sec. 1109. Period of effectiveness.

Subtitle B—Marketing Loans

Sec. 1201. Availability of nonrecourse marketing assistance loans for loan commodities.
Sec. 1202. Loan rates for nonrecourse marketing assistance loans.
Sec. 1203. Term of loans.
Sec. 1204. Repayment of loans.
Sec. 1205. Loan deficiency payments.
Sec. 1206. Payments in lieu of loan deficiency payments for grazed acreage.
Sec. 1207. Special marketing loan provisions for upland cotton.
Sec. 1208. Special competitive provisions for extra long staple cotton.
Sec. 1209. Availability of recourse loans for high moisture feed grains and seed cotton.
Sec. 1210. Adjustments of loans.

Subtitle C—Sugar

Sec. 1301. Sugar program.

Subtitle D—Dairy

PART I—DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN PROTECTION AND DAIRY MARKET STABILIZATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 1401. Definitions.
Sec. 1402. Calculation of average feed cost and actual dairy producer margins.

SUBPART A—DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN PROTECTION PROGRAM

Sec. 1411. Establishment of dairy producer margin protection program.
Sec. 1412. Participation of dairy producers in margin protection program.
Sec. 1413. Production history of participating dairy producers.
Sec. 1414. Basic margin protection.
Sec. 1415. Supplemental margin protection.
Sec. 1416. Effect of failure to pay administrative fees or premiums.

SUBPART B—DAIRY MARKET STABILIZATION PROGRAM

Sec. 1431. Establishment of dairy market stabilization program.
Sec. 1432. Threshold for implementation and reduction in dairy producer payments.

Sec. 1433. Producer milk marketing information.
Sec. 1434. Calculation and collection of reduced dairy producer payments.
Sec. 1435. Remitting monies to the Secretary and use of monies.
Sec. 1436. Suspension of reduced payment requirement.
Sec. 1437. Enforcement.
Sec. 1438. Audit requirements.

SUBPART C—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Sec. 1451. Use of Commodity Credit Corporation.

SUBPART D—INITIATION AND DURATION

Sec. 1461. Rulemaking.
Sec. 1462. Duration.

PART II—REPEAL OR REAUTHORIZATION OF OTHER DAIRY-RELATED PROVISIONS

Sec. 1481. Repeal of dairy product price support and milk income loss contract programs.
Sec. 1482. Repeal of dairy export incentive program.
Sec. 1483. Extension of dairy forward pricing program.
Sec. 1484. Extension of dairy indemnity program.
Sec. 1485. Extension of dairy promotion and research program.
Sec. 1486. Repeal of Federal Milk Marketing Order Review Commission.

PART III—EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 1491. Effective date.

Subtitle E—Supplemental Agricultural Disaster Assistance Programs

Sec. 1501. Supplemental agricultural disaster assistance.

Subtitle F—Administration

Sec. 1601. Administration generally.
Sec. 1602. Suspension of permanent price support authority.
Sec. 1603. Payment limitations.
Sec. 1604. Adjusted gross income limitation.
Sec. 1605. Geographically disadvantaged farmers and ranchers.
Sec. 1606. Personal liability of producers for deficiencies.
Sec. 1607. Prevention of deceased individuals receiving payments under farm commodity programs.
Sec. 1608. Technical corrections.
Sec. 1609. Assignment of payments.
Sec. 1610. Tracking of benefits.
Sec. 1611. Signature authority.
Sec. 1612. Implementation.
Sec. 1613. Protection of producer information.

TITLE II—CONSERVATION

Subtitle A—Conservation Reserve Program

Sec. 2001. Extension and enrollment requirements of conservation reserve program.
Sec. 2002. Farmable wetland program.
Sec. 2003. Duties of owners and operators.
Sec. 2004. Duties of the Secretary.
Sec. 2005. Payments.
Sec. 2006. Contract requirements.
Sec. 2007. Conversion of land subject to contract to other conserving uses.
Sec. 2008. Effective date.

Subtitle B—Conservation Stewardship Program

Sec. 2101. Conservation stewardship program.

Subtitle C—Environmental Quality Incentives Program

Sec. 2201. Purposes.
Sec. 2202. Establishment and administration.
Sec. 2203. Evaluation of applications.
Sec. 2204. Duties of producers.
Sec. 2205. Limitation on payments.
Sec. 2206. Conservation innovation grants and payments.
Sec. 2207. Effective date.

Subtitle D—Agricultural Conservation Easement Program

Sec. 2301. Agricultural conservation easement program.

Subtitle E—Regional Conservation Partnership Program

Sec. 2401. Regional conservation partnership program.

Subtitle F—Other Conservation Programs

Sec. 2501. Conservation of private grazing land.
Sec. 2502. Grassroots source water protection program.
Sec. 2503. Voluntary public access and habitat incentive program.
Sec. 2504. Agriculture conservation experienced services program.
Sec. 2505. Small watershed rehabilitation program.
Sec. 2506. Agricultural management assistance program.

Subtitle G—Funding and Administration

Sec. 2601. Funding.
Sec. 2602. Technical assistance.
Sec. 2603. Reservation of funds to provide assistance to certain farmers or ranchers for conservation access.
Sec. 2604. Annual report on program enrollments and assistance.
Sec. 2605. Review of conservation practice standards.
Sec. 2606. Administrative requirements applicable to all conservation programs.
Sec. 2607. Standards for State technical committees.
Sec. 2608. Rulemaking authority.

Subtitle H—Repeal of Superseded Program Authorities and Transitional Provisions; Technical Amendments

Sec. 2701. Comprehensive conservation enhancement program.
Sec. 2702. Emergency forestry conservation reserve program.
Sec. 2703. Wetlands reserve program.
Sec. 2704. Farmland protection program and farm viability program.
Sec. 2705. Grassland reserve program.
Sec. 2706. Agricultural water enhancement program.
Sec. 2707. Wildlife habitat incentive program.
Sec. 2708. Great Lakes basin program.
Sec. 2709. Chesapeake Bay watershed program.
Sec. 2710. Cooperative conservation partnership initiative.
Sec. 2711. Environmental easement program.
Sec. 2712. Technical amendments.

TITLE III—TRADE

Subtitle A—Food for Peace Act

Sec. 3001. General authority.
Sec. 3002. Support for organizations through which assistance is provided.
Sec. 3003. Food aid quality.
Sec. 3004. Minimum levels of assistance.
Sec. 3005. Food Aid Consultative Group.
Sec. 3006. Oversight, monitoring, and evaluation.
Sec. 3007. Assistance for stockpiling and rapid transportation, delivery, and distribution of shelf-stable prepackaged foods.
Sec. 3008. General provisions.
Sec. 3009. Prepositioning of agricultural commodities.
Sec. 3010. Annual report regarding food aid programs and activities.
Sec. 3011. Deadline for agreements to finance sales or to provide other assistance.
Sec. 3012. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 3013. Micronutrient fortification programs.
Sec. 3014. John Ogonowski and Doug Bereuter Farmer-to-Farmer Program.

Subtitle B—Agricultural Trade Act of 1978

Sec. 3101. Funding for export credit guarantee program.
Sec. 3102. Funding for market access program.
Sec. 3103. Foreign market development cooperator program.

Subtitle C—Other Agricultural Trade Laws

Sec. 3201. Food for Progress Act of 1985.
Sec. 3202. Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust.
Sec. 3203. Promotion of agricultural exports to emerging markets.
Sec. 3204. McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program.
Sec. 3205. Technical assistance for specialty crops.
Sec. 3206. Global Crop Diversity Trust.
Sec. 3207. Under Secretary of Agriculture for Foreign Agricultural Services.

TITLE IV—NUTRITION

Subtitle A—Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

Sec. 4001. Preventing payment of cash to recipients of supplemental nutrition assistance benefits for the return of empty bottles and cans used to contain food purchased with benefits provided under the program.
Sec. 4002. Retailers.
Sec. 4003. Enhancing services to elderly and disabled supplemental nutrition assistance program participants.
Sec. 4004. Food distribution program on Indian reservations.
Sec. 4005. Updating program eligibility.
Sec. 4006. Exclusion of medical marijuana from excess medical expense deduction.
Sec. 4007. Standard utility allowances based on the receipt of energy assistance payments.
Sec. 4008. Eligibility disqualifications.
Sec. 4009. Ending supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits for lottery or gambling winners.
Sec. 4010. Improving security of food assistance.
Sec. 4011. Demonstration projects on acceptance of benefits of mobile transactions.
Sec. 4012. Use of benefits for purchase of community-supported agriculture share.
Sec. 4013. Restaurant meals program.
Sec. 4014. Mandating State immigration verification.
Sec. 4015. Data exchange standardization for improved interoperability.
Sec. 4016. Pilot projects to improve Federal-State cooperation in identifying and reducing fraud in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.
Sec. 4017. Prohibiting government-sponsored recruitment activities.
Sec. 4018. Repeal of bonus program.
Sec. 4019. Funding of employment and training programs.
Sec. 4020. Monitoring employment and training programs.
Sec. 4021. Cooperation with program research and evaluation.
Sec. 4022. Pilot projects to reduce dependency and increase work effort in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.
Sec. 4023. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 4024. Limitation on use of block grant to Puerto Rico.
Sec. 4025. Assistance for community food projects.
Sec. 4026. Emergency food assistance.
Sec. 4027. Nutrition education.
Sec. 4028. Retailer trafficking.
Sec. 4029. Technical and conforming amendments.
Sec. 4030. Tolerance level for excluding small errors.
Sec. 4031. Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands pilot program.
Sec. 4032. Annual State report on verification of SNAP participation.

Subtitle B—Commodity Distribution Programs

Sec. 4101. Commodity distribution program.
Sec. 4102. Commodity supplemental food program.
Sec. 4103. Distribution of surplus commodities to special nutrition projects.
Sec. 4104. Processing of commodities.

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous

Sec. 4201. Farmers' market nutrition program.
Sec. 4202. Nutrition information and awareness pilot program.
Sec. 4203. Fresh fruit and vegetable program.
Sec. 4204. Additional authority for purchase of fresh fruits, vegetables, and other specialty food crops.
Sec. 4205. Encouraging locally and regionally grown and raised food.
Sec. 4206. Review of public health benefits of white potatoes.
Sec. 4207. Healthy Food Financing Initiative.

TITLE V—CREDIT

Subtitle A—Farm Ownership Loans

Sec. 5001. Eligibility for farm ownership loans.
Sec. 5002. Conservation loan and loan guarantee program.
Sec. 5003. Down payment loan program.
Sec. 5004. Elimination of mineral rights appraisal requirement.

Subtitle B—Operating Loans

Sec. 5101. Eligibility for farm operating loans.
Sec. 5102. Elimination of rural residency requirement for operating loans to youth.
Sec. 5103. Authority to waive personal liability for youth loans due to circumstances beyond borrower control.
Sec. 5104. Microloans.

Subtitle C—Emergency Loans

Sec. 5201. Eligibility for emergency loans.

Subtitle D—Administrative Provisions

Sec. 5301. Beginning farmer and rancher individual development accounts pilot program.
Sec. 5302. Eligible beginning farmers and ranchers.
Sec. 5303. Loan authorization levels.
Sec. 5304. Priority for participation loans.
Sec. 5305. Loan fund set-asides.
Sec. 5306. Conforming amendment to borrower training provision, relating to eligibility changes.

Subtitle E—State Agricultural Mediation Programs

Sec. 5401. State agricultural mediation programs.

Subtitle F—Loans to Purchasers of Highly Fractionated Land

Sec. 5501. Loans to purchasers of highly fractionated land.

TITLE VI—RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Subtitle A—Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act

Sec. 6001. Water, waste disposal, and wastewater facility grants.
Sec. 6002. Rural business opportunity grants.
Sec. 6003. Elimination of reservation of community facilities grant program funds.
Sec. 6004. Utilization of loan guarantees for community facilities.
Sec. 6005. Rural water and wastewater circuit rider program.
Sec. 6006. Tribal college and university essential community facilities.
Sec. 6007. Essential community facilities technical assistance and training.
Sec. 6008. Emergency and imminent community water assistance grant program.
Sec. 6009. Household water well systems.
Sec. 6010. Rural business and industry loan program.
Sec. 6011. Rural cooperative development grants.
Sec. 6012. Locally or regionally produced agricultural food products.
Sec. 6013. Intermediary relending program.
Sec. 6014. Rural college coordinated strategy.
Sec. 6015. Rural water and waste disposal infrastructure.
Sec. 6016. Simplified applications.
Sec. 6017. Grants for NOAA weather radio transmitters.
Sec. 6018. Rural microentrepreneur assistance program.
Sec. 6019. Delta Regional Authority.
Sec. 6020. Northern Great Plains Regional Authority.
Sec. 6021. Rural business investment program.

Subtitle B—Rural Electrification Act of 1936

Sec. 6101. Relending for certain purposes.
Sec. 6102. Fees for certain loan guarantees.
Sec. 6103. Guarantees for bonds and notes issued for electrification or telephone purposes.
Sec. 6104. Expansion of 911 access.
Sec. 6105. Access to broadband telecommunications services in rural areas.

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous

Sec. 6201. Distance learning and telemedicine.
Sec. 6202. Value-added agricultural market development program grants.
Sec. 6203. Agriculture innovation center demonstration program.
Sec. 6204. Program metrics.
Sec. 6205. Study of rural transportation issues.
Sec. 6206. Certain Federal actions not to be considered major.

TITLE VII—RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977

Sec. 7101. Option to be included as non-land-grant college of agriculture.
Sec. 7102. National Agricultural Research, Extension, Education, and Economics Advisory Board.
Sec. 7103. Specialty crop committee.
Sec. 7104. Veterinary services grant program.
Sec. 7105. Grants and fellowships for food and agriculture sciences education.
Sec. 7106. Policy research centers.
Sec. 7107. Repeal of human nutrition intervention and health promotion research program.
Sec. 7108. Repeal of pilot research program to combine medical and agricultural research.
Sec. 7109. Nutrition education program.
Sec. 7110. Continuing animal health and disease research programs.
Sec. 7111. Repeal of appropriations for research on national or regional problems.
Sec. 7112. Grants to upgrade agricultural and food sciences facilities at 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University.
Sec. 7113. Grants to upgrade agriculture and food science facilities and equipment at insular area land-grant institutions.
Sec. 7114. Repeal of national research and training virtual centers.
Sec. 7115. Hispanic-serving institutions.
Sec. 7116. Competitive Grants Program for Hispanic Agricultural Workers and Youth.
Sec. 7117. Competitive grants for international agricultural science and education programs.
Sec. 7118. Repeal of research equipment grants.
Sec. 7119. University research.
Sec. 7120. Extension service.
Sec. 7121. Auditing, reporting, bookkeeping, and administrative requirements.
Sec. 7122. Supplemental and alternative crops.
Sec. 7123. Capacity building grants for NLGCA institutions.
Sec. 7124. Aquaculture assistance programs.
Sec. 7125. Rangeland research programs.
Sec. 7126. Special authorization for biosecurity planning and response.
Sec. 7127. Distance education and resident instruction grants program for insular area institutions of higher education.
Sec. 7128. Matching funds requirement.

Subtitle B—Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990

Sec. 7201. Best utilization of biological applications.
Sec. 7202. Integrated management systems.
Sec. 7203. Sustainable agriculture technology development and transfer program.
Sec. 7204. National training program.
Sec. 7205. National Genetics Resources Program.
Sec. 7206. Repeal of National Agricultural Weather Information System.
Sec. 7207. Repeal of rural electronic commerce extension program.
Sec. 7208. Repeal of agricultural genome initiative.
Sec. 7209. High-priority research and extension initiatives.
Sec. 7210. Repeal of nutrient management research and extension initiative.
Sec. 7211. Organic agriculture research and extension initiative.
Sec. 7212. Repeal of agricultural bioenergy feedstock and energy efficiency research and extension initiative.
Sec. 7213. Farm business management.
Sec. 7214. Centers of excellence.
Sec. 7215. Repeal of red meat safety research center.
Sec. 7216. Assistive technology program for farmers with disabilities.
Sec. 7217. National rural information center clearinghouse.

Subtitle C—Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998

Sec. 7301. Relevance and merit of agricultural research, extension, and education funded by the Department.
Sec. 7302. Integrated research, education, and extension competitive grants program.
Sec. 7303. Repeal of coordinated program of research, extension, and education to improve viability of small and medium size dairy, livestock, and poultry operations.
Sec. 7304. Fusarium Graminearum grants.
Sec. 7305. Repeal of Bovine Johne's disease control program.
Sec. 7306. Grants for youth organizations.
Sec. 7307. Specialty crop research initiative.
Sec. 7308. Food animal residue avoidance database program.
Sec. 7309. Repeal of national swine research center.
Sec. 7310. Office of pest management policy.
Sec. 7311. Repeal of studies of agricultural research, extension, and education.

Subtitle D—Other Laws

Sec. 7401. Critical Agricultural Materials Act.
Sec. 7402. Equity in Educational Land-grant Status Act of 1994.
Sec. 7403. Research Facilities Act.
Sec. 7404. Repeal of carbon cycle research.
Sec. 7405. Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act.
Sec. 7406. Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978.
Sec. 7407. National Aquaculture Act of 1980.
Sec. 7408. Repeal of use of remote sensing data.
Sec. 7409. Repeal of reports under Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002.
Sec. 7410. Beginning farmer and rancher development program.
Sec. 7411. Inclusion of Northern Mariana Islands as a State under McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Act.

Subtitle E—Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008

PART 1—AGRICULTURAL SECURITY

Sec. 7501. Agricultural biosecurity communication center.
Sec. 7502. Assistance to build local capacity in agricultural biosecurity planning, preparation, and response.

Sec. 7503. Research and development of agricultural countermeasures.
Sec. 7504. Agricultural biosecurity grant program.

PART 2—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 7511. Enhanced use lease authority pilot program.
Sec. 7512. Grazinglands research laboratory.
Sec. 7513. Budget submission and funding.
Sec. 7514. Repeal of research and education grants for the study of antibiotic-resistant bacteria.
Sec. 7515. Repeal of farm and ranch stress assistance network.
Sec. 7516. Repeal of seed distribution.
Sec. 7517. Natural products research program.
Sec. 7518. Sun grant program.
Sec. 7519. Repeal of study and report on food deserts.
Sec. 7520. Repeal of agricultural and rural transportation research and education.

Subtitle F—Miscellaneous Provisions

Sec. 7601. Agreements with nonprofit organizations for National Arboretum.
Sec. 7602. Cotton Disease Research Report.
Sec. 7603. Acceptance of facility for Agricultural Research Service.
Sec. 7604. Miscellaneous technical corrections.

TITLE VIII—FORESTRY

Subtitle A—Repeal of Certain Forestry Programs

Sec. 8001. Forest land enhancement program.
Sec. 8002. Watershed forestry assistance program.
Sec. 8003. Expired cooperative national forest products marketing program.
Sec. 8004. Hispanic-serving institution agricultural land national resources leadership program.
Sec. 8005. Tribal watershed forestry assistance program.
Sec. 8006. Separate Forest Service decision-making and appeals process.

Subtitle B—Reauthorization of Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 Programs

Sec. 8101. State-wide assessment and strategies for forest resources.
Sec. 8102. Forest Legacy Program.
Sec. 8103. Community forest and open space conservation program.

Subtitle C—Reauthorization of Other Forestry-Related Laws

Sec. 8201. Rural revitalization technologies.
Sec. 8202. Office of International Forestry.
Sec. 8203. Change in funding source for healthy forests reserve program.
Sec. 8204. Stewardship end result contracting project authority.

Subtitle D—National Forest Critical Area Response

Sec. 8301. Definitions.
Sec. 8302. Designation of critical areas.
Sec. 8303. Application of expedited procedures and activities of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to critical areas.
Sec. 8304. Good neighbor authority.

Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Provisions

Sec. 8401. Revision of strategic plan for forest inventory and analysis.
Sec. 8402. Forest Service participation in ACES Program.
Sec. 8403. Green science and technology transfer research under Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978.
Sec. 8404. Extension of stewardship contracts authority regarding use of designation by prescription to all thinning sales under National Forest Management Act of 1976.
Sec. 8405. Reimbursement of fire funds expended by a State for management and suppression of certain wildfires.
Sec. 8406. Ability of National Forest System lands to meet needs of local wood producing facilities for raw materials.
Sec. 8407. Report on the National Forest System roads.

TITLE IX—ENERGY

Sec. 9001. Definition of renewable energy system.
Sec. 9002. Biobased markets program.
Sec. 9003. Biorefinery Assistance.
Sec. 9004. Repowering assistance program.
Sec. 9005. Bioenergy Program for Advanced Biofuels.
Sec. 9006. Biodiesel Fuel Education Program.
Sec. 9007. Rural Energy for America Program.
Sec. 9008. Biomass Research and Development.
Sec. 9009. Feedstock Flexibility Program for Bioenergy Producers.
Sec. 9010. Biomass Crop Assistance Program.
Sec. 9011. Community wood energy program.
Sec. 9012. Repeal of biofuels infrastructure study.
Sec. 9013. Repeal of renewable fertilizer study.

TITLE X—HORTICULTURE

Sec. 10001. Specialty crops market news allocation.
Sec. 10002. Repeal of grant program to improve movement of specialty crops.
Sec. 10003. Farmers market and local food promotion program.
Sec. 10004. Organic agriculture.
Sec. 10005. Investigations and enforcement of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990.
Sec. 10006. Food safety education initiatives.
Sec. 10007. Specialty crop block grants.
Sec. 10008. Report on honey.
Sec. 10009. Bulk shipments of apples to Canada.
Sec. 10010. Inclusion of olive oil in import controls under the Agricultural Adjustment Act.
Sec. 10011. Consolidation of plant pest and disease management and disaster prevention programs.
Sec. 10012. Modification, cancellation, or suspension on basis of a biological opinion.
Sec. 10013. Use and discharges of authorized pesticides.
Sec. 10014. Seed not pesticide or device for purposes of importation.
Sec. 10015. Stay of regulations related to Christmas Tree Promotion, Research, and Information Order.
Sec. 10016. Study on proposed order pertaining to sulfuryl fluoride.
Sec. 10017. Study on local and regional food production and program evaluation.

TITLE XI—CROP INSURANCE

Sec. 11001. Information sharing.
Sec. 11002. Publication of information on violations of prohibition on premium adjustments.
Sec. 11003. Supplemental coverage option.
Sec. 11004. Premium amounts for catastrophic risk protection.
Sec. 11005. Repeal of performance-based discount.
Sec. 11006. Permanent enterprise unit subsidy.
Sec. 11007. Enterprise units for irrigated and nonirrigated crops.
Sec. 11008. Data collection.
Sec. 11009. Adjustment in actual production history to establish insurable yields.
Sec. 11010. Submission and review of policies.
Sec. 11011. Equitable relief for specialty crop policies.
Sec. 11012. Budget limitations on renegotiation of the standard reinsurance agreement.
Sec. 11013. Crop production on native sod.
Sec. 11014. Coverage levels by practice.
Sec. 11015. Beginning farmer and rancher provisions.
Sec. 11016. Stacked income protection plan for producers of upland cotton.
Sec. 11017. Peanut revenue crop insurance.
Sec. 11018. Authority to correct errors.
Sec. 11019. Implementation.
Sec. 11020. Research and development priorities.
Sec. 11021. Additional research and development contracting requirements.
Sec. 11022. Program compliance partnerships.
Sec. 11023. Pilot programs.
Sec. 11024. Technical amendments.

TITLE XII—MISCELLANEOUS

Subtitle A—Livestock

Sec. 12101. National Sheep Industry Improvement Center.
Sec. 12102. Repeal of certain regulations under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921.
Sec. 12103. Trichinae certification program.
Sec. 12104. National Aquatic Animal Health Plan.
Sec. 12105. Country of origin labeling.
Sec. 12106. National animal health laboratory network.
Sec. 12107. Repeal of duplicative catfish inspection program.
Sec. 12108. National Poultry Improvement Program.
Sec. 12109. Report on bovine tuberculosis in Texas.

Subtitle B—Socially Disadvantaged Producers and Limited Resource Producers

Sec. 12201. Outreach and assistance for socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers and veteran farmers and ranchers.
Sec. 12202. Office of Advocacy and Outreach.
Sec. 12203. Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Policy Research Center.

Subtitle C—Other Miscellaneous Provisions

Sec. 12302. Grants to improve supply, stability, safety, and training of agricultural labor force.
Sec. 12303. Program benefit eligibility status for participants in high plains water study.
Sec. 12304. Office of Tribal Relations.
Sec. 12305. Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison.
Sec. 12306. Prohibition on keeping GSA leased cars overnight.
Sec. 12307. Noninsured crop assistance program.
Sec. 12308. Ensuring high standards for agency use of scientific information.
Sec. 12309. Evaluation required for purposes of prohibition on closure or relocation of county offices for the Farm Service Agency.
Sec. 12310. Acer access and development program.
Sec. 12311. Regulatory review by the Secretary of Agriculture.
Sec. 12312. Agricultural commodity definition.
Sec. 12313. Prohibition on attending an animal fighting venture or causing a minor to attend an animal fighting venture.
Sec. 12314. Prohibition against interference by State and local governments with production or manufacture of items in other States.
Sec. 12315. Increased protection for agricultural interests in the Missouri River Basin.
Sec. 12316. Increased protection for agricultural interests in the Black Dirt region.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

In this Act, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE I—COMMODITIES

Subtitle A—Repeals and Reforms

SEC. 1101. REPEAL OF DIRECT PAYMENTS.

(a) REPEAL.—Sections 1103 and 1303 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8713, 8753) are repealed.

(b) CONTINUED APPLICATION FOR 2013 CROP YEAR.—Sections 1103 and 1303 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8713, 8753), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply through the 2013 crop year with respect to all covered commodities (as defined in section 1001 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 8702)) and peanuts on a farm.

(c) CONTINUED APPLICATION FOR 2014 AND 2015 CROP YEARS.—Subject to this subtitle, the amendments made by sections 1603 and 1604 of this Act, and sections 1607 and 1611 of this Act, section 1103 of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8713), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply through the 2014 and 2015 crop years with respect to upland cotton only (as defined in section 1001 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 8702)), except that, in applying such section 1103, the term ''payment acres'' means the following:

(1) For crop year 2014, 70 percent of the base acres of upland cotton on a farm on which direct payments are made.

(2) For crop year 2015, 60 percent of the base acres of upland cotton on a farm on which direct payments are made.

SEC. 1102. REPEAL OF COUNTER-CYCLICAL PAYMENTS.

(a) REPEAL.—Sections 1104 and 1304 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8714, 8754) are repealed.

(b) CONTINUED APPLICATION FOR 2013 CROP YEAR.—Sections 1104 and 1304 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8714, 8754), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply through the 2013 crop year with respect to all covered commodities (as defined in section 1001 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 8702)) and peanuts on a farm.

SEC. 1103. REPEAL OF AVERAGE CROP REVENUE ELECTION PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1105 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8715) is repealed.

(b) CONTINUED APPLICATION FOR 2013 CROP YEAR.—Section 1105 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8715), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply through the 2013 crop year with respect to all covered commodities (as defined in section 1001 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 8702)) and peanuts on a farm for which the irrevocable election under section 1105 of that Act was made before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1104. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle and subtitle B:

(1) ACTUAL COUNTY REVENUE.—The term ''actual county revenue'', with respect to a covered commodity for a crop year, means the amount determined by the Secretary under section 1107(c)(4) to determine whether revenue loss coverage payments are required to be provided for that crop year.

(2) BASE ACRES.—The term ''base acres'', with respect to a covered commodity and cotton on a farm, means the number of acres established under section 1101 and 1302 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7911, 7952) or section 1101 and 1302 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8711, 8752), as in effect on September 30, 2013, subject to any adjustment under section 1105 of this Act. For purposes of making payments under subsections (b) and (c) of section 1107, base acres are reduced by the payment acres calculated in 1101(c).

(3) COUNTY REVENUE LOSS COVERAGE TRIGGER.—The term ''county revenue loss coverage trigger'', with respect to a covered commodity for a crop year, means the amount determined by the Secretary under section 1107(c)(5) to determine whether revenue loss coverage payments are required to be provided for that crop year.

(4) COVERED COMMODITY.—The term ''covered commodity'' means wheat, oats, and barley (including wheat, oats, and barley used for haying and grazing), corn, grain sorghum, long grain rice, medium grain rice, pulse crops, soybeans, other oilseeds, and peanuts.

(5) EFFECTIVE PRICE.—The term ''effective price'', with respect to a covered commodity for a crop year, means the price calculated by the Secretary under section 1107(b)(2) to determine whether price loss coverage payments are required to be provided for that crop year.

(6) EXTRA LONG STAPLE COTTON.—The term ''extra long staple cotton'' means cotton that—

(A) is produced from pure strain varieties of the Barbadense species or any hybrid of the species, or other similar types of extra long staple cotton, designated by the Secretary, having characteristics needed for various end uses for which United States upland cotton is not suitable and grown in irrigated cotton-growing regions of the United States designated by the Secretary or other areas designated by the Secretary as suitable for the production of the varieties or types; and

(B) is ginned on a roller-type gin or, if authorized by the Secretary, ginned on another type gin for experimental purposes.

(7) FARM BASE ACRES.—The term ''farm base acres'' means the sum of the base acreage for all covered commodities and cotton on a farm in effect as of September 30, 2013, and subject to any adjustment under section 1105.

(8) MEDIUM GRAIN RICE.—The term ''medium grain rice'' includes short grain rice.

(9) MIDSEASON PRICE.—The term ''midseason price'' means the applicable national average market price received by producers for the first 5 months of the applicable marketing year, as determined by the Secretary.

(10) OTHER OILSEED.—The term ''other oilseed'' means a crop of sunflower seed, rapeseed, canola, safflower, flaxseed, mustard seed, crambe, sesame seed, or any oilseed designated by the Secretary.

(11) PAYMENT ACRES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) through (D), the term ''payment acres'', with respect to the provision of price loss coverage payments and revenue loss coverage payments, means—

(i) 85 percent of total acres planted for the year to each covered commodity on a farm; and

(ii) 30 percent of total acres approved as prevented from being planted for the year to each covered commodity on a farm.

(B) MAXIMUM.—The total quantity of payment acres determined under subparagraph (A) shall not exceed the farm base acres.

(C) REDUCTION.—If the sum of all payment acres for a farm exceeds the limits established under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall reduce the payment acres applicable to each crop proportionately.

(D) EXCLUSION.—The term ''payment acres'' does not include any crop subsequently planted during the same crop year on the same land for which the first crop is eligible for payments under this subtitle, unless the crop was approved for double cropping in the county, as determined by the Secretary.

(12) PAYMENT YIELD.—The term ''payment yield'' means the yield established for counter-cyclical payments under section 1102 or 1302 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7912, 7952), section 1102 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8712), as in effect on September 30, 2013, or under section 1106 of this Act, for a farm for a covered commodity.

(13) PRICE LOSS COVERAGE.—The term ''price loss coverage'' means coverage provided under section 1107(b).

(14) PRODUCER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''producer'' means an owner, operator, landlord, tenant, or sharecropper that shares in the risk of producing a crop and is entitled to share in the crop available for marketing from the farm, or would have shared had the crop been produced.

(B) HYBRID SEED.—In determining whether a grower of hybrid seed is a producer, the Secretary shall—

(i) not take into consideration the existence of a hybrid seed contract; and

(ii) ensure that program requirements do not adversely affect the ability of the grower to receive a payment under this title.

(15) PULSE CROP.—The term ''pulse crop'' means dry peas, lentils, small chickpeas, and large chickpeas.

(16) REFERENCE PRICE.—The term ''reference price'', with respect to a covered commodity for a crop year, means the following:

(A) Wheat, $5.50 per bushel.

(B) Corn, $3.70 per bushel.

(C) Grain sorghum, $3.95 per bushel.

(D) Barley, $4.95 per bushel.

(E) Oats, $2.40 per bushel.

(F) Long grain rice, $14.00 per hundredweight.

(G) Medium grain rice, $14.00 per hundredweight.

(H) Soybeans, $8.40 per bushel.

(I) Other oilseeds, $20.15 per hundredweight.

(J) Peanuts $535.00 per ton.

(K) Dry peas, $11.00 per hundredweight.

(L) Lentils, $19.97 per hundredweight.

(M) Small chickpeas, $19.04 per hundredweight.

(N) Large chickpeas, $21.54 per hundredweight.

(17) REVENUE LOSS COVERAGE.—The term ''revenue loss coverage'' means coverage provided under section 1107(c).

(18) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(19) STATE.—The term ''State'' means—

(A) a State;

(B) the District of Columbia;

(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(D) any other territory or possession of the United States.

(20) TEMPERATE JAPONICA RICE.—The term ''temperate japonica rice'' means rice that is grown in high altitudes or temperate regions of high latitudes with cooler climate conditions, in the Western United States, as determined by the Secretary.

(21) TRANSITIONAL YIELD.—The term ''transitional yield'' has the meaning given the term in section 502(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1502(b)).

(22) UNITED STATES.—The term ''United States'', when used in a geographical sense, means all of the States.

(23) UNITED STATES PREMIUM FACTOR.—The term ''United States Premium Factor'' means the percentage by which the difference in the United States loan schedule premiums for Strict Middling (SM) 1⅛-inch upland cotton and for Middling (M) 1 3/32-inch upland cotton exceeds the difference in the applicable premiums for comparable international qualities.

SEC. 1105. BASE ACRES.

(a) ADJUSTMENT OF BASE ACRES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for an adjustment, as appropriate, in the base acres for covered commodities and cotton for a farm whenever any of the following circumstances occurs:

(A) A conservation reserve contract entered into under section 1231 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831) with respect to the farm expires or is voluntarily terminated.

(B) Cropland is released from coverage under a conservation reserve contract by the Secretary.

(C) The producer has eligible oilseed acreage as the result of the Secretary designating additional oilseeds, which shall be determined in the same manner as eligible oilseed acreage under section 1101(a)(1)(D) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8711(a)(1)(D)).

(2) SPECIAL CONSERVATION RESERVE ACREAGE PAYMENT RULES.—For the crop year in which a

base acres adjustment under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) is first made, the owner of the farm shall elect to receive price loss coverage or revenue loss coverage with respect to the acreage added to the farm under this subsection or a prorated payment under the conservation reserve contract, but not both.

(b) PREVENTION OF EXCESS BASE ACRES.—

(1) REQUIRED REDUCTION.—If the sum of the base acres for a farm, together with the acreage described in paragraph (2) exceeds the actual cropland acreage of the farm, the Secretary shall reduce the base acres for 1 or more covered commodities or cotton for the farm so that the sum of the base acres and acreage described in paragraph (2) does not exceed the actual cropland acreage of the farm.

(2) OTHER ACREAGE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include the following:

(A) Any acreage on the farm enrolled in the conservation reserve program or wetlands reserve program (or successor programs) under chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3830 et seq.).

(B) Any other acreage on the farm enrolled in a Federal conservation program for which payments are made in exchange for not producing an agricultural commodity on the acreage.

(C) If the Secretary designates additional oilseeds, any eligible oilseed acreage, which shall be determined in the same manner as eligible oilseed acreage under subsection (a)(1)(C).

(3) SELECTION OF ACRES.—The Secretary shall give the owner of the farm the opportunity to select the base acres for a covered commodity or cotton for the farm against which the reduction required by paragraph (1) will be made.

(4) EXCEPTION FOR DOUBLE-CROPPED ACREAGE.—In applying paragraph (1), the Secretary shall make an exception in the case of double cropping, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) REDUCTION IN BASE ACRES.—

(1) REDUCTION AT OPTION OF OWNER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The owner of a farm may reduce, at any time, the base acres for any covered commodity or cotton for the farm.

(B) EFFECT OF REDUCTION.—A reduction under subparagraph (A) shall be permanent and made in a manner prescribed by the Secretary.

(2) REQUIRED ACTION BY SECRETARY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall proportionately reduce base acres on a farm for covered commodities and cotton for land that has been subdivided and developed for multiple residential units or other nonfarming uses if the size of the tracts and the density of the subdivision is such that the land is unlikely to return to the previous agricultural use, unless the producers on the farm demonstrate that the land—

(i) remains devoted to commercial agricultural production; or

(ii) is likely to be returned to the previous agricultural use.

(B) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall establish procedures to identify land described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 1106. PAYMENT YIELDS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—For the purpose of making payments under this subtitle, the Secretary shall provide for the establishment of a yield for each farm for any designated oilseed for which a payment yield was not established under section 1102 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8712) in accordance with this section.

(b) PAYMENT YIELDS FOR DESIGNATED OILSEEDS.—

(1) DETERMINATION OF AVERAGE YIELD.—In the case of designated oilseeds, the Secretary shall determine the average yield per planted acre for the designated oilseed on a farm for the 1998 through 2001 crop years, excluding any crop year in which the acreage planted to the designated oilseed was zero.

(2) ADJUSTMENT FOR PAYMENT YIELD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The payment yield for a farm for a designated oilseed shall be equal to the product of the following:

(i) The average yield for the designated oilseed determined under paragraph (1).

(ii) The ratio resulting from dividing the national average yield for the designated oilseed for the 1981 through 1985 crops by the national average yield for the designated oilseed for the 1998 through 2001 crops.

(B) NO NATIONAL AVERAGE YIELD INFORMATION AVAILABLE.—To the extent that national average yield information for a designated oilseed is not available, the Secretary shall use such information as the Secretary determines to be fair and equitable to establish a national average yield under this section.

(3) USE OF COUNTY AVERAGE YIELD.—If the yield per planted acre for a crop of a designated oilseed for a farm for any of the 1998 through 2001 crop years was less than 75 percent of the county yield for that designated oilseed, the Secretary shall assign a yield for that crop year equal to 75 percent of the county yield for the purpose of determining the average under paragraph (1).

(4) NO HISTORIC YIELD DATA AVAILABLE.—In the case of establishing yields for designated oilseeds, if historic yield data is not available, the Secretary shall use the ratio for dry peas calculated under paragraph (2)(A)(ii) in determining the yields for designated oilseeds, as determined to be fair and equitable by the Secretary.

(c) EFFECT OF LACK OF PAYMENT YIELD.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT BY SECRETARY.—If no payment yield is otherwise established for a farm for which a covered commodity is planted and eligible to receive price loss coverage payments, the Secretary shall establish an appropriate payment yield for the covered commodity on the farm under paragraph (2).

(2) USE OF SIMILARLY SITUATED FARMS.—To establish an appropriate payment yield for a covered commodity on a farm as required by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall take into consideration the farm program payment yields applicable to that covered commodity for similarly situated farms. The use of such data in an appeal, by the Secretary or by the producer, shall not be subject to any other provision of law.

(d) SINGLE OPPORTUNITY TO UPDATE YIELDS USED TO DETERMINE PRICE LOSS COVERAGE PAYMENTS.—

(1) ELECTION TO UPDATE.—At the sole discretion of the owner of a farm, the owner of a farm shall have a 1-time opportunity to update the payment yields on a covered commodity-by-covered commodity basis that would otherwise be used in calculating any price loss coverage payment for covered commodities on the farm.

(2) TIME FOR ELECTION.—The election under paragraph (1) shall be made at a time and manner to be in effect for the 2014 crop year as determined by the Secretary.

(3) METHOD OF UPDATING YIELDS.—If the owner of a farm elects to update yields under this subsection, the payment yield for a covered commodity on the farm, for the purpose of calculating price loss coverage payments only, shall be equal to 90 percent of the average of the yield per planted acre for the crop of the covered commodity on the farm for the 2008 through 2012 crop years, as determined by the Secretary, excluding any crop year in which the acreage planted to the crop of the covered commodity was zero.

(4) USE OF COUNTY AVERAGE YIELD.—If the yield per planted acre for a crop of the covered commodity for a farm for any of the 2008 through 2012 crop years was less than 75 percent of the average of the 2008 through 2012 county yield for that commodity, the Secretary shall assign a yield for that crop year equal to 75 percent of the average of the 2008 through 2012 county yield for the purposes of determining the average yield under paragraph (3).

(5) EFFECT OF LACK OF PAYMENT YIELD.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT BY SECRETARY.—For purposes of this subsection, if no payment yield is otherwise established for a covered commodity on a farm, the Secretary shall establish an appropriate updated payment yield for the covered commodity on the farm under subparagraph (B).

(B) USE OF SIMILARLY SITUATED FARMS.—To establish an appropriate payment yield for a covered commodity on a farm as required by subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall take into consideration the farm program payment yields applicable to that covered commodity for similarly situated farms. The use of such data in an appeal, by the Secretary or by the producer, shall not be subject to any other provision of law.

SEC. 1107. FARM RISK MANAGEMENT ELECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) PAYMENTS REQUIRED.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), if the Secretary determines that payments are required under subsection (b)(1) or (c)(2) for a covered commodity, the Secretary shall make payments for that covered commodity available under such subsection to producers on a farm pursuant to the terms and conditions of this section.

(2) PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS; EXCEPTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a producer on a farm may not receive price loss coverage payments or revenue loss coverage payments if the sum of the planted acres of covered commodities on the farm is 10 acres or less, as determined by the Secretary, unless the producer is—

(A) a socially disadvantaged farmer or rancher (as defined in section 355(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2003(e))); or

(B) a limited resource farmer or rancher, as defined by the Secretary.

(b) PRICE LOSS COVERAGE.—

(1) PAYMENTS.—For each of the 2014 through 2018 crop years, the Secretary shall make price loss coverage payments to producers on a farm for a covered commodity if the Secretary determines that—

(A) the effective price for the covered commodity for the crop year; is less than

(B) the reference price for the covered commodity for the crop year.

(2) EFFECTIVE PRICE.—The effective price for a covered commodity for a crop year shall be the higher of—

(A) the midseason price; or

(B) the national average loan rate for a marketing assistance loan for the covered commodity in effect for crop years 2014 through 2018 under subtitle B.

(3) PAYMENT RATE.—The payment rate shall be equal to the difference between—

(A) the reference price for the covered commodity; and

(B) the effective price determined under paragraph (2) for the covered commodity.

(4) PAYMENT AMOUNT.—If price loss coverage payments are required to be provided under this subsection for any of the 2014 through 2018 crop years for a covered commodity, the amount of the price loss coverage payment to be paid to the producers on a farm for the crop year shall be equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

(A) the payment rate for the covered commodity under paragraph (3);

(B) the payment yield for the covered commodity; and

(C) the payment acres for the covered commodity.

(5) TIME FOR PAYMENTS.—If the Secretary determines under this subsection that price loss coverage payments are required to be provided for the covered commodity, the payments shall be made beginning October 1, or as soon as practicable thereafter, after the end of the applicable marketing year for the covered commodity.

(6) SPECIAL RULE FOR BARLEY.—In determining the effective price for barley in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall use the all-barley price.

(7) SPECIAL RULE FOR TEMPERATE JAPONICA RICE.—The Secretary shall provide a reference

price with respect to temperate japonica rice in an amount equal to 115 percent of the amount established in subparagraphs (F) and (G) of section 1104(16) in order to reflect price premiums.

(c) REVENUE LOSS COVERAGE.—

(1) AVAILABLE AS AN ALTERNATIVE.—As an alternative to receiving price loss coverage payments under subsection (b) for a covered commodity, all of the owners of the farm may make a one-time, irrevocable election on a covered commodity-by-covered commodity basis to receive revenue loss coverage payments for each covered commodity in accordance with this subsection. If any of the owners of the farm make different elections on the same covered commodity on the farm, all of the owners of the farm shall be deemed to have not made the election available under this paragraph.

(2) PAYMENTS.—In the case of owners of a farm that make the election described in paragraph (1) for a covered commodity, the Secretary shall make revenue loss coverage payments available under this subsection for each of the 2014 through 2018 crop years if the Secretary determines that—

(A) the actual county revenue for the crop year for the covered commodity; is less than

(B) the county revenue loss coverage trigger for the crop year for the covered commodity.

(3) TIME FOR PAYMENTS.—If the Secretary determines under this subsection that revenue loss coverage payments are required to be provided for the covered commodity, payments shall be made beginning October 1, or as soon as practicable thereafter, after the end of the applicable marketing year for the covered commodity.

(4) ACTUAL COUNTY REVENUE.—The amount of the actual county revenue for a crop year of a covered commodity shall be equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

(A) the actual county yield, as determined by the Secretary, for each planted acre for the crop year for the covered commodity; and

(B) the higher of—

(i) the midseason price; or

(ii) the national average loan rate for a marketing assistance loan for the covered commodity in effect for crop years 2014 through 2018 under subtitle B.

(5) COUNTY REVENUE LOSS COVERAGE TRIGGER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The county revenue loss coverage trigger for a crop year for a covered commodity on a farm shall equal 85 percent of the benchmark county revenue.

(B) BENCHMARK COUNTY REVENUE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The benchmark county revenue shall be the product obtained by multiplying—

(I) subject to clause (ii), the average historical county yield as determined by the Secretary for the most recent 5 crop years, excluding each of the crop years with the highest and lowest yields; and

(II) subject to clause (iii), the average national marketing year average price for the most recent 5 crop years, excluding each of the crop years with the highest and lowest prices.

(ii) YIELD CONDITIONS.—If the historical county yield in clause (i)(I) for any of the 5 most recent crop years, as determined by the Secretary, is less than 70 percent of the transitional yield, as determined by the Secretary, the amounts used for any of those years in clause (i)(I) shall be 70 percent of the transitional yield.

(iii) REFERENCE PRICE.—If the national marketing year average price in clause (i)(II) for any of the 5 most recent crop years is lower than the reference price for the covered commodity, the Secretary shall use the reference price for any of those years for the amounts in clause (i)(II).

(6) PAYMENT RATE.—The payment rate shall be equal to the lesser of—

(A) the difference between—

(i) the county revenue loss coverage trigger for the covered commodity; and

(ii) the actual county revenue for the crop year for the covered commodity; or

(B) 10 percent of the benchmark county revenue for the crop year for the covered commodity.

(7) PAYMENT AMOUNT.—If revenue loss coverage payments under this subsection are required to be provided for any of the 2014 through 2018 crop years of a covered commodity, the amount of the revenue loss coverage payment to be provided to the producers on a farm for the crop year shall be equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

(A) the payment rate under paragraph (6); and

(B) the payment acres of the covered commodity on the farm.

(8) DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.—In providing revenue loss coverage payments under this subsection, the Secretary—

(A) shall ensure that producers on a farm do not reconstitute the farm of the producers to void or change the election made under paragraph (1);

(B) to the maximum extent practicable, shall use all available information and analysis, including data mining, to check for anomalies in the provision of revenue loss coverage payments;

(C) to the maximum extent practicable, shall calculate a separate county revenue loss coverage trigger for irrigated and nonirrigated covered commodities and a separate actual county revenue for irrigated and nonirrigated covered commodities;

(D) shall assign a benchmark county yield for each planted acre for the crop year for the covered commodity on the basis of the yield history of representative farms in the State, region, or crop reporting district, as determined by the Secretary, if—

(i) the Secretary cannot establish the benchmark county yield for each planted acre for a crop year for a covered commodity in the county in accordance with paragraph (5); or

(ii) the yield determined under paragraph (5) is an unrepresentative average yield for the county (as determined by the Secretary); and

(E) to the maximum extent practicable, shall ensure that in order to be eligible for a payment under this subsection, the producers on the farm suffered an actual loss on the covered commodity for the crop year for which payment is sought.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report annually containing an evaluation of the impact of price loss coverage and revenue loss coverage—

(1) on the planting, production, price, and export of covered commodities; and

(2) on the cost of each commodity program.

SEC. 1108. PRODUCER AGREEMENTS.

(a) COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS.—Before the producers on a farm may receive payments under this subtitle with respect to the farm, the producers shall agree, during the crop year for which the payments are made and in exchange for the payments—

(A) to comply with applicable conservation requirements under subtitle B of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3811 et seq.);

(B) to comply with applicable wetland protection requirements under subtitle C of title XII of that Act (16 U.S.C. 3821 et seq.); and

(C) to effectively control noxious weeds and otherwise maintain the land in accordance with sound agricultural practices, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) COMPLIANCE.—The Secretary may issue such rules as the Secretary considers necessary to ensure producer compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1).

(3) MODIFICATION.—At the request of the transferee or owner, the Secretary may modify the requirements of this subsection if the modifications are consistent with the objectives of this subsection, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) TRANSFER OR CHANGE OF INTEREST IN FARM.—

(1) TERMINATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a transfer of (or change in) the interest of the producers on a farm for which payments under this subtitle are provided shall result in the termination of the payments, unless the transferee or owner of the acreage agrees to assume all obligations under subsection (a).

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The termination shall take effect on the date determined by the Secretary.

(2) EXCEPTION.—If a producer entitled to a payment under this subtitle dies, becomes incompetent, or is otherwise unable to receive the payment, the Secretary shall make the payment in accordance with rules issued by the Secretary.

(c) ACREAGE REPORTS.—As a condition on the receipt of any benefits under this subtitle or subtitle B, the Secretary shall require producers on a farm to submit to the Secretary annual acreage reports with respect to all cropland on the farm.

(d) TENANTS AND SHARECROPPERS.—In carrying out this subtitle, the Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers.

(e) SHARING OF PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall provide for the sharing of payments made under this subtitle among the producers on a farm on a fair and equitable basis.

SEC. 1109. PERIOD OF EFFECTIVENESS.

This subtitle shall be effective beginning with the 2014 crop year of each covered commodity through the 2018 crop year.

Subtitle B—Marketing Loans

SEC. 1201. AVAILABILITY OF NONRECOURSE MARKETING ASSISTANCE LOANS FOR LOAN COMMODITIES.

(a) DEFINITION OF LOAN COMMODITY.—In this subtitle, the term ''loan commodity'' means wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, upland cotton, extra long staple cotton, long grain rice, medium grain rice, peanuts, soybeans, other oilseeds, graded wool, nongraded wool, mohair, honey, dry peas, lentils, small chickpeas, and large chickpeas.

(b) NONRECOURSE LOANS AVAILABLE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For each of the 2014 through 2018 crops of each loan commodity, the Secretary shall make available to producers on a farm nonrecourse marketing assistance loans for loan commodities produced on the farm.

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The marketing assistance loans shall be made under terms and conditions that are prescribed by the Secretary and at the loan rate established under section 1202 for the loan commodity.

(c) ELIGIBLE PRODUCTION.—The producers on a farm shall be eligible for a marketing assistance loan under subsection (b) for any quantity of a loan commodity produced on the farm.

(d) COMPLIANCE WITH CONSERVATION AND WETLANDS REQUIREMENTS.—As a condition of the receipt of a marketing assistance loan under subsection (b), the producer shall comply with applicable conservation requirements under subtitle B of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3811 et seq.) and applicable wetland protection requirements under subtitle C of title XII of that Act (16 U.S.C. 3821 et seq.) during the term of the loan.

(e) SPECIAL RULES FOR PEANUTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall apply only to producers of peanuts.

(2) OPTIONS FOR OBTAINING LOAN.—A marketing assistance loan under this section, and loan deficiency payments under section 1205, may be obtained at the option of the producers on a farm through—

(A) a designated marketing association or marketing cooperative of producers that is approved by the Secretary; or

(B) the Farm Service Agency.

(3) STORAGE OF LOAN PEANUTS.—As a condition on the approval by the Secretary of an individual or entity to provide storage for peanuts for which a marketing assistance loan is made under this section, the individual or entity shall agree—

(A) to provide the storage on a nondiscriminatory basis; and

(B) to comply with such additional requirements as the Secretary considers appropriate to accomplish the purposes of this section and promote fairness in the administration of the benefits of this section.

(4) STORAGE, HANDLING, AND ASSOCIATED COSTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To ensure proper storage of peanuts for which a loan is made under this section, the Secretary shall pay handling and other associated costs (other than storage costs) incurred at the time at which the peanuts are placed under loan, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) REDEMPTION AND FORFEITURE.—The Secretary shall—

(i) require the repayment of handling and other associated costs paid under subparagraph (A) for all peanuts pledged as collateral for a loan that is redeemed under this section; and

(ii) pay storage, handling, and other associated costs for all peanuts pledged as collateral that are forfeited under this section.

(5) MARKETING.—A marketing association or cooperative may market peanuts for which a loan is made under this section in any manner that conforms to consumer needs, including the separation of peanuts by type and quality.

(6) REIMBURSABLE AGREEMENTS AND PAYMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The Secretary may implement any reimbursable agreements or provide for the payment of administrative expenses under this subsection only in a manner that is consistent with those activities in regard to other loan commodities.

SEC. 1202. LOAN RATES FOR NONRECOURSE MARKETING ASSISTANCE LOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of each of the 2014 through 2018 crop years, the loan rate for a marketing assistance loan under section 1201 for a loan commodity shall be equal to the following:

(1) In the case of wheat, $2.94 per bushel.

(2) In the case of corn, $1.95 per bushel.

(3) In the case of grain sorghum, $1.95 per bushel.

(4) In the case of barley, $1.95 per bushel.

(5) In the case of oats, $1.39 per bushel.

(6) In the case of base quality of upland cotton, for the 2014 and each subsequent crop year, the simple average of the adjusted prevailing world price for the 2 immediately preceding marketing years, as determined by the Secretary and announced October 1 preceding the next domestic plantings, but in no case less than $0.47 per pound or more than $0.52 per pound.

(7) In the case of extra long staple cotton, $0.7977 per pound.

(8) In the case of long grain rice, $6.50 per hundredweight.

(9) In the case of medium grain rice, $6.50 per hundredweight.

(10) In the case of soybeans, $5.00 per bushel.

(11) In the case of other oilseeds, $10.09 per hundredweight for each of the following kinds of oilseeds:

(A) Sunflower seed.

(B) Rapeseed.

(C) Canola.

(D) Safflower.

(E) Flaxseed.

(F) Mustard seed.

(G) Crambe.

(H) Sesame seed.

(I) Other oilseeds designated by the Secretary.

(12) In the case of dry peas, $5.40 per hundredweight.

(13) In the case of lentils, $11.28 per hundredweight.

(14) In the case of small chickpeas, $7.43 per hundredweight.

(15) In the case of large chickpeas, $11.28 per hundredweight.

(16) In the case of graded wool, $1.15 per pound.

(17) In the case of nongraded wool, $0.40 per pound.

(18) In the case of mohair, $4.20 per pound.

(19) In the case of honey, $0.69 per pound.

(20) In the case of peanuts, $355 per ton.

(b) SINGLE COUNTY LOAN RATE FOR OTHER OILSEEDS.—The Secretary shall establish a single loan rate in each county for each kind of other oilseeds described in subsection (a)(11).

SEC. 1203. TERM OF LOANS.

(a) TERM OF LOAN.—In the case of each loan commodity, a marketing assistance loan under section 1201 shall have a term of 9 months beginning on the first day of the first month after the month in which the loan is made.

(b) EXTENSIONS PROHIBITED.—The Secretary may not extend the term of a marketing assistance loan for any loan commodity.

SEC. 1204. REPAYMENT OF LOANS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—The Secretary shall permit the producers on a farm to repay a marketing assistance loan under section 1201 for a loan commodity (other than upland cotton, long grain rice, medium grain rice, extra long staple cotton, peanuts and confectionery and each other kind of sunflower seed (other than oil sunflower seed)) at a rate that is the lesser of—

(1) the loan rate established for the commodity under section 1202, plus interest (determined in accordance with section 163 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7283));

(2) a rate (as determined by the Secretary) that—

(A) is calculated based on average market prices for the loan commodity during the preceding 30-day period; and

(B) will minimize discrepancies in marketing loan benefits across State boundaries and across county boundaries; or

(3) a rate that the Secretary may develop using alternative methods for calculating a repayment rate for a loan commodity that the Secretary determines will—

(A) minimize potential loan forfeitures;

(B) minimize the accumulation of stocks of the commodity by the Federal Government;

(C) minimize the cost incurred by the Federal Government in storing the commodity;

(D) allow the commodity produced in the United States to be marketed freely and competitively, both domestically and internationally; and

(E) minimize discrepancies in marketing loan benefits across State boundaries and across county boundaries.

(b) REPAYMENT RATES FOR UPLAND COTTON, LONG GRAIN RICE, AND MEDIUM GRAIN RICE.—The Secretary shall permit producers to repay a marketing assistance loan under section 1201 for upland cotton, long grain rice, and medium grain rice at a rate that is the lesser of—

(1) the loan rate established for the commodity under section 1202, plus interest (determined in accordance with section 163 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7283)); or

(2) the prevailing world market price for the commodity, as determined and adjusted by the Secretary in accordance with this section.

(c) REPAYMENT RATES FOR EXTRA LONG STAPLE COTTON.—Repayment of a marketing assistance loan for extra long staple cotton shall be at the loan rate established for the commodity under section 1202, plus interest (determined in accordance with section 163 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7283)).

(d) PREVAILING WORLD MARKET PRICE.—For purposes of this section and section 1207, the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation—

(1) a formula to determine the prevailing world market price for each of upland cotton, long grain rice, and medium grain rice; and

(2) a mechanism by which the Secretary shall announce periodically those prevailing world market prices.

(e) ADJUSTMENT OF PREVAILING WORLD MARKET PRICE FOR UPLAND COTTON, LONG GRAIN RICE, AND MEDIUM GRAIN RICE.—

(1) RICE.—The prevailing world market price for long grain rice and medium grain rice determined under subsection (d) shall be adjusted to United States quality and location.

(2) COTTON.—The prevailing world market price for upland cotton determined under subsection (d)—

(A) shall be adjusted to United States quality and location, with the adjustment to include—

(i) a reduction equal to any United States Premium Factor for upland cotton of a quality higher than Middling (M) 1 3/32-inch; and

(ii) the average costs to market the commodity, including average transportation costs, as determined by the Secretary; and

(B) may be further adjusted, during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on July 31, 2019, if the Secretary determines the adjustment is necessary—

(i) to minimize potential loan forfeitures;

(ii) to minimize the accumulation of stocks of upland cotton by the Federal Government;

(iii) to ensure that upland cotton produced in the United States can be marketed freely and competitively, both domestically and internationally; and

(iv) to ensure an appropriate transition between current-crop and forward-crop price quotations, except that the Secretary may use forward-crop price quotations prior to July 31 of a marketing year only if—

(I) there are insufficient current-crop price quotations; and

(II) the forward-crop price quotation is the lowest such quotation available.

(3) GUIDELINES FOR ADDITIONAL ADJUSTMENTS.—In making adjustments under this subsection, the Secretary shall establish a mechanism for determining and announcing the adjustments in order to avoid undue disruption in the United States market.

(f) REPAYMENT RATES FOR CONFECTIONERY AND OTHER KINDS OF SUNFLOWER SEEDS.—The Secretary shall permit the producers on a farm to repay a marketing assistance loan under section 1201 for confectionery and each other kind of sunflower seed (other than oil sunflower seed) at a rate that is the lesser of—

(1) the loan rate established for the commodity under section 1202, plus interest (determined in accordance with section 163 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7283)); or

(2) the repayment rate established for oil sunflower seed.

(g) PAYMENT OF COTTON STORAGE COSTS.—Effective for each of the 2014 through 2018 crop years, the Secretary shall make cotton storage payments available in the same manner, and at the same rates as the Secretary provided storage payments for the 2006 crop of cotton, except that the rates shall be reduced by 10 percent.

(h) REPAYMENT RATE FOR PEANUTS.—The Secretary shall permit producers on a farm to repay a marketing assistance loan for peanuts under section 1201 at a rate that is the lesser of—

(1) the loan rate established for peanuts under section 1202(a)(20), plus interest (determined in accordance with section 163 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7283)); or

(2) a rate that the Secretary determines will—

(A) minimize potential loan forfeitures;

(B) minimize the accumulation of stocks of peanuts by the Federal Government;

(C) minimize the cost incurred by the Federal Government in storing peanuts; and

(D) allow peanuts produced in the United States to be marketed freely and competitively, both domestically and internationally.

(i) AUTHORITY TO TEMPORARILY ADJUST REPAYMENT RATES.—

(1) ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.—In the event of a severe disruption to marketing, transportation, or related infrastructure, the Secretary may modify the repayment rate otherwise applicable under this section for marketing assistance loans under section 1201 for a loan commodity.

(2) DURATION.—Any adjustment made under paragraph (1) in the repayment rate for marketing assistance loans for a loan commodity shall be in effect on a short-term and temporary basis, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 1205. LOAN DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF LOAN DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (d), the Secretary may make loan deficiency payments available to producers on a farm that, although eligible to obtain a marketing assistance loan under section 1201 with respect to a loan commodity, agree to forgo obtaining the loan for the commodity in return for loan deficiency payments under this section.

(2) UNSHORN PELTS, HAY, AND SILAGE.—

(A) MARKETING ASSISTANCE LOANS.—Subject to subparagraph (B), nongraded wool in the form of unshorn pelts and hay and silage derived from a loan commodity are not eligible for a marketing assistance loan under section 1201.

(B) LOAN DEFICIENCY PAYMENT.—Effective for the 2014 through 2018 crop years, the Secretary may make loan deficiency payments available under this section to producers on a farm that produce unshorn pelts or hay and silage derived from a loan commodity.

(b) COMPUTATION.—A loan deficiency payment for a loan commodity or commodity referred to in subsection (a)(2) shall be equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

(1) the payment rate determined under subsection (c) for the commodity; by

(2) the quantity of the commodity produced by the eligible producers, excluding any quantity for which the producers obtain a marketing assistance loan under section 1201.

(c) PAYMENT RATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a loan commodity, the payment rate shall be the amount by which—

(A) the loan rate established under section 1202 for the loan commodity; exceeds

(B) the rate at which a marketing assistance loan for the loan commodity may be repaid under section 1204.

(2) UNSHORN PELTS.—In the case of unshorn pelts, the payment rate shall be the amount by which—

(A) the loan rate established under section 1202 for ungraded wool; exceeds

(B) the rate at which a marketing assistance loan for ungraded wool may be repaid under section 1204.

(3) HAY AND SILAGE.—In the case of hay or silage derived from a loan commodity, the payment rate shall be the amount by which—

(A) the loan rate established under section 1202 for the loan commodity from which the hay or silage is derived; exceeds

(B) the rate at which a marketing assistance loan for the loan commodity may be repaid under section 1204.

(d) EXCEPTION FOR EXTRA LONG STAPLE COTTON.—This section shall not apply with respect to extra long staple cotton.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE FOR PAYMENT RATE DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall determine the amount of the loan deficiency payment to be made under this section to the producers on a farm with respect to a quantity of a loan commodity or commodity referred to in subsection (a)(2) using the payment rate in effect under subsection (c) as of the date the producers request the payment.

SEC. 1206. PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF LOAN DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS FOR GRAZED ACREAGE.

(a) ELIGIBLE PRODUCERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective for the 2014 through 2018 crop years, in the case of a producer that would be eligible for a loan deficiency payment under section 1205 for wheat, barley, or oats, but that elects to use acreage planted to the wheat, barley, or oats for the grazing of livestock, the Secretary shall make a payment to the producer under this section if the producer enters into an agreement with the Secretary to forgo any other harvesting of the wheat, barley, or oats on that acreage.

(2) GRAZING OF TRITICALE ACREAGE.—Effective for the 2014 through 2018 crop years, with respect to a producer on a farm that uses acreage planted to triticale for the grazing of livestock, the Secretary shall make a payment to the producer under this section if the producer enters into an agreement with the Secretary to forgo any other harvesting of triticale on that acreage.

(b) PAYMENT AMOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of a payment made under this section to a producer on a farm described in subsection (a)(1) shall be equal to the amount determined by multiplying—

(A) the loan deficiency payment rate determined under section 1205(c) in effect, as of the date of the agreement, for the county in which the farm is located; by

(B) the payment quantity determined by multiplying—

(i) the quantity of the grazed acreage on the farm with respect to which the producer elects to forgo harvesting of wheat, barley, or oats; and

(ii)(I) the payment yield in effect for the calculation of price loss coverage under subtitle A with respect to that loan commodity on the farm; or

(II) in the case of a farm without a payment yield for that loan commodity, an appropriate yield established by the Secretary in a manner consistent with section 1106(c) of this Act.

(2) GRAZING OF TRITICALE ACREAGE.—The amount of a payment made under this section to a producer on a farm described in subsection (a)(2) shall be equal to the amount determined by multiplying—

(A) the loan deficiency payment rate determined under section 1205(c) in effect for wheat, as of the date of the agreement, for the county in which the farm is located; by

(B) the payment quantity determined by multiplying—

(i) the quantity of the grazed acreage on the farm with respect to which the producer elects to forgo harvesting of triticale; and

(ii)(I) the payment yield in effect for the calculation of price loss coverage under subtitle A with respect to wheat on the farm; or

(II) in the case of a farm without a payment yield for wheat, an appropriate yield established by the Secretary in a manner consistent with section 1106(c) of this Act.

(c) TIME, MANNER, AND AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENT.—

(1) TIME AND MANNER.—A payment under this section shall be made at the same time and in the same manner as loan deficiency payments are made under section 1205.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish an availability period for the payments authorized by this section.

(B) CERTAIN COMMODITIES.—In the case of wheat, barley, and oats, the availability period shall be consistent with the availability period for the commodity established by the Secretary for marketing assistance loans authorized by this subtitle.

(d) PROHIBITION ON CROP INSURANCE INDEMNITY OR NONINSURED CROP ASSISTANCE.—A 2014 through 2018 crop of wheat, barley, oats, or triticale planted on acreage that a producer elects, in the agreement required by subsection (a), to use for the grazing of livestock in lieu of any other harvesting of the crop shall not be eligible for an indemnity under a policy or plan of insurance authorized under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) or noninsured crop assistance under section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333).

SEC. 1207. SPECIAL MARKETING LOAN PROVISIONS FOR UPLAND COTTON.

(a) SPECIAL IMPORT QUOTA.—

(1) DEFINITION OF SPECIAL IMPORT QUOTA.—In this subsection, the term ''special import quota'' means a quantity of imports that is not subject to the over-quota tariff rate of a tariff-rate quota.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall carry out an import quota program during the period beginning on August 1, 2014, and ending on July 31, 2019, as provided in this subsection.

(B) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—Whenever the Secretary determines and announces that for any consecutive 4-week period, the Friday through Thursday average price quotation for the lowest-priced United States growth, as quoted for Middling (M) 1 3/32-inch cotton, delivered to a definable and significant international market, as determined by the Secretary, exceeds the prevailing world market price, there shall immediately be in effect a special import quota.

(3) QUANTITY.—The quota shall be equal to the consumption during a 1-week period of cotton by domestic mills at the seasonally adjusted average rate of the most recent 3 months for which official data of the Department of Agriculture are available or, in the absence of sufficient data, as estimated by the Secretary.

(4) APPLICATION.—The quota shall apply to upland cotton purchased not later than 90 days after the date of the Secretary's announcement under paragraph (2) and entered into the United States not later than 180 days after that date.

(5) OVERLAP.—A special quota period may be established that overlaps any existing quota period if required by paragraph (2), except that a special quota period may not be established under this subsection if a quota period has been established under subsection (b).

(6) PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—The quantity under a special import quota shall be considered to be an in-quota quantity for purposes of—

(A) section 213(d) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703(d));

(B) section 204 of the Andean Trade Preference Act (19 U.S.C. 3203);

(C) section 503(d) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(d)); and

(D) General Note 3(a)(iv) to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule.

(7) LIMITATION.—The quantity of cotton entered into the United States during any marketing year under the special import quota established under this subsection may not exceed the equivalent of 10 week's consumption of upland cotton by domestic mills at the seasonally adjusted average rate of the 3 months immediately preceding the first special import quota established in any marketing year.

(b) LIMITED GLOBAL IMPORT QUOTA FOR UPLAND COTTON.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) DEMAND.—The term ''demand'' means—

(i) the average seasonally adjusted annual rate of domestic mill consumption of cotton during the most recent 3 months for which official data of the Department of Agriculture are available or, in the absence of sufficient data, as estimated by the Secretary; and

(ii) the larger of—

(I) average exports of upland cotton during the preceding 6 marketing years; or

(II) cumulative exports of upland cotton plus outstanding export sales for the marketing year in which the quota is established.

(B) LIMITED GLOBAL IMPORT QUOTA.—The term ''limited global import quota'' means a quantity of imports that is not subject to the over-quota tariff rate of a tariff-rate quota.

(C) SUPPLY.—The term ''supply'' means, using the latest official data of the Department of Agriculture—

(i) the carry-over of upland cotton at the beginning of the marketing year (adjusted to 480-pound bales) in which the quota is established;

(ii) production of the current crop; and

(iii) imports to the latest date available during the marketing year.

(2) PROGRAM.—The President shall carry out an import quota program that provides that whenever the Secretary determines and announces that the average price of the base quality of upland cotton, as determined by the Secretary, in the designated spot markets for a month exceeded 130 percent of the average price of the quality of cotton in the markets for the preceding 36 months, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there shall immediately be in effect a limited global import quota subject to the following conditions:

(A) QUANTITY.—The quantity of the quota shall be equal to 21 days of domestic mill consumption of upland cotton at the seasonally adjusted average rate of the most recent 3 months for which official data of the Department of Agriculture are available or, in the absence of sufficient data, as estimated by the Secretary.

(B) QUANTITY IF PRIOR QUOTA.—If a quota has been established under this subsection during the preceding 12 months, the quantity of the quota next established under this subsection shall be the smaller of 21 days of domestic mill consumption calculated under subparagraph (A) or the quantity required to increase the supply to 130 percent of the demand.

(C) PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—The quantity under a limited global import quota shall be considered to be an in-quota quantity for purposes of—

(i) section 213(d) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703(d));

(ii) section 204 of the Andean Trade Preference Act (19 U.S.C. 3203);

(iii) section 503(d) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(d)); and

(iv) General Note 3(a)(iv) to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule.

(D) QUOTA ENTRY PERIOD.—When a quota is established under this subsection, cotton may be entered under the quota during the 90-day period beginning on the date the quota is established by the Secretary.

(3) NO OVERLAP.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), a quota period may not be established that overlaps an existing quota period or a special quota period established under subsection (a).

(c) ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE TO USERS OF UPLAND COTTON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall, on a monthly basis, make economic adjustment assistance available to domestic users of upland cotton in the form of payments for all documented use of that upland cotton during the previous monthly period regardless of the origin of the upland cotton.

(2) VALUE OF ASSISTANCE.—Effective beginning on August 1, 2013, the value of the assistance provided under paragraph (1) shall be 3 cents per pound.

(3) ALLOWABLE PURPOSES.—Economic adjustment assistance under this subsection shall be made available only to domestic users of upland cotton that certify that the assistance shall be used only to acquire, construct, install, modernize, develop, convert, or expand land, plant, buildings, equipment, facilities, or machinery.

(4) REVIEW OR AUDIT.—The Secretary may conduct such review or audit of the records of a domestic user under this subsection as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out this subsection.

(5) IMPROPER USE OF ASSISTANCE.—If the Secretary determines, after a review or audit of the records of the domestic user, that economic adjustment assistance under this subsection was not used for the purposes specified in paragraph (3), the domestic user shall be—

(A) liable for the repayment of the assistance to the Secretary, plus interest, as determined by the Secretary; and

(B) ineligible to receive assistance under this subsection for a period of 1 year following the determination of the Secretary.

SEC. 1208. SPECIAL COMPETITIVE PROVISIONS FOR EXTRA LONG STAPLE COTTON.

(a) COMPETITIVENESS PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act through July 31, 2019, the Secretary shall carry out a program—

(1) to maintain and expand the domestic use of extra long staple cotton produced in the United States;

(2) to increase exports of extra long staple cotton produced in the United States; and

(3) to ensure that extra long staple cotton produced in the United States remains competitive in world markets.

(b) PAYMENTS UNDER PROGRAM; TRIGGER.—Under the program, the Secretary shall make payments available under this section whenever—

(1) for a consecutive 4-week period, the world market price for the lowest priced competing growth of extra long staple cotton (adjusted to United States quality and location and for other factors affecting the competitiveness of such cotton), as determined by the Secretary, is below the prevailing United States price for a competing growth of extra long staple cotton; and

(2) the lowest priced competing growth of extra long staple cotton (adjusted to United States quality and location and for other factors affecting the competitiveness of such cotton), as determined by the Secretary, is less than 134 percent of the loan rate for extra long staple cotton.

(c) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS.—The Secretary shall make payments available under this section to domestic users of extra long staple cotton produced in the United States and exporters of extra long staple cotton produced in the United States that enter into an agreement with the Commodity Credit Corporation to participate in the program under this section.

(d) PAYMENT AMOUNT.—Payments under this section shall be based on the amount of the difference in the prices referred to in subsection (b)(1) during the fourth week of the consecutive 4-week period multiplied by the amount of documented purchases by domestic users and sales for export by exporters made in the week following such a consecutive 4-week period.

SEC. 1209. AVAILABILITY OF RECOURSE LOANS FOR HIGH MOISTURE FEED GRAINS AND SEED COTTON.

(a) HIGH MOISTURE FEED GRAINS.—

(1) DEFINITION OF HIGH MOISTURE STATE.—In this subsection, the term ''high moisture state'' means corn or grain sorghum having a moisture content in excess of Commodity Credit Corporation standards for marketing assistance loans made by the Secretary under section 1201.

(2) RECOURSE LOANS AVAILABLE.—For each of the 2014 through 2018 crops of corn and grain sorghum, the Secretary shall make available recourse loans, as determined by the Secretary, to producers on a farm that—

(A) normally harvest all or a portion of their crop of corn or grain sorghum in a high moisture state;

(B) present—

(i) certified scale tickets from an inspected, certified commercial scale, including a licensed warehouse, feedlot, feed mill, distillery, or other similar entity approved by the Secretary, pursuant to regulations issued by the Secretary; or

(ii) field or other physical measurements of the standing or stored crop in regions of the United States, as determined by the Secretary, that do not have certified commercial scales from which certified scale tickets may be obtained within reasonable proximity of harvest operation;

(C) certify that the producers on the farm were the owners of the feed grain at the time of delivery to, and that the quantity to be placed under loan under this subsection was in fact harvested on the farm and delivered to, a feedlot, feed mill, or commercial or on-farm high-moisture storage facility, or to a facility maintained by the users of corn and grain sorghum in a high moisture state; and

(D) comply with deadlines established by the Secretary for harvesting the corn or grain sorghum and submit applications for loans under this subsection within deadlines established by the Secretary.

(3) ELIGIBILITY OF ACQUIRED FEED GRAINS.—A loan under this subsection shall be made on a quantity of corn or grain sorghum of the same crop acquired by the producer equivalent to a quantity determined by multiplying—

(A) the acreage of the corn or grain sorghum in a high moisture state harvested on the farm of the producer; by

(B) the lower of the farm program payment yield used to make payments under subtitle A or the actual yield on a field, as determined by the Secretary, that is similar to the field from which the corn or grain sorghum was obtained.

(b) RECOURSE LOANS AVAILABLE FOR SEED COTTON.—For each of the 2014 through 2018 crops of upland cotton and extra long staple cotton, the Secretary shall make available recourse seed cotton loans, as determined by the Secretary, on any production.

(c) REPAYMENT RATES.—Repayment of a recourse loan made under this section shall be at the loan rate established for the commodity by the Secretary, plus interest (determined in accordance with section 163 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7283)).

SEC. 1210. ADJUSTMENTS OF LOANS.

(a) ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.—Subject to subsection (e), the Secretary may make appropriate adjustments in the loan rates for any loan commodity (other than cotton) for differences in grade, type, quality, location, and other factors.

(b) MANNER OF ADJUSTMENT.—The adjustments under subsection (a) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be made in such a manner that the average loan level for the commodity will, on the basis of the anticipated incidence of the factors, be equal to the level of support determined in accordance with this subtitle and subtitle C.

(c) ADJUSTMENT ON COUNTY BASIS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish loan rates for a crop for producers in individual counties in a manner that results in the lowest loan rate being 95 percent of the national average loan rate, if those loan rates do not result in an increase in outlays.

(2) PROHIBITION.—Adjustments under this subsection shall not result in an increase in the national average loan rate for any year.

(d) ADJUSTMENT IN LOAN RATE FOR COTTON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make appropriate adjustments in the loan rate for cotton for differences in quality factors.

(2) TYPES OF ADJUSTMENTS.—Loan rate adjustments under paragraph (1) may include—

(A) the use of non-spot market price data, in addition to spot market price data, that would enhance the accuracy of the price information used in determining quality adjustments under this subsection;

(B) adjustments in the premiums or discounts associated with upland cotton with a staple length of 33 or above due to micronaire with the goal of eliminating any unnecessary artificial splits in the calculations of the premiums or discounts; and

(C) such other adjustments as the Secretary determines appropriate, after consultations conducted in accordance with paragraph (3).

(3) CONSULTATION WITH PRIVATE SECTOR.—

(A) PRIOR TO REVISION.—In making adjustments to the loan rate for cotton (including any review of the adjustments) as provided in this subsection, the Secretary shall consult with representatives of the United States cotton industry.

(B) INAPPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to consultations under this subsection.

(4) REVIEW OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary may review the operation of the upland cotton quality adjustments implemented pursuant to this subsection and may make further adjustments to the administration of the loan program for upland cotton, by revoking or revising any adjustment taken under paragraph (2).

(e) RICE.—The Secretary shall not make adjustments in the loan rates for long grain rice and medium grain rice, except for differences in grade and quality (including milling yields).

Subtitle C—Sugar

SEC. 1301. SUGAR PROGRAM.

(a) CONTINUATION OF CURRENT PROGRAM AND LOAN RATES.—

(1) SUGARCANE.—Section 156(a)(5) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(a)(5)) is amended by striking ''the 2012 crop year'' and inserting ''each of the 2012 through 2018 crop years''.

(2) SUGAR BEETS.—Section 156(b)(2) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(3) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Section 156(i) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(i)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) FLEXIBLE MARKETING ALLOTMENTS FOR SUGAR.—

(1) SUGAR ESTIMATES.—Section 359b(a)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359bb(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(2) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Section 359l(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359ll(a)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

Subtitle D—Dairy

PART I—DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN PROTECTION AND DAIRY MARKET STABILIZATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 1401. DEFINITIONS.

In this part:

(1) ACTUAL DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN.—The term ''actual dairy producer margin'' means the difference between the all-milk price and the average feed cost, as calculated under section 1402.

(2) ALL-MILK PRICE.—The term ''all-milk price'' means the average price received, per hundredweight of milk, by dairy producers for all milk sold to plants and dealers in the United States, as determined by the Secretary.

(3) ANNUAL PRODUCTION HISTORY.—The term ''annual production history'' means the production history determined for a participating dairy producer under section 1413(b) whenever the dairy producer purchases supplemental margin protection.

(4) AVERAGE FEED COST.—The term ''average feed cost'' means the average cost of feed used by a dairy operation to produce a hundredweight of milk, determined under section 1402 using the sum of the following:

(A) The product determined by multiplying 1.0728 by the price of corn per bushel.

(B) The product determined by multiplying 0.00735 by the price of soybean meal per ton.

(C) The product determined by multiplying 0.0137 by the price of alfalfa hay per ton.

(5) BASIC PRODUCTION HISTORY.—The term ''basic production history'' means the production history determined for a participating dairy producer under section 1413(a) for provision of basic margin protection.

(6) CONSECUTIVE TWO-MONTH PERIOD.—The term ''consecutive two-month period'' refers to the two-month period consisting of the months of January and February, March and April, May and June, July and August, September and October, or November and December, respectively.

(7) DAIRY PRODUCER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the term ''dairy producer'' means an individual or entity that directly or indirectly (as determined by the Secretary)—

(i) shares in the risk of producing milk; and

(ii) makes contributions (including land, labor, management, equipment, or capital) to the dairy operation of the individual or entity that are at least commensurate with the share of the individual or entity of the proceeds of the operation.

(B) ADDITIONAL OWNERSHIP STRUCTURES.—The Secretary shall determine additional ownership structures to be covered by the definition of dairy producer.

(8) HANDLER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''handler'' means the initial individual or entity making payment to a dairy producer for milk produced in the United States and marketed for commercial use.

(B) PRODUCER-HANDLER.—The term includes a ''producer-handler'' when the producer satisfies the definition in subparagraph (A).

(9) MARGIN PROTECTION PROGRAM.—The term ''margin protection program'' means the dairy producer margin protection program required by subpart A.

(10) PARTICIPATING DAIRY PRODUCER.—The term ''participating dairy producer'' means a dairy producer that—

(A) signs up under section 1412 to participate in the margin protection program under subpart A; and

(B) as a result, also participates in the stabilization program under subpart B.

(11) STABILIZATION PROGRAM.—The term ''stabilization program'' means the dairy market stabilization program required by subpart B for all participating dairy producers.

(12) STABILIZATION PROGRAM BASE.—The term ''stabilization program base'', with respect to a participating dairy producer, means the stabilization program base calculated for the producer under section 1431(b).

(13) UNITED STATES.—The term ''United States'', in a geographical sense, means the 50 States, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands of the United States, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 1402. CALCULATION OF AVERAGE FEED COST AND ACTUAL DAIRY PRODUCER MARGINS.

(a) CALCULATION OF AVERAGE FEED COST.—The Secretary shall calculate the national average feed cost for each month using the following data:

(1) The price of corn for a month shall be the price received during that month by farmers in the United States for corn, as reported in the monthly Agricultural Prices report by the Secretary.

(2) The price of soybean meal for a month shall be the central Illinois price for soybean meal, as reported in the Market News-Monthly Soybean Meal Price Report by the Secretary.

(3) The price of alfalfa hay for a month shall be the price received during that month by farmers in the United States for alfalfa hay, as reported in the monthly Agricultural Prices report by the Secretary.

(b) CALCULATION OF ACTUAL DAIRY PRODUCER MARGINS.—

(1) MARGIN PROTECTION PROGRAM.—For use in the margin protection program under subpart A, the Secretary shall calculate the actual dairy producer margin for each consecutive two-month period by subtracting—

(A) the average feed cost for that consecutive two-month period, determined in accordance with subsection (a); from

(B) the all-milk price for that consecutive two-month period.

(2) STABILIZATION PROGRAM.—For use in the stabilization program under subpart B, the Secretary shall calculate each month the actual dairy producer margin for the preceding month by subtracting—

(A) the average feed cost for that preceding month, determined in accordance with subsection (a); from

(B) the all-milk price for that preceding month.

(3) TIME FOR CALCULATIONS.—The calculations required by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be made as soon as practicable each month using the full month price of the applicable reference month, but in no case shall the calculation be made later than the last business day of the month.

Subpart A—Dairy Producer Margin Protection Program

SEC. 1411. ESTABLISHMENT OF DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN PROTECTION PROGRAM.

The Secretary shall establish and administer a dairy producer margin protection program for the purpose of protecting dairy producer income by paying participating dairy producers—

(1) basic margin protection payments when actual dairy producer margins are less than the threshold levels for such payments; and

(2) supplemental margin protection payments if purchased by a participating dairy producer.

SEC. 1412. PARTICIPATION OF DAIRY PRODUCERS IN MARGIN PROTECTION PROGRAM.

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—All dairy producers in the United States are eligible to participate in the margin protection program, except that a dairy producer must sign up with the Secretary before the producer may receive—

(1) basic margin protection payments under section 1414; and

(2) if the dairy producer purchases supplemental margin protection under section 1415, supplemental margin protection payments under such section.

(b) SIGN-UP PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall allow all interested dairy producers to sign up to participate in the margin protection program. The Secretary shall specify the manner and form by which a dairy producer must sign up to participate in the margin protection program.

(2) TREATMENT OF MULTI-PRODUCER OPERATIONS.—If a dairy operation consists of more than one dairy producer, all of the dairy producers of the operation shall be treated as a single dairy producer for purposes of—

(A) registration to receive basic margin protection and purchase supplemental margin protection;

(B) payment of the administrative fee under subsection (e) and producer premiums under section 1415; and

(C) participation in the stabilization program under subpart B.

(3) TREATMENT OF PRODUCERS WITH MULTIPLE DAIRY OPERATIONS.—If a dairy producer operates two or more dairy operations, each dairy operation of the producer shall require a separate registration to receive basic margin protection and purchase supplemental margin protection. Only those dairy operations so registered shall be subject to the stabilization program.

(c) TIME FOR SIGN UP.—

(1) EXISTING DAIRY PRODUCERS.—During the one-year period beginning on the date of the initiation of the sign-up period for the margin protection program, a dairy producer that is actively engaged in a dairy operation as of such date may sign up with the Secretary—

(A) to receive basic margin protection; and

(B) if the producer elects, to purchase supplemental margin protection.

(2) NEW ENTRANTS.—A dairy producer that has no existing interest in a dairy operation as of the date of the initiation of the sign-up period for the margin protection program, but that, after such date, establishes a new dairy operation, may sign up with the Secretary during the one year period beginning on the date on which the dairy operation first markets milk commercially—

(A) to receive basic margin protection; and

(B) if the producer elects, to purchase supplemental margin protection.

(d) RETROACTIVITY PROVISION.—

(1) NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF RETROACTIVE PROTECTION.—Not later than 30 days after the effective date of this subtitle, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register to inform dairy producers of the availability of retroactive basic margin protection and retroactive supplemental margin protection, subject to the condition that interested producers must file a notice of intent (in such form and manner as the Secretary specifies in the Federal Register notice)—

(A) to participate in the margin protection program and receive basic margin protection; and

(B) at the election of the producer under paragraph (3), to also obtain supplemental margin protection.

(2) RETROACTIVE BASIC MARGIN PROTECTION.—

(A) AVAILABILITY.—If a dairy producer files a notice of intent under paragraph (1) to participate in the margin protection program before the initiation of the sign-up period for the margin protection program and subsequently signs up for the margin protection program, the producer shall receive basic margin protection retroactive to the effective date of this subtitle.

(B) DURATION.—Retroactive basic margin protection under this paragraph for a dairy producer shall apply from the effective date of this subtitle until the date on which the producer signs up for the margin protection program.

(3) RETROACTIVE SUPPLEMENTAL MARGIN PROTECTION.—

(A) AVAILABILITY.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), if a dairy producer files a notice of intent under paragraph (1) to participate in the margin protection program and obtain supplemental margin protection and subsequently signs up for the margin protection program, the producer shall receive supplemental margin protection, in addition to the basic margin protection under paragraph (2), retroactive to the effective date of this subtitle.

(B) DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION.—A notice of intent to obtain retroactive supplemental margin protection must be filed with the Secretary no later than the earlier of the following:

(i) 150 days after the date on which the Secretary publishes the notice in the Federal Register required by paragraph (1).

(ii) The date on which the Secretary initiates the sign up period for the margin protection program.

(C) ELECTION OF COVERAGE LEVEL AND PERCENTAGE OF COVERAGE.—To be sufficient to obtain retroactive supplemental margin protection, the notice of intent to participate filed by a dairy producer must specify—

(i) a selected coverage level that is higher, in any increment of $0.50, than the payment threshold for basic margin protection specified in section 1414(b), but not to exceed $6.00; and

(ii) the percentage of coverage, subject to limits imposed in section 1415(c).

(D) DURATION.—The coverage level and percentage specified in the notice of intent to participate filed by a dairy producer shall apply from the effective date of this subtitle until the later of the following:

(i) October 1, 2013.

(ii) The date on which the Secretary initiates the sign-up period for the margin protection program.

(4) NOTICE OF INTENT AND OBLIGATION TO PARTICIPATE IN MARGIN PROTECTION PROGRAM.—In no way does filing a notice of intent under this subsection obligate a dairy producer to sign up for the margin protection program once the program rules are final, but if a producer does file a notice of intent and subsequently signs up for the margin protection program, that dairy producer is obligated to pay fees and premiums for any retroactive basic margin protection or retroactive supplemental margin protection selected in the notice of intent.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE FEE.—

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE FEE REQUIRED.—A dairy producer shall pay an administrative fee under this subsection to sign up to participate in the margin protection program. The participating dairy producer shall pay the administrative fee annually thereafter to continue to participate in the margin protection program.

(2) FEE AMOUNT.—The administrative fee for a participating dairy producer for a calendar year is based on the pounds of milk (in millions) marketed by the dairy producer in the previous calendar year, as follows:

Pounds Marketed (in millions)	*Admin. Fee*
less than 1	*$100*
1 to 10	*$250*
more than 10 to 40	*$500*
more than 40	*$1000*

(3) DEPOSIT OF FEES.—All administrative fees collected under this subsection shall be credited to the fund or account used to cover the costs incurred to administer the margin protection program and the stabilization program and shall be available to the Secretary, subject to appropriation and until expended, for use or transfer as provided in paragraph (4).

(4) USE OF FEES.—The Secretary shall use administrative fees collected under this subsection—

(A) to cover administrative costs of the margin protection program and stabilization program; and

(B) to the extent funds remain available after operation of subparagraphs (A), to cover costs of the Department of Agriculture relating to reporting of dairy market news and to carry out section 273 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1637b).

(f) RECONSTITUTION.—The Secretary shall prohibit a dairy producer from reconstituting a dairy operation for the sole purpose of the dairy producer—

(1) receiving basic margin protection;

(2) purchasing supplemental margin protection; or

(3) avoiding participation in the stabilization program.

(g) PRIORITY CONSIDERATION.—A dairy operation that participates in the margin protection program shall be eligible to participate in the livestock gross margin for dairy program under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) only after operations that are not participating in the production margin protection program are enrolled.

SEC. 1413. PRODUCTION HISTORY OF PARTICIPATING DAIRY PRODUCERS.

(a) PRODUCTION HISTORY FOR BASIC MARGIN PROTECTION.—

(1) DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—For purposes of providing basic margin protection, the Secretary shall determine the basic production history of the dairy operation of each participating dairy producer in the margin protection program.

(2) CALCULATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the basic production history of a participating dairy producer for basic margin protection is equal to the highest annual milk marketings of the dairy producer during any one of the three calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the dairy producer first signed up to participate in the margin protection program.

(3) ELECTION BY NEW PRODUCERS.—If a participating dairy producer has been in operation for less than a year, the dairy producer shall elect one of the following methods for the Secretary to determine the basic production history of the dairy producer:

(A) The volume of the actual milk marketings for the months the dairy producer has been in operation extrapolated to a yearly amount.

(B) An estimate of the actual milk marketings of the dairy producer based on the herd size of the producer relative to the national rolling herd average data published by the Secretary.

(4) NO CHANGE IN PRODUCTION HISTORY FOR BASIC MARGIN PROTECTION.—Once the basic production history of a participating dairy producer is determined under paragraph (2) or (3), the basic production history shall not be subsequently changed for purposes of determining the amount of any basic margin protection payments for the dairy producer made under section 1414.

(b) ANNUAL PRODUCTION HISTORY FOR SUPPLEMENTAL MARGIN PROTECTION.—

(1) DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—For purposes of providing supplemental margin protection for a participating dairy producer that purchases supplemental margin protection for a year under section 1415, the Secretary shall determine the annual production history of the dairy operation of the dairy producer under paragraph (2).

(2) CALCULATION.—The annual production history of a participating dairy producer for a year is equal to the actual milk marketings of the dairy producer during the preceding calendar year.

(3) NEW PRODUCERS.—Subsection (a)(3) shall apply with respect to determining the annual production history of a participating dairy producer that has been in operation for less than a year.

(c) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—A participating dairy producer shall provide all information that the Secretary may require in order to establish—

(1) the basic production history of the dairy operation of the dairy producer under subsection (a); and

(2) the production history of the dairy operation of the dairy producer whenever the producer purchases supplemental margin protection under section 1415.

(d) TRANSFER OF PRODUCTION HISTORIES.—

(1) TRANSFER BY SALE OR LEASE.—In promulgating the rules to initiate the margin protection program, the Secretary shall specify the conditions under which and the manner by which the production history of a dairy operation may be transferred by sale or lease.

(2) COVERAGE LEVEL.—

(A) BASIC MARGIN PROTECTION.—A purchaser or lessee to whom the Secretary transfers a basic production history under this subsection shall not obtain a different level of basic margin protection than the basic margin protection coverage held by the seller or lessor from whom the transfer was obtained.

(B) SUPPLEMENTAL MARGIN PROTECTION.—A purchaser or lessee to whom the Secretary transfers an annual production history under this subsection shall not obtain a different level of supplemental margin protection coverage than the supplemental margin protection coverage in effect for the seller or lessor from whom the transfer was obtained for the calendar year in which the transfer was made.

(e) MOVEMENT AND TRANSFER OF PRODUCTION HISTORY.—

(1) MOVEMENT AND TRANSFER AUTHORIZED.—Subject to paragraph (2), if a dairy producer moves from one location to another location, the dairy producer may maintain the basic production history and annual production history associated with the operation.

(2) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—A dairy producer shall notify the Secretary of any move of a dairy operation under paragraph (1).

(3) SUBSEQUENT OCCUPATION OF VACATED LOCATION.—A party subsequently occupying a dairy operation location vacated as described in paragraph (1) shall have no interest in the basic production history or annual production history previously associated with the operation at such location.

SEC. 1414. BASIC MARGIN PROTECTION.

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—All participating dairy producers are eligible to receive basic margin protection under the margin protection program.

(b) PAYMENT THRESHOLD.—Participating dairy producers shall receive a basic margin protection payment whenever the average actual dairy producer margin for a consecutive two-month period is less than $4.00 per hundredweight of milk.

(c) BASIC MARGIN PROTECTION PAYMENT.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall make a basic margin protection payment to each participating dairy producer whenever such a payment is required by subsection (b).

(2) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The basic margin protection payment for the dairy operation of a participating dairy producer for a consecutive two-month period shall be determined as follows:

(A) The Secretary shall calculate the difference between the average actual dairy producer margin for the consecutive two-month period and $4.00, except that, if the difference is more than $4.00, the Secretary shall use $4.00.

(B) The Secretary shall multiply the amount under subparagraph (A) by the lesser of the following:

(i) 80 percent of the production history of the dairy producer, divided by six.

(ii) The actual amount of milk marketed by the dairy operation of the dairy producer during the consecutive two-month period.

SEC. 1415. SUPPLEMENTAL MARGIN PROTECTION.

(a) ELECTION OF SUPPLEMENTAL MARGIN PROTECTION.—Supplemental margin protection is available only on an annual basis. A participating dairy producer may annually purchase supplemental margin protection to protect, during the calendar year for which purchased, a higher level of the income of a participating dairy producer than the income level guaranteed by basic margin protection under section 1414.

(b) SELECTION OF PAYMENT THRESHOLD.—A participating dairy producer purchasing supplemental margin protection for a year shall elect a coverage level that is higher, in any increment of $0.50, than the payment threshold for basic margin protection specified in section 1414(b), but not to exceed $8.00.

(c) SELECTION OF COVERAGE PERCENTAGE.—A participating dairy producer purchasing supplemental margin protection for a year shall elect a percentage of coverage equal to not more than 90 percent, nor less than 25 percent, of the annual production history of the dairy operation of the participating dairy producer.

(d) PRODUCER PREMIUMS FOR SUPPLEMENTAL MARGIN PROTECTION.—

(1) PREMIUMS REQUIRED.—A participating dairy producer that purchases supplemental margin protection shall pay an annual premium equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

(A) the percentage selected by the dairy producer under subsection (c);

(B) the annual production history of the dairy producer; and

(C) the premium per hundredweight of milk, as specified in the applicable table under paragraph (2) or (3).

(2) PREMIUM PER HUNDREDWEIGHT FOR FIRST 4 MILLION POUNDS OF PRODUCTION.—For the first 4,000,000 pounds of milk marketings included in the annual production history of a participating dairy producer, the premium per hundredweight corresponding to each coverage level specified in the following table is as follows:

Coverage Level	Premium per Cwt.
$4.50	$0.01
$5.00	$0.025
$5.50	$0.04
$6.00	$0.065
$6.50	$0.09
$7.00	$0.434
$7.50	$0.590
$8.00	$0.922

(3) PREMIUM PER HUNDREDWEIGHT FOR PRODUCTION IN EXCESS OF 4 MILLION POUNDS.—For milk marketings in excess of 4,000,000 pounds included in the annual production history of a participating dairy producer, the premium per hundredweight corresponding to each coverage level is as follows:

Coverage Level	Premium per Cwt.
$4.50	$0.015
$5.00	$0.036
$5.50	$0.081
$6.00	$0.155
$6.50	$0.230
$7.00	$0.434
$7.50	$0.590
$8.00	$0.922

(4) TIME FOR PAYMENT.—In promulgating the rules to initiate the margin protection program, the Secretary shall provide more than one method by which a participating dairy producer that purchases supplemental margin protection for a calendar year may pay the premium under this subsection for that year that maximizes producer payment flexibility and program integrity.

(e) PRODUCER'S PREMIUM OBLIGATIONS.—

(1) PRO-RATION OF PREMIUM FOR NEW PRODUCERS.—A dairy producer described in section 1412(c)(2) that purchases supplemental margin protection for a calendar year after the start of the calendar year shall pay a pro-rated premium for that calendar year based on the portion of the calendar year for which the producer purchases the coverage.

(2) LEGAL OBLIGATION.—A participating dairy producer that purchases supplemental margin protection for a calendar year shall be legally obligated to pay the applicable premium for that calendar year, except that, if the dairy producer retires, the producer may request that Secretary cancel the supplemental margin protection if the producer has terminated the dairy operation entirely and certifies under oath that the producer will not be actively engaged in any dairy operation for at least the next seven years.

(f) SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENT THRESHOLD.—A participating dairy producer with supplemental margin protection shall receive a supplemental margin protection payment whenever the average actual dairy producer margin for a consecutive two-month period is less than the coverage level threshold selected by the dairy producer under subsection (b).

(g) SUPPLEMENTAL MARGIN PROTECTION PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The supplemental margin protection payment for a participating dairy producer is in addition to the basic margin protection payment.

(2) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The supplemental margin protection payment for the dairy operation of a participating dairy producer shall be determined as follows:

(A) The Secretary shall calculate the difference between the coverage level threshold selected by the dairy producer under subsection (b) and the greater of—

(i) the average actual dairy producer margin for the consecutive two-month period; or

(ii) $4.00.

(B) The amount determined under subparagraph (A) shall be multiplied by the percentage selected by the participating dairy producer under subsection (c) and by the lesser of the following:

(i) The annual production history of the dairy operation of the dairy producer, divided by six.

(ii) The actual amount of milk marketed by the dairy operation of the dairy producer during the consecutive two-month period.

SEC. 1416. EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PAY ADMINISTRATIVE FEES OR PREMIUMS.

(a) LOSS OF BENEFITS.—A participating dairy producer that fails to pay the required administrative fee under section 1412 or is in arrears on premium payments for supplemental margin protection under section 1415—

(1) remains legally obligated to pay the administrative fee or premiums, as the case may be; and

(2) may not receive basic margin protection payments or supplemental margin protection payments until the fees or premiums are fully paid.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary may take such action as necessary to collect administrative fees and premium payments for supplemental margin protection.

Subpart B—Dairy Market Stabilization Program

SEC. 1431. ESTABLISHMENT OF DAIRY MARKET STABILIZATION PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED; PURPOSE.—The Secretary shall establish and administer a dairy market stabilization program applicable to participating dairy producers for the purpose of assisting in balancing the supply of milk with demand when dairy producers are experiencing low or negative operating margins.

(b) ELECTION OF STABILIZATION PROGRAM BASE CALCULATION METHOD.—

(1) ELECTION.—When a dairy producer signs up under section 1412 to participate in the margin protection program, the dairy producer shall inform the Secretary of the method by which the stabilization program base for the dairy producer for fiscal year 2013 will be calculated under paragraph (3).

(2) CHANGE IN CALCULATION METHOD.—A participating dairy producer may change the stabilization program base calculation method to be used for a calendar year by notifying the Secretary of the change not later than a date determined by the Secretary.

(3) CALCULATION METHODS.—A participating dairy producer may elect either of the following methods for calculation of the stabilization program base for the producer:

(A) The volume of the average monthly milk marketings of the dairy producer for the three months immediately preceding the announcement by the Secretary that the stabilization program will become effective.

(B) The volume of the monthly milk marketings of the dairy producer for the same month in the preceding year as the month for which the Secretary has announced the stabilization program will become effective.

SEC. 1432. THRESHOLD FOR IMPLEMENTATION AND REDUCTION IN DAIRY PRODUCER PAYMENTS.

(a) WHEN STABILIZATION PROGRAM REQUIRED.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary shall announce that the stabilization program is in effect and order reduced payments for any participating dairy producer that exceeds the applicable percentage of the producer's stabilization program base whenever—

(1) the actual dairy producer margin has been $6.00 or less per hundredweight of milk for each of the immediately preceding two months; or

(2) the actual dairy producer margin has been $4.00 or less per hundredweight of milk for the immediately preceding month.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary shall not make the announcement under subsection (a) to implement the stabilization program or order reduced payments if any of the conditions described in section 1436(b) have been met during the two months immediately preceding the month in which the announcement under subsection (a) would otherwise be made by the Secretary in the absence of this exception.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF PAYMENT REDUCTIONS.—Reductions in dairy producer payments shall commence beginning on the first day of the month immediately following the date of the announcement by the Secretary under subsection (a).

SEC. 1433. PRODUCER MILK MARKETING INFORMATION.

(a) COLLECTION OF MILK MARKETING DATA.—The Secretary shall establish, by regulation, a process to collect from participating dairy producers and handlers such information that the Secretary considers necessary for each month during which the stabilization program is in effect.

(b) REDUCE REGULATORY BURDEN.—When implementing the process under subsection (a), the Secretary shall minimize the regulatory burden on dairy producers and handlers.

SEC. 1434. CALCULATION AND COLLECTION OF REDUCED DAIRY PRODUCER PAYMENTS.

(a) REDUCED PRODUCER PAYMENTS REQUIRED.—During any month in which payment reductions are in effect under the stabilization program, each handler shall reduce payments to each participating dairy producer from whom the handler receives milk.

(b) REDUCTIONS BASED ON ACTUAL DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN.—

(1) REDUCTION REQUIREMENT 1.—Unless the reduction required by paragraph (2) or (3) applies, when the actual dairy producer margin has been $6.00 or less per hundredweight of milk for two consecutive months, the handler shall make payments to a participating dairy producer for a month based on the greater of the following:

(A) 98 percent of the stabilization program base of the dairy producer.

(B) 94 percent of the marketings of milk for the month by the producer.

(2) REDUCTION REQUIREMENT 2.—Unless the reduction required by paragraph (3) applies, when the actual dairy producer margin has been $5.00 or less per hundredweight of milk for two consecutive months, the handler shall make payments to a participating dairy producer for a month based on the greater of the following:

(A) 97 percent of the stabilization program base of the dairy producer.

(B) 93 percent of the marketings of milk for the month by the producer.

(3) REDUCTION REQUIREMENT 3.—When the actual dairy producer margin has been $4.00 or less for any one month, the handler shall make payments to a participating dairy producer for a month based on the greater of the following:

(A) 96 percent of the stabilization program base of the dairy producer.

(B) 92 percent of the marketings of milk for the month by the producer.

(c) CONTINUATION OF REDUCTIONS.—The largest level of payment reduction required under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (b) shall be continued for each month until the Secretary suspends the stabilization program and terminates payment reductions in accordance with section 1436.

(d) PAYMENT REDUCTION EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding any preceding subsection of this section, a handler shall make no payment reductions for a dairy producer for a month if the producer's milk marketings for the month are equal to or less than the percentage of the stabilization program base applicable to the producer under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (b).

SEC. 1435. REMITTING MONIES TO THE SECRETARY AND USE OF MONIES.

(a) REMITTING MONIES.—As soon as practicable after the end of each month during which payment reductions are in effect under the stabilization program, each handler shall remit to the Secretary an amount equal to the amount by which payments to participating dairy producers are reduced by the handler under section 1434.

(b) DEPOSIT OF MONIES.—All monies received under subsection (a) shall, subject to appropriation, be available to the Secetary until expended for use or transfer as provided in subsection (c).

(c) USE OF MONIES.—

(1) AVAILABILITY FOR CERTAIN COMMODITY DONATIONS.—Within three months of the receipt of monies under subsection (a), and as provided in subsection (b), Secretary shall obligate the monies for the purpose of—

(A) purchasing dairy products for donation to food banks and other programs that the Secretary determines appropriate; and

(B) expanding consumption and building demand for dairy products.

(2) NO DUPLICATION OF EFFORT.—The Secretary shall ensure that expenditures under paragraph (1) are compatible with, and do not duplicate, programs supported by the dairy research and promotion activities conducted under the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 4501 et seq.).

(3) ACCOUNTING.—The Secretary shall keep an accurate account of all monies obligated under paragraph (1).

(d) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than December 31 of each year that the stabilization program is in effect, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that provides an accurate accounting of—

(1) the monies received by the Secretary during the preceding fiscal year under subsection (a); and

(2) all expenditures made by the Secretary under subsection (b) during the preceding fiscal year.

(e) ENFORCEMENT.—If a participating dairy producer or handler fails to remit or collect the amounts by which payments to participating dairy producers are reduced under section 1434, the producer or handler responsible for the failure shall be liable to the Secretary for the amount that should have been remitted or collected, plus interest. In addition to the enforcement authorities available under section 1437, the Secretary may enforce this subsection in the courts of the United States.

SEC. 1436. SUSPENSION OF REDUCED PAYMENT REQUIREMENT.

(a) DETERMINATION OF PRICES.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The price in the United States for cheddar cheese and nonfat dry milk shall be determined by the Secretary.

(2) The world price of cheddar cheese and skim milk powder shall be determined by the Secretary.

(b) INITIAL SUSPENSION THRESHOLDS.—The Secretary shall announce that the stabilization program shall be suspended whenever the Secretary determines that—

(1) the actual dairy producer margin is greater than $6.00 per hundredweight of milk for two consecutive months;

(2) the dairy producer margin is equal to or less than $6.00 (but greater than $5.00) for two consecutive months, and during the same two consecutive months—

(A) the price in the United States for cheddar cheese is equal to or greater than the world price of cheddar cheese; or

(B) the price in the United States for nonfat dry milk is equal to or greater than the world price of skim milk powder;

(3) the dairy producer margin is equal to or less than $5.00 (but greater than $4.00) for two consecutive months, and during the same two consecutive months—

(A) the price in the United States for cheddar cheese is more than 5 percent above the world price of cheddar cheese; or

(B) the price in the United States for nonfat dry milk is more than 5 percent above the world price of skim milk powder; or

(4) the dairy producer margin is equal to or less than $4.00 for two consecutive months, and during the same two consecutive months—

(A) the price in the United States for cheddar cheese is more than 7 percent above the world price of cheddar cheese; or

(B) the price in the United States for nonfat dry milk is more than 7 percent above the world price of skim milk powder.

(c) ENHANCED SUSPENSION THRESHOLDS.—If the stabilization program is not suspended pursuant to subsection (b) for six consecutive months or more, the stabilization program shall be suspended whenever the Secretary determines that—

(1) the actual dairy producer margin is greater than $6.00 per hundredweight of milk for two consecutive months;

(2) the dairy producer margin is equal to or less than $6.00 (but greater than $5.00) for two consecutive months, and during the same two consecutive months—

(A) the price in the United States for cheddar cheese is not less than 97 percent of the world price of cheddar cheese; or

(B) the price in the United States for non-fat dry milk is not less than 97 percent of the world price of skim milk powder;

(3) the dairy producer margin is equal to or less than $5.00 (but greater than $4.00) for two consecutive months, and during the same two consecutive months—

(A) the price in the United States for cheddar cheese is more than 3 percent above the world price of cheddar cheese; or

(B) the price in the United States for non fat dry milk is more than 3 percent above the world price of skim milk powder; or

(4) the dairy producer margin is equal to or less than $4.00 for two consecutive months, and during the same two consecutive months—

(A) the price in the United States for cheddar cheese is more than 6 percent above the world price of cheddar cheese; or

(B) the price in the United States for non fat dry milk is more than 6 percent above the world price of skim milk powder.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION BY HANDLERS.—Effective on the day after the date of the announcement by the Secretary under subsection (b) or (c) of the suspension of the stabilization program, the handler shall cease reducing payments to participating dairy producers under the stabilization program.

(e) CONDITION ON RESUMPTION OF STABILIZATION PROGRAM.—Upon the announcement by the Secretary under subsection (b) or (c) that the stabilization program has been suspended, the stabilization program may not be implemented again until, at the earliest—

(1) two months have passed, beginning on the first day of the month immediately following the announcement by the Secretary; and

(2) the conditions of section 1432(a) are again met.

SEC. 1437. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) UNLAWFUL ACT.—It shall be unlawful and a violation of the this subpart for any person subject to the stabilization program to willfully fail or refuse to provide, or delay the timely reporting of, accurate information and remittance of funds to the Secretary in accordance with this subpart.

(b) ORDER.—After providing notice and opportunity for a hearing to an affected person, the Secretary may issue an order against any person to cease and desist from continuing any violation of this subpart.

(c) APPEAL.—An order of the Secretary under subsection (b) shall be final and conclusive unless an affected person files an appeal of the order of the Secretary in United States district court not later than 30 days after the date of the issuance of the order. A finding of the Secretary in the order shall be set aside only if the finding is not supported by substantial evidence.

(d) NONCOMPLIANCE WITH ORDER.—If a person subject to this subpart fails to obey an order issued under subsection (b) after the order has become final and unappealable, or after the appropriate United States district court has entered a final judgment in favor of the Secretary, the United States may apply to the appropriate United States district court for enforcement of the order. If the court determines that the order was lawfully made and duly served and that the

person violated the order, the court shall enforce the order.

SEC. 1438. AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.

(a) AUDITS OF PRODUCER AND HANDLER COMPLIANCE.—

(1) AUDITS AUTHORIZED.—If determined by the Secretary to be necessary to ensure compliance by participating dairy producers and handlers with the stabilization program, the Secretary may conduct periodic audits of participating dairy producers and handlers.

(2) SAMPLE OF DAIRY PRODUCERS.—Any audit conducted under this subsection shall include, at a minimum, investigation of a statistically valid and random sample of participating dairy producers.

(b) SUBMISSION OF RESULTS.—The Secretary shall submit the results of any audit conducted under subsection (a) to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and include such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate regarding the stabilization program.

Subpart C—Commodity Credit Corporation

SEC. 1451. USE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.

The Secretary shall use the funds, facilities, and the authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out this part.

Subpart D—Initiation and Duration

SEC. 1461. RULEMAKING.

(a) PROCEDURE.—The promulgation of regulations for the initiation of the margin protection program and the stabilization program, and for administration of such programs, shall be made—

(1) without regard to chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the Paperwork Reduction Act);

(2) without regard to the Statement of Policy of the Secretary of Agriculture effective July 24, 1971 (36 Fed. Reg. 13804), relating to notices of proposed rulemaking and public participation in rulemaking; and

(3) subject to subsection (b), pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) SPECIAL RULEMAKING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) INTERIM RULES PROHIBITED FOR STABILIZATION PROGRAM.—With respect to the stabilization program, the Secretary may not use the authority of subparagraph (B) of section 553(b) of title 5, United States Code, to promulgate interim rules or to otherwise avoid the requirements of such section.

(2) INTERIM RULES AUTHORIZED FOR MARGIN PROTECTION PROGRAM.—With respect to the margin protection program, the Secretary may promulgate interim rules under the authority provided in subparagraph (B) of section 553(b) of title 5, United States Code, if the Secretary determines such interim rules to be needed. Any such interim rules for the margin protection program shall be effective on publication.

(3) FINAL RULES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the margin protection program and stabilization program, the Secretary shall promulgate final rules, with an opportunity for public notice and comment, no later than 21 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) ADDITIONAL STABILIZATION PROGRAM REQUIREMENT.—The final rules required for the stabilization program shall include a certification by the Secretary of compliance with the requirements contained in sections 1, 3(f), and 6(a) of Executive Order 12866, as amended (Regulatory Planning and Review; 5 U.S.C. 601 note) and a detailed description of the process used by the Secretary to ensure such compliance and the issues considered, determinations made, and the grounds for those determinations in such process.

(c) INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL ORDER.—Section 143(a)(2) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7253(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Subsection (b)(2) does not apply to the authority of the Secretary under this subsection.''.

SEC. 1462. DURATION.

The margin protection program and the stabilization program shall end on December 31, 2018.

PART II—REPEAL OR REAUTHORIZATION OF OTHER DAIRY-RELATED PROVISIONS

SEC. 1481. REPEAL OF DAIRY PRODUCT PRICE SUPPORT AND MILK INCOME LOSS CONTRACT PROGRAMS.

(a) REPEAL OF DAIRY PRODUCT PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM.—Section 1501 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8771) is repealed.

(b) REPEAL OF MILK INCOME LOSS CONTRACT PROGRAM.—Section 1506 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8773) is repealed.

SEC. 1482. REPEAL OF DAIRY EXPORT INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 153 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (15 U.S.C. 713a–14) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 902(2) of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7201(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (D); and

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively.

SEC. 1483. EXTENSION OF DAIRY FORWARD PRICING PROGRAM.

Section 1502(e) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8772(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2021''.

SEC. 1484. EXTENSION OF DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM.

Section 3 of Public Law 90–484 (7 U.S.C. 450l) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 1485. EXTENSION OF DAIRY PROMOTION AND RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 113(e)(2) of the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 4504(e)(2)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 1486. REPEAL OF FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER REVIEW COMMISSION.

Section 1509 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1726) is repealed.

PART III—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 1491. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

Subtitle E—Supplemental Agricultural Disaster Assistance Programs

SEC. 1501. SUPPLEMENTAL AGRICULTURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE PRODUCER ON A FARM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''eligible producer on a farm'' means an individual or entity described in subparagraph (B) that, as determined by the Secretary, assumes the production and market risks associated with the agricultural production of crops or livestock.

(B) DESCRIPTION.—An individual or entity referred to in subparagraph (A) is—

(i) a citizen of the United States;

(ii) a resident alien;

(iii) a partnership of citizens of the United States; or

(iv) a corporation, limited liability corporation, or other farm organizational structure organized under State law.

(2) FARM-RAISED FISH.—The term ''farm-raised fish'' means any aquatic species that is propagated and reared in a controlled environment.

(3) LIVESTOCK.—The term ''livestock'' includes—

(A) cattle (including dairy cattle);

(B) bison;

(C) poultry;

(D) sheep;

(E) swine;

(F) horses; and

(G) other livestock, as determined by the Secretary.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) LIVESTOCK INDEMNITY PAYMENTS.—

(1) PAYMENTS.—For each of the fiscal years 2012 through 2018, the Secretary shall use such sums as are necessary of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make livestock indemnity payments to eligible producers on farms that have incurred livestock death losses in excess of the normal mortality, as determined by the Secretary, due to—

(A) attacks by animals reintroduced into the wild by the Federal Government or protected by Federal law, including wolves and avian predators; or

(B) adverse weather, as determined by the Secretary, during the calendar year, including losses due to hurricanes, floods, blizzards, disease, wildfires, extreme heat, and extreme cold.

(2) PAYMENT RATES.—Indemnity payments to an eligible producer on a farm under paragraph (1) shall be made at a rate of 75 percent of the market value of the applicable livestock on the day before the date of death of the livestock, as determined by the Secretary.

(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR PAYMENTS MADE DUE TO DISEASE.—The Secretary shall ensure that payments made to an eligible producer under paragraph (1) are not made for the same livestock losses for which compensation is provided pursuant to section 10407(d) of the Animal Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 8306(d)).

(c) LIVESTOCK FORAGE DISASTER PROGRAM.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COVERED LIVESTOCK.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the term ''covered livestock'' means livestock of an eligible livestock producer that, during the 60 days prior to the beginning date of a qualifying drought or fire condition, as determined by the Secretary, the eligible livestock producer—

(I) owned;

(II) leased;

(III) purchased;

(IV) entered into a contract to purchase;

(V) is a contract grower; or

(VI) sold or otherwise disposed of due to qualifying drought conditions during—

(aa) the current production year; or

(bb) subject to paragraph (3)(B)(ii), 1 or both of the 2 production years immediately preceding the current production year.

(ii) EXCLUSION.—The term ''covered livestock'' does not include livestock that were or would have been in a feedlot, on the beginning date of the qualifying drought or fire condition, as a part of the normal business operation of the eligible livestock producer, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) DROUGHT MONITOR.—The term ''drought monitor'' means a system for classifying drought severity according to a range of abnormally dry to exceptional drought, as defined by the Secretary.

(C) ELIGIBLE LIVESTOCK PRODUCER.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ''eligible livestock producer'' means an eligible producer on a farm that—

(I) is an owner, cash or share lessee, or contract grower of covered livestock that provides the pastureland or grazing land, including cash-leased pastureland or grazing land, for the livestock;

(II) provides the pastureland or grazing land for covered livestock, including cash-leased pastureland or grazing land that is physically located in a county affected by drought;

(III) certifies grazing loss; and

(IV) meets all other eligibility requirements established under this subsection.

(ii) EXCLUSION.—The term ''eligible livestock producer'' does not include an owner, cash or share lessee, or contract grower of livestock that rents or leases pastureland or grazing land owned by another person on a rate-of-gain basis.

(D) NORMAL CARRYING CAPACITY.—The term ''normal carrying capacity'', with respect to each type of grazing land or pastureland in a county, means the normal carrying capacity, as determined under paragraph (3)(D)(i), that would be expected from the grazing land or pastureland for livestock during the normal grazing period, in the absence of a drought or fire that diminishes the production of the grazing land or pastureland.

(E) NORMAL GRAZING PERIOD.—The term ''normal grazing period'', with respect to a county, means the normal grazing period during the calendar year for the county, as determined under paragraph (3)(D)(i).

(2) PROGRAM.—For each of the fiscal years 2012 through 2018, the Secretary shall use such sums as are necessary of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide compensation for losses to eligible livestock producers due to grazing losses for covered livestock due to—

(A) a drought condition, as described in paragraph (3); or

(B) fire, as described in paragraph (4).

(3) ASSISTANCE FOR LOSSES DUE TO DROUGHT CONDITIONS.—

(A) ELIGIBLE LOSSES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—An eligible livestock producer may receive assistance under this subsection only for grazing losses for covered livestock that occur on land that—

(I) is native or improved pastureland with permanent vegetative cover; or

(II) is planted to a crop planted specifically for the purpose of providing grazing for covered livestock.

(ii) EXCLUSIONS.—An eligible livestock producer may not receive assistance under this subsection for grazing losses that occur on land used for haying or grazing under the conservation reserve program established under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 et seq.).

(B) MONTHLY PAYMENT RATE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the payment rate for assistance under this paragraph for 1 month shall, in the case of drought, be equal to 60 percent of the lesser of—

(I) the monthly feed cost for all covered livestock owned or leased by the eligible livestock producer, as determined under subparagraph (C); or

(II) the monthly feed cost calculated by using the normal carrying capacity of the eligible grazing land of the eligible livestock producer.

(ii) PARTIAL COMPENSATION.—In the case of an eligible livestock producer that sold or otherwise disposed of covered livestock due to drought conditions in 1 or both of the 2 production years immediately preceding the current production year, as determined by the Secretary, the payment rate shall be 80 percent of the payment rate otherwise calculated in accordance with clause (i).

(C) MONTHLY FEED COST.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The monthly feed cost shall equal the product obtained by multiplying—

(I) 30 days;

(II) a payment quantity that is equal to the feed grain equivalent, as determined under clause (ii); and

(III) a payment rate that is equal to the corn price per pound, as determined under clause (iii).

(ii) FEED GRAIN EQUIVALENT.—For purposes of clause (i)(II), the feed grain equivalent shall equal—

(I) in the case of an adult beef cow, 15.7 pounds of corn per day; or

(II) in the case of any other type of weight of livestock, an amount determined by the Secretary that represents the average number of pounds of corn per day necessary to feed the livestock.

(iii) CORN PRICE PER POUND.—For purposes of clause (i)(III), the corn price per pound shall equal the quotient obtained by dividing—

(I) the higher of—

(aa) the national average corn price per bushel for the 12-month period immediately preceding March 1 of the year for which the disaster assistance is calculated; or

(bb) the national average corn price per bushel for the 24-month period immediately preceding that March 1; by

(II) 56.

(D) NORMAL GRAZING PERIOD AND DROUGHT MONITOR INTENSITY.—

(i) FSA COUNTY COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall determine the normal carrying capacity and normal grazing period for each type of grazing land or pastureland in the county served by the applicable committee.

(II) CHANGES.—No change to the normal carrying capacity or normal grazing period established for a county under subclause (I) shall be made unless the change is requested by the appropriate State and county Farm Service Agency committees.

(ii) DROUGHT INTENSITY.—

(I) D2.—An eligible livestock producer that owns or leases grazing land or pastureland that is physically located in a county that is rated by the U.S. Drought Monitor as having a D2 (severe drought) intensity in any area of the county for at least 8 consecutive weeks during the normal grazing period for the county, as determined by the Secretary, shall be eligible to receive assistance under this paragraph in an amount equal to 1 monthly payment using the monthly payment rate determined under subparagraph (B).

(II) D3.—An eligible livestock producer that owns or leases grazing land or pastureland that is physically located in a county that is rated by the U.S. Drought Monitor as having at least a D3 (extreme drought) intensity in any area of the county at any time during the normal grazing period for the county, as determined by the Secretary, shall be eligible to receive assistance under this paragraph—

(aa) in an amount equal to 3 monthly payments using the monthly payment rate determined under subparagraph (B);

(bb) if the county is rated as having a D3 (extreme drought) intensity in any area of the county for at least 4 weeks during the normal grazing period for the county, or is rated as having a D4 (exceptional drought) intensity in any area of the county at any time during the normal grazing period, in an amount equal to 4 monthly payments using the monthly payment rate determined under subparagraph (B); or

(cc) if the county is rated as having a D4 (exceptional drought) intensity in any area of the county for at least 4 weeks during the normal grazing period, in an amount equal to 5 monthly payments using the monthly rate determined under subparagraph (B).

(4) ASSISTANCE FOR LOSSES DUE TO FIRE ON PUBLIC MANAGED LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible livestock producer may receive assistance under this paragraph only if—

(i) the grazing losses occur on rangeland that is managed by a Federal agency; and

(ii) the eligible livestock producer is prohibited by the Federal agency from grazing the normal permitted livestock on the managed rangeland due to a fire.

(B) PAYMENT RATE.—The payment rate for assistance under this paragraph shall be equal to 50 percent of the monthly feed cost for the total number of livestock covered by the Federal lease of the eligible livestock producer, as determined under paragraph (3)(C).

(C) PAYMENT DURATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), an eligible livestock producer shall be eligible to receive assistance under this paragraph for the period—

(I) beginning on the date on which the Federal agency excludes the eligible livestock producer from using the managed rangeland for grazing; and

(II) ending on the last day of the Federal lease of the eligible livestock producer.

(ii) LIMITATION.—An eligible livestock producer may only receive assistance under this paragraph for losses that occur on not more than 180 days per year.

(5) NO DUPLICATIVE PAYMENTS.—An eligible livestock producer may elect to receive assistance for grazing or pasture feed losses due to drought conditions under paragraph (3) or fire under paragraph (4), but not both for the same loss, as determined by the Secretary.

(d) EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE FOR LIVESTOCK, HONEY BEES, AND FARM-RAISED FISH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For each of the fiscal years 2012 through 2018, the Secretary shall use not more than $20,000,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide emergency relief to eligible producers of livestock, honey bees, and farm-raised fish to aid in the reduction of losses due to disease (including cattle tick fever), adverse weather, or other conditions, such as blizzards and wildfires, as determined by the Secretary, that are not covered under subsection (b) or (c).

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds made available under this subsection shall be used to reduce losses caused by feed or water shortages, disease, or other factors as determined by the Secretary.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Any funds made available under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(e) TREE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) ELIGIBLE ORCHARDIST.—The term ''eligible orchardist'' means a person that produces annual crops from trees for commercial purposes.

(B) NATURAL DISASTER.—The term ''natural disaster'' means plant disease, insect infestation, drought, fire, freeze, flood, earthquake, lightning, or other occurrence, as determined by the Secretary.

(C) NURSERY TREE GROWER.—The term ''nursery tree grower'' means a person who produces nursery, ornamental, fruit, nut, or Christmas trees for commercial sale, as determined by the Secretary.

(D) TREE.—The term ''tree'' includes a tree, bush, and vine.

(2) ELIGIBILITY.—

(A) LOSS.—Subject to subparagraph (B), for each of the fiscal years 2012 through 2018, the Secretary shall use such sums as are necessary of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide assistance—

(i) under paragraph (3) to eligible orchardists and nursery tree growers that planted trees for commercial purposes but lost the trees as a result of a natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary; and

(ii) under paragraph (3)(B) to eligible orchardists and nursery tree growers that have a production history for commercial purposes on planted or existing trees but lost the trees as a result of a natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) LIMITATION.—An eligible orchardist or nursery tree grower shall qualify for assistance under subparagraph (A) only if the tree mortality of the eligible orchardist or nursery tree grower, as a result of damaging weather or related condition, exceeds 15 percent (adjusted for normal mortality).

(3) ASSISTANCE.—Subject to paragraph (4), the assistance provided by the Secretary to eligible orchardists and nursery tree growers for losses described in paragraph (2) shall consist of—

(A)(i) reimbursement of 65 percent of the cost of replanting trees lost due to a natural disaster,

as determined by the Secretary, in excess of 15 percent mortality (adjusted for normal mortality); or

(ii) at the option of the Secretary, sufficient seedlings to reestablish a stand; and

(B) reimbursement of 50 percent of the cost of pruning, removal, and other costs incurred by an eligible orchardist or nursery tree grower to salvage existing trees or, in the case of tree mortality, to prepare the land to replant trees as a result of damage or tree mortality due to a natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary, in excess of 15 percent damage or mortality (adjusted for normal tree damage and mortality).

(4) LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE.—

(A) DEFINITIONS OF LEGAL ENTITY AND PERSON.—In this paragraph, the terms ''legal entity'' and ''person'' have the meaning given those terms in section 1001(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308(a)).

(B) AMOUNT.—The total amount of payments received, directly or indirectly, by a person or legal entity (excluding a joint venture or general partnership) under this subsection may not exceed $125,000 for any crop year, or an equivalent value in tree seedlings.

(C) ACRES.—The total quantity of acres planted to trees or tree seedlings for which a person or legal entity shall be entitled to receive payments under this subsection may not exceed 500 acres.

(f) PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS OF LEGAL ENTITY AND PERSON.—In this subsection, the terms ''legal entity'' and ''person'' have the meaning given those terms in section 1001(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308(a)).

(2) AMOUNT.—The total amount of disaster assistance payments received, directly or indirectly, by a person or legal entity (excluding a joint venture or general partnership) under this section (excluding payments received under subsection (e)) may not exceed $125,000 for any crop year.

(3) DIRECT ATTRIBUTION.—Subsections (e) and (f) of section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308) or any successor provisions relating to direct attribution shall apply with respect to assistance provided under this section.

Subtitle F—Administration

SEC. 1601. ADMINISTRATION GENERALLY.

(a) USE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall use the funds, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out this title.

(b) DETERMINATIONS BY SECRETARY.—A determination made by the Secretary under this title shall be final and conclusive.

(c) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Commodity Credit Corporation, as appropriate, shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to implement this title and the amendments made by this title.

(2) PROCEDURE.—The promulgation of the regulations and administration of this title and the amendments made by this title and sections 11003 and 11016 of this Act shall be made—

(A) pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code, including by interim rules effective on publication under the authority provided in subparagraph (B) of subsection (b) of such section if the Secretary determines such interim rules to be needed and final rules, with an opportunity for notice and comment, no later than 21 months after the date of the enactment of this Act;

(B) without regard to chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Paperwork Reduction Act''); and

(C) without regard to the Statement of Policy of the Secretary of Agriculture effective July 24, 1971 (36 Fed. Reg. 13804), relating to notices of proposed rulemaking and public participation in rulemaking.

(d) ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY RELATED TO TRADE AGREEMENTS COMPLIANCE.—

(1) REQUIRED DETERMINATION; ADJUSTMENT.—If the Secretary determines that expenditures under this title that are subject to the total allowable domestic support levels under the Uruguay Round Agreements (as defined in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501)) will exceed the allowable levels for any applicable reporting period, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, make adjustments in the amount of the expenditures during that period to ensure that the expenditures do not exceed the allowable levels.

(2) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Before making any adjustment under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the determination made under that paragraph and the extent of the adjustment to be made.

SEC. 1602. SUSPENSION OF PERMANENT PRICE SUPPORT AUTHORITY.

(a) AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938.—The following provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 shall not be applicable to the 2014 through 2018 crops of covered commodities (as defined in section 1104), cotton, and sugar and shall not be applicable to milk during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act through December 31, 2018:

(1) Parts II through V of subtitle B of title III (7 U.S.C. 1326 et seq.).

(2) In the case of upland cotton, section 377 (7 U.S.C. 1377).

(3) Subtitle D of title III (7 U.S.C. 1379a et seq.).

(4) Title IV (7 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.).

(b) AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949.—The following provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 shall not be applicable to the 2013 through 2018 crops of covered commodities (as defined in section 1104), cotton, and sugar and shall not be applicable to milk during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and through December 31, 2018:

(1) Section 101 (7 U.S.C. 1441).

(2) Section 103(a) (7 U.S.C. 1444(a)).

(3) Section 105 (7 U.S.C. 1444b).

(4) Section 107 (7 U.S.C. 1445a).

(5) Section 110 (7 U.S.C. 1445e).

(6) Section 112 (7 U.S.C. 1445g).

(7) Section 115 (7 U.S.C. 1445k).

(8) Section 201 (7 U.S.C. 1446).

(9) Title III (7 U.S.C. 1447 et seq.).

(10) Title IV (7 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.), other than sections 404, 412, and 416 (7 U.S.C. 1424, 1429, and 1431).

(11) Title V (7 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.).

(12) Title VI (7 U.S.C. 1471 et seq.).

(c) SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN QUOTA PROVISIONS.—The joint resolution entitled ''A joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended'', approved May 26, 1941 (7 U.S.C. 1330, 1340), shall not be applicable to the crops of wheat planted for harvest in the calendar years 2014 through 2018.

SEC. 1603. PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308) is amended by striking subsections (b) and (c) and inserting the following:

''(b) LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS FOR COVERED COMMODITIES (OTHER THAN PEANUTS).—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The total amount of payments received, directly or indirectly, by a person or legal entity (except a joint venture or general partnership) for any crop year under section 1101(c) of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 and subsections (b) and (c) of section 1107 of such Act (other than peanuts) may not exceed $125,000.

''(2) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS RELATED TO UPLAND COTTON.—The total amount of direct payments received, directly or indirectly, by a person or legal entity (except a joint venture or a general partnership) for each of the 2014 and 2015 crop years under section 1101(c) of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 may not exceed $40,000.

''(c) LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS FOR PEANUTS.—The total amount of payments received, directly or indirectly, by a person or legal entity (except a joint venture or general partnership) for any crop year under subtitle A of title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 for peanuts may not exceed $125,000.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1001(f) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308(f)) is amended by striking ''or title XII'' each place it appears in paragraphs (5)(A) and (6)(A) and inserting '', title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, or title XII''.

(2) Section 1001C(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3(a)) is amended by inserting ''title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013,'' after ''2008,''.

(c) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall apply beginning with the 2014 crop year.

SEC. 1604. ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME LIMITATION.

(a) LIMITATIONS AND COVERED BENEFITS.—Section 1001D(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a(b)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''LIMITATIONS'' and inserting ''LIMITATIONS ON COMMODITY AND CONSERVATION PROGRAMS'';

(2) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(1) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person or legal entity shall not be eligible to receive any benefit described in paragraph (2) during a crop, fiscal, or program year, as appropriate, if the average adjusted gross income of the person or legal entity exceeds $950,000.

''(2) COVERED BENEFITS.—Paragraph (1) applies with respect to a payment or benefit under subtitle A, B, or E of title I, or title II of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, title II of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, title II of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, section 524(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1524(b)), or section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333).''.

(b) ELIMINATION OF UNUSED DEFINITIONS.—Paragraph (1) of section 1001D(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) AVERAGE ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—In this section, the term 'average adjusted gross income', with respect to a person or legal entity, means the average of the adjusted gross income or comparable measure of the person or legal entity over the 3 taxable years preceding the most immediately preceding complete taxable year, as determined by the Secretary.''.

(c) INCOME DETERMINATION.—Section 1001D of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1001D of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by striking ''subparagraph (A) or (B) of''; and

(B) by striking '', the average adjusted gross farm income, and the average adjusted gross nonfarm income'';

(2) in subsection (a)(3), by striking '', average adjusted gross farm income, and average adjusted gross nonfarm income'' both places it appears;

(3) in subsection (c) (as redesignated by subsection (c)(2) of this section)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking '', average adjusted gross farm income, and average adjusted gross nonfarm income'' both places it appears; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''paragraphs (1)(C) and (2)(B) of subsection (b)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)(2)''; and

(4) in subsection (d) (as redesignated by subsection (c)(2) of this section)—

(A) by striking ''paragraphs (1)(C) and (2)(B) of subsection (b)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)(2)''; and

(B) by striking '', average adjusted gross farm income, or average adjusted gross nonfarm income''.

(e) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Subsection (e) of section 1001D of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a), as redesignated by subsection (c)(2) of this section, is amended by striking ''2009 through 2012'' and inserting ''2014 through 2018''.

(f) LIMITATION ON APPLICABILITY.—Section 1001(d) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''or title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013''.

(g) TRANSITION.—Section 1001D of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308–3a), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall apply with respect to the 2013 crop, fiscal, or program year, as appropriate, for each program described in paragraphs (1)(C) and (2)(B) of subsection (b) of that section (as so in effect on that day).

SEC. 1605. GEOGRAPHICALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS AND RANCHERS.

Section 1621(d) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8792(d)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 1606. PERSONAL LIABILITY OF PRODUCERS FOR DEFICIENCIES.

Section 164 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7284) is amended by striking ''and title I of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008'' each place it appears and inserting ''title I of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8702 et seq.), and title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013''.

SEC. 1607. PREVENTION OF DECEASED INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING PAYMENTS UNDER FARM COMMODITY PROGRAMS.

(a) RECONCILIATION.—At least twice each year, the Secretary shall reconcile social security numbers of all individuals who receive payments under this title, whether directly or indirectly, with the Commissioner of Social Security to determined if the individuals are alive.

(b) PRECLUSION.—The Secretary shall preclude the issuance of payments to, and on behalf of, deceased individuals that were not eligible for payments.

SEC. 1608. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) MISSING PUNCTUATION.—Section 359f(c)(1)(B) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359ff(c)(1)(B)) is amended by adding a period at the end.

(b) ERRONEOUS CROSS REFERENCE.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Section 1603(g) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1739) is amended in paragraphs (2) through (6) and the amendments made by those paragraphs by striking ''1703(a)'' each place it appears and inserting ''1603(a)''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection and the amendments made by this subsection take effect as if included in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1651).

(c) CONTINUED APPLICABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS GENERAL PROVISION.—Section 767 of division A of Public Law 108–7 (7 U.S.C. 7911 note; 117 Stat. 48) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''sections 1101 and 1102 of Public Law 107–171'' and inserting ''subtitle A of title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013''; and

(B) by striking ''such section 1102'' and inserting ''such subtitle''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(b) This section, as amended by section 1608(c) of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, shall take effect beginning with the 2014 crop year.''.

SEC. 1609. ASSIGNMENT OF PAYMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The provisions of section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(g)), relating to assignment of payments, shall apply to payments made under this title.

(b) NOTICE.—The producer making the assignment, or the assignee, shall provide the Secretary with notice, in such manner as the Secretary may require, of any assignment made under this section.

SEC. 1610. TRACKING OF BENEFITS.

As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary may track the benefits provided, directly or indirectly, to individuals and entities under titles I and II and the amendments made by those titles.

SEC. 1611. SIGNATURE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this title and title II and amendments made by those titles, if the Secretary approves a document, the Secretary shall not subsequently determine the document is inadequate or invalid because of the lack of authority of any person signing the document on behalf of the applicant or any other individual, entity, general partnership, or joint venture, or the documents relied upon were determined inadequate or invalid, unless the person signing the program document knowingly and willfully falsified the evidence of signature authority or a signature.

(b) AFFIRMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section prohibits the Secretary from asking a proper party to affirm any document that otherwise would be considered approved under subsection (a).

(2) NO RETROACTIVE EFFECT.—A denial of benefits based on a lack of affirmation under paragraph (1) shall not be retroactive with respect to third-party producers who were not the subject of the erroneous representation of authority, if the third-party producers—

(A) relied on the prior approval by the Secretary of the documents in good faith; and

(B) substantively complied with all program requirements.

SEC. 1612. IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) STREAMLINING.—In implementing this title, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

(1) seek to reduce administrative burdens and costs to producers by streamlining and reducing paperwork, forms, and other administrative requirements;

(2) improve coordination, information sharing, and administrative work with the Risk Management Agency and the Natural Resources Conservation Service; and

(3) take advantage of new technologies to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of program delivery to producers.

(b) MAINTENANCE OF BASE ACRES AND PAYMENT YIELDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall maintain through September 30, 2018, for each covered commodity and upland cotton, base acres and payment yields on a farm established under—

(A)(i) in the case of covered commodities and upland cotton, sections 1101 and 1102 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7911, 7912); and

(ii) in the case of peanuts, section 1302 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 7952); and

(B)(i) in the case of covered commodities and upland cotton, sections 1101 and 1102 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8711, 8712); and

(ii) in the case of peanuts, section 1302 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 8752).

(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR LONG GRAIN AND MEDIUM GRAIN RICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall maintain separate base acres for long grain rice and medium grain rice.

(B) LIMITATION.—In carrying out this paragraph, the Secretary shall use the same total base acres and payment yields established with respect to rice under sections 1108 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8718), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, subject to any adjustment under section 1105.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall make available to the Farm Service Agency to carry out this title $100,000,000.

SEC. 1613. PROTECTION OF PRODUCER INFORMATION.

(a) PROHIBITION OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF PROTECTED INFORMATION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary, any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture, any contractor or cooperator of the Department, and any officer or employee of another Federal agency shall not disclose—

(1) information submitted by a producer or owner of agricultural land to the Federal Government pursuant to title I or II of this Act; or

(2) other information provided by a producer or owner of agricultural land concerning the agricultural operation, farming or conservation practices, or the land itself in order to participate in programs of the Department of Agriculture or other Federal agencies.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Information described in subsection (a) may be disclosed if—

(1) the information is required to be made publicly available under any other provision of Federal law;

(2) the producer or owner of agricultural land who provided the information has lawfully publicly disclosed the information;

(3) the producer or owner of agricultural land who provided the information consents to the disclosure; or

(4) the information is disclosed to the Attorney General, to the extent necessary, to ensure compliance and law enforcement.

(c) NOTICE OF DISCLOSURE.—Any disclosure of information pursuant to an exception provided in subsection (b) shall be reported to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate within 24 hours after the disclosure.

(d) PRODUCER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''producer'' has the meaning given that term in section 1104(14) of this Act.

TITLE II—CONSERVATION

Subtitle A—Conservation Reserve Program

SEC. 2001. EXTENSION AND ENROLLMENT REQUIREMENTS OF CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 1231(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831(a)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) ELIGIBLE LAND.—Section 1231(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''the date of enactment of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008'' and inserting ''the date of the enactment of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013'';

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(3) by inserting before paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

''(3) grasslands that—

''(A) contain forbs or shrubland (including improved rangeland and pastureland) for which grazing is the predominant use;

''(B) are located in an area historically dominated by grasslands; and

''(C) could provide habitat for animal and plant populations of significant ecological value if the land is retained in its current use or restored to a natural condition;'';

(4) in paragraph (4)(C), by striking ''filterstrips devoted to trees or shrubs'' and inserting ''filterstrips or riparian buffers devoted to trees, shrubs, or grasses''; and

(5) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(5) the portion of land in a field not enrolled in the conservation reserve in a case in which—

''(A) more than 50 percent of the land in the field is enrolled as a buffer or filterstrip, or more than 75 percent of the land in the field is enrolled as a conservation practice other than as a buffer or filterstrip; and

''(B) the remainder of the field is—

''(i) infeasible to farm; and

''(ii) enrolled at regular rental rates.''.

(c) PLANTING STATUS OF CERTAIN LAND.—Section 1231(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831(c)) is amended by striking ''if'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''if, during the crop year, the land was devoted to a conserving use.''.

(d) ENROLLMENT.—Subsection (d) of section 1231 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) ENROLLMENT.—

''(1) MAXIMUM ACREAGE ENROLLED.—The Secretary may maintain in the conservation reserve at any one time during—

''(A) fiscal year 2014, no more than 27,500,000 acres;

''(B) fiscal year 2015, no more than 26,000,000 acres;

''(C) fiscal year 2016, no more than 25,000,000 acres;

''(D) fiscal year 2017, no more than 24,000,000 acres; and

''(E) fiscal year 2018, no more than 24,000,000 acres.

''(2) GRASSLANDS.—

''(A) LIMITATION.—For purposes of applying the limitations in paragraph (1), no more than 2,000,000 acres of the land described in subsection (b)(3) may be enrolled in the program at any one time during the 2014 through 2018 fiscal years.

''(B) PRIORITY.—In enrolling acres under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may give priority to land with expiring conservation reserve program contracts.

''(C) METHOD OF ENROLLMENT.—In enrolling acres under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall make the program available to owners or operators of eligible land on a continuous enrollment basis with one or more ranking periods.''.

(e) DURATION OF CONTRACT.—Section 1231(e) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831(e)) is amended by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN LAND.—In the case of land devoted to hardwood trees, shelterbelts, windbreaks, or wildlife corridors under a contract entered into under this subchapter, the owner or operator of the land may, within the limitations prescribed under paragraph (1), specify the duration of the contract.''.

(f) CONSERVATION PRIORITY AREAS.—Section 1231(f) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''watershed areas of the Chesapeake Bay Region, the Great Lakes Region, the Long Island Sound Region, and other'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''WATERSHEDS.—Watersheds'' and inserting ''AREAS.—Areas''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking ''a watershed's designation—'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''an area's designation if the Secretary finds that the area no longer contains actual and significant adverse water quality or habitat impacts related to agricultural production activities.''.

SEC. 2002. FARMABLE WETLAND PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 1231B(a)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831b(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) by striking ''a program'' and inserting ''a farmable wetland program''.

(b) ELIGIBLE ACREAGE.—Section 1231B(b)(1)(B) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831b(b)(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''flow from a row crop agriculture drainage system'' and inserting ''surface and subsurface flow from row crop agricultural production''.

(c) ACREAGE LIMITATION.—Section 1231B(c)(1)(B) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831b(c)(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''1,000,000'' and inserting ''750,000''.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The heading of section 1231B of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831b) is amended to read as follows: ''**farmable wetland program**''.

SEC. 2003. DUTIES OF OWNERS AND OPERATORS.

(a) LIMITATION ON HARVESTING, GRAZING, OR COMMERCIAL USE OF FORAGE.—Section 1232(a)(8) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3832(a)(8)) is amended by striking ''except that'' and all that follows through the semicolon at the end of the paragraph and inserting ''except as provided in subsection (b) or (c) of section 1233;''.

(b) CONSERVATION PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—Subsection (b) of section 1232 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3832) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) CONSERVATION PLANS.—The plan referred to in subsection (a)(1) shall set forth—

''(1) the conservation measures and practices to be carried out by the owner or operator during the term of the contract; and

''(2) the commercial use, if any, to be permitted on the land during the term.''.

(c) RENTAL PAYMENT REDUCTION.—Section 1232 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3832) is amended by striking subsection (d).

SEC. 2004. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.

Section 1233 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3833) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1233. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.

''(a) COST-SHARE AND RENTAL PAYMENTS.—In return for a contract entered into by an owner or operator under the conservation reserve program, the Secretary shall—

''(1) share the cost of carrying out the conservation measures and practices set forth in the contract for which the Secretary determines that cost sharing is appropriate and in the public interest; and

''(2) for a period of years not in excess of the term of the contract, pay an annual rental payment in an amount necessary to compensate for—

''(A) the conversion of highly erodible cropland or other eligible lands normally devoted to the production of an agricultural commodity on a farm or ranch to a less intensive use;

''(B) the retirement of any base history that the owner or operator agrees to retire permanently; and

''(C) the development and management of grasslands for multiple natural resource conservation benefits, including to soil, water, air, and wildlife.

''(b) SPECIFIED ACTIVITIES PERMITTED.—The Secretary shall permit certain activities or commercial uses of land that is subject to a contract under the conservation reserve program in a manner that is consistent with a plan approved by the Secretary, as follows:

''(1) Harvesting, grazing, or other commercial use of the forage in response to a drought or other emergency created by a natural disaster, without any reduction in the rental rate.

''(2) Consistent with the conservation of soil, water quality, and wildlife habitat (including habitat during nesting seasons for birds in the area), and in exchange for a reduction of not less than 25 percent in the annual rental rate for the acres covered by the authorized activity—

''(A) managed harvesting and other commercial use (including the managed harvesting of biomass), except that in permitting managed harvesting, the Secretary, in coordination with the State technical committee—

''(i) shall develop appropriate vegetation management requirements; and

''(ii) shall identify periods during which managed harvesting may be conducted, such that the frequency is not more than once every three years;

''(B) routine grazing or prescribed grazing for the control of invasive species, except that in permitting such routine grazing or prescribed grazing, the Secretary, in coordination with the State technical committee—

''(i) shall develop appropriate vegetation management requirements and stocking rates for the land that are suitable for continued routine grazing; and

''(ii) shall identify the periods during which routine grazing may be conducted, such that the frequency is not more than once every two years, taking into consideration regional differences such as—

''(I) climate, soil type, and natural resources;

''(II) the number of years that should be required between routine grazing activities; and

''(III) how often during a year in which routine grazing is permitted that routine grazing should be allowed to occur; and

''(C) the installation of wind turbines and associated access, except that in permitting the installation of wind turbines, the Secretary shall determine the number and location of wind turbines that may be installed, taking into account—

''(i) the location, size, and other physical characteristics of the land;

''(ii) the extent to which the land contains wildlife and wildlife habitat; and

''(iii) the purposes of the conservation reserve program under this subchapter.

''(3) The intermittent and seasonal use of vegetative buffer practices incidental to agricultural production on lands adjacent to the buffer such that the permitted use does not destroy the permanent vegetative cover.

''(c) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES ON GRASSLANDS.—For eligible land described in section 1231(b)(3), the Secretary shall permit the following activities:

''(1) Common grazing practices, including maintenance and necessary cultural practices, on the land in a manner that is consistent with maintaining the viability of grassland, forb, and shrub species appropriate to that locality.

''(2) Haying, mowing, or harvesting for seed production, subject to appropriate restrictions during the nesting season for critical bird species in the area.

''(3) Fire presuppression, fire-related rehabilitation, and construction of fire breaks.

''(4) Grazing-related activities, such as fencing and livestock watering.

''(d) RESOURCE CONSERVING USE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date that is 1 year before the date of termination of a contract under the program, the Secretary shall allow an owner or operator to make conservation and land improvements that facilitate maintaining protection of enrolled land after expiration of the contract.

''(2) CONSERVATION PLAN.—The Secretary shall require an owner or operator carrying out the activities described in paragraph (1) to develop and implement a conservation plan.

''(3) RE-ENROLLMENT PROHIBITED.—Land improved under paragraph (1) may not be re-enrolled in the conservation reserve program for 5 years after the date of termination of the contract.''.

SEC. 2005. PAYMENTS.

(a) TREES, WINDBREAKS, SHELTERBELTS, AND WILDLIFE CORRIDORS.—Section 1234(b)(3)(A) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3834(b)(3)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) by striking clause (ii); and

(3) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

(b) ANNUAL RENTAL PAYMENTS.—Section 1234(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3834(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''or other eligible lands'' after ''highly erodible cropland'' both places it appears; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(2) METHODS OF DETERMINATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The amounts payable to owners or operators in the form of rental payments under contracts entered into under this subchapter may be determined through—

''(i) the submission of bids for such contracts by owners and operators in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe; or

''(ii) such other means as the Secretary determines are appropriate.

''(B) GRASSLANDS.—In the case of eligible land described in section 1231(b)(3), the Secretary shall make annual payments in an amount that is not more than 75 percent of the grazing value of the land covered by the contract.''.

(c) PAYMENT SCHEDULE.—Subsection (d) of section 1234 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3834) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) PAYMENT SCHEDULE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, payments under this subchapter shall be made in cash in such amount and on such time schedule as is agreed on and specified in the contract.

''(2) ADVANCE PAYMENT.—Payments under this subchapter may be made in advance of determination of performance.''.

(d) PAYMENT LIMITATION.—Section 1234(f) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3834(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking '', including rental payments made in the form of in-kind commodities,'';

(2) by striking paragraph (3); and

(3) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

SEC. 2006. CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.

(a) EARLY TERMINATION BY OWNER OR OPERATOR.—Section 1235(e) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3835(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting ''During fiscal year 2014, the Secretary''; and

(B) by striking ''before January 1, 1995,'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) Land devoted to hardwood trees.

''(D) Wildlife habitat, duck nesting habitat, pollinator habitat, upland bird habitat buffer, wildlife food plots, State acres for wildlife enhancement, shallow water areas for wildlife, and rare and declining habitat.

''(E) Farmable wetland and restored wetland.

''(F) Land that contains diversions, erosion control structures, flood control structures, contour grass strips, living snow fences, salinity reducing vegetation, cross wind trap strips, and sediment retention structures.

''(G) Land located within a federally-designated wellhead protection area.

''(H) Land that is covered by an easement under the conservation reserve program.

''(I) Land located within an average width, according to the applicable Natural Resources Conservation Service field office technical guide, of a perennial stream or permanent water body.''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking ''60 days after the date on which the owner or operator submits the notice required under paragraph (1)(C)'' and inserting ''upon approval by the Secretary''.

(b) TRANSITION OPTION FOR CERTAIN FARMERS OR RANCHERS.—Section 1235(f) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3835(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''DUTIES'' and all that follows through ''a beginning farmer'' and inserting ''TRANSITION TO COVERED FARMER OR RANCHER.—In the case of a contract modification approved in order to facilitate the transfer of land subject to a contract from a retired farmer or rancher to a beginning farmer'';

(B) in subparagraph (A)(i), by inserting '', including preparing to plant an agricultural crop'' after ''improvements'';

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''the farmer or rancher'' and inserting ''the covered farmer or rancher''; and

(D) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''section 1001A(b)(3)(B)'' and inserting ''section 1001''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''requirement of section 1231(h)(4)(B)'' and inserting ''option pursuant to section 1234(c)(2)(A)(ii)''.

(c) FINAL YEAR CONTRACT.—Section 1235 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3835) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(g) FINAL YEAR OF CONTRACT.—The Secretary shall not consider an owner or operator to be in violation of a term or condition of the conservation reserve contract if—

''(1) during the year prior to expiration of the contract, the land is enrolled in the conservation stewardship program; and

''(2) the activity required under the conservation stewardship program pursuant to such enrollment is consistent with this subchapter.

''(h) LAND ENROLLED IN AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION EASEMENT PROGRAM.—The Secretary may terminate or modify a contract entered into under this subchapter if eligible land that is subject to such contract is transferred into the agricultural conservation easement program under subtitle H.''.

SEC. 2007. CONVERSION OF LAND SUBJECT TO CONTRACT TO OTHER CONSERVING USES.

Section 1235A of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3835a) is repealed.

SEC. 2008. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on October 1, 2013, except the amendment made by section 2001(d), which shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this subtitle shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 et seq.) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) UPDATING OF EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The Secretary shall permit an owner or operator of land subject to a contract entered into under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 et seq.) before October 1, 2013, to update the contract to reflect the activities and uses of land under contract permitted under the terms and conditions of section 1233(b) of that Act (as amended by section 2004), as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

Subtitle B—Conservation Stewardship Program

SEC. 2101. CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) REVISION OF CURRENT PROGRAM.—Subchapter B of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838d et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

''Subchapter B—Conservation Stewardship Program

''SEC. 1238D. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subchapter:

''(1) AGRICULTURAL OPERATION.—The term 'agricultural operation' means all eligible land, whether or not contiguous, that is—

''(A) under the effective control of a producer at the time the producer enters into a contract under the program; and

''(B) operated with equipment, labor, management, and production or cultivation practices that are substantially separate from other agricultural operations, as determined by the Secretary.

''(2) CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'conservation activities' means conservation systems, practices, or management measures.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'conservation activities' includes—

''(i) structural measures, vegetative measures, and land management measures, including agriculture drainage management systems, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(ii) planning needed to address a priority resource concern.

''(3) CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP PLAN.—The term 'conservation stewardship plan' means a plan that—

''(A) identifies and inventories priority resource concerns;

''(B) establishes benchmark data and conservation objectives;

''(C) describes conservation activities to be implemented, managed, or improved; and

''(D) includes a schedule and evaluation plan for the planning, installation, and management of the new and existing conservation activities.

''(4) ELIGIBLE LAND.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'eligible land' means—

''(i) private or tribal land on which agricultural commodities, livestock, or forest-related products are produced; and

''(ii) lands associated with the land described in clause (i) on which priority resource concerns could be addressed through a contract under the program.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'eligible land' includes—

''(i) cropland;

''(ii) grassland;

''(iii) rangeland;

''(iv) pasture land;

''(v) nonindustrial private forest land; and

''(vi) other agricultural areas (including cropped woodland, marshes, and agricultural land used or capable of being used for the production of livestock), as determined by the Secretary.

''(5) PRIORITY RESOURCE CONCERN.—The term 'priority resource concern' means a natural resource concern or problem, as determined by the Secretary, that—

''(A) is identified at the national, State, or local level as a priority for a particular area of a State;

''(B) represents a significant concern in a State or region; and

''(C) is likely to be addressed successfully through the implementation of conservation activities under this program.

''(6) PROGRAM.—The term 'program' means the conservation stewardship program established by this subchapter.

''(7) STEWARDSHIP THRESHOLD.—The term 'stewardship threshold' means the level of management required, as determined by the Secretary, to conserve and improve the quality and condition of a natural resource.

''SEC. 1238E. CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—During each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, the Secretary shall carry out a conservation stewardship program to encourage producers to address

priority resource concerns in a comprehensive manner—

''(1) by undertaking additional conservation activities; and

''(2) by improving, maintaining, and managing existing conservation activities.

''(b) EXCLUSIONS.—

''(1) LAND ENROLLED IN OTHER CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.—Subject to paragraph (2), the following land (even if covered by the definition of eligible land) is not eligible for enrollment in the program:

''(A) Land enrolled in the conservation reserve program, unless—

''(i) the conservation reserve contract will expire at the end of the fiscal year in which the land is to be enrolled in the program; and

''(ii) conservation reserve program payments for land enrolled in the program cease before the first program payment is made to the applicant under this subchapter.

''(B) Land enrolled in a wetland easement through the agricultural conservation easement program.

''(C) Land enrolled in the conservation security program.

''(2) CONVERSION TO CROPLAND.—Eligible land used for crop production after October 1, 2013, that had not been planted, considered to be planted, or devoted to crop production for at least 4 of the 6 years preceding that date shall not be the basis for any payment under the program, unless the land does not meet the requirement because—

''(A) the land had previously been enrolled in the conservation reserve program;

''(B) the land has been maintained using long-term crop rotation practices, as determined by the Secretary; or

''(C) the land is incidental land needed for efficient operation of the farm or ranch, as determined by the Secretary.

''SEC. 1238F. STEWARDSHIP CONTRACTS.

''(a) SUBMISSION OF CONTRACT OFFERS.—To be eligible to participate in the conservation stewardship program, a producer shall submit to the Secretary a contract offer for the agricultural operation that—

''(1) demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the producer, at the time of the contract offer, meets or exceeds the stewardship threshold for at least 2 priority resource concerns; and

''(2) would, at a minimum, meet or exceed the stewardship threshold for at least 1 additional priority resource concern by the end of the stewardship contract by—

''(A) installing and adopting additional conservation activities; and

''(B) improving, maintaining, and managing existing conservation activities across the entire agricultural operation in a manner that increases or extends the conservation benefits in place at the time the contract offer is accepted by the Secretary.

''(b) EVALUATION OF CONTRACT OFFERS.—

''(1) RANKING OF APPLICATIONS.—In evaluating contract offers submitted under subsection (a), the Secretary shall rank applications based on—

''(A) the level of conservation treatment on all applicable priority resource concerns at the time of application;

''(B) the degree to which the proposed conservation activities effectively increase conservation performance;

''(C) the number of applicable priority resource concerns proposed to be treated to meet or exceed the stewardship threshold by the end of the contract;

''(D) the extent to which other priority resource concerns will be addressed to meet or exceed the stewardship threshold by the end of the contract period;

''(E) the extent to which the actual and anticipated conservation benefits from the contract are provided at the least cost relative to other similarly beneficial contract offers; and

''(F) the extent to which priority resource concerns will be addressed when transitioning from the conservation reserve program to agricultural production.

''(2) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary may not assign a higher priority to any application because the applicant is willing to accept a lower payment than the applicant would otherwise be eligible to receive.

''(3) ADDITIONAL CRITERIA.—The Secretary may develop and use such additional criteria that the Secretary determines are necessary to ensure that national, State, and local priority resource concerns are effectively addressed.

''(c) ENTERING INTO CONTRACTS.—After a determination that a producer is eligible for the program under subsection (a), and a determination that the contract offer ranks sufficiently high under the evaluation criteria under subsection (b), the Secretary shall enter into a conservation stewardship contract with the producer to enroll the eligible land to be covered by the contract.

''(d) CONTRACT PROVISIONS.—

''(1) TERM.—A conservation stewardship contract shall be for a term of 5 years.

''(2) REQUIRED PROVISIONS.—The conservation stewardship contract of a producer shall—

''(A) state the amount of the payment the Secretary agrees to make to the producer for each year of the conservation stewardship contract under section 1238G(d);

''(B) require the producer—

''(i) to implement a conservation stewardship plan that describes the program purposes to be achieved through 1 or more conservation activities;

''(ii) to maintain and supply information as required by the Secretary to determine compliance with the conservation stewardship plan and any other requirements of the program; and

''(iii) not to conduct any activities on the agricultural operation that would tend to defeat the purposes of the program;

''(C) permit all economic uses of the eligible land that—

''(i) maintain the agricultural nature of the land; and

''(ii) are consistent with the conservation purposes of the conservation stewardship contract;

''(D) include a provision to ensure that a producer shall not be considered in violation of the contract for failure to comply with the contract due to circumstances beyond the control of the producer, including a disaster or related condition, as determined by the Secretary;

''(E) include provisions requiring that upon the violation of a term or condition of the contract at any time the producer has control of the land—

''(i) if the Secretary determines that the violation warrants termination of the contract—

''(I) the producer shall forfeit all rights to receive payments under the contract; and

''(II) the producer shall refund all or a portion of the payments received by the producer under the contract, including any interest on the payments, as determined by the Secretary; or

''(ii) if the Secretary determines that the violation does not warrant termination of the contract, the producer shall refund or accept adjustments to the payments provided to the producer, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate;

''(F) include provisions in accordance with paragraphs (3) and (4) of this section; and

''(G) include any additional provisions the Secretary determines are necessary to carry out the program.

''(3) CHANGE OF INTEREST IN LAND SUBJECT TO A CONTRACT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—At the time of application, a producer shall have control of the eligible land to be enrolled in the program. Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a change in the interest of a producer in eligible land covered by a contract under the program shall result in the termination of the contract with regard to that land.

''(B) TRANSFER OF DUTIES AND RIGHTS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply if—

''(i) within a reasonable period of time (as determined by the Secretary) after the date of the change in the interest in eligible land covered by a contract under the program, the transferee of the land provides written notice to the Secretary that all duties and rights under the contract have been transferred to, and assumed by, the transferee for the portion of the land transferred;

''(ii) the transferee meets the eligibility requirements of the program; and

''(iii) the Secretary approves the transfer of all duties and rights under the contract.

''(4) MODIFICATION AND TERMINATION OF CONTRACTS.—

''(A) VOLUNTARY MODIFICATION OR TERMINATION.—The Secretary may modify or terminate a contract with a producer if—

''(i) the producer agrees to the modification or termination; and

''(ii) the Secretary determines that the modification or termination is in the public interest.

''(B) INVOLUNTARY TERMINATION.—The Secretary may terminate a contract if the Secretary determines that the producer violated the contract.

''(5) REPAYMENT.—If a contract is terminated, the Secretary may, consistent with the purposes of the program—

''(A) allow the producer to retain payments already received under the contract; or

''(B) require repayment, in whole or in part, of payments received and assess liquidated damages.

''(e) CONTRACT RENEWAL.—At the end of the initial 5-year contract period, the Secretary may allow the producer to renew the contract for 1 additional 5-year period if the producer—

''(1) demonstrates compliance with the terms of the initial contract;

''(2) agrees to adopt and continue to integrate conservation activities across the entire agricultural operation, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(3) agrees, by the end of the contract period—

''(A) to meet the stewardship threshold of at least two additional priority resource concerns on the agricultural operation; or

''(B) to exceed the stewardship threshold of two existing priority resource concerns that are specified by the Secretary in the initial contract.

''SEC. 1238G. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—To achieve the conservation goals of a contract under the conservation stewardship program, the Secretary shall—

''(1) make the program available to eligible producers on a continuous enrollment basis with 1 or more ranking periods, one of which shall occur in the first quarter of each fiscal year;

''(2) identify not less than 5 priority resource concerns in a particular watershed or other appropriate region or area within a State; and

''(3) establish a science-based stewardship threshold for each priority resource concern identified under paragraph (2).

''(b) ALLOCATION TO STATES.—The Secretary shall allocate acres to States for enrollment, based—

''(1) primarily on each State's proportion of eligible land to the total acreage of eligible land in all States; and

''(2) also on consideration of—

''(A) the extent and magnitude of the conservation needs associated with agricultural production in each State;

''(B) the degree to which implementation of the program in the State is, or will be, effective in helping producers address those needs; and

''(C) other considerations to achieve equitable geographic distribution of funds, as determined by the Secretary.

''(c) ACREAGE ENROLLMENT LIMITATION.—During the period beginning on October 1, 2013,

and ending on September 30, 2021, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

''(1) enroll in the program an additional 8,695,000 acres for each fiscal year; and

''(2) manage the program to achieve a national average rate of $18 per acre, which shall include the costs of all financial assistance, technical assistance, and any other expenses associated with enrollment or participation in the program.

''(d) CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP PAYMENTS.—

''(1) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall provide annual payments under the program to compensate the producer for—

''(A) installing and adopting additional conservation activities; and

''(B) improving, maintaining, and managing conservation activities in place at the agricultural operation of the producer at the time the contract offer is accepted by the Secretary.

''(2) PAYMENT AMOUNT.—The amount of the conservation stewardship annual payment shall be determined by the Secretary and based, to the maximum extent practicable, on the following factors:

''(A) Costs incurred by the producer associated with planning, design, materials, installation, labor, management, maintenance, or training.

''(B) Income forgone by the producer.

''(C) Expected conservation benefits.

''(D) The extent to which priority resource concerns will be addressed through the installation and adoption of conservation activities on the agricultural operation.

''(E) The level of stewardship in place at the time of application and maintained over the term of the contract.

''(F) The degree to which the conservation activities will be integrated across the entire agricultural operation for all applicable priority resource concerns over the term of the contract.

''(G) Such other factors as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

''(3) EXCLUSIONS.—A payment to a producer under this subsection shall not be provided for—

''(A) the design, construction, or maintenance of animal waste storage or treatment facilities or associated waste transport or transfer devices for animal feeding operations; or

''(B) conservation activities for which there is no cost incurred or income forgone to the producer.

''(4) DELIVERY OF PAYMENTS.—In making payments under this subsection, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable—

''(A) prorate conservation performance over the term of the contract so as to accommodate, to the extent practicable, producers earning equal annual payments in each fiscal year; and

''(B) make payments as soon as practicable after October 1 of each fiscal year for activities carried out in the previous fiscal year.

''(e) SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS FOR RESOURCE-CONSERVING CROP ROTATIONS.—

''(1) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall provide additional payments to producers that, in participating in the program, agree to adopt or improve resource-conserving crop rotations to achieve beneficial crop rotations as appropriate for the eligible land of the producers.

''(2) BENEFICIAL CROP ROTATIONS.—The Secretary shall determine whether a resource-conserving crop rotation is a beneficial crop rotation eligible for additional payments under paragraph (1) based on whether the resource-conserving crop rotation is designed to provide natural resource conservation and production benefits.

''(3) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a payment described in paragraph (1), a producer shall agree to adopt and maintain beneficial resource-conserving crop rotations for the term of the contract.

''(4) RESOURCE-CONSERVING CROP ROTATION.—In this subsection, the term 'resource-conserving crop rotation' means a crop rotation that—

''(A) includes at least 1 resource conserving crop (as defined by the Secretary);

''(B) reduces erosion;

''(C) improves soil fertility and tilth;

''(D) interrupts pest cycles; and

''(E) in applicable areas, reduces depletion of soil moisture or otherwise reduces the need for irrigation.

''(f) PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.—A person or legal entity may not receive, directly or indirectly, payments under the program that, in the aggregate, exceed $200,000 under all contracts entered into during fiscal years 2014 through 2018, excluding funding arrangements with Indian tribes, regardless of the number of contracts entered into under the program by the person or legal entity.

''(g) SPECIALTY CROP AND ORGANIC PRODUCERS.—The Secretary shall ensure that outreach and technical assistance are available, and program specifications are appropriate to enable specialty crop and organic producers to participate in the program.

''(h) COORDINATION WITH ORGANIC CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall establish a transparent means by which producers may initiate organic certification under the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.) while participating in a contract under the program.

''(i) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations that—

''(1) prescribe such other rules as the Secretary determines to be necessary to ensure a fair and reasonable application of the limitations established under subsection (f); and

''(2) otherwise enable the Secretary to carry out the program.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

(c) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under subchapter B of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838d et seq.) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) CONSERVATION STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM.—Funds made available under section 1241(a)(4) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(a)(4)) (as amended by section 2601(a) of this title) may be used to administer and make payments to program participants that enrolled into contracts during any of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

Subtitle C—Environmental Quality Incentives Program

SEC. 2201. PURPOSES.

Section 1240 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C) and, in such subparagraph, by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

''(B) developing and improving wildlife habitat; and'';

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking paragraph (5).

SEC. 2202. ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION.

Section 1240B of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2018'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(2) TERM.—A contract under the program shall have a term that does not exceed 10 years.'';

(3) in subsection (d)(4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting '', veteran farmer or rancher (as defined in section 2501(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e))),'' before ''or a beginning farmer or rancher''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(B) ADVANCE PAYMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not more than 50 percent of the amount determined under subparagraph (A) may be provided in advance for the purpose of purchasing materials or contracting.

''(ii) RETURN OF FUNDS.—If funds provided in advance are not expended during the 90-day period beginning on the date of receipt of the funds, the funds shall be returned within a reasonable time frame, as determined by the Secretary.'';

(4) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(f) ALLOCATION OF FUNDING.—

''(1) LIVESTOCK.—For each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, at least 60 percent of the funds made available for payments under the program shall be targeted at practices relating to livestock production.

''(2) WILDLIFE HABITAT.—For each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, 5 percent of the funds made available for payments under the program shall be targeted at practices benefitting wildlife habitat.'';

(5) in subsection (g)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED NATIVE AMERICAN INDIAN TRIBES AND ALASKA NATIVE CORPORATIONS'' and inserting ''INDIAN TRIBES'';

(B) by striking ''federally recognized Native American Indian Tribes and Alaska Native Corporations (including their affiliated membership organizations)'' and inserting ''Indian tribes''; and

(C) by striking ''or Native Corporation''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(j) WILDLIFE HABITAT INCENTIVE PRACTICE.—The Secretary shall provide payments to producers under the program for practices, including recurring practices for the term of the contract, that support the restoration, development, protection, and improvement of wildlife habitat on eligible land, including—

''(1) upland wildlife habitat;

''(2) wetland wildlife habitat;

''(3) habitat for threatened and endangered species;

''(4) fish habitat;

''(5) habitat on pivot corners and other irregular areas of a field; and

''(6) other types of wildlife habitat, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.''.

SEC. 2203. EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS.

Section 1240C(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–3(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''environmental'' and inserting ''conservation''; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking ''purpose of the environmental quality incentives program specified in section 1240(1)'' and inserting ''purposes of the program''.

SEC. 2204. DUTIES OF PRODUCERS.

Section 1240D(2) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–4(2)) is amended by striking ''farm, ranch, or forest'' and inserting ''enrolled''.

SEC. 2205. LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS.

Section 1240G of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–7) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1240G. LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS.

''A person or legal entity may not receive, directly or indirectly, cost share or incentive payments under this chapter that, in aggregate, exceed $450,000 for all contracts entered into under this chapter by the person or legal entity during the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, regardless of the number of contracts entered into

under this chapter by the person or legal entity.''.

SEC. 2206. CONSERVATION INNOVATION GRANTS AND PAYMENTS.

Section 1240H of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–8) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

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

''(E) facilitate on-farm conservation research and demonstration activities; and

''(F) facilitate pilot testing of new technologies or innovative conservation practices.''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(b) REPORTING.—Not later than December 31, 2014, and every two years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report on the status of projects funded under this section, including—

''(1) funding awarded;

''(2) project results; and

''(3) incorporation of project findings, such as new technology and innovative approaches, into the conservation efforts implemented by the Secretary.''.

SEC. 2207. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

(b) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendments made by this subtitle shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa et seq.) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

Subtitle D—Agricultural Conservation Easement Program

SEC. 2301. AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION EASEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle:

''Subtitle H—Agricultural Conservation Easement Program

''SEC. 1265. ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSES.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an agricultural conservation easement program for the conservation of eligible land and natural resources through easements or other interests in land.

''(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the program are to—

''(1) combine the purposes and coordinate the functions of the wetlands reserve program established under section 1237, the grassland reserve program established under section 1238N, and the farmland protection program established under section 1238I, as such sections were in effect on September 30, 2013;

''(2) restore, protect, and enhance wetlands on eligible land;

''(3) protect the agricultural use and related conservation values of eligible land by limiting nonagricultural uses of that land; and

''(4) protect grazing uses and related conservation values by restoring and conserving eligible land.

''SEC. 1265A. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subtitle:

''(1) AGRICULTURAL LAND EASEMENT.—The term 'agricultural land easement' means an easement or other interest in eligible land that—

''(A) is conveyed for the purpose of protecting natural resources and the agricultural nature of the land; and

''(B) permits the landowner the right to continue agricultural production and related uses subject to an agricultural land easement plan, as approved by the Secretary.

''(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term 'eligible entity' means—

''(A) an agency of State or local government or an Indian tribe (including a farmland protection board or land resource council established under State law); or

''(B) an organization that is—

''(i) organized for, and at all times since the formation of the organization has been operated principally for, 1 or more of the conservation purposes specified in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of section 170(h)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

''(ii) an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of that Code that is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of that Code; or

''(iii) described in—

''(I) paragraph (1) or (2) of section 509(a) of that Code; or

''(II) section 509(a)(3) of that Code and is controlled by an organization described in section 509(a)(2) of that Code.

''(3) ELIGIBLE LAND.—The term 'eligible land' means private or tribal land that is—

''(A) in the case of an agricultural land easement, agricultural land, including land on a farm or ranch—

''(i) that is subject to a pending offer for purchase of an agricultural land easement from an eligible entity;

''(ii) that—

''(I) has prime, unique, or other productive soil;

''(II) contains historical or archaeological resources; or

''(III) the protection of which will further a State or local policy consistent with the purposes of the program; and

''(iii) that is—

''(I) cropland;

''(II) rangeland;

''(III) grassland or land that contains forbs, or shrubland for which grazing is the predominate use;

''(IV) pastureland; or

''(V) nonindustrial private forest land that contributes to the economic viability of an offered parcel or serves as a buffer to protect such land from development;

''(B) in the case of a wetland easement, a wetland or related area, including—

''(i) farmed or converted wetlands, together with adjacent land that is functionally dependent on that land, if the Secretary determines it—

''(I) is likely to be successfully restored in a cost effective manner; and

''(II) will maximize the wildlife benefits and wetland functions and values, as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior at the local level;

''(ii) cropland or grassland that was used for agricultural production prior to flooding from the natural overflow of—

''(I) a closed basin lake and adjacent land that is functionally dependent upon it, if the State or other entity is willing to provide 50 percent share of the cost of an easement;

''(II) a pothole and adjacent land that is functionally dependent on it;

''(iii) farmed wetlands and adjoining lands that—

''(I) are enrolled in the conservation reserve program;

''(II) have the highest wetland functions and values, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(III) are likely to return to production after they leave the conservation reserve program;

''(iv) riparian areas that link wetlands that are protected by easements or some other device that achieves the same purpose as an easement; or

''(v) other wetlands of an owner that would not otherwise be eligible, if the Secretary determines that the inclusion of such wetlands in a wetland easement would significantly add to the functional value of the easement; or

''(C) in the case of either an agricultural land easement or wetland easement, other land that is incidental to land described in subparagraph (A) or (B), if the Secretary determines that it is necessary for the efficient administration of the easements under this program.

''(4) PROGRAM.—The term 'program' means the agricultural conservation easement program established by this subtitle.

''(5) WETLAND EASEMENT.—The term 'wetland easement' means a reserved interest in eligible land that—

''(A) is defined and delineated in a deed; and

''(B) stipulates—

''(i) the rights, title, and interests in land conveyed to the Secretary; and

''(ii) the rights, title, and interests in land that are reserved to the landowner.

''SEC. 1265B. AGRICULTURAL LAND EASEMENTS.

''(a) AVAILABILITY OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall facilitate and provide funding for—

''(1) the purchase by eligible entities of agricultural land easements and other interests in eligible land; and

''(2) technical assistance to provide for the conservation of natural resources pursuant to an agricultural land easement plan.

''(b) COST-SHARE ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall protect the agricultural use, including grazing, and related conservation values of eligible land through cost-share assistance to eligible entities for purchasing agricultural land easements.

''(2) SCOPE OF ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE.—

''(A) FEDERAL SHARE.—An agreement described in paragraph (4) shall provide for a Federal share determined by the Secretary of an amount not to exceed 50 percent of the fair market value of the agricultural land easement or other interest in land, as determined by the Secretary using—

''(i) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice;

''(ii) an area-wide market analysis or survey; or

''(iii) another industry-approved method.

''(B) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Under the agreement, the eligible entity shall provide a share that is at least equivalent to that provided by the Secretary.

''(ii) SOURCE OF CONTRIBUTION.—An eligible entity may include as part of its share a charitable donation or qualified conservation contribution (as defined by section 170(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) from the private landowner if the eligible entity contributes its own cash resources in an amount that is at least 50 percent of the amount contributed by the Secretary.

''(C) EXCEPTION.—In the case of grassland of special environmental significance, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary may provide an amount not to exceed 75 percent of the fair market value of the agricultural land easement.

''(3) EVALUATION AND RANKING OF APPLICATIONS.—

''(A) CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall establish evaluation and ranking criteria to maximize the benefit of Federal investment under the program.

''(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing the criteria, the Secretary shall emphasize support for—

''(i) protecting agricultural uses and related conservation values of the land; and

''(ii) maximizing the protection of areas devoted to agricultural use.

''(C) BIDDING DOWN.—If the Secretary determines that 2 or more applications for cost-share assistance are comparable in achieving the purpose of the program, the Secretary shall not assign a higher priority to any of those applications solely on the basis of lesser cost to the program.

''(4) AGREEMENTS WITH ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into agreements with eligible entities to stipulate the terms and conditions under which the eligible entity is permitted to use cost-share assistance provided under this section.

''(B) LENGTH OF AGREEMENTS.—An agreement shall be for a term that is—

''(i) in the case of an eligible entity certified under the process described in paragraph (5), a minimum of five years; and

''(ii) for all other eligible entities, at least three, but not more than five years.

''(C) MINIMUM TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—An eligible entity shall be authorized to use its own terms and conditions for agricultural land easements so long as the Secretary determines such terms and conditions—

''(i) are consistent with the purposes of the program;

''(ii) permit effective enforcement of the conservation purposes of such easements;

''(iii) include a right of enforcement for the Secretary, that may be used only if the terms of the easement are not enforced by the holder of the easement;

''(iv) subject the land in which an interest is purchased to an agricultural land easement plan that—

''(I) describes the activities which promote the long-term viability of the land to meet the purposes for which the easement was acquired;

''(II) requires the management of grasslands according to a grasslands management plan; and

''(III) includes a conservation plan, where appropriate, and requires, at the option of the Secretary, the conversion of highly erodible cropland to less intensive uses; and

''(v) include a limit on the impervious surfaces to be allowed that is consistent with the agricultural activities to be conducted.

''(D) SUBSTITUTION OF QUALIFIED PROJECTS.—An agreement shall allow, upon mutual agreement of the parties, substitution of qualified projects that are identified at the time of the proposed substitution.

''(E) EFFECT OF VIOLATION.—If a violation occurs of a term or condition of an agreement under this subsection—

''(i) the Secretary may terminate the agreement; and

''(ii) the Secretary may require the eligible entity to refund all or part of any payments received by the entity under the program, with interest on the payments as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

''(5) CERTIFICATION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

''(A) CERTIFICATION PROCESS.—The Secretary shall establish a process under which the Secretary may—

''(i) directly certify eligible entities that meet established criteria;

''(ii) enter into long-term agreements with certified eligible entities; and

''(iii) accept proposals for cost-share assistance for the purchase of agricultural land easements throughout the duration of such agreements.

''(B) CERTIFICATION CRITERIA.—In order to be certified, an eligible entity shall demonstrate to the Secretary that the entity will maintain, at a minimum, for the duration of the agreement—

''(i) a plan for administering easements that is consistent with the purpose of this subtitle;

''(ii) the capacity and resources to monitor and enforce agricultural land easements; and

''(iii) policies and procedures to ensure—

''(I) the long-term integrity of agricultural land easements on eligible land;

''(II) timely completion of acquisitions of such easements; and

''(III) timely and complete evaluation and reporting to the Secretary on the use of funds provided under the program.

''(C) REVIEW AND REVISION.—

''(i) REVIEW.—The Secretary shall conduct a review of eligible entities certified under subparagraph (A) every three years to ensure that such entities are meeting the criteria established under subparagraph (B).

''(ii) REVOCATION.—If the Secretary finds that the certified eligible entity no longer meets the criteria established under subparagraph (B), the Secretary may—

''(I) allow the certified eligible entity a specified period of time, at a minimum 180 days, in which to take such actions as may be necessary to meet the criteria; and

''(II) revoke the certification of the eligible entity, if after the specified period of time, the certified eligible entity does not meet such criteria.

''(c) METHOD OF ENROLLMENT.—The Secretary shall enroll eligible land under this section through the use of—

''(1) permanent easements; or

''(2) easements for the maximum duration allowed under applicable State laws.

''(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance, if requested, to assist in—

''(1) compliance with the terms and conditions of easements; and

''(2) implementation of an agricultural land easement plan.

''SEC. 1265C. WETLAND EASEMENTS.

''(a) AVAILABILITY OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide assistance to owners of eligible land to restore, protect, and enhance wetlands through—

''(1) wetland easements and related wetland easement plans; and

''(2) technical assistance.

''(b) EASEMENTS.—

''(1) METHOD OF ENROLLMENT.—The Secretary shall enroll eligible land under this section through the use of—

''(A) 30-year easements;

''(B) permanent easements;

''(C) easements for the maximum duration allowed under applicable State laws; or

''(D) as an option for Indian tribes only, 30-year contracts (which shall be considered to be 30-year easements for the purposes of this subtitle).

''(2) LIMITATIONS.—

''(A) INELIGIBLE LAND.—The Secretary may not acquire easements on—

''(i) land established to trees under the conservation reserve program, except in cases where the Secretary determines it would further the purposes of the program; and

''(ii) farmed wetlands or converted wetlands where the conversion was not commenced prior to December 23, 1985.

''(B) CHANGES IN OWNERSHIP.—No wetland easement shall be created on land that has changed ownership during the preceding 24-month period unless—

''(i) the new ownership was acquired by will or succession as a result of the death of the previous owner;

''(ii)(I) the ownership change occurred because of foreclosure on the land; and

''(II) immediately before the foreclosure, the owner of the land exercises a right of redemption from the mortgage holder in accordance with State law; or

''(iii) the Secretary determines that the land was acquired under circumstances that give adequate assurances that such land was not acquired for the purposes of placing it in the program.

''(3) EVALUATION AND RANKING OF OFFERS.—

''(A) CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall establish evaluation and ranking criteria to maximize the benefit of Federal investment under the program.

''(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—When evaluating offers from landowners, the Secretary may consider—

''(i) the conservation benefits of obtaining a wetland easement, including the potential environmental benefits if the land was removed from agricultural production;

''(ii) the cost-effectiveness of each wetland easement, so as to maximize the environmental benefits per dollar expended;

''(iii) whether the landowner or another person is offering to contribute financially to the cost of the wetland easement to leverage Federal funds; and

''(iv) such other factors as the Secretary determines are necessary to carry out the purposes of the program.

''(C) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall place priority on acquiring wetland easements based on the value of the wetland easement for protecting and enhancing habitat for migratory birds and other wildlife.

''(4) AGREEMENT.—To be eligible to place eligible land into the program through a wetland easement, the owner of such land shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary to—

''(A) grant an easement on such land to the Secretary;

''(B) authorize the implementation of a wetland easement plan developed for the eligible land under subsection (f);

''(C) create and record an appropriate deed restriction in accordance with applicable State law to reflect the easement agreed to;

''(D) provide a written statement of consent to such easement signed by those holding a security interest in the land;

''(E) comply with the terms and conditions of the easement and any related agreements; and

''(F) permanently retire any existing base history for the land on which the easement has been obtained.

''(5) TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF EASEMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A wetland easement shall include terms and conditions that—

''(i) permit—

''(I) repairs, improvements, and inspections on the land that are necessary to maintain existing public drainage systems; and

''(II) owners to control public access on the easement areas while identifying access routes to be used for restoration activities and management and easement monitoring;

''(ii) prohibit—

''(I) the alteration of wildlife habitat and other natural features of such land, unless specifically authorized by the Secretary;

''(II) the spraying of such land with chemicals or the mowing of such land, except where such spraying or mowing is authorized by the Secretary or is necessary—

''(aa) to comply with Federal or State noxious weed control laws;

''(bb) to comply with a Federal or State emergency pest treatment program; or

''(cc) to meet habitat needs of specific wildlife species;

''(III) any activities to be carried out on the owner's or successor's land that is immediately adjacent to, and functionally related to, the land that is subject to the easement if such activities will alter, degrade, or otherwise diminish the functional value of the eligible land; and

''(IV) the adoption of any other practice that would tend to defeat the purposes of the program, as determined by the Secretary;

''(iii) provide for the efficient and effective establishment of wildlife functions and values; and

''(iv) include such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable to carry out the program or facilitate the practical administration thereof.

''(B) VIOLATION.—On the violation of the terms or conditions of a wetland easement, the wetland easement shall remain in force and the Secretary may require the owner to refund all or part of any payments received by the owner under the program, together with interest thereon as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

''(C) COMPATIBLE USES.—Land subject to a wetland easement may be used for compatible economic uses, including such activities as hunting and fishing, managed timber harvest, or periodic haying or grazing, if such use is specifically permitted by the wetland easement plan developed for the land under subsection (f) and is consistent with the long-term protection and

enhancement of the wetland resources for which the easement was established.

''(D) RESERVATION OF GRAZING RIGHTS.—The Secretary may include in the terms and conditions of a wetland easement a provision under which the owner reserves grazing rights if—

''(i) the Secretary determines that the reservation and use of the grazing rights—

''(I) is compatible with the land subject to the easement;

''(II) is consistent with the historical natural uses of the land and the long-term protection and enhancement goals for which the easement was established; and

''(III) complies with the wetland easement plan developed for the land under subsection (f); and

''(ii) the agreement provides for a commensurate reduction in the easement payment to account for the grazing value, as determined by the Secretary.

''(6) COMPENSATION.—

''(A) DETERMINATION.—

''(i) PERMANENT EASEMENTS.—The Secretary shall pay as compensation for a permanent wetland easement acquired under the program an amount necessary to encourage enrollment in the program, based on the lowest of—

''(I) the fair market value of the land, as determined by the Secretary, using the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice or an area-wide market analysis or survey;

''(II) the amount corresponding to a geographical cap, as determined by the Secretary in regulations; or

''(III) the offer made by the landowner.

''(ii) 30-YEAR EASEMENTS.—Compensation for a 30-year wetland easement shall be not less than 50 percent, but not more than 75 percent, of the compensation that would be paid for a permanent wetland easement.

''(B) FORM OF PAYMENT.—Compensation for a wetland easement shall be provided by the Secretary in the form of a cash payment, in an amount determined under subparagraph (A).

''(C) PAYMENT SCHEDULE.—

''(i) EASEMENTS VALUED AT $500,000 OR LESS.—For wetland easements valued at $500,000 or less, the Secretary may provide easement payments in not more than 10 annual payments.

''(ii) EASEMENTS VALUED AT MORE THAN $500,000.—For wetland easements valued at more than $500,000, the Secretary may provide easement payments in at least 5, but not more than 10 annual payments, except that, if the Secretary determines it would further the purposes of the program, the Secretary may make a lump sum payment for such an easement.

''(c) EASEMENT RESTORATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide financial assistance to owners of eligible land to carry out the establishment of conservation measures and practices and protect wetland functions and values, including necessary maintenance activities, as set forth in a wetland easement plan developed for the eligible land under subsection (f).

''(2) PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall—

''(A) in the case of a permanent wetland easement, pay an amount that is not less than 75 percent, but not more than 100 percent, of the eligible costs, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(B) in the case of a 30-year wetland easement, pay an amount that is not less than 50 percent, but not more than 75 percent, of the eligible costs, as determined by the Secretary.

''(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall assist owners in complying with the terms and conditions of wetland easements.

''(2) CONTRACTS OR AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into 1 or more contracts with private entities or agreements with a State, nongovernmental organization, or Indian tribe to carry out necessary restoration, enhancement, or maintenance of a wetland easement if the Secretary determines that the contract or agreement will advance the purposes of the program.

''(e) WETLAND ENHANCEMENT OPTION.—The Secretary may enter into 1 or more agreements with a State (including a political subdivision or agency of a State), nongovernmental organization, or Indian tribe to carry out a special wetland enhancement option that the Secretary determines would advance the purposes of program.

''(f) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(1) WETLAND EASEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary shall develop a wetland easement plan for eligible lands subject to a wetland easement, which shall include practices and activities necessary to restore, protect, enhance, and maintain the enrolled lands.

''(2) DELEGATION OF EASEMENT ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary may delegate—

''(A) any of the easement management, monitoring, and enforcement responsibilities of the Secretary to other Federal or State agencies that have the appropriate authority, expertise, and resources necessary to carry out such delegated responsibilities; and

''(B) any of the easement management responsibilities of the Secretary to other conservation organizations if the Secretary determines the organization has the appropriate expertise and resources.

''(3) PAYMENTS.—

''(A) TIMING OF PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall provide payment for obligations incurred by the Secretary under this section—

''(i) with respect to any easement restoration obligation under subsection (c), as soon as possible after the obligation is incurred; and

''(ii) with respect to any annual easement payment obligation incurred by the Secretary, as soon as possible after October 1 of each calendar year.

''(B) PAYMENTS TO OTHERS.—If an owner who is entitled to a payment under this section dies, becomes incompetent, is otherwise unable to receive such payment, or is succeeded by another person or entity who renders or completes the required performance, the Secretary shall make such payment, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary and without regard to any other provision of law, in such manner as the Secretary determines is fair and reasonable in light of all of the circumstances.

''SEC. 1265D. ADMINISTRATION.

''(a) INELIGIBLE LAND.—The Secretary may not use program funds for the purposes of acquiring an easement on—

''(1) lands owned by an agency of the United States, other than land held in trust for Indian tribes;

''(2) lands owned in fee title by a State, including an agency or a subdivision of a State, or a unit of local government;

''(3) land subject to an easement or deed restriction which, as determined by the Secretary, provides similar protection as would be provided by enrollment in the program; or

''(4) lands where the purposes of the program would be undermined due to on-site or off-site conditions, such as risk of hazardous substances, proposed or existing rights of way, infrastructure development, or adjacent land uses.

''(b) PRIORITY.—In evaluating applications under the program, the Secretary may give priority to land that is currently enrolled in the conservation reserve program in a contract that is set to expire within 1 year and—

''(1) in the case of an agricultural land easement, is grassland that would benefit from protection under a long-term easement; and

''(2) in the case of a wetland easement, is a wetland or related area with the highest functions and value and is likely to return to production after the land leaves the conservation reserve program.

''(c) SUBORDINATION, EXCHANGE, MODIFICATION, AND TERMINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may subordinate, exchange, modify, or terminate any interest in land, or portion of such interest, administered by the Secretary, either directly or on behalf of the Commodity Credit Corporation under the program if the Secretary determines that—

''(A) it is in the Federal Government's interest to subordinate, exchange, modify, or terminate the interest in land;

''(B) the subordination, exchange, modification, or termination action—

''(i) will address a compelling public need for which there is no practicable alternative; or

''(ii) such action will further the practical administration of the program; and

''(C) the subordination, exchange, modification, or termination action will result in comparable conservation value and equivalent or greater economic value to the United States.

''(2) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall work with the owner, and eligible entity if applicable, to address any subordination, exchange, modification, or termination of the interest, or portion of such interest, in land.

''(3) NOTICE.—At least 90 days before taking any termination action described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide written notice of such action to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

''(d) LAND ENROLLED IN CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM.—The Secretary may terminate or modify a contract entered into under section 1231(a) if eligible land that is subject to such contract is transferred into the program.

''(e) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR AGRICULTURAL LAND EASEMENTS.—Of the funds made available under section 1241 to carry out the program for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, use for agricultural land easements—

''(1) no less than 40 percent in each of fiscal years 2014 through 2017; and

''(2) no less than 50 percent in fiscal year 2018.''.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—Before an eligible entity or owner of eligible land may receive assistance under subtitle H of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, the eligible entity or person shall agree, during the crop year for which the assistance is provided and in exchange for the assistance—

(1) to comply with applicable conservation requirements under subtitle B of title XII of that Act (16 U.S.C. 3811 et seq.); and

(2) to comply with applicable wetland protection requirements under subtitle C of title XII of that Act (16 U.S.C. 3821 et seq.).

(c) CROSS REFERENCE; CALCULATION.—Section 1244 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3844) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A);

(ii) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C);

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) the agricultural conservation easement program established under subtitle H; and''; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''programs administered under subchapters B and C of chapter 1 of subtitle D'' and inserting ''conservation reserve program established under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D and wetland easements under section 1265C''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''an easement acquired under subchapter C of chapter 1 of subtitle D'' and inserting ''a wetland easement under section 1265C''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) CALCULATION.—In calculating the percentages described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include any acreage that was included in calculations of percentages made

under such paragraph, as in effect on September 30, 2013, and that remains enrolled when the calculation is made after that date under paragraph (1).''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

Subtitle E—Regional Conservation Partnership Program

SEC. 2401. REGIONAL CONSERVATION PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after subtitle H, as added by section 2301, the following new subtitle:

''Subtitle I—Regional Conservation Partnership Program

''SEC. 1271. ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSES.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a regional conservation partnership program to implement eligible activities on eligible land through—

''(1) partnership agreements with eligible partners; and

''(2) contracts with producers.

''(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the program are as follows:

''(1) To use covered programs to accomplish purposes and functions similar to those of the following programs, as in effect on September 30, 2013:

''(A) The agricultural water enhancement program established under section 1240I.

''(B) The Chesapeake Bay watershed program established under section 1240Q.

''(C) The cooperative conservation partnership initiative established under section 1243.

''(D) The Great Lakes basin program for soil erosion and sediment control established under section 1240P.

''(2) To further the conservation, restoration, and sustainable use of soil, water, wildlife, and related natural resources on eligible land on a regional or watershed scale.

''(3) To encourage eligible partners to cooperate with producers in—

''(A) meeting or avoiding the need for national, State, and local natural resource regulatory requirements related to production on eligible land; and

''(B) implementing projects that will result in the carrying out of eligible activities that affect multiple agricultural or nonindustrial private forest operations on a local, regional, State, or multi-State basis.

''SEC. 1271A. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subtitle:

''(1) COVERED PROGRAM.—The term 'covered program' means the following:

''(A) The agricultural conservation easement program.

''(B) The environmental quality incentives program.

''(C) The conservation stewardship program.

''(2) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITY.—The term 'eligible activity' means any of the following conservation activities:

''(A) Water quality or quantity conservation, restoration, or enhancement projects relating to surface water and groundwater resources, including—

''(i) the conversion of irrigated cropland to the production of less water-intensive agricultural commodities or dryland farming; or

''(ii) irrigation system improvement and irrigation efficiency enhancement.

''(B) Drought mitigation.

''(C) Flood prevention.

''(D) Water retention.

''(E) Air quality improvement.

''(F) Habitat conservation, restoration, and enhancement.

''(G) Erosion control and sediment reduction.

''(H) Other related activities that the Secretary determines will help achieve conservation benefits.

''(3) ELIGIBLE LAND.—The term 'eligible land' means land on which agricultural commodities, livestock, or forest-related products are produced, including—

''(A) cropland;

''(B) grassland;

''(C) rangeland;

''(D) pastureland;

''(E) nonindustrial private forest land; and

''(F) other land incidental to agricultural production (including wetlands and riparian buffers) on which significant natural resource issues could be addressed under the program.

''(4) ELIGIBLE PARTNER.—The term 'eligible partner' means any of the following:

''(A) An agricultural or silvicultural producer association or other group of producers.

''(B) A State or unit of local government.

''(C) An Indian tribe.

''(D) A farmer cooperative.

''(E) A water district, irrigation district, rural water district or association, or other organization with specific water delivery authority to producers on agricultural land.

''(F) An institution of higher education.

''(G) An organization or entity with an established history of working cooperatively with producers on agricultural land, as determined by the Secretary, to address—

''(i) local conservation priorities related to agricultural production, wildlife habitat development, or nonindustrial private forest land management; or

''(ii) critical watershed-scale soil erosion, water quality, sediment reduction, or other natural resource issues.

''(5) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT.—The term 'partnership agreement' means an agreement entered into under section 1271B between the Secretary and an eligible partner.

''(6) PROGRAM.—The term 'program' means the regional conservation partnership program established by this subtitle.

''SEC. 1271B. REGIONAL CONSERVATION PARTNERSHIPS.

''(a) PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may enter into a partnership agreement with an eligible partner to implement a project that will assist producers with installing and maintaining an eligible activity on eligible land.

''(b) LENGTH.—A partnership agreement shall be for a period not to exceed 5 years, except that the Secretary may extend the agreement one time for up to 12 months when an extension is necessary to meet the objectives of the program.

''(c) DUTIES OF PARTNERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Under a partnership agreement, the eligible partner shall—

''(A) define the scope of a project, including—

''(i) the eligible activities to be implemented;

''(ii) the potential agricultural or nonindustrial private forest land operations affected;

''(iii) the local, State, multi-State, or other geographic area covered; and

''(iv) the planning, outreach, implementation, and assessment to be conducted;

''(B) conduct outreach to producers for potential participation in the project;

''(C) at the request of a producer, act on behalf of a producer participating in the project in applying for assistance under section 1271C;

''(D) leverage financial or technical assistance provided by the Secretary with additional funds to help achieve the project objectives;

''(E) conduct an assessment of the project's effects; and

''(F) at the conclusion of the project, report to the Secretary on its results and funds leveraged.

''(2) CONTRIBUTION.—An eligible partner shall provide a significant portion of the overall costs of the scope of the project that is the subject of the agreement entered into under subsection (a), as determined by the Secretary.

''(d) APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) COMPETITIVE PROCESS.—The Secretary shall conduct a competitive process to select applications for partnership agreements and may assess and rank applications with similar conservation purposes as a group.

''(2) CRITERIA USED.—In carrying out the process described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall make public the criteria used in evaluating applications.

''(3) CONTENT.—An application to the Secretary shall include a description of—

''(A) the scope of the project, as described in subsection (c)(1)(A);

''(B) the plan for monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on progress made towards achieving the project's objectives;

''(C) the program resources requested for the project, including the covered programs to be used and estimated funding needed from the Secretary;

''(D) eligible partners collaborating to achieve project objectives, including their roles, responsibilities, capabilities, and financial contribution; and

''(E) any other elements the Secretary considers necessary to adequately evaluate and competitively select applications for funding under the program.

''(4) PRIORITY TO CERTAIN APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary may give a higher priority to applications that—

''(A) assist producers in meeting or avoiding the need for a natural resource regulatory requirement;

''(B) have a high percentage of eligible producers in the area to be covered by the agreement;

''(C) significantly leverage non-Federal financial and technical resources and coordinate with other local, State, or national efforts;

''(D) deliver high percentages of applied conservation to address conservation priorities or regional, State, or national conservation initiatives;

''(E) provide innovation in conservation methods and delivery, including outcome-based performance measures and methods; or

''(F) meet other factors that are important for achieving the purposes of the program, as determined by the Secretary.

''SEC. 1271C. ASSISTANCE TO PRODUCERS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into contracts with producers to provide financial and technical assistance to—

''(1) producers participating in a project with an eligible partner, as described in section 1271B; or

''(2) producers that fit within the scope of a project described in section 1271B or a critical conservation area designated under section 1271F, but who are seeking to implement an eligible activity on eligible land independent of a partner.

''(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

''(1) CONSISTENCY WITH PROGRAM RULES.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall ensure that the terms and conditions of a contract under this section are consistent with the applicable rules of the covered programs to be used as part of the project, as described in the application under section 1271B(d)(3)(C).

''(2) ADJUSTMENTS.—Except with respect to statutory program requirements governing appeals, payment limitations, and conservation compliance, the Secretary may adjust the discretionary program rules of a covered program—

''(A) to provide a simplified application and evaluation process; and

''(B) to better reflect unique local circumstances and purposes if the Secretary determines such adjustments are necessary to achieve the purposes of the program.

''(c) PAYMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with statutory requirements of the covered programs involved, the Secretary may make payments to a producer in an amount determined by the Secretary to be necessary to achieve the purposes of the program.

''(2) PAYMENTS TO PRODUCERS IN STATES WITH WATER QUANTITY CONCERNS.—The Secretary may

provide payments to producers participating in a project that addresses water quantity concerns for a period of five years in an amount sufficient to encourage conversion from irrigated farming to dryland farming.

''(3) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—To assist in the implementation of the program, the Secretary may waive the applicability of the limitation in section 1001D(b)(2) of this Act for participating producers if the Secretary determines that the waiver is necessary to fulfill the objectives of the program.

''SEC. 1271D. FUNDING.

''(a) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall use $100,000,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 to carry out the program.

''(b) DURATION OF AVAILABILITY.—Funds made available under subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

''(c) ADDITIONAL FUNDING AND ACRES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the funds made available under subsection (a), the Secretary shall reserve 6 percent of the funds and acres made available for a covered program for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 in order to ensure additional resources are available to carry out this program.

''(2) UNUSED FUNDS AND ACRES.—Any funds or acres reserved under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year from a covered program that are not obligated under this program by April 1 of that fiscal year shall be returned for use under the covered program.

''(d) ALLOCATION OF FUNDING.—Of the funds and acres made available for the program under subsections (a) and (c), the Secretary shall allocate—

''(1) 25 percent of the funds and acres to projects based on a State competitive process administered by the State Conservationist, with the advice of the State technical committee established under subtitle G;

''(2) 50 percent of the funds and acres to projects based on a national competitive process to be established by the Secretary; and

''(3) 25 percent of the funds and acres to projects for the critical conservation areas designated under section 1271F.

''(e) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—None of the funds made available under the program may be used to pay for the administrative expenses of eligible partners.

''SEC. 1271E. ADMINISTRATION.

''(a) DISCLOSURE.—In addition to the criteria used in evaluating applications as described in section 1271B(d)(2), the Secretary shall make publicly available information on projects selected through the competitive process described in section 1271B(d)(1).

''(b) REPORTING.—Not later than December 31, 2014, and every two years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on the status of projects funded under the program, including—

''(1) the number and types of eligible partners and producers participating in the partnership agreements selected;

''(2) the number of producers receiving assistance; and

''(3) total funding committed to projects, including from Federal and non-Federal resources.

''SEC. 1271F. CRITICAL CONSERVATION AREAS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In administering funds under section 1271D(d)(3), the Secretary shall select applications for partnership agreements and producer contracts within critical conservation areas designated under this section.

''(b) CRITICAL CONSERVATION AREA DESIGNATIONS.—

''(1) PRIORITY.—In designating critical conservation areas under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to geographical areas based on the degree to which the geographical area—

''(A) includes multiple States with significant agricultural production;

''(B) is covered by an existing regional, State, binational, or multistate agreement or plan that has established objectives, goals, and work plans and is adopted by a Federal, State, or regional authority;

''(C) would benefit from water quality improvement, including through reducing erosion, promoting sediment control, and addressing nutrient management activities affecting large bodies of water of regional, national, or international significance;

''(D) would benefit from water quantity improvement, including improvement relating to—

''(i) groundwater, surface water, aquifer, or other water sources; or

''(ii) a need to promote water retention and flood prevention; or

''(E) contains producers that need assistance in meeting or avoiding the need for a natural resource regulatory requirement that could have a negative economic impact on agricultural operations within the area.

''(2) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not designate more than 8 geographical areas as critical conservation areas under this section.

''(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall administer any partnership agreement or producer contract under this section in a manner that is consistent with the terms of the program.

''(2) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING ACTIVITY.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that eligible activities carried out in critical conservation areas designated under this section complement and are consistent with other Federal and State programs and water quality and quantity strategies.

''(3) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—For a critical conservation area described in subsection (b)(1)(D), the Secretary may use authorities under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), other than section 14 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1012), to carry out projects for the purposes of this section.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

Subtitle F—Other Conservation Programs

SEC. 2501. CONSERVATION OF PRIVATE GRAZING LAND.

Section 1240M(e) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb(e)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 2502. GRASSROOTS SOURCE WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM.

Section 1240O(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–2) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) FUNDING.—

''(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

''(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—In addition to funds made available under paragraph (1), of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.''.

SEC. 2503. VOLUNTARY PUBLIC ACCESS AND HABITAT INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

(a) FUNDING.—Section 1240R(f)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–5(f)(1)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and $30,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

(b) REPORT ON PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report evaluating the effectiveness of the voluntary public access program established by section 1240R of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–5), including—

(1) identifying cooperating agencies;

(2) identifying the number of land holdings and total acres enrolled by each State and tribal government;

(3) evaluating the extent of improved access on eligible lands, improved wildlife habitat, and related economic benefits; and

(4) any other relevant information and data relating to the program that would be helpful to such Committees.

SEC. 2504. AGRICULTURE CONSERVATION EXPERIENCED SERVICES PROGRAM.

(a) FUNDING.—Subsection (c) of section 1252 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3851) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) FUNDING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out the ACES program using funds made available to carry out each program under this title.

''(2) EXCLUSION.—Funds made available to carry out the conservation reserve program may not be used to carry out the ACES program.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2505. SMALL WATERSHED REHABILITATION PROGRAM.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Section 14(h)(1) of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1012(h)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(H) $250,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, to remain available until expended.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 14(h)(2)(E) of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1012(h)(2)(E)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 2506. AGRICULTURAL MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) USES.—Section 524(b)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1524(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (B) and redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (F) as subparagraphs (B) through (E), respectively; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''or resource conservation practices''; and

(B) by striking clause (i) and redesignating clauses (ii) through (iv) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively.

(b) COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.—

(1) FUNDING.—Section 524(b)(4)(B) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1524(b)(4)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

''(B) FUNDING.—The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available to carry out this subsection not less than $10,000,000 for each fiscal year.''.

(2) CERTAIN USES.—Section 524(b)(4)(C) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1524(b)(4)(C)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking ''50'' and inserting ''30''; and

(ii) by striking ''(A), (B), and (C)'' and inserting ''(A) and (B)''; and

(B) in clause (iii), by striking ''40'' and inserting ''60''.

Subtitle G—Funding and Administration

SEC. 2601. FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1241 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) ANNUAL FUNDING.—For each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, the Secretary shall use the funds, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out the following programs under this title (including the provision of technical assistance):

''(1) The conservation reserve program under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D, including, to the maximum extent practicable, $25,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 to carry out section 1235(f) to facilitate the transfer of land subject to contracts from retired or retiring owners and operators to beginning farmers or ranchers and socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers.

''(2) The agriculture conservation easement program under subtitle H, using, to the maximum extent practicable—

''(A) $425,000,000 in fiscal year 2014;

''(B) $450,000,000 in fiscal year 2015;

''(C) $475,000,000 in fiscal year 2016;

''(D) $500,000,000 in fiscal year 2017; and

''(E) $200,000,000 in fiscal year 2018.

''(3) The conservation security program under subchapter A of chapter 2 of subtitle D, using such sums as are necessary to administer contracts entered into before September 30, 2008.

''(4) The conservation stewardship program under subchapter B of chapter 2 of subtitle D.

''(5) The environmental quality incentives program under chapter 4 of subtitle D, using, to the maximum extent practicable, $1,750,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

(b) REGIONAL EQUITY; GUARANTEED AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Section 1241 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d);

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

''(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available by subsection (a) shall be used by the Secretary to carry out the programs specified in such subsection for fiscal years 2014 through 2018 and shall remain available until expended. Amounts made available for the programs specified in such subsection during a fiscal year through modifications, cancellations, terminations, and other related administrative actions and not obligated in that fiscal year shall remain available for obligation during subsequent fiscal years, but shall reduce the amount of additional funds made available in the subsequent fiscal year by an amount equal to the amount remaining unobligated.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2602. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 1241 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841), as redesignated by section 2601(b)(2) of this Act, is amended to read as follows:

''(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Commodity Credit Corporation funds made available for a fiscal year for each of the programs specified in subsection (a)—

''(A) shall be available for the provision of technical assistance for the programs for which funds are made available as necessary to implement the programs effectively; and

''(B) shall not be available for the provision of technical assistance for conservation programs specified in subsection (a) other than the program for which the funds were made available.

''(2) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2013, the Secretary shall submit (and update as necessary in subsequent years) to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report—

''(A) detailing the amount of technical assistance funds requested and apportioned in each program specified in subsection (a) during the preceding fiscal year; and

''(B) any other data relating to this subsection that would be helpful to such Committees.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2603. RESERVATION OF FUNDS TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN FARMERS OR RANCHERS FOR CONSERVATION ACCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (g) of section 1241 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

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

''(4) PREFERENCE.—In providing assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give preference to a veteran farmer or rancher (as defined in section 2501(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e))) that qualifies under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2604. ANNUAL REPORT ON PROGRAM ENROLLMENTS AND ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (h) of section 1241 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''wetlands reserve program'' and inserting ''agricultural conservation easement program'';

(2) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking ''agricultural water enhancement program'' and inserting ''regional conservation partnership program''; and

(B) by striking ''1240I(g)'' and inserting ''1271C(c)(3)''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2605. REVIEW OF CONSERVATION PRACTICE STANDARDS.

Section 1242(h)(1)(A) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3842(h)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008'' and inserting ''the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2606. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO ALL CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1244 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3844) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) Veteran farmers or ranchers (as defined in section 2501(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e))).'';

(2) in subsection (d), by inserting '', H, and I'' before the period at the end;

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''country'' and inserting ''county''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''subsection (c)(2)(B) or (f)(4)'' and inserting ''subsection (c)(2)(A)(ii) or (f)(2)''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(j) IMPROVED ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS.—In administrating a conservation program under this title, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

''(1) seek to reduce administrative burdens and costs to producers by streamlining conservation planning and program resources; and

''(2) take advantage of new technologies to enhance efficiency and effectiveness.

''(k) RELATION TO OTHER PAYMENTS.—Any payment received by an owner or operator under this title, including an easement payment or rental payment, shall be in addition to, and not affect, the total amount of payments that the owner or operator is otherwise eligible to receive under any of the following:

''(1) This Act.

''(2) The Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.).

''(3) The Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

''(4) Any law that succeeds a law specified in paragraph (1), (2), or (3).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2607. STANDARDS FOR STATE TECHNICAL COMMITTEES.

Section 1261(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3861(b)) is amended by striking ''Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, the Secretary shall develop'' and inserting ''The Secretary shall review and update as necessary''.

SEC. 2608. RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.

Subtitle E of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 1246. REGULATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to implement programs under this title, including such regulations as the Secretary determines to be necessary to ensure a fair and reasonable application of the limitations established under section 1244(f).

''(b) RULEMAKING PROCEDURE.—The promulgation of regulations and administration of programs under this title—

''(1) shall be carried out without regard to—

''(A) the Statement of Policy of the Secretary effective July 24, 1971 (36 Fed. Reg. 13804), relating to notices of proposed rulemaking and public participation in rulemaking; and

''(B) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the Paperwork Reduction Act); and

''(2) shall be made pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code, including by interim rules effective on publication under the authority provided in subparagraph (B) of subsection (b) of such section if the Secretary determines such interim rules to be needed and final rules, with an opportunity for notice and comment, no later than 21 months after the date of the enactment of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.''.

Subtitle H—Repeal of Superseded Program Authorities and Transitional Provisions; Technical Amendments

SEC. 2701. COMPREHENSIVE CONSERVATION ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1230 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3830) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3830 et seq.) is amended to read as follows: ''**CONSERVATION RESERVE**''.

SEC. 2702. EMERGENCY FORESTRY CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1231A of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831a) is repealed.

(b) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 1231A of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831a) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the conservation reserve program under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 et seq.) to continue to carry out contracts referred to in paragraph (1) using the provisions of law and regulation applicable to such contracts as they existed on September 30, 2013.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2703. WETLANDS RESERVE PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Subchapter C of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3837 et seq.) is repealed.

(b) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under subchapter C of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3837 et seq.) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the agricultural conservation easement program under subtitle H of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as added by section 2301 of this Act, to continue to carry out contracts referred to in paragraph (1) using the provisions of law and regulation applicable to such contracts as they existed on September 30, 2013.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2704. FARMLAND PROTECTION PROGRAM AND FARM VIABILITY PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Subchapter C of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838h et seq.) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838 et seq.) is amended by striking ''**AND FARMLAND PROTECTION**''.

(c) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendments made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under subchapter C of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838h et seq.) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the agricultural conservation easement program under subtitle H of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as added by section 2301 of this Act, to continue to carry out contracts referred to in paragraph (1) using the provisions of law and regulation applicable to such contracts as they existed on September 30, 2013.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2705. GRASSLAND RESERVE PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Subchapter D of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838n et seq.) is repealed.

(b) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under subchapter D of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838n et seq.) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the agricultural conservation easement program under subtitle H of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as added by section 2301 of this Act, to continue to carry out contracts referred to in paragraph (1) using the provisions of law and regulation applicable to such contracts as they existed on September 30, 2013.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2706. AGRICULTURAL WATER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1240I of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–9) is repealed.

(b) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 1240I of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–9) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the regional conservation partnership program under subtitle I of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as added by section 2401 of this Act, to continue to carry out contracts referred to in paragraph (1) using the provisions of law and regulation applicable to such contracts as they existed on September 30, 2013.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2707. WILDLIFE HABITAT INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1240N of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–1) is repealed.

(b) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 1240N of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–1) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the environmental quality incentives program under chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa et seq.) to continue to carry out contracts referred to in paragraph (1) using the provisions of law and regulation applicable to such contracts as they existed on September 30, 2013.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2708. GREAT LAKES BASIN PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1240P of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–3) is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2709. CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1240Q of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–4) is repealed.

(b) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 1240Q of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–4) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the regional conservation partnership program under subtitle I of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as added by section 2401 of this Act, to continue to carry out contracts referred to in paragraph (1) using the provisions of law and regulation applicable to such contracts as they existed on September 30, 2013.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2710. COOPERATIVE CONSERVATION PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 1243 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3843) is repealed.

(b) TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The amendment made by this section shall not affect the validity or terms of any contract entered into by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 1243 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3843) before October 1, 2013, or any payments required to be made in connection with the contract.

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the regional conservation partnership program under subtitle I of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as added by section 2401 of this Act, to continue to carry out contracts referred to in paragraph (1) using the provisions of law and regulation applicable to such contracts as they existed on September 30, 2013.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 2711. ENVIRONMENTAL EASEMENT PROGRAM.

Chapter 3 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 2712. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1201(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3801(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''E'' and inserting ''I''.

(b) PROGRAM INELIGIBILITY.—Section 1211(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3811(a)) is amended by striking ''predominate'' each place it appears and inserting ''predominant''.

(c) SPECIALTY CROP PRODUCERS.—Section 1242(i) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3842(i)) is amended in the header by striking ''SPECIALITY'' and inserting ''SPECIALTY''.

TITLE III—TRADE

Subtitle A—Food for Peace Act

SEC. 3001. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

Section 201 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1721) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''(to be implemented by the Administrator)'' after ''under this title''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (7) and the second sentence and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(7) build resilience to mitigate and prevent food crises and reduce the future need for emergency aid.''.

SEC. 3002. SUPPORT FOR ORGANIZATIONS THROUGH WHICH ASSISTANCE IS PROVIDED.

Section 202(e)(1) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1722(e)(1)) is amended by striking ''13 percent'' and inserting ''11 percent''.

SEC. 3003. FOOD AID QUALITY.

Section 202(h) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1722(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''The Administrator shall use funds made available for fiscal year 2009'' and inserting ''In consultation with the Secretary, the Administrator shall use funds made available for fiscal year 2013''; and

(ii) by inserting ''to establish a mechanism'' after ''this title'';

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(C) to evaluate, as necessary, the use of current and new agricultural commodities and products thereof in different program settings and for particular recipient groups, including the testing of prototypes;

''(D) to establish and implement appropriate protocols for quality assurance of food products procured by the Secretary for food aid programs; and

''(E) to periodically update program guidelines on the recommended use of agricultural commodities and food products in food aid programs to reflect findings from the implementation of this subsection and other relevant information.'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''The Administrator'' and inserting ''In consultation with the Secretary, the Administrator''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking ''section 207(f)'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: ''section 207(f)—

''(A) for fiscal years 2009 through 2013, not more than $4,500,000 may be used to carry out this subsection; and

''(B) for fiscal years 2014 through 2018, not more than $1,000,000 may be used to carry out this subsection.''.

SEC. 3004. MINIMUM LEVELS OF ASSISTANCE.

Section 204(a) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1724(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3005. FOOD AID CONSULTATIVE GROUP.

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—Section 205(b) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1725(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (6);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

''(7) representatives from the United States agricultural processing sector involved in providing agricultural commodities for programs under this Act; and''.

(b) CONSULTATION.—Section 205(d) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1725(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following:

''(1) CONSULTATION IN ADVANCE OF ISSUANCE OF IMPLEMENTATION REGULATIONS, HANDBOOKS, AND GUIDELINES.—Not later than 45 days before a proposed regulation, handbook, or guideline implementing this title, or a proposed significant revision to a regulation, handbook, or guideline implementing this title, becomes final, the Administrator shall provide the proposal to the Group for review and comment.''; and

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

''(2) CONSULTATION REGARDING FOOD AID QUALITY EFFORTS.—The Administrator shall seek input from and consult with the Group on the implementation of section 202(h).''.

(c) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 205(f) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1725(f)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3006. OVERSIGHT, MONITORING, AND EVALUATION.

(a) REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE.—Section 207(c) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1726a(c)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting ''AND GUIDANCE'' after ''REGULATIONS'';

(2) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, the Administrator shall issue all regulations and revisions to agency guidance necessary to implement the amendments made to this title by such Act.''; and

(3) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''and guidance'' after ''develop regulations''.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 207(f) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1726a(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

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

(B) by striking ''; and'' at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting the period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (F);

(2) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(4) in paragraph (4) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''2012'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''2013, and up to $10,000,000 of such funds for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report describing—

(1) the implementation of section 207(c) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1726a(c));

(2) the surveys, studies, monitoring, reporting, and audit requirements for programs conducted under title II of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1721 et seq.) by an eligible organization that is a nongovernmental organization (as such term is defined in section 402 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1732)); and

(3) the surveys, studies, monitoring, reporting, and audit requirements for such programs by an eligible organization that is an intergovernmental organization, such as the World Food Program or other multilateral organization.

SEC. 3007. ASSISTANCE FOR STOCKPILING AND RAPID TRANSPORTATION, DELIVERY, AND DISTRIBUTION OF SHELF-STABLE PREPACKAGED FOODS.

Section 208(f) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1726b(f)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3008. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) IMPACT ON LOCAL FARMERS AND ECONOMY.—Section 403(b) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1733(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The Secretary or the Administrator, as appropriate, shall seek information, as part of the regular proposal and submission process, from implementing agencies on the potential benefits to the local economy of sales of agricultural commodities within the recipient country.''.

(b) PREVENTION OF PRICE DISRUPTIONS.—Section 403(e) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1733(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''reasonable market price'' and inserting ''fair market value''; and

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

''(3) COORDINATION ON ASSESSMENTS.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall coordinate in assessments to carry out paragraph (1) and in the development of approaches to be used by implementing agencies for determining the fair market value described in paragraph (2).''.

(c) REPORT ON USE OF FUNDS.—Section 403 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1733) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(m) REPORT ON USE OF FUNDS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report—

''(1) specifying the amount of funds (including funds for administrative costs, indirect cost recovery, and internal transportation, storage and handling, and associated distribution costs) provided to each eligible organization that received assistance under this Act in the previous fiscal year; and

''(2) describing how those funds were used by the eligible organization.''.

SEC. 3009. PREPOSITIONING OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES.

Section 407(c)(4) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736a(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(B) by striking ''for each such fiscal year not more than $10,000,000 of such funds'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2013 not more than $10,000,000 of such funds and for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 not more than $15,000,000 of such funds''; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(B) ADDITIONAL PREPOSITIONING SITES.—The Administrator may establish additional sites for prepositioning in foreign countries or change the location of current sites for prepositioning in foreign countries after conducting, and based on the results of, assessments of need, the availability of appropriate technology for long-term storage, feasibility, and cost.''.

SEC. 3010. ANNUAL REPORT REGARDING FOOD AID PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.

Section 407(f)(1) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736a(f)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''AGRICULTURAL TRADE'' and inserting ''FOOD AID'';

(2) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ''and the total number of beneficiaries of the project and the activities carried out through such project''; and

(3) in subparagraph (B)(iii)—

(A) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by inserting '', and the total number of beneficiaries in,'' after ''commodities made available to'';

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end of subclause (I);

(C) by inserting ''and'' at the end of subclause (II); and

(D) by inserting after subclause (II) the following new subclause:

''(III) the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program established by section 3107 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1736o-1);''.

SEC. 3011. DEADLINE FOR AGREEMENTS TO FINANCE SALES OR TO PROVIDE OTHER ASSISTANCE.

Section 408 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736b) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3012. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 412(a)(1) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736f(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''for fiscal year 2008 and each fiscal year thereafter, $2,500,000,000'' and inserting ''$2,500,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 and $2,000,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

(b) MINIMUM LEVEL OF NONEMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE.—Paragraph (1) of section 412(e) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736f(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) FUNDS AND COMMODITIES.—For each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, of the amounts made available to carry out emergency and nonemergency food assistance programs under title II, not less than $400,000,000 shall be expended for nonemergency food assistance programs under such title.''.

SEC. 3013. MICRONUTRIENT FORTIFICATION PROGRAMS.

(a) ELIMINATION OF OBSOLETE REFERENCE TO STUDY.—Section 415(a)(2)(B) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736g–2(a)(2)(B)) is amended by striking '', using recommendations'' and all that follows through ''quality enhancements''.

(b) EXTENSION.—Section 415(c) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736g–2(c)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3014. JOHN OGONOWSKI AND DOUG BEREUTER FARMER-TO-FARMER PROGRAM.

Section 501 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1737) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2013, and not less than the greater of $15,000,000 or 0.5 percent of the amounts made available for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018,''; and

(2) in subsection (e)(1), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

Subtitle B—Agricultural Trade Act of 1978

SEC. 3101. FUNDING FOR EXPORT CREDIT GUARANTEE PROGRAM.

Section 211(b) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5641(b)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3102. FUNDING FOR MARKET ACCESS PROGRAM.

Section 211(c)(1)(A) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5641(c)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3103. FOREIGN MARKET DEVELOPMENT COOPERATOR PROGRAM.

Section 703(a) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5723(a)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

Subtitle C—Other Agricultural Trade Laws

SEC. 3201. FOOD FOR PROGRESS ACT OF 1985.

(a) EXTENSION.—The Food for Progress Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1736o) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)(3), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018'';

(2) in subsection (g), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018'';

(3) in subsection (k), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(4) in subsection (l)(1), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) REPEAL OF COMPLETED PROJECT.—Subsection (f) of the Food for Progress Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1736o) is amended by striking paragraph (6).

SEC. 3202. BILL EMERSON HUMANITARIAN TRUST.

Section 302 of the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust Act (7 U.S.C. 1736f–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(B)(i), by striking ''2012'' both places it appears and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking ''2012'' both places it appears and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3203. PROMOTION OF AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO EMERGING MARKETS.

(a) DIRECT CREDITS OR EXPORT CREDIT GUARANTEES.—Section 1542(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–624; 7 U.S.C. 5622 note) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS.—Section 1542(d)(1)(A)(i) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–624; 7 U.S.C. 5622 note) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 3204. MCGOVERN-DOLE INTERNATIONAL FOOD FOR EDUCATION AND CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAM.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 3107(l)(2) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1736o–1(l)(2)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 3107(d) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1736o–1(d)) is amended by striking ''to'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1).

SEC. 3205. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SPECIALTY CROPS.

(a) PURPOSE.—Section 3205(b) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 5680(b)) is amended by striking ''related barriers to trade'' and inserting ''technical barriers to trade''.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 3205(e)(2) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 5680(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (C); and

(2) by striking subparagraphs (D) and (E) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(D) $9,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2018.''.

SEC. 3206. GLOBAL CROP DIVERSITY TRUST.

Section 3202(c) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 22 U.S.C. 2220a note) is amended by striking ''section'' and all that follows through the period and inserting the following: ''section—

''(1) $60,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; and

''(2) $50,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 3207. UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 is amended by inserting after section 225 (7 U.S.C. 6931) the following new section:

''SEC. 225A. UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary is authorized to establish in the Department the position of Under Secretary of Agriculture for Foreign Agricultural Services.

''(b) CONFIRMATION REQUIRED.—If the Secretary establishes the position of Under Secretary of Agriculture for Foreign Agricultural Services under subsection (a), the Under Secretary shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(c) FUNCTIONS OF UNDER SECRETARY.—

''(1) PRINCIPAL FUNCTIONS.—Upon establishment, the Secretary shall delegate to the Under Secretary of Agriculture for Foreign Agricultural Services those functions under the jurisdiction of the Department that are related to foreign agricultural services.

''(2) ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS.—The Under Secretary of Agriculture for Foreign Agricultural Services shall perform such other functions as may be required by law or prescribed by the Secretary.

''(d) SUCCESSION.—Any official who is serving as Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services on the date of the enactment of this section and who was appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall not be required to be reappointed under subsection (b) or section 225(b) to the successor position authorized under subsection (a) or section 225(a) if the Secretary establishes the position, and the official occupies the new position, with 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section (or such later date set by the Secretary if litigation delays rapid succession).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 225 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6931) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services'' each place it appears and inserting ''Under Secretary of Agriculture for Farm Services''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''and foreign agricultural''.

(c) PERMANENT AUTHORITY.—Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6)(C), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

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

''(8) the authority of the Secretary to establish in the Department the position of Under Secretary of Agriculture for Foreign Agricultural Services in accordance with section 225A;''.

TITLE IV—NUTRITION

Subtitle A—Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

SEC. 4001. PREVENTING PAYMENT OF CASH TO RECIPIENTS OF SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE BENEFITS FOR THE RETURN OF EMPTY BOTTLES AND CANS USED TO CONTAIN FOOD PURCHASED WITH BENEFITS PROVIDED UNDER THE PROGRAM.

Section 3(k)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(k)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and hot foods'' and inserting ''hot foods''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''and any deposit fee in excess of amount of the State fee reimbursement (if any) required to purchase any food or food product contained in a returnable bottle or can, regardless of whether such fee is included in the shelf price posted for such food or food product,''.

SEC. 4002. RETAILERS.

(a) DEFINITION OF RETAIL FOOD STORE.—Section 3(p)(1)(A) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(p)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''at least 2'' and inserting ''at least 3''.

(b) ALTERNATIVE BENEFIT DELIVERY.—Section 7(f) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) IMPOSITION OF COSTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall require participating retailers (including restaurants participating in a State option restaurant program intended to serve the elderly, disabled, and homeless) to pay 100 percent of the costs of acquiring, and arrange for the implementation of, electronic benefit transfer point-of-sale equipment and supplies.

''(B) EXEMPTIONS.—The Secretary may exempt from subparagraph (A)—

''(i) farmers' markets and other direct-to-consumer markets, military commissaries, nonprofit food buying cooperatives, and establishments, organizations, programs, or group living arrangements described in paragraphs (5), (7), and (8) of section 3(k); and

''(ii) establishments described in paragraphs (3), (4), and (9) of section 3(k), other than restaurants participating in a State option restaurant program.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) TERMINATION OF MANUAL VOUCHERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective beginning on the effective date of this paragraph, except as provided in subparagraph (B), no State shall issue manual vouchers to a household that receives supplemental nutrition assistance under this Act or allow retailers to accept manual vouchers as payment, unless the Secretary determines that the manual vouchers are necessary, such as in the event of an electronic benefit transfer system failure or a disaster situation.

''(B) EXEMPTIONS.—The Secretary may exempt categories of retailers or individual retailers from subparagraph (A) based on criteria established by the Secretary.

''(5) UNIQUE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER REQUIRED.—In an effort to enhance the antifraud protections of the program, the Secretary shall require all parties providing electronic benefit transfer services to provide for and maintain a unique business identification and a unique terminal identification number information through the supplemental nutrition assistance program electronic benefit transfer transaction routing system. In developing the regulations implementing this paragraph, the Secretary shall consider existing commercial practices for other point-of-sale debit transactions. The Secretary shall issue proposed regulations implementing this paragraph not earlier than 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph.''.

(c) ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSFERS.—Section 7(h)(3)(B) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)(3)(B)) is amended by striking ''is operational—'' and all that follows through ''(ii) in the case of other participating stores,'' and inserting ''is operational''.

(d) APPROVAL OF RETAIL FOOD STORES AND WHOLESALE FOOD CONCERNS.—Section 9 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2018) is amended—

(1) in the 2d sentence of subsection (a)(1) by striking ''; and (C)'' and inserting ''; (C) whether the applicant is located in an area with significantly limited access to food; and (D)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(g) EBT SERVICE REQUIREMENT.—An approved retail food store shall provide adequate EBT service as described in section 7(h)(3)(B).''.

SEC. 4003. ENHANCING SERVICES TO ELDERLY AND DISABLED SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.

(a) ENHANCING SERVICES TO ELDERLY AND DISABLED PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.—Section 3(p) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(p)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by striking ''and'' at the end,

(2) in paragraph (4) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and'', and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) a governmental or private nonprofit food purchasing and delivery service that—

''(A) purchases food for, and delivers such food to, individuals who are—

''(i) unable to shop for food; and

''(ii)(I) not less than 60 years of age; or

''(II) physically or mentally handicapped or otherwise disabled;

''(B) clearly notifies the participating household at the time such household places a food order—

''(i) of any delivery fee associated with the food purchase and delivery provided to such household by such service; and

''(ii) that a delivery fee cannot be paid with benefits provided under supplemental nutrition assistance program; and

''(C) sells food purchased for such household at the price paid by such service for such food and without any additional cost markup.''.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) ISSUANCE OF RULES.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall issue regulations that—

(A) establish criteria to identify a food purchasing and delivery service referred to in section 3(p)(5) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 as amended by this Act, and

(B) establish procedures to ensure that such service—

(i) does not charge more for a food item than the price paid by the such service for such food item,

(ii) offers food delivery service at no or low cost to households under such Act,

(iii) ensures that benefits provided under the supplemental nutrition assistance program are used only to purchase food, as defined in section 3 of such Act,

(iv) limits the purchase of food, and the delivery of such food, to households eligible to receive services described in section 3(p)(5) of such Act as so amended,

(v) has established adequate safeguards against fraudulent activities, including unauthorized use of electronic benefit cards issued under such Act, and

(vi) such other requirements as the Secretary deems to be appropriate.

(2) LIMITATION.—Before the issuance of rules under paragraph (1) , the Secretary of Agriculture may not approve more than 20 food purchasing and delivery services referred to in section 3(p)(5) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 as amended by this Act, to participate as retail food stores under the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

SEC. 4004. FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS.

Section 4(b)(6)(F) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b)(6)(F)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 4005. UPDATING PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY.

Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(1) in the 2d sentence of subsection (a) by striking ''households in which each member receives benefits'' and inserting ''households in which each member receives cash assistance'', and

(2) in subsection (j) by striking ''or who receives benefits under a State program'' and inserting ''or who receives cash assistance under a State program''.

SEC. 4006. EXCLUSION OF MEDICAL MARIJUANA FROM EXCESS MEDICAL EXPENSE DEDUCTION.

Section 5(e)(5) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(e)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) EXCLUSION OF MEDICAL MARIJUANA.—The Secretary shall promulgate rules to ensure that medical marijuana is not treated as a medical expense for purposes of this paragraph.''.

SEC. 4007. STANDARD UTILITY ALLOWANCES BASED ON THE RECEIPT OF ENERGY ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS.

(a) STANDARD UTILITY ALLOWANCES IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Section 5(e)(6)(C) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(e)(6)(C)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i) by inserting '', subject to clause (iv)'' after ''Secretary''; and

(2) by striking subclause (I) of clause (iv) and inserting the following:

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subclause (II), if a State agency elects to use a standard utility allowance that reflects heating and cooling costs, the standard utility allowance shall be made available to households that received a payment, or on behalf of which a payment was made, under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.) or other similar energy assistance program, if in the current month or in the immediately preceding 12 months, the household either received such payment, or such payment was made on behalf of the household, that was greater than $20 annually, as determined by the Secretary.''; and

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2605(f)(2)(A) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8624(f)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', except that, for purposes of the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), such payments or allowances were greater than $20 annually, consistent with section 5(e)(6)(C)(iv)(I) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 2014(e)(6)(C)(iv)(I)), as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE AND IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013, and shall apply with respect to certification periods that begin after such date.

(2) STATE OPTION TO DELAY IMPLEMENTATION FOR CURRENT RECIPIENTS.—A State may, at the option of the State, implement a policy that eliminates or reduces the effect of the amendments made by this section on households that received a standard utility allowance as of the date of enactment of this Act, for not more than a 180-day period that begins on the date on which such amendments would otherwise apply to the respective household.

SEC. 4008. ELIGIBILITY DISQUALIFICATIONS.

Section 6(e)(3)(B) of Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(e)(3)(B)) is amended by striking ''section;'' and inserting the following: ''section, subject to the condition that the course or program of study—''

''(i) is part of a program of career and technical education (as defined in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302)) that may be completed in not more than 4 years at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)); or

''(ii) is limited to remedial courses, basic adult education, literacy, or English as a second language;''.

SEC. 4009. ENDING SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS FOR LOTTERY OR GAMBLING WINNERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(r) INELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS DUE TO RECEIPT OF SUBSTANTIAL LOTTERY OR GAMBLING WINNINGS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any household in which a member receives substantial lottery or gambling winnings, as determined by the Secretary, shall lose eligibility for benefits immediately upon receipt of the winnings.

''(2) DURATION OF INELIGIBILITY.—A household described in paragraph (1) shall remain ineligible for participation until the household meets the allowable financial resources and income eligibility requirements under subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (i), (k), (l), (m), and (n) of section 5.

''(3) AGREEMENTS.—As determined by the Secretary, each State agency, to the maximum extent practicable, shall establish agreements with entities responsible for the regulation or sponsorship of gaming in the State to determine whether individuals participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program have received substantial lottery or gambling winnings.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 5(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(a)) is amended in the 2d sentence by striking ''sections 6(b), 6(d)(2), and 6(g)'' and inserting ''subsections (b), (d)(2), (g), and (r) of section 6''.

SEC. 4010. IMPROVING SECURITY OF FOOD ASSISTANCE.

Section 7(h)(8) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)(8)) is amended—

(1) in the heading by striking ''CARD FEE'' and inserting ''OF CARDS'';

(2) by striking ''A State'' and inserting the following:

''(A) FEES.—A State''; and

(3) by adding after subparagraph (A) (as so designated by paragraph (2)) the following:

''(B) PURPOSEFUL LOSS OF CARDS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to terms and conditions established by the Secretary in accordance with clause (ii), if a household makes excessive requests for replacement of the electronic benefit transfer card of the household, the Secretary may require a State agency to decline to issue a replacement card to the household unless the household, upon request of the State agency, provides an explanation for the loss of the card.

''(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—The terms and conditions established by the Secretary shall provide that—

''(I) the household be given the opportunity to provide the requested explanation and meet the requirements under this paragraph promptly;

''(II) after an excessive number of lost cards, the head of the household shall be required to review program rights and responsibilities with State agency personnel authorized to make determinations under section 5(a); and

''(III) any action taken, including actions required under section 6(b)(2), other than the withholding of the electronic benefit transfer card until an explanation described in subclause (I) is provided, shall be consistent with the due process protections under section 6(b) or 11(e)(10), as appropriate.

''(C) PROTECTING VULNERABLE PERSONS.—In implementing this paragraph, a State agency shall act to protect homeless persons, persons with disabilities, victims of crimes, and other vulnerable persons who lose electronic benefit transfer cards but are not intentionally committing fraud.

''(D) EFFECT ON ELIGIBILITY.—While a State may decline to issue an electronic benefits transfer card until a household satisfies the requirements under this paragraph, nothing in this paragraph shall be considered a denial of, or limitation on, the eligibility for benefits under section 5.''.

SEC. 4011. DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS ON ACCEPTANCE OF BENEFITS OF MOBILE TRANSACTIONS.

Section 7(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(14) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS ON ACCEPTANCE OF BENEFITS OF MOBILE TRANSACTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall pilot the use of mobile technologies determined by the Secretary to be appropriate to test the feasibility and implications for program integrity, by allowing retail food stores, farmers markets, and other direct producer-to-consumer marketing outlets to accept benefits from recipients of supplemental nutrition assistance through mobile transactions.

''(B) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—To be eligible to participate in a demonstration project under subsection (a), a retail food store, farmers market, or other direct producer-to-consumer marketing outlet shall submit to the Secretary for approval a plan that includes—

''(i) a description of the technology;

''(ii) the manner by which the retail food store, farmers market or other direct producer-to-consumer marketing outlet will provide proof of the transaction to households;

''(iii) the provision of data to the Secretary, consistent with requirements established by the Secretary, in a manner that allows the Secretary to evaluate the impact of the demonstration on participant access, ease of use, and program integrity; and

''(iv) such other criteria as the Secretary may require.

''(C) DATE OF COMPLETION.—The demonstration projects under this paragraph shall be completed and final reports submitted to the Secretary by not later than July 1, 2016.

''(D) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate that includes a finding, based on the data provided under subparagraph (C) whether or not implementation in all States is in the best interest of the supplemental nutrition assistance program.''.

SEC. 4012. USE OF BENEFITS FOR PURCHASE OF COMMUNITY-SUPPORTED AGRICULTURE SHARE.

Section 10 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2019) is amended in the 1st sentence by inserting ''agricultural producers who market agricultural products directly to consumers shall be authorized to redeem benefits for the initial cost of the purchase of a community-supported agriculture share,'' after ''food so purchased,''.

SEC. 4013. RESTAURANT MEALS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 11(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (22) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (23)(C) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(24) if the State elects to carry out a program to contract with private establishments to offer meals at concessional prices, as described in paragraphs (3), (4), and (9) of section 3(k)—

''(A) the plans of the State agency for operating the program, including—

''(i) documentation of a need that eligible homeless, elderly, and disabled clients are underserved in a particular geographic area;

''(ii) the manner by which the State agency will limit participation to only those private establishments that the State determines necessary to meet the need identified in clause (i); and

''(iii) any other conditions the Secretary may prescribe, such as the level of security necessary to ensure that only eligible recipients participate in the program; and

''(B) a report by the State agency to the Secretary annually, the schedule of which shall be established by the Secretary, that includes—

''(i) the number of households and individual recipients authorized to participate in the program, including any information on whether the individual recipient is elderly, disabled, or homeless; and

''(ii) an assessment of whether the program is meeting an established need, as documented under subparagraph (A)(i).''.

(b) APPROVAL OF RETAIL FOOD STORES AND WHOLESALE FOOD CONCERNS.—Section 9 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2018) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) PRIVATE ESTABLISHMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), no private establishment that contracts with a State agency to offer meals at concessional prices as described in paragraphs (3), (4), and (9) of section 3(k) may be authorized to accept and redeem benefits unless the Secretary determines that the participation of the private establishment is required to meet a documented need in accordance with section 11(e)(24).

''(2) EXISTING CONTRACTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If, on the day before the effective date of this subsection, a State has entered into a contract with a private establishment described in paragraph (1) and the Secretary has not determined that the participation of the private establishment is necessary to meet a documented need in accordance with section 11(e)(24), the Secretary shall allow the operation of the private establishment to continue without that determination of need for a period not to exceed 180 days from the date on which the Secretary establishes determination criteria, by regulation, under section 11(e)(24).

''(B) JUSTIFICATION.—If the Secretary determines to terminate a contract with a private establishment that is in effect on the effective date of this subsection, the Secretary shall provide justification to the State in which the private establishment is located for that termination.

''(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after September 30, 2014, and 90 days after the last day of each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate on the effectiveness of a program under this subsection using any information received from States under section 11(e)(24) as well as any other information the Secretary may have relating to the manner in which benefits are used.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3(k) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(k)) is amended by inserting ''subject to section 9(h)'' after ''concessional prices'' each place it appears.

SEC. 4014. MANDATING STATE IMMIGRATION VERIFICATION.

Section 11(p) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(p)) is amended to read as follows:

''(p) STATE VERIFICATION OPTION.—In carrying out the supplemental nutrition assistance program, a State agency shall be required to use an income and eligibility, or an immigration status, verification system established under section 1137 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b–7), in accordance with standards set by the Secretary.''.

SEC. 4015. DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDIZATION FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.

(a) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDIZATION.—Section 11 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(v) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDIZATION FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.—

''(1) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS.—

''(A) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with an interagency work group which shall be established by the Office of Management and Budget, and considering State perspectives, shall, by rule, designate a data exchange standard for any category of information required to be reported under this Act.

''(B) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS MUST BE NONPROPRIETARY AND INTEROPERABLE.—The data exchange standard designated under subparagraph (A) shall, to the extent practicable, be nonproprietary and interoperable.

''(C) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—In designating data exchange standards under this subsection, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate—

''(i) interoperable standards developed and maintained by an international voluntary consensus standards body, as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, such as the International Organization for Standardization;

''(ii) interoperable standards developed and maintained by intergovernmental partnerships, such as the National Information Exchange Model; and

''(iii) interoperable standards developed and maintained by Federal entities with authority over contracting and financial assistance, such as the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council.

''(2) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS FOR REPORTING.—

''(A) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with an interagency work group established by the Office of Management and Budget, and considering State perspectives, shall, by rule, designate data exchange standards to govern the data reporting required under this part.

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The data exchange standards required by subparagraph (A) shall, to the extent practicable—

''(i) incorporate a widely-accepted, nonproprietary, searchable, computer-readable format;

''(ii) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles; and

''(iii) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary.

''(C) INCORPORATION OF NONPROPRIETARY STANDARDS.—In designating reporting standards under this subsection, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate existing nonproprietary standards, such as the eXtensible Markup Language.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall issue a proposed rule under section 11(v)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 within 12 months after the effective date of this section, and shall issue a final rule under such section after public comment, within 24 months after such effective date.

(2) DATA REPORTING STANDARDS.—The reporting standards required under section 11(v)(2) of such Act shall become effective with respect to reports required in the first reporting period, after the effective date of the final rule referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, for which the authority for data collection and reporting is established or renewed under the Paperwork Reduction Act.

SEC. 4016. PILOT PROJECTS TO IMPROVE FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION IN IDENTIFYING AND REDUCING FRAUD IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 12 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2021) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) PILOT PROJECTS TO IMPROVE FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION IN IDENTIFYING AND REDUCING FRAUD IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out, under such terms and conditions as determined by the Secretary, pilot projects to test innovative Federal-State partnerships to identify, investigate, and reduce retailer fraud in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, including allowing States to operate retail Food Store investigation programs.

''(2) SELECTION CRITERIA.—Pilot projects shall be selected based on criteria the Secretary establishes, which shall include—

''(A) enhancing existing efforts by the Secretary to reduce retailer fraud;

''(B) requiring participant States to maintain their overall level of effort at addressing recipient fraud, as determined by the Secretary, prior to participation in the pilot project;

''(C) collaborating with other law enforcement authorities as necessary to carry out an effective pilot project;

''(D) commitment of the participant State agency to follow Federal rules and procedures with respect to retailer investigations; and

''(E) the extent to which a State has committed resources to recipient fraud and the relative success of those efforts.

''(3) EVALUATION.—

''(A) The Secretary shall evaluate the projects selected under this subsection to measure the impact of the pilot projects.

''(B) Such evaluation shall include—

''(i) each pilot project's impact on increasing the Secretary's capacity to address retailer fraud;

''(ii) the effectiveness of the pilot projects in identifying, preventing and reducing retailer fraud; and

''(iii) the cost effectiveness of such pilot projects.

''(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than September 30, 2017, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry of the Senate, a report that includes a description of the results of each pilot project, including an evaluation of the impact of the project on retailer fraud and the costs associated with each pilot project.

''(5) FUNDING.—Any costs incurred by the State to operate the pilot projects in excess of the amount expended under this Act for retailer fraud in the respective State in the previous fiscal year shall not be eligible for Federal reimbursement under this Act.''.

SEC. 4017. PROHIBITING GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) ADMINISTRATIVE COST-SHARING AND QUALITY CONTROL.—Section 16(a)(4) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(a)(4)) is amended by inserting after ''recruitment activities'' the following: ''designed to persuade an individual to apply for program benefits or that promote the program via television, radio, or billboard advertisements''.

(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED UNDER ACT.—Section 18 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) BAN ON RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTION ACTIVITIES.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), no funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act shall be used by the Secretary for—

''(A) recruitment activities designed to persuade an individual to apply for supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits;

''(B) television, radio, or billboard advertisements that are designed to promote supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits and enrollment; or

''(C) any agreements with foreign governments designed to promote supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits and enrollment.

''(2) Paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply to programmatic activities undertaken with respect to benefits made available in response to a natural disaster.''.

(c) BAN ON RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES BY ENTITIES THAT RECEIVE FUNDS.—Section 18 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027) is amended by adding at the end the following :

''(h) BAN ON RECRUITMENT BY ENTITIES THAT RECEIVE FUNDS.—The Secretary shall issue regulations that forbid entities that receive funds under this Act to compensate any person for conducting outreach activities relating to participation in, or for recruiting individuals to apply to receive benefits under, the supplemental nutrition assistance program if the amount of such compensation would be based on the number of individuals who apply to receive such benefits.''.

SEC. 4018. REPEAL OF BONUS PROGRAM.

Section 16(d) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(d)) is repealed.

SEC. 4019. FUNDING OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.

Section 16(h)(1)(A) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(h)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''$90,000,000'' and all that follows through ''$79,000,000'', and inserting ''$79,000,000 for each fiscal year''.

SEC. 4020. MONITORING EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.

(a) REPORTING MEASURES.—Section 16(h)(5) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(h)(5)) is amended to read:

''(5)(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall monitor the employment and training programs carried out by State agencies under section 6(d)(4) and assess their effectiveness in—

''(i) preparing members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program for employment, including the acquisition of basic skills necessary for employment; and

''(ii) increasing the numbers of household members who obtain and retain employment subsequent to their participation in such employment and training programs.

''(B) REPORTING MEASURES.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall develop reporting measures that identify improvements in the skills, training education or work experience of members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program. Measures shall be based on common measures of performance for federal workforce training programs, so long as they reflect the challenges facing the types of members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program who participate in a specific employment and training component. The Secretary shall require that each State employment and training plan submitted under section 11(3)(19) identify appropriate reporting measures for each of their proposed components that serve at least 100 people. Such measures may include:

''(i) the percentage and number of program participants who received employment and training services and are in unsubsidized employment subsequent to the receipt of those services;

''(ii) the percentage and number of program participants who obtain a recognized postsecondary credential, including a registered apprenticeship, or a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, while participating in or within 1 year after receiving employment and training services;

''(iii) the percentage and number of program participants who are in an education or training program that is intended to lead to a recognized postsecondary credential, including a registered apprenticeship or on-the-job training program, a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, or unsubsidized employment;

''(iv) subject to the terms and conditions set by the Secretary, measures developed by each State agency to assess the skills acquisition of employment and training program participants that reflect the goals of their specific employment and training program components, which may include, but are not limited to—

''(I) the percentage and number of program participants who are meeting program requirements in each component of the State's education and training program; and

''(II) the percentage and number of program participants who are gaining skills likely to lead to employment as measured through testing, quantitative or qualitative assessment or other method; and

''(v) other indicators as approved by the Secretary.

''(C) STATE REPORT.—Each State agency shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report on the State's employment and training program that includes the numbers of supplemental nutrition assistance program participants who have gained skills, training, work or experience that will increase their ability to obtain regular employment using measures identified in subparagraph (B).

''(D) MODIFICATIONS TO THE STATE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PLAN.—Subject to the terms and conditions established by the Secretary, if the Secretary determines that the state agency's performance with respect to employment and training outcomes is inadequate, the Secretary may require the State agency to make modifications to their employment and training plan to improve such outcomes.

''(E) PERIODIC EVALUATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to terms and conditions established by the Secretary, not later than October 1, 2016, and not less frequently than once every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary shall conduct a study to review existing practice and research to identify employment and training program components and practices that—

''(I) effectively assist members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program in gaining skills, training, work, or experience that will increase their ability to obtain regular employment, and

''(II) are best integrated with statewide workforce development systems.

''(ii) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit a report that describes the results of the study under clause (i) to the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry in the Senate.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Notwithstanding section 4(c) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(a)), the Secretary shall issue interim final regulations implementing the amendment made by subsection (a) no later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act. States shall include such reporting measures in their employment and training plans for the 1st fiscal year thereafter that begins no sooner than 6 months after the date that such regulations are published.

SEC. 4021. COOPERATION WITH PROGRAM RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.

Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(l) COOPERATION WITH PROGRAM RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—States, State agencies, local agencies, institutions, facilities such as data consortiums, and contractors participating in programs authorized under this Act shall cooperate with officials and contractors acting on behalf of the Secretary in the conduct of evaluations and studies under this Act and shall submit information at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require.''.

SEC. 4022. PILOT PROJECTS TO REDUCE DEPENDENCY AND INCREASE WORK EFFORT IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026), as amended by section 4021, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) PILOT PROJECTS TO REDUCE DEPENDENCY AND INCREASE WORK EFFORT IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers to be appropriate, pilot projects to identify best practices for employment and training programs under this Act to raise the number of work registrants who obtain unsubsidized employment, increase their earned income, and reduce their reliance on public assistance, including but not limited to the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

''(2) SELECTION CRITERIA.—Pilot projects shall be selected based on criteria the Secretary establishes, that shall include—

''(A) enhancing existing employment and training programs in the State;

''(B) agreeing to participate in the evaluation described in paragraph (3), including making

available data on participants' employment activities and post-participation employment, earnings, and public benefit receipt;

''(C) collaborating with the State workforce board and other job training programs in the State and local area;

''(D) the extent to which the pilot project's components can be easily replicated by other States or political subdivisions; and

''(E) such additional criteria that ensure that the pilot projects—

''(i) target a variety of populations of work registrants, including childless adults, parents, and individuals with low skills or limited work experience;

''(ii) are selected from a range of existing employment and training programs including programs that provide—

''(I) section 20 workfare;

''(II) skills development for work registrants with limited employment history;

''(III) post-employment support services necessary for maintaining employment; and

''(IV) education leading to a recognized post-secondary credential, registered apprenticeship, or secondary school diploma or its equivalent;

''(iii) are located in a range of geographic areas, including rural, urban, and Indian reservations; and

''(iv) include participants who are exempt and not exempt under section (6)(d)(2).

''(3) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall provide for an independent evaluation of projects selected under this subsection to measure the impact of the pilot projects on the ability of each pilot project target population to find and retain employment that leads to increased household income and reduced dependency, compared to what would have occurred in the absence of the pilot project.

''(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—By September 30, 2017, the Secretary shall submit, to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, a report that includes a description of—

''(A) the results of each pilot project, including an evaluation of the impact of the project on the employment, income, and public benefit receipt of the targeted population of work registrants;

''(B) the Federal, State, and other costs of each pilot project;

''(C) the planned dissemination of the reports' findings with State agencies; and

''(D) the steps and funding necessary to incorporate components of pilot projects that demonstrate increased employment and earnings into State employment and training programs.

''(5) FUNDING.—From amounts made available to under section 18(a)(1), the Secretary shall make $10,000,000 available for each of the fiscal years 2014, 2015, and 2016 to carry out this subsection. Such amounts shall remain available until expended.

''(6) USE OF FUNDS.—

''(A) Funds provided under this subsection for pilot projects shall be used only for—

''(i) pilot projects that comply with the provisions of this Act;

''(ii) the costs and administration of the pilot projects;

''(iii) the costs incurred in providing information and data to the independent evaluation under paragraph (3); and

''(iv) the costs of the evaluation under paragraph (3).

''(B) Funds made available under this subsection may not be used to supplant non-Federal funds used for existing employment and training activities.''.

SEC. 4023. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 18(a)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027(a)(1)) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 4024. LIMITATION ON USE OF BLOCK GRANT TO PUERTO RICO.

Section 19(a)(2)(B) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2028(a)(2)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under this subparagraph may be used to provide nutrition assistance in the form of cash benefits.''.

SEC. 4025. ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITY FOOD PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 25(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2034(a)(1)(B)(i)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (II) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subclause (III) by striking ''or'' at the end and inserting ''and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(IV) to provide incentives for the consumption of fruits and vegetables among low-income individuals; or''.

(b) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—Section 25(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2034) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) FUNDING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary to carry out this section not less than $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter. Of the amount made available under this subparagraph for each such fiscal year, $5,000,000 shall be available to carry out subsection (a)(1)(B)(I)(IV).

''(B) RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE.—The Secretary shall be entitled to receive, shall accept, and shall use to carry out this section, the funds transferred under subparagraph (A) without further appropriation.

''(C) MAINTENANCE OF FUNDING.—The funding provided under subparagraph (A) shall supplement (and not supplant) other Federal funding made available to the Secretary to carry out this section.''.

SEC. 4026. EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE.

(a) PURCHASE OF COMMODITIES.—Section 27(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''2013 through 2018'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

''(A) for fiscal year 2013, $265,750,000;

''(B) for fiscal year 2014 the dollar amount of commodities specified in subparagraph (A) adjusted by the percentage by which the thrifty food plan has been adjusted under section 3(u)(4) between June 30, 2012 and June 30, 2013, and subsequently increased by $20,000,000;''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking ''2010 through 2012, the dollar amount of commodities specified in'' and inserting ''2015 through 2018, the total amount of commodities under''; and

(ii) by striking ''2008'' and inserting ''2013''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) FUNDS AVAILABILITY.—For purposes of the funds described in this subsection, the Secretary shall—

''(A) make the funds available for 2 fiscal years; and

''(B) allow States to carry over unexpended balances to the next fiscal year pursuant to such terms and conditions as are determined by the Secretary.''.

(b) EMERGENCY FOOD PROGRAM INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS.—Section 209(d) of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7511a(d)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 4027. NUTRITION EDUCATION.

Section 28 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by inserting ''and physical activity'' after ''healthy food choices''; and

(2) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (D) by striking ''$401,000,000;'' and inserting ''$375,000,000; and'';

(B) by striking subparagraph (E); and

(C) in subparagraph (F) by striking ''(F) for fiscal year 2016'' and inserting ''(E) for fiscal year 2015''.

SEC. 4028. RETAILER TRAFFICKING.

The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 29. RETAILER TRAFFICKING.

''(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide the Department of Agriculture with additional resources to prevent trafficking in violation of this Act by strengthening recipient and retailer program integrity. Additional funds are provided to supplement the Department's payment accuracy, and retailer and recipient integrity activities.

''(b) FUNDING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary to carry out this section not less than $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter.

''(2) RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE.—The Secretary shall be entitled to receive, shall accept, and shall use to carry out this section the funds transferred under paragraph (1) without further appropriation.

''(3) MAINTENANCE OF FUNDING.—The funding provided under paragraph (1) shall supplement (and not supplant) other Federal funding for programs carried out under this Act.''.

SEC. 4029. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g) by striking ''coupon,'' the last place it appears and inserting ''coupon'';

(2) in subsection (k)(7) by striking ''or are'' and inserting ''and'';

(3) by striking subsection (l);

(4) by redesignating subsections (m) through (t) as subsections (l) through (s), respectively; and

(5) by inserting after subsection (s) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(t) 'Supplemental nutritional assistance program' means the program operated pursuant to this Act.''.

(b) Section 4(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(a)) is amended by striking ''benefits'' the last place it appears and inserting ''Benefits''.

(c) Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(1) in the last sentence of subsection (i)(2)(D) by striking ''section 13(b)(2)'' and inserting ''section 13(b)''; and

(2) in subsection (k)(4)(A) by striking ''paragraph (2)(H)'' and inserting ''paragraph (2)(G)''.

(d) Section 6(d)(4) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(d)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(vii) by moving the left margin 4 ems to the left, and

(2) in subparagraph (F)(iii) by moving the left margin 6 ems to the left.

(e) Section 7(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)) is amended by redesignating the 2d paragraph (12) as paragraph (13).

(f) Section 12 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2021) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3)(C) by striking ''civil money penalties'' and inserting ''civil penalties''; and

(2) in subsection (g)(1) by striking ''(7 U.S.C. 1786)'' and inserting ''(42 U.S.C. 1786)''.

(g) Section 15(b)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2024(b)(1)) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking ''an benefit'' both places it appears and inserting ''a benefit''.

(h) Section 16(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(a)) is amended in the proviso following paragraph (8) by striking '', *as amended.''.*

(i) Section 18(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027(e)) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking ''sections 7(f)'' and inserting ''section 7(f)''.

(j) Section 22(b)(10)(B)(i) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2031(b)(10)(B)(i)) is amended in the last sentence by striking ''Food benefits'' and inserting ''Benefits''.

(k) Section 26(f)(3)(C) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2035(f)(3)(C)) is amended by striking ''subsection'' and inserting ''subsections''.

(l) Section 27(a)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''(Public Law 98–8; 7 U.S.C. 612c note)'' and inserting ''(7 U.S.C. 7515)''.

(m) Section 509 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056g) is amended in the section heading by striking ''**FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS**'' *and inserting* ''**SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM**''.

(n) Section 4115(c)(2)(H) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1871) is amended by striking ''531'' and inserting ''454''.

(o) Section 3803(c)(2)(C)(vii) of title 31 of the United States Code is amended by striking ''section 3(l)'' and inserting ''section 3(s)''.

(p) Section 115 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–193) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2) by striking ''section 3(l)'' and inserting ''section 3(s)'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2) by striking ''section 3(l)'' and inserting ''section 3(s)''; and

(3) in subsection (e)(2) by striking ''section 3(l)'' and inserting ''section 3(s)''.

(q) The Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c) is amended—

(1) in section 4(a) by striking ''Food Stamp Act of 1977'' and inserting ''Food and Nutrition Act of 2008''; and

(2) in section 5—

(A) in subsection (i)(1) by striking ''Food Stamp Act of 1977'' and inserting ''Food and Nutrition Act of 2008''; and

(B) in subsection (l)(2)(B) by striking ''Food Stamp Act of 1977'' and inserting ''Food and Nutrition Act of 2008''.

(r) The Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the heading of section 453(j)(10) by striking ''FOOD STAMP'' and inserting ''SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE'';

(2) in section 1137—

(A) in subsection (a)(5)(B) by striking ''food stamp'' and inserting ''supplemental nutrition assistance''; and

(B) in subsection (b)(4) by striking ''food stamp program under the Food Stamp Act of 1977'' and inserting ''supplemental nutrition assistance program under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008''; and

(3) in the heading of section 1631(n) by striking ''FOOD STAMP'' and inserting ''SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE''.

SEC. 4030. TOLERANCE LEVEL FOR EXCLUDING SMALL ERRORS.

The Secretary shall set the tolerance level for excluding small errors for the purposes of section 16(c) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(c))—

(1) for fiscal year 2014 at an amount no greater than $25; and

(2) for each fiscal year thereafter, the amount specified in paragraph (1) adjusted by the percentage by which the thrifty food plan is adjusted under section 3(u)(4) of such Act between June 30, 2012, and June 30 of the immediately preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 4031. COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Prior to establishing the pilot program under subsection (b), the Secretary shall conduct a study to be completed not later than 2 years after the effective date of this section to assess—

(A) the capabilities of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to operate the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the same manner in which the program is operated in the States (as defined in section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq)); and

(B) alternative models of the supplemental nutrition assistance program operation and benefit delivery that best meet the nutrition assistance needs of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(2) SCOPE.—The study conducted under paragraph (1)(A) will assess the capability of the Commonwealth to fulfill the responsibilities of a State agency, including—

(A) extending and limiting participation to eligible households, as prescribed by sections 5 and 6 of the Act;

(B) issuing benefits through EBT cards, as prescribed by section 7 of the Act;

(C) maintaining the integrity of the program, including operation of a quality control system, as prescribed by section 16(c) of the Act;

(D) implementing work requirements, including operating an employment and training program, as prescribed by section 6(d) of the Act; and

(E) paying a share of administrative costs with non-Federal funds, as prescribed by section 16(a) of the Act.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—If the Secretary determines that a pilot program is feasible, the Secretary shall establish a pilot program for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to operate the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the same manner in which the program is operated in the States.

(c) SCOPE.—The Secretary shall utilize the information obtained from the study conducted under subsection (a) to establish the scope of the pilot program established under subsection (b).

(d) REPORT.—Not later than June 30, 2019, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on the pilot program carried out under this section, including an analysis of the feasibility of operating in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands the supplemental nutrition assistance program as it is operated in the States.

(e) FUNDING.—

(1) STUDY.—Of the funds made available under section 18(a)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, the Secretary may use not more than $1,000,000 in each of fiscal years 2014 and 2015 to conduct the study described in subsection (a).

(2) PILOT PROGRAM.—Of the funds made available under section 18(a)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, for the purposes of establishing and carrying out the pilot program established under subsection (b) of this section, including the Federal costs for providing technical assistance to the Commonwealth, authorizing and monitoring retail food stores, and assessing pilot operations, the Secretary may use not more than—

(A) $13,500,000 in fiscal year 2016; and

(B) $8,500,000 in each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018.

SEC. 4032. ANNUAL STATE REPORT ON VERIFICATION OF SNAP PARTICIPATION.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later 1 year after the date specified by the Secretary in the 180-period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, each State agency that carries out the supplemental nutrition assistance program shall submit to the Secretary a report containing sufficient information for the Secretary to determine whether the State agency has, for the then most recently concluded fiscal year preceding such annual date, verified that households to which such State agency provided such assistance in such fiscal year—

(1) did not obtain benefits attributable to a deceased individual;

(2) did not include an individual who was simultaneously included in a household receiving such assistance in another State; and

(3) did not include, during the time benefits were provided, an individual who was then disqualified from receiving benefits.

(b) PENALTY FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—For any fiscal year for which a State agency fails to comply with subsection (a), the Secretary shall reduce by 50 percent the amount otherwise payable to such State agency under section 16(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 with respect to such fiscal year.

Subtitle B—Commodity Distribution Programs

SEC. 4101. COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM.

Section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note; Public Law 93–86) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 4102. COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM.

Section 5 of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note; Public Law 93–86) is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1) and (2)(B) of subsection (a) by striking ''2012'' each place it appears and inserting ''2018'';

(2) in the 1st sentence of subsection (d)(2) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018'';

(3) by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following:

''(g) ELIGIBILITY.—Except as provided in subsection (m), the States shall only provide assistance under the commodity supplemental food program to low-income individuals aged 60 and older.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(m) PHASE-OUT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an individual who receives assistance under the commodity supplemental food program on the day before the effective date of this subsection shall continue to receive that assistance until the date on which the individual no longer qualifies for assistance under the eligibility criteria for the program in effect on the day before the effective date of this subsection.''.

SEC. 4103. DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES TO SPECIAL NUTRITION PROJECTS.

Section 1114(a)(2)(A) of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 1431e(2)(A)) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 4104. PROCESSING OF COMMODITIES.

(a) Section 17 of the Commodity Distribution Reform Act and WIC Amendments of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 612c note) is amended by—

(1) striking the heading and inserting ''**COMMODITY DONATIONS AND PROCESSING**''*; and*

(2) adding at the end the following:

''(c) PROCESSING.—For any program included in subsection (b), the Secretary may, notwithstanding any other provision of State or Federal law relating to the procurement of goods and services—

''(1) retain title to commodities delivered to a processor, on behalf of a State (including a State distributing agency and a recipient agency), until such time as end products containing such commodities, or similar commodities as approved by the Secretary, are delivered to a State distributing agency or to a recipient agency; and

''(2) promulgate regulations to ensure accountability for commodities provided to a processor for processing into end products, and to facilitate processing of commodities into end

products for use by recipient agencies. Such regulations may provide that—

''(A) a processor that receives commodities for processing into end products, or provides a service with respect to such commodities or end products, in accordance with its agreement with a State distributing agency or a recipient agency, provide to the Secretary a bond or other means of financial assurance to protect the value of such commodities; and

''(B) in the event a processor fails to deliver to a State distributing agency or a recipient agency an end product in conformance with the processing agreement entered into under this Act, the Secretary take action with respect to the bond or other means of financial assurance pursuant to regulations promulgated under this paragraph and distribute any proceeds obtained by the Secretary to one or more State distributing agencies and recipient agencies as determined appropriate by the Secretary.''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 18 of the Commodity Distribution Reform Act and WIC Amendments of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 612c note) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

''(1) The term 'commodities' means agricultural commodities and their products that are donated by the Secretary for use by recipient agencies.

''(2) The term 'end product' means a food product that contains processed commodities.''.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3 of the Commodity Distribution Reform Act and WIC Amendments of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 612c note; Public Law 100–237) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) the program established under section 4(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b));''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(D) by striking ''the Committee on Education and Labor'' and inserting ''the Committee on Education and the Workforce'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii) by striking ''section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)'' and inserting ''section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c)'';

(3) in subsection (e)(1)(D)(iii) by striking subclause (II) and inserting the following:

''(II) the program established under section 4(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b));''; and

(4) in subsection (k) by striking ''the Committee on Education and Labor'' and inserting ''the Committee on Education and the Workforce''.

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous

SEC. 4201. FARMERS' MARKET NUTRITION PROGRAM.

Section 4402 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3007) is amended—

(1) in the section heading by striking **''SENIORS''**;

(2) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) FUNDING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary of Agriculture shall use to carry out and expand the farmers market nutrition program $20,600,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

''(2) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection for each of the fiscal years specified in paragraph (1).'';

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''seniors''; and

(B) in paragraph (1) by inserting '', and low-income families who are determined to be at nutritional risk'' after ''low-income seniors'';

(4) in subsection (c) by striking ''seniors'';

(5) in subsection (d) by striking ''seniors'';

(6) in subsection (e) by striking ''seniors'';

(7) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively; and

(8) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) STATE GRANTS AND OTHER ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall carry out the Program through grants and other assistance provided in accordance with agreements made with States, for implementation through State agencies and local agencies, that include provisions—

''(1) for the issuance of coupons or vouchers to participating individuals;

''(2) establishing an appropriate annual percentage limitation on the use of funds for administrative costs; and

''(3) specifying other terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate to encourage expanding the participation of small scale farmers in Federal nutrition programs.''.

SEC. 4202. NUTRITION INFORMATION AND AWARENESS PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 4403 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3171 note; Public Law 107–171) is repealed.

SEC. 4203. FRESH FRUIT AND VEGETABLE PROGRAM.

Section 19 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769a) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking **''FRESH''**;

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''fresh'';

(3) in subsection (b), by striking ''fresh''; and

(4) in subsection (e), by striking ''fresh''.

SEC. 4204. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR PURCHASE OF FRESH FRUITS, VEGETABLES, AND OTHER SPECIALTY FOOD CROPS.

Section 10603 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 612c–4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) PILOT GRANT PROGRAM FOR PURCHASE OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Using amounts made available to carry out subsection (b), the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct a pilot program under which the Secretary will give not more than five participating States the option of receiving a grant in an amount equal to the value of the commodities that the participating State would otherwise receive under this section for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

''(2) USE OF GRANT FUNDS.—A participating State receiving a grant under this subsection may use the grant funds solely to purchase fresh fruits and vegetables for distribution to schools and service institutions in the State that participate in the food service programs under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.).

''(3) SELECTION OF PARTICIPATING STATES.—The Secretary shall select participating States from applications submitted by the States.

''(4) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) SCHOOL AND SERVICE INSTITUTION REQUIREMENT.—Schools and service institutions in a participating State shall keep records of purchases of fresh fruits and vegetables made using the grant funds and report such records to the State.

''(B) STATE REQUIREMENT.—Each participating State shall submit to the Secretary a report on the success of the pilot program in the State, including information on—

''(i) the amount and value of each type of fresh fruit and vegetable purchased by the State; and

''(ii) the benefit provided by such purchases in conducting the school food service in the State, including meeting school meal requirements.''.

SEC. 4205. ENCOURAGING LOCALLY AND REGIONALLY GROWN AND RAISED FOOD.

(a) COMMODITY PURCHASE STREAMLINING.—The Secretary may permit each school food authority with a low annual commodity entitlement value, as determined by the Secretary, to elect to substitute locally and regionally grown and raised food for the authority's allotment, in whole or in part, of commodity assistance for the school meal programs under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.), if—

(1) the election is requested by the school food authority;

(2) the Secretary determines that the election will reduce State and Federal administrative costs; and

(3) the election will provide the school food authority with greater flexibility to purchase locally and regionally grown and raised foods.

(b) FARM-TO-SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish farm-to-school demonstration programs under which school food authorities, agricultural producers producing for local and regional markets, and other farm-to-school stakeholders will collaborate with the Agriculture Marketing Service to, on a cost neutral basis, source food for the school meal programs under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.) from local farmers and ranchers in lieu of the commodity assistance provided to the school food authorities for the school meal programs.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each demonstration program carried out under this subsection shall—

(i) facilitate and increase the purchase of unprocessed and minimally processed locally and regionally grown and raised agricultural products to be served under the school meal programs;

(ii) test methods to improve procurement, transportation, and meal preparation processes for the school meal programs;

(iii) assess whether administrative costs can be saved through increased school food authority flexibility to source locally and regionally produced foods for the school meal programs; and

(iv) undertake rigorous evaluation and share information about results of the demonstration program, including cost savings, with the Secretary, other school food authorities, agricultural producers producing for the local and regional market, and the general public.

(B) PLANS.—In order to be selected to carry out a demonstration program under this subsection, a school food authority shall submit to the Secretary a plan at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require, and containing information with respect to the requirements described in clauses (i) through (iv) of subparagraph (A).

(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance to demonstration program participants to assist such participants to acquire bids from potential vendors in a timely and cost-effective manner.

(4) LENGTH.—The Secretary shall determine the appropriate length of time for each demonstration program under this subsection.

(5) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate among relevant agencies of the Department of Agriculture and non-governmental organizations with appropriate expertise to facilitate the provision of training and technical assistance necessary to successfully carry out demonstration programs under this subsection.

(6) NUMBER.—Subject to the availability of funds to carry out this subsection, the Secretary shall select at least 10 demonstration programs to be carried out under this subsection.

(7) DIVERSITY AND BALANCE.—In selecting demonstration programs to be carried out under this subsection, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure—

(A) geographical diversity;

(B) that at least half of the demonstration programs are completed in collaboration with school food authorities with small annual commodity entitlements, as determined by the Secretary;

(C) that at least half of the demonstration programs are completed in rural or tribal communities;

(D) equitable treatment of school food authorities with a high percentage of students eligible for free or reduced price lunches, as determined by the Secretary; and

(E) that at least one of the demonstration programs is completed on a military installation as defined in section 2687(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 4206. REVIEW OF PUBLIC HEALTH BENEFITS OF WHITE POTATOES.

The Secretary shall conduct a review of the economic and public health benefits of white potatoes on low-income families who are determined to be at nutritional risk. Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report the findings of this review to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

SEC. 4207. HEALTHY FOOD FINANCING INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle D of title II of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6951 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 242. HEALTHY FOOD FINANCING INITIATIVE.

''(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to enhance the authorities of the Secretary to support efforts to provide access to healthy food by establishing an initiative to improve access to healthy foods in underserved areas, to create and preserve quality jobs, and to revitalize low-income communities by providing loans and grants to eligible fresh, healthy food retailers to overcome the higher costs and initial barriers to entry in underserved areas.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'community development financial institution' has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4702).

''(2) INITIATIVE.—The term 'Initiative' means the Healthy Food Financing Initiative established under subsection (c)(1).

''(3) NATIONAL FUND MANAGER.—The term 'national fund manager' means a community development financial institution that is—

''(A) in existence on the date of enactment of this section; and

''(B) certified by the Community Development Financial Institution Fund of the Department of Treasury to manage the Initiative for purposes of—

''(i) raising private capital;

''(ii) providing financial and technical assistance to partnerships; and

''(iii) funding eligible projects to attract fresh, healthy food retailers to underserved areas, in accordance with this section.

''(4) PARTNERSHIP.—The term 'partnership' means a regional, State, or local public-private partnership that—

''(A) is organized to improve access to fresh, healthy foods;

''(B) provides financial and technical assistance to eligible projects; and

''(C) meets such other criteria as the Secretary may establish.

''(5) PERISHABLE FOOD.—The term 'perishable food' means a staple food that is fresh, refrigerated, or frozen.

''(6) QUALITY JOB.—The term 'quality job' means a job that provides wages and other benefits comparable to, or better than, similar positions in existing businesses of similar size in similar local economies.

''(7) STAPLE FOOD.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'staple food' means food that is a basic dietary item.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'staple food' includes—

''(i) bread;

''(ii) flour;

''(iii) fruits;

''(iv) vegetables; and

''(v) meat.

''(c) INITIATIVE.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an initiative to achieve the purpose described in subsection (a) in accordance with this subsection.

''(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Initiative, the Secretary shall provide funding to entities with eligible projects, as described in subparagraph (B), subject to the priorities described in subparagraph (C).

''(ii) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds provided to an entity pursuant to clause (i) shall be used—

''(I) to create revolving loan pools of capital or other products to provide loans to finance eligible projects or partnerships;

''(II) to provide grants for eligible projects or partnerships;

''(III) to provide technical assistance to funded projects and entities seeking Initiative funding; and

''(IV) to cover administrative expenses of the national fund manager in an amount not to exceed 10 percent of the Federal funds provided.

''(B) ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.—Subject to the approval of the Secretary, the national fund manager shall establish eligibility criteria for projects under the Initiative, which shall include the existence or planned execution of agreements—

''(i) to expand or preserve the availability of staple foods in underserved areas with moderate- and low-income populations by maintaining or increasing the number of retail outlets that offer an assortment of perishable food and staple food items, as determined by the Secretary, in those areas; and

''(ii) to accept benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.).

''(C) PRIORITIES.—In carrying out the Initiative, priority shall be given to projects that—

''(i) are located in severely distressed low-income communities, as defined by the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund of the Department of Treasury; and

''(ii) include 1 or more of the following characteristics:

''(I) The project will create or retain quality jobs for low-income residents in the community.

''(II) The project supports regional food systems and locally grown foods, to the maximum extent practicable.

''(III) In areas served by public transit, the project is accessible by public transit.

''(IV) The project involves women- or minority-owned businesses.

''(V) The project receives funding from other sources, including other Federal agencies.

''(VI) The project otherwise advances the purpose of this section, as determined by the Secretary.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section $125,000,000, to remain available until expended.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)), as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further amended, by adding at the end the following:

''(9) the authority of the Secretary to establish and carry out the Health Food Financing Initiative under section 242;''.

TITLE V—CREDIT

Subtitle A—Farm Ownership Loans

SEC. 5001. ELIGIBILITY FOR FARM OWNERSHIP LOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 302(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1922(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(a) IN GENERAL.—The'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—The'';

(2) in the 1st sentence, by inserting after ''limited liability companies'' the following: '', and such other legal entities as the Secretary deems appropriate,'';

(3) in the 2nd sentence, by redesignating clauses (1) through (4) as clauses (A) through (D), respectively;

(4) in each of the 2nd and 3rd sentences, by striking ''and limited liability companies'' each place it appears and inserting ''limited liability companies, and such other legal entities'';

(5) in the 3rd sentence, by striking ''(3)'' and ''(4)'' and inserting ''(C)'' and ''(D)'', respectively; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) SPECIAL DEEMING RULES.—

''(A) ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN OPERATING-ONLY ENTITIES.—An entity that is or will become only the operator of a family farm is deemed to meet the owner-operator requirements of paragraph (1) if the individuals that are the owners of the family farm own more than 50 percent (or such other percentage as the Secretary determines is appropriate) of the entity.

''(B) ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN EMBEDDED ENTITIES.—An entity that is an owner-operator described in paragraph (1), or an operator described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph that is owned, in whole or in part, by other entities, is deemed to meet the direct ownership requirement imposed under paragraph (1) if at least 75 percent of the ownership interests of each embedded entity of such entity is owned directly or indirectly by the individuals that own the family farm.''.

(b) DIRECT FARM OWNERSHIP EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENT.—Section 302(b)(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1922(b)(1)) is amended by inserting ''or has other acceptable experience for a period of time, as determined by the Secretary,'' after ''3 years''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 304(c)(2) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1924(c)(2)) by striking ''paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 302(a)'' and inserting ''clauses (A) and (B) of section 302(a)(1)''.

(2) Section 310D of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1934) is amended—

(A) by inserting after ''partnership'' the following: '', or such other legal entities as the Secretary deems appropriate,''; and

(B) by striking ''or partners'' each place it appears and inserting ''partners, or owners''.

SEC. 5002. CONSERVATION LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM.

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 304(c) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1924(c)) is amended by inserting after ''limited liability companies'' the following: '', or such other legal entities as the Secretary deems appropriate,''.

(b) LIMITATION ON LOAN GUARANTEE AMOUNT.—Section 304(e) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1924(e)) is amended by striking ''75 percent'' and inserting ''90 percent''.

(c) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Section 304(h) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1924(h)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 5003. DOWN PAYMENT LOAN PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 310E(b)(1)(C) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1935(b)(1)(C)) is amended by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$667,000''.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 310E(b) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1935(b)) is amended by striking the 2nd paragraph (2).

SEC. 5004. ELIMINATION OF MINERAL RIGHTS APPRAISAL REQUIREMENT.

Section 307 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1927) is amended by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

Subtitle B—Operating Loans

SEC. 5101. ELIGIBILITY FOR FARM OPERATING LOANS.

Section 311(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1941(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(a) IN GENERAL.—The'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—The'';

(2) in the 1st sentence, by inserting after ''limited liability companies'' the following: '', and such other legal entities as the Secretary deems appropriate,'';

(3) in the 2nd sentence, by redesignating clauses (1) through (4) as clauses (A) through (D), respectively;

(4) in each of the 2nd and 3rd sentences, by striking ''and limited liability companies'' each place it appears and inserting ''limited liability companies, and such other legal entities'';

(5) in the 3rd sentence, by striking ''(3)'' and ''(4)'' and inserting ''(C)'' and ''(D)'', respectively; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) SPECIAL DEEMING RULE.—An entity that is an operator described in paragraph (1) that is owned, in whole or in part, by other entities, is deemed to meet the direct ownership requirement imposed under paragraph (1) if at least 75 percent of the ownership interests of each embedded entity of such entity is owned directly or indirectly by the individuals that own the family farm.''.

SEC. 5102. ELIMINATION OF RURAL RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR OPERATING LOANS TO YOUTH.

Section 311(b)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1941(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''who are rural residents''.

SEC. 5103. AUTHORITY TO WAIVE PERSONAL LIABILITY FOR YOUTH LOANS DUE TO CIRCUMSTANCES BEYOND BORROWER CONTROL.

Section 311(b) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1941(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) The Secretary may, on a case by case basis, waive the personal liability of a borrower for a loan made under this subsection if any default on the loan was due to circumstances beyond the control of the borrower.''.

SEC. 5104. MICROLOANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 313 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1943) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) MICROLOANS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may establish a program to make or guarantee microloans.

''(2) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not make or guarantee a microloan under this subsection that exceeds $35,000 or that would cause the total principal indebtedness outstanding at any 1 time for microloans made under this chapter to any 1 borrower to exceed $70,000.

''(3) APPLICATIONS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall limit the administrative burdens and streamline the application and approval process for microloans under this subsection.

''(4) COOPERATIVE LENDING PROJECTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary may contract with community-based and nongovernmental organizations, State entities, or other intermediaries, as the Secretary determines appropriate—

''(i) to make or guarantee a microloan under this subsection; and

''(ii) to provide business, financial, marketing, and credit management services to borrowers.

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Before contracting with an entity described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary—

''(i) shall review and approve—

''(I) the loan loss reserve fund for microloans established by the entity; and

''(II) the underwriting standards for microloans of the entity; and

''(ii) establish such other requirements for contracting with the entity as the Secretary determines necessary.''.

(b) EXCEPTIONS FOR DIRECT LOANS.—Section 311(c)(2) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1941(c)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—In this subsection, the term 'direct operating loan' shall not include—

''(A) a loan made to a youth under subsection (b); or

''(B) a microloan made to a beginning farmer or rancher or a veteran farmer or rancher (as defined in section 2501(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e)).''.

(c) Section 312(a) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1942(a)) is amended by inserting ''(including a microloan, as defined by the Secretary)'' after ''A direct loan''.

(d) Section 316(a)(2) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1946(a)(2)) is amended by inserting ''a microloan to a beginning farmer or rancher or veteran farmer or rancher (as defined in section 2501(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e)) or'' after ''The interest rate on''.

Subtitle C—Emergency Loans

SEC. 5201. ELIGIBILITY FOR EMERGENCY LOANS.

Section 321(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1961(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''owner-operators (in the case of loans for a purpose under subtitle A) or operators (in the case of loans for a purpose under subtitle B)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(in the case of farm ownership loans in accordance with subtitle A) owner-operators or operators, or (in the case of loans for a purpose under subtitle B) operators'';

(2) by inserting after ''limited liability companies'' the 1st place it appears the following: '', or such other legal entities as the Secretary deems appropriate''; and

(3) by inserting after ''limited liability companies'' the 2nd place it appears the following: '', or other legal entities'';

(4) by striking ''and limited liability companies,'' and inserting ''limited liability companies, and such other legal entities'';

(5) by striking ''ownership and operator'' and inserting ''ownership or operator''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following: ''An entity that is an owner-operator or operator described in this subsection is deemed to meet the direct ownership requirement imposed under this subsection if at least 75 percent of the ownership interests of each embedded entity of such entity is owned directly or indirectly by the individuals that own the family farm.''.

Subtitle D—Administrative Provisions

SEC. 5301. BEGINNING FARMER AND RANCHER INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 333B(h) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1983b(h)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 5302. ELIGIBLE BEGINNING FARMERS AND RANCHERS.

(a) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO CHANGES IN ELIGIBILITY RULES.—Section 343(a)(11) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1991(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after ''joint operation,'' the 1st place it appears the following: ''or such other legal entity as the Secretary deems appropriate,'';

(2) by striking ''or joint operators'' each place it appears and inserting ''joint operators, or owners''; and

(3) by inserting after ''joint operation,'' the 2nd and 3rd place it appears the following: ''or such other legal entity,''.

(b) MODIFICATION OF ACREAGE OWNERSHIP LIMITATION.—Section 343(a)(11)(F) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1991(a)(11)(F)) is amended by striking ''median acreage'' and inserting ''average acreage''.

SEC. 5303. LOAN AUTHORIZATION LEVELS.

Section 346(b)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1994(b)(1)) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 5304. PRIORITY FOR PARTICIPATION LOANS.

Section 346(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1994(b)(2)(A)(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(III) PRIORITY.—In order to maximize the number of borrowers served under this clause, the Secretary—

''(aa) shall give priority to applicants who apply under the down payment loan program under section 310E or joint financing arrangements under section 307(a)(3)(D); and

''(bb) may offer other financing options under this subtitle to applicants only if the Secretary determines that down payment or other participation loan options are not a viable approach for the applicants.''.

SEC. 5305. LOAN FUND SET-ASIDES.

Section 346(b)(2)(A)(ii)(III) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1994(b)(2)(A)(ii)(III)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) by striking ''of the total amount''.

SEC. 5306. CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO BORROWER TRAINING PROVISION, RELATING TO ELIGIBILITY CHANGES.

Section 359(c)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2006a(c)(2)) is amended by striking ''section 302(a)(2) or 311(a)(2)'' and inserting ''section 302(a)(1)(B) or 311(a)(1)(B)''.

Subtitle E—State Agricultural Mediation Programs

SEC. 5401. STATE AGRICULTURAL MEDIATION PROGRAMS.

Section 506 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 5106) is amended by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2018''.

Subtitle F—Loans to Purchasers of Highly Fractionated Land

SEC. 5501. LOANS TO PURCHASERS OF HIGHLY FRACTIONATED LAND.

The first section of Public Law 91–229 (25 U.S.C. 488) is amended in subsection (b)(1) by striking ''pursuant to section 205(c) of the Indian Land Consolidation Act (25 U.S.C. 2204(c))'' and inserting ''or to intermediaries in order to establish revolving loan funds for the purchase of highly fractionated land''.

TITLE VI—RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Subtitle A—Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act

SEC. 6001. WATER, WASTE DISPOSAL, AND WASTEWATER FACILITY GRANTS.

Section 306(a)(2)(B)(vii) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(2)(B)(vii)) is amended by striking ''2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 6002. RURAL BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY GRANTS.

Section 306(a)(11)(D) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(11)(D)) is amended by striking ''$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 6003. ELIMINATION OF RESERVATION OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES GRANT PROGRAM FUNDS.

Section 306(a)(19) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(19)) is amended by striking subparagraph (C).

SEC. 6004. UTILIZATION OF LOAN GUARANTEES FOR COMMUNITY FACILITIES.

Section 306(a)(24) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(24)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) UTILIZATION OF LOAN GUARANTEES FOR COMMUNITY FACILITIES.—The Secretary shall consider the benefits to communities that result from using loan guarantees in the Community Facilities Program and to the maximum extent possible utilize guarantees to enhance community involvement.''.

SEC. 6005. RURAL WATER AND WASTEWATER CIRCUIT RIDER PROGRAM.

Section 306(a)(22) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(22)) is amended to read as follows:

''(22) RURAL WATER AND WASTEWATER CIRCUIT RIDER PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall continue a national rural water and wastewater circuit rider program that—

''(i) is consistent with the activities and results of the program conducted before the date of enactment of this paragraph, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(ii) receives funding from the Secretary, acting through the Rural Utilities Service.

''(B) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this paragraph $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter.''.

SEC. 6006. TRIBAL COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ESSENTIAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES.

Section 306(a)(25)(C) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(25)(C)) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 6007. ESSENTIAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.

Section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(19)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(26) ESSENTIAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to public bodies and private nonprofit corporations, such as States, counties, cities, townships, and incorporated towns and villages, boroughs, authorities, districts and Indian tribes on Federal and State reservations which will serve rural areas for the purpose of enabling them to provide to associations described in this subsection technical assistance and training, with respect to essential community facilities programs authorized under this subsection, to—

''(i) assist communities in identifying and planning for community facility needs;

''(ii) identify public and private resources to finance community facilities needs;

''(iii) prepare reports and surveys necessary to request financial assistance to develop community facilities;

''(iv) prepare applications for financial assistance;

''(v) improve the management, including financial management, related to the operation of community facilities; or

''(vi) assist with other areas of need identified by the Secretary.

''(B) SELECTION PRIORITY.—In selecting recipients of grants under this paragraph, the Secretary shall give priority to private, nonprofit, or public organizations that have experience in providing technical assistance and training to rural entities.

''(C) FUNDING.—Not less than 3 nor more than 5 percent of any funds appropriated to carry out each of the essential community facilities grant, loan and loan guarantee programs as authorized under this subsection for any fiscal year shall be reserved for grants under this paragraph.''.

SEC. 6008. EMERGENCY AND IMMINENT COMMUNITY WATER ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 306A(i)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926a(i)(2)) is amended by striking ''$35,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$27,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 6009. HOUSEHOLD WATER WELL SYSTEMS.

Section 306E(d) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926e(d)) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 6010. RURAL BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY LOAN PROGRAM.

(a) FLEXIBILITY FOR THE BUSINESS AND LOAN PROGRAM.—Section 310B(a)(2)(A) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(a)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting ''including working capital'' after ''employment''.

(b) GREATER FLEXIBILITY FOR ADEQUATE COLLATERAL THROUGH ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE.—Section 310B(g)(7) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(g)(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''In the discretion of the Secretary, if the Secretary determines that the action would not create or otherwise contribute to an unreasonable risk of default or loss to the Federal Government, the Secretary may take account receivables as security for the obligations entered into in connection with loans and a borrower may use account receivables as collateral to secure a loan made or guaranteed under this subsection.''.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to implement the amendments made by this section.

SEC. 6011. RURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS.

Section 310B(e)(12) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(e)(12)) is amended by striking ''$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 6012. LOCALLY OR REGIONALLY PRODUCED AGRICULTURAL FOOD PRODUCTS.

Section 310B(g)(9)(B)(v)(I) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(g)(9)(B)(v)(I)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) by inserting ''and not more than 7 percent'' after ''5 percent''.

SEC. 6013. INTERMEDIARY RELENDING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1922–1936a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 310H. INTERMEDIARY RELENDING PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make loans to the entities, for the purposes, and subject to the terms and conditions specified in the 1st, 2nd, and last sentences of section 623(a) of the Community Economic Development Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)).

''(b) LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For loans under subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary not more than $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1323(b)(2) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–198; 7 U.S.C. 1932 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (C).

SEC. 6014. RURAL COLLEGE COORDINATED STRATEGY.

Section 331 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1981) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) RURAL COLLEGE COORDINATED STRATEGY.—The Secretary shall develop a coordinated strategy across the relevant programs within the Rural Development mission areas to serve the specific, local needs of rural communities when making investments in rural community colleges and technical colleges through other current authorities. During the development of a coordinated strategy, the Secretary shall consult with groups representing rural-serving community colleges and technical colleges to coordinate critical investments in rural community colleges and technical colleges involved in workforce training. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to provide a priority for funding within current authorities. The Secretary shall use the coordinated strategy and information developed for the strategy to more effectively serve rural communities with respect to investments in community colleges and technical colleges.''.

SEC. 6015. RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

Section 333 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1983) is amended—

(1) by striking ''require'';

(2) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''require'' after ''(1)'';

(3) in paragraph (2), by inserting '', require'' after ''314'';

(4) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''require'' after ''loans,'';

(5) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting ''require'' after ''(4)''; and

(B) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(6) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by inserting ''require'' after ''(5)''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) with respect to water and waste disposal direct and guaranteed loans provided under section 306, encourage, to the maximum extent practicable, private or cooperative lenders to finance rural water and waste disposal facilities by—

''(A) maximizing the use of loan guarantees to finance eligible projects in rural communities where the population exceeds 5,500;

''(B) maximizing the use of direct loans to finance eligible projects in rural communities where the impact on rate payers will be material when compared to financing with a loan guarantee;

''(C) establishing and applying a materiality standard when determining the difference in impact on rate payers between a direct loan and a loan guarantee;

''(D) in the case of projects that require interim financing in excess of $500,000, requiring that such projects initially seek such financing from private or cooperative lenders; and

''(E) determining if an existing direct loan borrower can refinance with a private or cooperative lender, including with a loan guarantee, prior to providing a new direct loan.''.

SEC. 6016. SIMPLIFIED APPLICATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 333A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1983a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) SIMPLIFIED APPLICATION FORMS.—Except as provided in subsection (g)(2) of this section, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, develop a simplified application process, including a single page application where possible, for grants and relending authorized under sections 306, 306C, 306D, 306E,

310B(b), 310B(c), 310B(e), 310B(f), 310H, 379B, and 379E.''.

(b) REPORT TO THE CONGRESS.—Within 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a written report that contains an evaluation of the implementation of the amendment made by subsection (a).

SEC. 6017. GRANTS FOR NOAA WEATHER RADIO TRANSMITTERS.

Section 379B(d) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2008p(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 6018. RURAL MICROENTREPRENEUR ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 379E(d)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2008s(d)(2)) is amended by striking ''$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2012'' and inserting ''$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 6019. DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 382M(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009aa–12(a)) is amended by striking ''$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

(b) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 382N of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2009aa–13) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6020. NORTHERN GREAT PLAINS REGIONAL AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 383N(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009bb–12(a)) is amended by striking ''$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

(b) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 383O of such Act (7 U.S.C. 2009bb–13) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6021. RURAL BUSINESS INVESTMENT PROGRAM.

Section 384S of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2009cc–18) is amended by striking ''$50,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

Subtitle B—Rural Electrification Act of 1936

SEC. 6101. RELENDING FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2(a), by inserting ''(including relending for this purpose as provided in section 4)'' after ''efficiency'';

(2) in section 4(a), by inserting ''(including relending to ultimate consumers for this purpose by borrowers enumerated in the proviso in this section)'' after ''efficiency''; and

(3) in section 313(b)(2)(B)—

(A) by inserting ''(acting through the Rural Utilities Service)'' after ''Secretary''; and

(B) by inserting ''energy efficiency (including relending to ultimate consumers for this purpose),'' after ''promoting''.

(b) CURRENT AUTHORITY.—The authority provided in this section is in addition to any other relending authority of the Secretary under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901 et. seq.) or any other law.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary (acting through the Rural Utilities Service) shall continue to carry out section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 940c) in the same manner as on the day before enactment of this Act until such time as any regulations necessary to carry out the amendments made by this section are fully implemented.

SEC. 6102. FEES FOR CERTAIN LOAN GUARANTEES.

The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 4 the following:

''SEC. 5. FEES FOR CERTAIN LOAN GUARANTEES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For electrification baseload generation loan guarantees, the Secretary shall, at the request of the borrower, charge an upfront fee to cover the costs of the loan guarantee.

''(b) FEE.—The fee described in subsection (a) for a loan guarantee shall be equal to the costs of the loan guarantee (within the meaning of section 502(5)(C) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a(5)(C))).

''(c) LIMITATION.—Funds received from a borrower to pay the fee described in this section shall not be derived from a loan or other debt obligation that is made or guaranteed by the Federal Government.''.

SEC. 6103. GUARANTEES FOR BONDS AND NOTES ISSUED FOR ELECTRIFICATION OR TELEPHONE PURPOSES.

Section 313A(f) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 940c–1(f)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6104. EXPANSION OF 911 ACCESS.

Section 315(d) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 940e(d)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6105. ACCESS TO BROADBAND TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS.

Section 601 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) PRIORITIES.—In making or guaranteeing loans under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give—

''(A) the highest priority to applicants that offer to provide broadband service to the greatest proportion of households that, prior to the provision of the broadband service, had no incumbent service provider; and

''(B) priority to applicants that offer in their applications to provide broadband service not predominantly for business service, but where at least 25 percent of customers in the proposed service territory are commercial interests.'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B);

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

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) the amount and type of support requested; and

''(E) a list of the census block groups or tracts proposed to be so served.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) ADDITIONAL PROCESS.—The Secretary shall establish a process under which an incumbent service provider which, as of the date of the publication of notice under paragraph (5) with respect to an application submitted by the provider, is providing broadband service to a remote rural area, may (but shall not be required to) submit to the Secretary, not less than 15 and not more than 30 days after that date, information regarding the broadband services that the provider offers in the proposed service territory, so that the Secretary may assess whether the application meets the requirements of this section with respect to eligible projects.'';

(3) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following:

''(3) REQUIREMENT.—In considering the technology needs of customers in a proposed service territory, the Secretary shall take into consideration the upgrade or replacement cost for the construction or acquisition of facilities and equipment in the territory.''; and

(4) in each of subsections (k)(1) and (l), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous

SEC. 6201. DISTANCE LEARNING AND TELEMEDICINE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 2335A of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 950aaa–5) is amended by striking ''$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2012'' and inserting ''$65,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1(b) of Public Law 102–551 (7 U.S.C. 950aaa note) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6202. VALUE-ADDED AGRICULTURAL MARKET DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM GRANTS.

Section 231(b)(7) of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1632a(b)(7)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''2008'' and inserting ''2013''; and

(B) by striking ''$15,000,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 6203. AGRICULTURE INNOVATION CENTER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 6402(i) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1632b(i)) is amended by striking ''$6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 6204. PROGRAM METRICS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall collect data regarding economic activities created through grants and loans, including any technical assistance provided as a component of the grant or loan program, and measure the short and long term viability of award recipients and any entities to whom those recipients provide assistance using award funds under section 231 of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note; Public Law 106–224), section 9007 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107), section 313(b)(2) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 940c(b)(2)), or section 306(a)(11), 310B(c), 310B(e), 310B(g), 310H, or 379E, or subtitle E, of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(11), 1932(c), 1932(e), 1932(g), 2008s, or 2009 through 2009m).

(b) DATA.—The data collected under subsection (a) shall include information collected from recipients both during the award period and after the period as determined by the Secretary, but not less than 2 years after the award period ends.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that contains the data described in subsection (a). The report shall include detailed information regarding—

(1) actions taken by the Secretary to utilize the data;

(2) the number of jobs, including self-employment and the value of salaries and wages;

(3) how the provision of funds from the grant or loan involved affected the local economy;

(4) any benefit, such as an increase in revenue or customer base; and

(5) such other information as the Secretary deems appropriate.

SEC. 6205. STUDY OF RURAL TRANSPORTATION ISSUES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Transportation shall publish an updated version of the study described

in section 6206 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (as amended by subsection (b)).

(b) ADDITION TO STUDY.—Section 6206(b) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1971) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(5) the sufficiency of infrastructure along waterways in the United States and the impact of such infrastructure on the movement of agricultural goods in terms of safety, efficiency and speed, as well as the benefits derived through upgrades and repairs to locks and dams.''.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to the Congress the updated version of the study required by subsection (a).

SEC. 6206. CERTAIN FEDERAL ACTIONS NOT TO BE CONSIDERED MAJOR.

In the case of a loan, loan guarantee, or grant program in the rural development mission area of the Department of Agriculture, an action of the Secretary before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act that does not involve the provision by the Department of Agriculture of Federal dollars or a Federal loan guarantee, including—

(1) the approval by the Department of Agriculture of the decision of a borrower to commence a privately funded activity;

(2) a lien accommodation or subordination;

(3) a debt settlement or restructuring; or

(4) the restructuring of a business entity by a borrower,

shall not be considered a major Federal action.

TITLE VII—RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977

SEC. 7101. OPTION TO BE INCLUDED AS NON-LAND-GRANT COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE.

Section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(5) COOPERATING FORESTRY SCHOOL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'cooperating forestry school' means an institution—

''(i) that is eligible to receive funds under the Act of October 10, 1962 (16 U.S.C. 582a et seq.), commonly known as the McIntire-Stennis Act of 1962; and

''(ii) with respect to which the Secretary has not received a declaration of the intent of that institution to not be considered a cooperating forestry school.

''(B) TERMINATION OF DECLARATION.—A declaration of the intent of an institution to not be considered a cooperating forestry school submitted to the Secretary shall be in effect until September 30, 2018.''; and

(2) in paragraph (10)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''that'';

(ii) in clause (i)—

(I) by inserting ''that'' before ''qualify''; and

(II) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(iii) in clause (ii)—

(I) by inserting ''that'' before ''offer''; and

(II) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) with respect to which the Secretary has not received a statement of the declaration of the intent of a college or university to not be considered a Hispanic-serving agricultural college or university.''; and

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

''(C) TERMINATION OF DECLARATION OF INTENT.—A declaration of the intent of a college or university to not be considered a Hispanic-serving agricultural college or university submitted to the Secretary shall be in effect until September 30, 2018.''.

SEC. 7102. NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) EXTENSION OF TERMINATION DATE.—Section 1408(h) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3123(h)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) DUTIES OF NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS ADVISORY BOARD.—Section 1408(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3123(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4)(C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(5) consult with industry groups on agricultural research, extension, education, and economics, and make recommendations to the Secretary based on that consultation.''.

SEC. 7103. SPECIALTY CROP COMMITTEE.

Section 1408A(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3123a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Measures'' and inserting ''Programs'';

(2) by striking paragraph (2);

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively; and

(4) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''Programs that would'' and inserting ''Research, extension, and teaching programs designed to improve competitiveness in the specialty crop industry, including programs that would'';

(B) in subparagraph (D), by inserting '', including improving the quality and taste of processed specialty crops'' before the semicolon; and

(C) in subparagraph (G), by inserting ''the remote sensing and the'' before ''mechanization''.

SEC. 7104. VETERINARY SERVICES GRANT PROGRAM.

The National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 is amended by inserting after section 1415A (7 U.S.C. 3151a) the following new section:

''SEC. 1415B. VETERINARY SERVICES GRANT PROGRAM.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) QUALIFIED ENTITY.—The term 'qualified entity' means—

''(A) a for-profit or nonprofit entity located in the United States that, or an individual who, operates a veterinary clinic providing veterinary services—

''(i) in a rural area, as defined in section 343(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1991(a)); and

''(ii) in a veterinarian shortage situation;

''(B) a State, national, allied, or regional veterinary organization or specialty board recognized by the American Veterinary Medical Association;

''(C) a college or school of veterinary medicine accredited by the American Veterinary Medical Association;

''(D) a university research foundation or veterinary medical foundation;

''(E) a department of veterinary science or department of comparative medicine accredited by the Department of Education;

''(F) a State agricultural experiment station; or

''(G) a State, local, or tribal government agency.

''(2) VETERINARIAN SHORTAGE SITUATION.—The term 'veterinarian shortage situation' means a veterinarian shortage situation as determined by the Secretary under section 1415A.

''(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—

''(1) COMPETITIVE GRANTS.—The Secretary shall carry out a program to make competitive grants to qualified entities that carry out programs or activities described in paragraph (2) for the purpose of developing, implementing, and sustaining veterinary services.

''(2) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—A qualified entity shall be eligible to receive a grant described in paragraph (1) if the entity carries out programs or activities that the Secretary determines will—

''(A) substantially relieve veterinarian shortage situations;

''(B) support or facilitate private veterinary practices engaged in public health activities; or

''(C) support or facilitate the practices of veterinarians who are providing or have completed providing services under an agreement entered into with the Secretary under section 1415A(a)(2).

''(c) AWARD PROCESSES AND PREFERENCES.—

''(1) APPLICATION, EVALUATION, AND INPUT PROCESSES.—In administering the grant program established under this section, the Secretary shall—

''(A) use an appropriate application and evaluation process, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(B) seek the input of interested persons.

''(2) COORDINATION PREFERENCE.—In selecting recipients of grants to be used for any of the purposes described in subsection (d)(1), the Secretary shall give a preference to qualified entities that provide documentation of coordination with other qualified entities, with respect to any such purpose.

''(3) CONSIDERATION OF AVAILABLE FUNDS.—In selecting recipients of grants to be used for any of the purposes described in subsection (d), the Secretary shall take into consideration the amount of funds available for grants and the purposes for which the grant funds will be used.

''(4) NATURE OF GRANTS.—A grant awarded under this section shall be considered to be a competitive research, extension, or education grant.

''(d) USE OF GRANTS TO RELIEVE VETERINARIAN SHORTAGE SITUATIONS AND SUPPORT VETERINARY SERVICES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a qualified entity may use funds provided by a grant awarded under this section to relieve veterinarian shortage situations and support veterinary services for any of the following purposes:

''(A) To promote recruitment (including for programs in secondary schools), placement, and retention of veterinarians, veterinary technicians, students of veterinary medicine, and students of veterinary technology.

''(B) To allow veterinary students, veterinary interns, externs, fellows, and residents, and veterinary technician students to cover expenses (other than the types of expenses described in section 1415A(c)(5)) to attend training programs in food safety or food animal medicine.

''(C) To establish or expand accredited veterinary education programs (including faculty recruitment and retention), veterinary residency and fellowship programs, or veterinary internship and externship programs carried out in coordination with accredited colleges of veterinary medicine.

''(D) To provide continuing education and extension, including veterinary telemedicine and other distance-based education, for veterinarians, veterinary technicians, and other health professionals needed to strengthen veterinary programs and enhance food safety.

''(E) To provide technical assistance for the preparation of applications submitted to the Secretary for designation as a veterinarian shortage situation under this section or section 1415A.

''(2) QUALIFIED ENTITIES OPERATING VETERINARY CLINICS.—A qualified entity described in subsection (a)(1)(A) may only use funds provided by a grant awarded under this section to establish or expand veterinary practices, including—

''(A) equipping veterinary offices;

''(B) sharing in the reasonable overhead costs of such veterinary practices, as determined by the Secretary; or

''(C) establishing mobile veterinary facilities in which a portion of the facilities will address education or extension needs.

''(e) SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN GRANTS.—

''(1) TERMS OF SERVICE REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Funds provided through a grant made under this section to a qualified entity described in subsection (a)(1)(A) and used by such entity under subsection (d)(2) shall be subject to an agreement between the Secretary and such entity that includes a required term of service for such entity (including a qualified entity operating as an individual), as prospectively established by the Secretary.

''(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing a term of service under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consider only—

''(i) the amount of the grant awarded; and

''(ii) the specific purpose of the grant.

''(2) BREACH REMEDIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An agreement under paragraph (1) shall provide remedies for any breach of the agreement by the qualified entity referred to in paragraph (1)(A), including repayment or partial repayment of the grant funds, with interest.

''(B) WAIVER.—The Secretary may grant a waiver of the repayment obligation for breach of contract if the Secretary determines that such qualified entity demonstrates extreme hardship or extreme need.

''(C) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECOVERED.—Funds recovered under this paragraph shall—

''(i) be credited to the account available to carry out this section; and

''(ii) remain available until expended without further appropriation.

''(f) PROHIBITION ON USE OF GRANT FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION.—Except as provided in subsection (d)(2), funds made available for grants under this section may not be used—

''(1) to construct a new building or facility; or

''(2) to acquire, expand, remodel, or alter an existing building or facility, including site grading and improvement and architect fees.

''(g) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to carry out this section.

''(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter, to remain available until expended.''.

SEC. 7105. GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE SCIENCES EDUCATION.

Section 1417(m) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3152(m)) is amended by striking ''section $60,000,000'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''section—

''(1) $60,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1990 through 2013; and

''(2) $40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7106. POLICY RESEARCH CENTERS.

Section 1419A of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3155) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''**AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD**'' before ''**policy**'';

(2) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''Secretary may'' and inserting ''Secretary shall, acting through the Office of the Chief Economist,'';

(B) by striking ''make grants, competitive grants, and special research grants to, and enter into cooperative agreements and other contracting instruments with,'' and inserting ''make competitive grants to, or enter into cooperative agreements with,''; and

(C) by inserting ''with a history of providing unbiased, nonpartisan economic analysis to Congress'' after ''subsection (b)'';

(3) in subsection (b), by striking ''other research institutions'' and all that follows through ''shall be eligible'' and inserting ''and other public research institutions and organizations shall be eligible'';

(4) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(5) by inserting after subsection (b), the following new subsection:

''(c) PREFERENCE.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give a preference to policy research centers that have extensive databases, models, and demonstrated experience in providing Congress with agricultural market projections, rural development analysis, agricultural policy analysis, and baseline projections at the farm, multiregional, national, and international levels.''; and

(6) by striking subsection (e) (as redesignated by paragraph (4)) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2013; and

''(2) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7107. REPEAL OF HUMAN NUTRITION INTERVENTION AND HEALTH PROMOTION RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 1424 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3174) is repealed.

SEC. 7108. REPEAL OF PILOT RESEARCH PROGRAM TO COMBINE MEDICAL AND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 1424A of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3174a) is repealed.

SEC. 7109. NUTRITION EDUCATION PROGRAM.

Section 1425(f) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3175(f)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 7110. CONTINUING ANIMAL HEALTH AND DISEASE RESEARCH PROGRAMS.

Section 1433 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3195) is amended by striking the section designation and heading and all that follows through subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 1433. APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONTINUING ANIMAL HEALTH AND DISEASE RESEARCH PROGRAMS.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to support continuing animal health and disease research programs at eligible institutions—

''(A) $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1991 through 2013; and

''(B) $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

''(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds made available under this section shall be used—

''(A) to meet the expenses of conducting animal health and disease research, publishing and disseminating the results of such research, and contributing to the retirement of employees subject to the Act of March 4, 1940 (7 U.S.C. 331);

''(B) for administrative planning and direction; and

''(C) to purchase equipment and supplies necessary for conducting the research described in subparagraph (A).''.

SEC. 7111. REPEAL OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR RESEARCH ON NATIONAL OR REGIONAL PROBLEMS.

(a) REPEAL.—Effective October 1, 2013, section 1434 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3196) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) MATCHING FUNDS.—Section 1438 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3200) is amended in the first sentence by striking '', exclusive of the funds provided for research on specific national or regional animal health and disease problems under the provisions of section 1434 of this title,''.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXISTING AND CERTAIN NEW AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS.—Section 1463(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3311(c)) is amended by striking ''sections 1433 and 1434'' and inserting ''section 1433''.

SEC. 7112. GRANTS TO UPGRADE AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD SCIENCES FACILITIES AT 1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES, INCLUDING TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY.

Section 1447(b) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222b(b)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 7113. GRANTS TO UPGRADE AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SCIENCE FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT AT INSULAR AREA LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS.

(a) SUPPORTING TROPICAL AND SUBTROPICAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1447B(a) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222b–2(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) PURPOSE.—It is the intent of Congress to assist the land-grant colleges and universities in the insular areas in efforts to—

''(1) acquire, alter, or repair facilities or relevant equipment necessary for conducting agricultural research; and

''(2) support tropical and subtropical agricultural research, including pest and disease research.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1447B of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222b–2) is amended in the heading—

(A) by inserting ''**AND SUPPORT TROPICAL AND SUBTROPICAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH**'' after ''**EQUIPMENT**''; and

(B) by striking ''**INSTITUTIONS**'' and inserting ''**COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**''.

(b) EXTENSION.—Section 1447B(d) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222b–2(d)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 7114. REPEAL OF NATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING VIRTUAL CENTERS.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 1448 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222c) is repealed.

SEC. 7115. HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS.

Section 1455(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3241(c)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 7116. COMPETITIVE GRANTS PROGRAM FOR HISPANIC AGRICULTURAL WORKERS AND YOUTH.

Section 1456(e)(1) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3243(e)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a competitive grants program—

''(A) to fund fundamental and applied research and extension at Hispanic-serving agricultural colleges and universities in agriculture, human nutrition, food science, bioenergy, and environmental science; and

''(B) to award competitive grants to Hispanic-serving agricultural colleges and universities to provide for training in the food and agricultural sciences of Hispanic agricultural workers and Hispanic youth working in the food and agricultural sciences.''.

SEC. 7117. COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

Section 1459A(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3292b(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2013; and

''(2) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7118. REPEAL OF RESEARCH EQUIPMENT GRANTS.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 1462A of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3310a) is repealed.

SEC. 7119. UNIVERSITY RESEARCH.

Section 1463 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3311) is amended in both of subsections (a) and (b) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 7120. EXTENSION SERVICE.

Section 1464 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3312) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 7121. AUDITING, REPORTING, BOOKKEEPING, AND ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS.

Section 1469 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3315) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(B) by striking paragraph (3); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3);

(2) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsections:

''(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may retain not more than 4 percent of amounts made available for agricultural research, extension, and teaching assistance programs for the administration of those programs authorized under this Act or any other Act.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The limitation on administrative expenses under paragraph (1) shall not apply to peer panel expenses under subsection (d) or any other provision of law related to the administration of agricultural research, extension, and teaching assistance programs that contains a limitation on administrative expenses that is less than the limitation under paragraph (1).

''(c) AGREEMENTS WITH NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.—

''(1) FORMER AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FACILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary, for purposes of supporting ongoing research and information dissemination activities, including supporting research and those activities through co-locating scientists and other technical personnel, sharing of laboratory and field equipment, and providing financial support, shall enter into grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, or other legal instruments with former Department of Agriculture agricultural research facilities.

''(2) AGREEMENTS WITH AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary, for purposes of receiving from a non-Federal agricultural research organization support for agricultural research, including staffing, laboratory and field equipment, or direct financial assistance, may enter into grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, or other legal instruments with a non-Federal agricultural research organization, the operation of which is consistent with the research mission and programs of an agricultural research facility of the Department of Agriculture.''.

SEC. 7122. SUPPLEMENTAL AND ALTERNATIVE CROPS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND TERMINATION.—Section 1473D of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

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

''(e) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for fiscal year 2013; and

''(2) $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

(b) COMPETITIVE GRANTS.—Section 1473D(c)(1) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319d(c)(1)) is amended by striking ''use such research funding, special or competitive grants, or other means, as the Secretary determines,'' and inserting ''make competitive grants''.

SEC. 7123. CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS FOR NLGCA INSTITUTIONS.

Section 1473F(b) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319i(b)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 7124. AQUACULTURE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) COMPETITIVE GRANTS.—Section 1475(b) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3322(b)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''competitive'' before ''grants''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1477 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3324) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1477. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle—

''(1) $7,500,000 for each of fiscal years 1991 through 2013; and

''(2) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

''(b) PROHIBITION ON USE.—Funds made available under this section may not be used to acquire or construct a building.''.

SEC. 7125. RANGELAND RESEARCH PROGRAMS.

Section 1483(a) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3336(a)) is amended by striking ''subtitle'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''subtitle—

''(1) $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1991 through 2013; and

''(2) $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7126. SPECIAL AUTHORIZATION FOR BIOSECURITY PLANNING AND RESPONSE.

Section 1484(a) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3351(a)) is amended by striking ''response such sums as are necessary'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''response—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2013; and

''(2) $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7127. DISTANCE EDUCATION AND RESIDENT INSTRUCTION GRANTS PROGRAM FOR INSULAR AREA INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

(a) DISTANCE EDUCATION GRANTS FOR INSULAR AREAS.—

(1) COMPETITIVE GRANTS.—Section 1490(a) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3362(a)) is amended by striking ''or noncompetitive''.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1490(f) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3362(f)) is amended by striking ''section'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2013; and

''(2) $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

(b) RESIDENT INSTRUCTION GRANTS FOR INSULAR AREAS.—Section 1491(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3363(c)) is amended by striking ''such sums as are necessary'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2013; and

''(2) $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7128. MATCHING FUNDS REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle:

''Subtitle P—General Provisions

''SEC. 1492. MATCHING FUNDS REQUIREMENT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The recipient of a competitive grant that is awarded by the Secretary under a covered law shall provide funds, in-kind contributions, or a combination of both, from sources other than funds provided through such grant in an amount at least equal to the amount of such grant.

''(b) EXCEPTION.—The matching funds requirement under subsection (a) shall not apply to grants awarded—

''(1) to a research agency of the Department of Agriculture;

''(2) to an entity eligible to receive funds under a capacity and infrastructure program (as defined in section 251(f)(1)(C) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6971(f)(1)(C))), including a partner of such entity.

''(c) COVERED LAW.—In this section, the term 'covered law' means each of the following provisions of law:

''(1) This title.

''(2) Title XVI of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5801 et seq.).

''(3) The Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7601 et seq.).

''(4) Part III of subtitle E of title VII of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 3202 et seq.).

''(5) The Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (9) of subsection (b) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (B);

(2) in the heading, by inserting ''FOR EQUIPMENT GRANTS'' after ''FUNDS'';

(3) by striking ''(A) EQUIPMENT GRANTS.—''; and

(4) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and moving the margins of such subparagraphs two ems to the left.

(c) APPLICATION TO AMENDMENTS.—

(1) NEW GRANTS.—Section 1492 of the National Agricultural, Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to grants described in such section awarded after October 1, 2013, unless the provision of a covered law under which such grants are awarded specifically exempts such grants from the matching funds requirement under such section.

(2) EXISTING GRANTS.—A matching funds requirement in effect on or before October 1, 2013, under a covered law shall continue to apply to a grant awarded under such provision of law on or before that date.

Subtitle B—Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990

SEC. 7201. BEST UTILIZATION OF BIOLOGICAL APPLICATIONS.

Section 1624 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5814) is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by striking ''$40,000,000 for each fiscal year''; and

(2) by inserting ''$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2018'' after ''chapter''.

SEC. 7202. INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS.

Section 1627(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5821(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section through the National Institute of Food and Agriculture $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7203. SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER PROGRAM.

Section 1628(f) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5831(f)) is amended to read as follows:

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for fiscal year 2013; and

''(2) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7204. NATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM.

Section 1629(i) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5832(i)) is amended to read as follows:

''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the National Training Program $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7205. NATIONAL GENETICS RESOURCES PROGRAM.

Section 1635(b) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5844(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''such funds as may be necessary''; and

(2) by striking ''subtitle'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''subtitle—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 1991 through 2013; and

''(2) $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7206. REPEAL OF NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL WEATHER INFORMATION SYSTEM.

Effective October 1, 2013, subtitle D of title XVI of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5851 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 7207. REPEAL OF RURAL ELECTRONIC COMMERCE EXTENSION PROGRAM.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 1670 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5923) is repealed.

SEC. 7208. REPEAL OF AGRICULTURAL GENOME INITIATIVE.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 1671 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5924) is repealed.

SEC. 7209. HIGH-PRIORITY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION INITIATIVES.

Section 1672 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of subsection (a), by striking ''subsections (e) through (i)'' and inserting ''subsections (e) and (f)'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2), in the first sentence, by striking ''subsections (e) through (i)'' and inserting ''subsections (e) and (f)'';

(3) by striking subsections (e), (f), and (i);

(4) by redesignating subsections (g), (h), and (j) as subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively;

(5) in subsection (f) (as redesignated by paragraph (4))—

(A) by striking ''2012'' each place it appears in paragraphs (1)(B), (2)(B), and (3) and inserting ''2018''; and

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and honey bee health disorders'' after ''collapse''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting '', including best management practices'' after ''strategies''; and

(6) in subsection (g) (as redesignated by paragraph (4)), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 7210. REPEAL OF NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT RESEARCH AND EXTENSION INITIATIVE.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 1672A of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925a) is repealed.

SEC. 7211. ORGANIC AGRICULTURE RESEARCH AND EXTENSION INITIATIVE.

Section 1672B of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925b) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(e) FARM BUSINESS MANAGEMENT ENCOURAGED.—Following the completion of a peer review process for grant proposals received under this section, the Secretary shall give a priority to grant proposals found in the review process to be scientifically meritorious using the same criteria the Secretary uses to give priority to grants under section 1672D(b).''; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the heading of such paragraph, by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(C) $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading of such paragraph, by striking ''2009 THROUGH 2012'' and inserting ''2014 THROUGH 2018''; and

(ii) by striking ''2009 through 2012'' and inserting ''2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 7212. REPEAL OF AGRICULTURAL BIOENERGY FEEDSTOCK AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION INITIATIVE.

(a) REPEAL.—Effective October 1, 2013, section 1672C of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925e) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 251(f)(1)(D) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6971(f)(1)(D)) is amended—

(1) by striking clause (xi); and

(2) by redesignating clauses (xii) and (xiii) as clauses (xi) and (xii), respectively.

SEC. 7213. FARM BUSINESS MANAGEMENT.

Section 1672D(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925f(d)) is amended by striking ''such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.'' and inserting the following: ''to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for fiscal year 2013; and

''(2) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7214. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.

The Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 is amended by inserting after section 1672D (7 U.S.C. 5925f) the following new section:

''SEC. 1673. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.

''(a) FUNDING PRIORITIES.—The Secretary shall prioritize centers of excellence established for specific agricultural commodities for the receipt of funding for any competitive research or extension program administered by the Secretary.

''(b) COMPOSITION.—A center of excellence is composed of 1 or more of the eligible entities specified in subsection (b)(7) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(7)) that provide financial or in-kind support to the center of excellence.

''(c) CRITERIA FOR CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.—

''(1) REQUIRED EFFORTS.—The criteria for consideration to be recognized as a center of excellence shall include efforts—

''(A) to ensure coordination and cost effectiveness by reducing unnecessarily duplicative efforts regarding research, teaching, and extension;

''(B) to leverage available resources by using public/private partnerships among agricultural industry groups, institutions of higher education, and the Federal Government;

''(C) to implement teaching initiatives to increase awareness and effectively disseminate solutions to target audiences through extension activities; and

''(D) to increase the economic returns to rural communities by identifying, attracting, and directing funds to high-priority agricultural issues.

''(2) ADDITIONAL EFFORTS.—Where practicable, the criteria for consideration to be recognized as a center of excellence shall include efforts to improve teaching capacity and infrastructure at colleges and universities (including land-grant institutions, schools of forestry, schools of veterinary medicine, and NLGCA Institutions).''.

SEC. 7215. REPEAL OF RED MEAT SAFETY RESEARCH CENTER.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 1676 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5929) is repealed.

SEC. 7216. ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM FOR FARMERS WITH DISABILITIES.

Section 1680(c)(1) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5933(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''is'' and inserting ''are''; and

(2) by striking ''section'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''section—

''(A) $6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2013; and

''(B) $3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7217. NATIONAL RURAL INFORMATION CENTER CLEARINGHOUSE.

Section 2381(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 3125b(e)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

Subtitle C—Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998

SEC. 7301. RELEVANCE AND MERIT OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION FUNDED BY THE DEPARTMENT.

Section 103(a)(2) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7613(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the heading by striking ''MERIT REVIEW OF EXTENSION'' and inserting ''RELEVANCE AND MERIT REVIEW OF RESEARCH, EXTENSION,'';

(2) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting ''relevance and'' before ''merit''; and

(B) by striking ''extension or education'' and inserting ''research, extension, or education''; and

(3) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''on a continuous basis'' after ''procedures''.

SEC. 7302. INTEGRATED RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION COMPETITIVE GRANTS PROGRAM.

Section 406(f) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7626(f)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 7303. REPEAL OF COORDINATED PROGRAM OF RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION TO IMPROVE VIABILITY OF SMALL AND MEDIUM SIZE DAIRY, LIVESTOCK, AND POULTRY OPERATIONS.

(a) REPEAL.—Effective October 1, 2013, section 407 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7627) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 251(f)(1)(D) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6971(f)(1)(D)), as amended by section 7212(b), is further amended—

(1) by striking clause (xi) (as redesignated by section 7212(b)); and

(2) by redesignating clause (xii) (as redesignated by section 7212(b)) as clause (xi).

SEC. 7304. FUSARIUM GRAMINEARUM GRANTS.

Section 408(e) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7628(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2013; and

''(2) $7,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7305. REPEAL OF BOVINE JOHNE'S DISEASE CONTROL PROGRAM.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 409 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7629) is repealed.

SEC. 7306. GRANTS FOR YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 410(d) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7630(d)) is amended by striking ''section such sums as are necessary'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; and

''(2) $3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7307. SPECIALTY CROP RESEARCH INITIATIVE.

Section 412 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7632) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and genomics'' and inserting ''genomics, and other methods''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''handling and processing,'' after ''production efficiency,'';

(2) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(d) RESEARCH PROJECTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall award competitive grants on the basis of—

''(1) an initial scientific peer review conducted by a panel of subject matter experts from Federal agencies, non-Federal entities, and the specialty crop industry; and

''(2) a final funding determination made by the Secretary based on a review and ranking for merit, relevance, and impact conducted by a panel of specialty crop industry representatives for the specific specialty crop.''; and

(3) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''(1) MANDATORY FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEARS 2008 THROUGH 2012.—Of the funds'' and inserting the following: ''(1) MANDATORY FUNDING.—

''(A) FISCAL YEARS 2008 THROUGH 2012.—Of the funds''; and

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

''(B) SUBSEQUENT FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall make available to carry out this section—

''(i) $50,000,000 for fiscal years 2014 and 2015;

''(ii) $55,000,000 for fiscal years 2016 and 2017; and

''(iii) $65,000,000 for fiscal year 2018 and each fiscal year thereafter.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''2014 through 2018''; and

(ii) by striking ''2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 7308. FOOD ANIMAL RESIDUE AVOIDANCE DATABASE PROGRAM.

Section 604(e) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7642(e)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 7309. REPEAL OF NATIONAL SWINE RESEARCH CENTER.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 612 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–185; 112 Stat. 605) is repealed.

SEC. 7310. OFFICE OF PEST MANAGEMENT POLICY.

Section 614(f) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7653(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''such sums as are necessary''; and

(2) by striking ''section'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2013; and

''(2) $3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7311. REPEAL OF STUDIES OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION.

Effective October 1, 2013, subtitle C of title VI of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7671 et seq.) is repealed.

Subtitle D—Other Laws

SEC. 7401. CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS ACT.

Section 16(a) of the Critical Agricultural Materials Act (7 U.S.C. 178n(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''such sums as are necessary''; and

(2) by striking ''Act'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''Act—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 1991 through 2013; and

''(2) $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7402. EQUITY IN EDUCATIONAL LAND-GRANT STATUS ACT OF 1994.

(a) DEFINITION OF 1994 INSTITUTIONS.—Section 532 of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103–382) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking ''Memorial'';

(2) in paragraph (26), by striking ''Community'';

(3) by striking paragraphs (5), (10), and (27);

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (6), (7), (8), (9), (14), (15), (16), (17), (18), (19), (20), (21), (22), (23), (24), (25), (26), (28), (29), (30), (31), (32), (33), and (34) as paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (7), (8), (9), (5), (10), (15), (17), (18), (19), (20), (22), (23), (24), (25), (32), (26), (27), (28), (29), (30), (31), (33), (34), (35), and (14), respectively, and transferring the paragraphs so as to appear in numerical order;

(5) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), the following new paragraph:

''(1) Aaniih Nakoda College.'';

(6) by inserting after paragraph (5) (as so redesignated), the following new paragraph:

''(6) College of the Muscogee Nation.'';

(7) by inserting after paragraph (15) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraph:

''(16) Keweenaw Bay Ojibwa Community College.''; and

(8) by inserting after paragraph (20) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraph:

''(21) Navajo Technical College.''.

(b) ENDOWMENT FOR 1994 INSTITUTIONS.—Section 533(b) of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103–382) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(c) INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS.—Section 535 of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103–382) is amended by striking ''2012'' each place it appears in subsections (b)(1) and (c) and inserting ''2018''.

(d) RESEARCH GRANTS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 536(c) of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103–382) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(2) RESEARCH GRANT REQUIREMENTS.—Section 536(b) of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103–382) is amended by striking ''with at least 1 other land-grant college or university'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''with—

''(1) the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture; or

''(2) at least 1—

''(A) other land-grant college or university (exclusive of another 1994 Institution);

''(B) non-land-grant college of agriculture (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)); or

''(C) cooperating forestry school (as defined in that section).''.

SEC. 7403. RESEARCH FACILITIES ACT.

Section 6(a) of the Research Facilities Act (7 U.S.C. 390d(a)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 7404. REPEAL OF CARBON CYCLE RESEARCH.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 221 of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 6711) is repealed.

SEC. 7405. COMPETITIVE, SPECIAL, AND FACILITIES RESEARCH GRANT ACT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subsection (b)(11)(A) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(11)(A)) is amended in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) PRIORITY AREAS.—Subsection (b)(2) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (vi), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in clause (vii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(viii) plant-based foods that are major sources of nutrients of concern (as determined by the Secretary).'';

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (vii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in clause (viii), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

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

''(ix) the research and development of surveillance methods, vaccines, vaccination delivery systems, or diagnostic tests for pests and diseases (especially zoonotic diseases) in wildlife

reservoirs presenting a potential concern to public health or domestic livestock and pests and diseases in minor species (including deer, elk, and bison); and

''(x) the identification of animal drug needs and the generation and dissemination of data for safe and effective therapeutic applications of animal drugs for minor species and minor uses of such drugs in major species.'';

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) in clause (ii), by inserting before the semicolon '', including the effects of plant-based foods that are major sources of nutrients of concern on diet and health'';

(B) in clause (iii), by inserting before the semicolon '', including plant-based foods that are major sources of nutrients of concern'';

(C) in clause (iv), by inserting before the semicolon '', including postharvest practices conducted with respect to plant-based foods that are major sources of nutrients of concern''; and

(D) in clause (v), by inserting before the period '', including improving the functionality of plant-based foods that are major sources of nutrients of concern'';

(4) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (iv), (v), and (vi) as clauses (v), (vi), and (vii), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

''(iv) the effectiveness of conservation practices and technologies designed to address nutrient losses and improve water quality;''; and

(5) in subparagraph (F)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting ''economics,'' after ''trade,'';

(B) by redesignating clauses (v) and (vi) as clauses (vi) and (vii), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after clause (iv) the following new clause:

''(v) the economic costs, benefits, and viability of producers adopting conservation practices and technologies designed to improve water quality;''.

(c) GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.—Subsection (b)(4) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(F) establish procedures under which a commodity board established under a commodity promotion law (as such term is defined under section 501(a) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7401(a))) or a State commodity board (or other equivalent State entity) may directly submit to the Secretary proposals for requests for applications to specifically address particular issues related to the priority areas specified in paragraph (2).''.

(d) SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS.—Subsection (b)(6) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(6)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(E) to eligible entities to carry out the specific research proposals submitted under procedures established under paragraph (4)(F).''.

(e) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—Subsection (b)(7)(G) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(7)(G)) is amended by striking ''or corporations'' and inserting '', foundations, or corporations''.

(f) INTER-REGIONAL RESEARCH PROJECT NUMBER 4.—Subsection (e) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''minor use pesticides'' and inserting ''pesticides for minor agricultural use and for use on specialty crops (as defined in section 3 of the Specialty Crop Competitiveness Act of 2004 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note)''; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and for use on specialty crops'' after ''minor agricultural use'';

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (G); and

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraphs:

''(C) prioritize potential pest management technology for minor agricultural use and for use on specialty crops;

''(D) conduct research to develop the data necessary to facilitate pesticide registrations, reregistrations, and associated tolerances;

''(E) assist in removing trade barriers caused by residues of pesticides registered for minor agricultural use and for use on domestically grown specialty crops;

''(F) assist in the registration and reregistration of pest management technologies for minor agricultural use and for use on specialty crops; and''.

(g) EMPHASIS ON SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE.—The Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i) is amended by striking subsection (k).

SEC. 7406. RENEWABLE RESOURCES EXTENSION ACT OF 1978.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 6 of the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1675) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) TERMINATION DATE.—Section 8 of the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1671 note; Public Law 95–306) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 7407. NATIONAL AQUACULTURE ACT OF 1980.

Section 10 of the National Aquaculture Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 2809) is amended by striking ''2012'' each place it appears and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 7408. REPEAL OF USE OF REMOTE SENSING DATA.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 892 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 5935) is repealed.

SEC. 7409. REPEAL OF REPORTS UNDER FARM SECURITY AND RURAL INVESTMENT ACT OF 2002.

(a) REPEAL OF REPORT ON PRODUCERS AND HANDLERS FOR ORGANIC PRODUCTS.—Effective October 1, 2013, section 7409 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 5925b note; Public Law 107–171) is repealed.

(b) REPEAL OF REPORT ON GENETICALLY MODIFIED PEST-PROTECTED PLANTS.—Effective October 1, 2013, section 7410 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–171; 116 Stat. 462) is repealed.

(c) REPEAL OF STUDY ON NUTRIENT BANKING.—Effective October 1, 2013, section 7411 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 5925a note; Public Law 107–171) is repealed.

SEC. 7410. BEGINNING FARMER AND RANCHER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Section 7405 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3319f) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraphs (A) through (R) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

''(A) basic livestock, forest management, and crop farming practices;

''(B) innovative farm, ranch, and private, nonindustrial forest land transfer strategies;

''(C) entrepreneurship and business training;

''(D) financial and risk management training (including the acquisition and management of agricultural credit);

''(E) natural resource management and planning;

''(F) diversification and marketing strategies;

''(G) curriculum development;

''(H) mentoring, apprenticeships, and internships;

''(I) resources and referral;

''(J) farm financial benchmarking;

''(K) assisting beginning farmers or ranchers in acquiring land from retiring farmers and ranchers;

''(L) agricultural rehabilitation and vocational training for veterans; and

''(M) other similar subject areas of use to beginning farmers or ranchers.'';

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking ''and community-based organizations'' and inserting '', community-based organizations, and school-based agricultural educational organizations'';

(C) by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(8) MILITARY VETERAN BEGINNING FARMERS AND RANCHERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not less than 5 percent of the funds used to carry out this subsection for a fiscal year shall be used to support programs and services that address the needs of military veteran beginning farmers and ranchers.

''(B) COORDINATION PERMITTED.—A recipient of a grant under this section using the grant as described in subparagraph (A) may coordinate with a recipient of a grant under section 1680 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5933) in addressing the needs of military veteran beginning farmers and ranchers with disabilities.''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(11) LIMITATION ON INDIRECT COSTS.—A recipient of a grant under this section may not use more than 10 percent of the funds provided by the grant for the indirect costs of carrying out the initiatives described in paragraph (1).'';

(2) in subsection (h)(1)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(C) $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, to remain available until expended.''; and

(3) in subsection (h)(2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''2008 THROUGH 2012'' and inserting ''2014 THROUGH 2018''; and

(B) by striking ''2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''2014 through 2018''.

SEC. 7411. INCLUSION OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS AS A STATE UNDER MCINTIRE-STENNIS COOPERATIVE FORESTRY ACT.

Section 8 of Public Law 87–788 (commonly known as the McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Act; 16 U.S.C. 582a–7) is amended by striking ''and Guam'' and inserting ''Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands''.

Subtitle E—Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008

PART 1—AGRICULTURAL SECURITY

SEC. 7501. AGRICULTURAL BIOSECURITY COMMUNICATION CENTER.

Section 14112(c) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8912(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; and

''(2) $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7502. ASSISTANCE TO BUILD LOCAL CAPACITY IN AGRICULTURAL BIOSECURITY PLANNING, PREPARATION, AND RESPONSE.

Section 14113 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8913) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by striking ''such sums as may be necessary''; and

(B) by striking ''subsection'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''subsection—

''(A) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; and

''(B) $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection—

''(A) $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; and

''(B) $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7503. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL COUNTERMEASURES.

Section 14121(b) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8921(b)) is amended by striking ''is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; and

''(2) $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7504. AGRICULTURAL BIOSECURITY GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 14122(e) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8922(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''sums as are necessary''; and

(2) by striking ''section'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013, to remain available until expended; and

''(2) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, to remain available until expended.''.

PART 2—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 7511. ENHANCED USE LEASE AUTHORITY PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 308 of the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 3125a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(6)(A), by striking ''5 years'' and inserting ''10 years''; and

(2) in subsection (d)(2), by striking ''1, 3, and 5 years'' and inserting ''6, 8, and 10 years''.

SEC. 7512. GRAZINGLANDS RESEARCH LABORATORY.

Section 7502 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2019) is amended by striking ''5-year period'' and inserting ''10-year period''.

SEC. 7513. BUDGET SUBMISSION AND FUNDING.

Section 7506 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7614c) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) COVERED PROGRAM.—The term 'covered program' means—

''(A) each research program carried out by the Agricultural Research Service or the Economic Research Service for which annual appropriations are requested in the annual budget submission of the President; and

''(B) each competitive program carried out by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture for which annual appropriations are requested in the annual budget submission of the President.

''(2) REQUEST FOR AWARDS.—The term 'request for awards' means a funding announcement published by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture that provides detailed information on funding opportunities at the Institute, including the purpose, eligibility, restriction, focus areas, evaluation criteria, regulatory information, and instructions on how to apply for such opportunities.''; and

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

''(e) ADDITIONAL PRESIDENTIAL BUDGET SUBMISSION REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each year, the President shall submit to Congress, together with the annual budget submission of the President, the information described in paragraph (2) for each funding request for a covered program.

''(2) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The information described in this paragraph includes—

''(A) baseline information, including with respect to each covered program—

''(i) the funding level for the program for the fiscal year preceding the year the annual budget submission of the President is submitted;

''(ii) the funding level requested in the annual budget submission of the President, including any increase or decrease in the funding level; and

''(iii) an explanation justifying any change from the funding level specified in clause (i) to the level specified in clause (ii);

''(B) with respect to each covered program that is carried out by the Economic Research Service or the Agricultural Research Service, the location and staff years of the program;

''(C) the proposed funding levels to be allocated to, and the expected publication date, scope, and allocation level for, each request for awards to be published under or associated with—

''(i) each priority area specified in subsection (b)(2) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(2));

''(ii) each research and extension project carried out under section 1621(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5811(a));

''(iii) each grant to be awarded under section 1672B(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925b(a));

''(iv) each grant awarded under section 412(d) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7632(d)); and

''(v) each grant awarded under 7405(c)(1) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3319f(c)(1)); or

''(D) any other information the Secretary determines will increase congressional oversight with respect to covered programs.

''(3) PROHIBITION.—Unless the President submits the information described in paragraph (2)(C) for a fiscal year, the President may not carry out any program during the fiscal year that is authorized under—

''(A) subsection (b) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b));

''(B) section 1621 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5811);

''(C) section 1672B of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925b);

''(D) section 412 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7632); or

''(E) section 7405 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3319f).

''(f) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.—Each year on a date that is not later than the date on which the President submits the annual budget, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report containing a description of the agricultural research, extension, and education activities carried out by the Federal Government during the fiscal year that immediately precedes the year for which the report is submitted, including—

''(1) a review of the extent to which those activities—

''(A) are duplicative or overlap within the Department of Agriculture; or

''(B) are similar to activities carried out by—

''(i) other Federal agencies;

''(ii) the States (including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and other territories or possessions of the United States);

''(iii) institutions of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)); or

''(iv) the private sector; and

''(2) for each report submitted under this section on or after January 1, 2013, a 5-year projection of national priorities with respect to agricultural research, extension, and education, taking into account domestic needs.''.

SEC. 7514. REPEAL OF RESEARCH AND EDUCATION GRANTS FOR THE STUDY OF ANTIBIOTIC-RESISTANT BACTERIA.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 7521 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 3202) is repealed.

SEC. 7515. REPEAL OF FARM AND RANCH STRESS ASSISTANCE NETWORK.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 7522 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 5936) is repealed.

SEC. 7516. REPEAL OF SEED DISTRIBUTION.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 7523 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 415–1) is repealed.

SEC. 7517. NATURAL PRODUCTS RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 7525(e) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 5937(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 7518. SUN GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7526 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8114) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4)(B), by striking ''the Department of Energy'' and inserting ''other appropriate Federal agencies (as determined by the Secretary)'';

(2) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''multistate'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''integrated, multistate research, extension, and education programs on technology development and technology implementation.'';

(B) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C);

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''in accordance with paragraph (2)'';

(ii) by striking ''gasification'' and inserting ''bioproducts''; and

(iii) by striking ''the Department of Energy'' and inserting ''other appropriate Federal agencies'';

(B) by striking paragraph (2); and

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (g), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 7526(f)(1) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8114(f)(1)) is amended by striking ''subsection (c)(1)(D)(i)'' and inserting ''subsection (c)(1)(C)(i)''.

SEC. 7519. REPEAL OF STUDY AND REPORT ON FOOD DESERTS.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 7527 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2039) is repealed.

SEC. 7520. REPEAL OF AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH AND EDUCATION.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 7529 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 5938) is repealed.

Subtitle F—Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 7601. AGREEMENTS WITH NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS FOR NATIONAL ARBORETUM.

Section 6 of the Act of March 4, 1927 (20 U.S.C. 196), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) negotiate agreements for the National Arboretum with nonprofit scientific or educational organizations, the interests of which are complementary to the mission of the National Arboretum, or nonprofit organizations that support the purpose of the National Arboretum, except that the net proceeds of the organizations from the agreements shall be used exclusively for research and educational work for the benefit of the National Arboretum and the operation and maintenance of the facilities of the National Arboretum, including enhancements, upgrades, restoration, and conservation;''; and

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

''(d) RECOGNITION OF DONORS.—A non-profit organization that entered into an agreement under subsection (a)(1) may recognize donors if that recognition is approved in advance by the Secretary. In considering whether to approve such recognition, the Secretary shall broadly exercise the discretion of the Secretary to the fullest extent allowed under Federal law in effect on the date of the enactment of this subsection.''.

SEC. 7602. COTTON DISEASE RESEARCH REPORT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the fungus fusarium oxysporum f. sp. vasinfectum race 4 (referred to in this section as ''FOV Race 4'') and the impact of such fungus on cotton, including—

(1) an overview of the threat FOV Race 4 poses to the cotton industry in the United States;

(2) the status and progress of Federal research initiatives to detect, contain, or eradicate FOV Race 4, including current FOV Race 4-specific research projects; and

(3) a comprehensive strategy to combat FOV Race 4 that establishes—

(A) detection and identification goals;

(B) containment goals;

(C) eradication goals; and

(D) a plan to partner with the cotton industry in the United States to maximize resources, information sharing, and research responsiveness and effectiveness.

SEC. 7603. ACCEPTANCE OF FACILITY FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZED.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize a non-Federal entity to construct, at no cost and without obligation to the Federal Government, a facility for use by the Agricultural Research Service on land owned by the Agricultural Research Service and managed by the Secretary.

(b) ACCEPTANCE OF GIFT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), upon the completion of the construction of the facility by the non-Federal entity under subsection (a), the Secretary shall accept the facility as a gift in accordance with Public Law 95–442 (7 U.S.C. 2269).

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall certify in advance that the acceptance under paragraph (1) complies with the limitations specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c).

(c) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) VALUE.—The Secretary may not accept a facility as a gift under this section if the fair market value of the facility is more than $5,000,000.

(2) NO FEDERAL COST.—The Secretary shall not enter into any acquisitions, demonstrations, exchanges, grants, contracts, incentives, leases, procurements, sales, or other transaction authorities or arrangements that would obligate future appropriations with respect to the facility constructed under subsection (a).

(d) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—No facility may be accepted by the Secretary for use by the Agricultural Research Service under this section after September 30, 2018.

SEC. 7604. MISCELLANEOUS TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

Sections 7408 and 7409 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2013) are both amended by striking ''Title III of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994'' and inserting ''Title III of the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994''.

TITLE VIII—FORESTRY

Subtitle A—Repeal of Certain Forestry Programs

SEC. 8001. FOREST LAND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 4 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8002 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–171; 16 U.S.C. 2103 note) is amended by striking subsection (a).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 8002. WATERSHED FORESTRY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 6 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103b) is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 8003. EXPIRED COOPERATIVE NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS MARKETING PROGRAM.

Section 18 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2112) is repealed.

SEC. 8004. HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTION AGRICULTURAL LAND NATIONAL RESOURCES LEADERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 8402 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (16 U.S.C. 1649a) is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 8005. TRIBAL WATERSHED FORESTRY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 303 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6542) is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

SEC. 8006. SEPARATE FOREST SERVICE DECISION-MAKING AND APPEALS PROCESS.

Section 322 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102–381; 16 U.S.C. 1612 note) is repealed. Section 428 of division E of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74; 125 Stat. 1046; 16 U.S.C. 6515 note) shall not apply to any project or activity implementing a land and resource management plan developed under section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604) that is categorically excluded from documentation in an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

Subtitle B—Reauthorization of Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 Programs

SEC. 8101. STATE-WIDE ASSESSMENT AND STRATEGIES FOR FOREST RESOURCES.

Section 2A(c) of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'';

(2) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

''(5) as feasible, appropriate military installations where the voluntary participation and management of private or State-owned or other public forestland is able to support, promote, and contribute to the missions of such installations; and''.

SEC. 8102. FOREST LEGACY PROGRAM.

Subsection (m) of section 7 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103c) is amended to read as follows:

''(m) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for fiscal year 2013; and

''(2) $55,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 8103. COMMUNITY FOREST AND OPEN SPACE CONSERVATION PROGRAM.

Subsection (g) of section 7A of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103d) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for fiscal year 2013; and

''(2) $1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

Subtitle C—Reauthorization of Other Forestry-Related Laws

SEC. 8201. RURAL REVITALIZATION TECHNOLOGIES.

Section 2371(d)(2) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6601(d)(2)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 8202. OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL FORESTRY.

Subsection (d) of section 2405 of the Global Climate Change Prevention Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6704) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2013; and

''(2) $6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 8203. CHANGE IN FUNDING SOURCE FOR HEALTHY FORESTS RESERVE PROGRAM.

Section 508 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6578) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''IN GENERAL'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2013'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (d); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsections:

''(b) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out this section $9,750,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

''(c) ADDITIONAL SOURCE OF FUNDS.—In addition to funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (b) for a fiscal year, the Secretary may use such amount of the funds appropriated for that fiscal year to carry out the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590a et seq.) as the Secretary determines necessary to cover the

cost of technical assistance, management, and enforcement responsibilities for land enrolled in the healthy forests reserve program pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of section 504.''.

SEC. 8204. STEWARDSHIP END RESULT CONTRACTING PROJECT AUTHORITY.

Section 347 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 2104 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) CONTRACT FOR SALE OF PROPERTY.—At the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, a contract entered into by the Forest Service under this section may be considered a contract for the sale of property under such terms as the Secretary may prescribe without regard to any other provision of law.''.

Subtitle D—National Forest Critical Area Response

SEC. 8301. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CRITICAL AREA.—The term ''critical area'' means an area of the National Forest System designated by the Secretary under section 8302

(2) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.—The term ''National Forest System'' has the meaning given that term in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 8302. DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL AREAS.

(a) DESIGNATION REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall designate critical areas within the National Forest System for the purposes of addressing—

(1) deteriorating forest health conditions in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act due to insect infestation, drought, disease, or storm damage; and

(2) the future risk of insect infestations or disease outbreaks through preventative treatments.

(b) DESIGNATION METHOD.—In considering National Forest System land for designation as a critical area, the Secretary shall use—

(1) for purposes of subsection (a)(1), the most recent annual forest health aerial surveys of mortality and defoliation; and

(2) for purposes of subsection (a)(2), the National Insect and Disease Risk Map.

(c) TIME FOR INITIAL DESIGNATIONS.—The first critical areas shall be designated by the Secretary not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) DURATION OF DESIGNATION.—The designation of a critical area shall expire not later than 10 years after the date of the designation.

SEC. 8303. APPLICATION OF EXPEDITED PROCEDURES AND ACTIVITIES OF THE HEALTHY FORESTS RESTORATION ACT OF 2003 TO CRITICAL AREAS.

(a) APPLICABILITY.—Subject to subsections (b) through (e), title I of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6511 et seq.) (including the environmental analysis requirements of section 104 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 6514), the special administrative review process under section 105 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 6515), and the judicial review process under section 106 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 6516)), shall apply to all Forest Service projects and activities carried out in a critical area.

(b) APPLICATION OF OTHER LAW.—Section 322 of Public Law 102–381 (16 U.S.C. 1612 note; 106 Stat. 1419) shall not apply to projects conducted in accordance with this section.

(c) REQUIRED MODIFICATIONS.—In applying title I of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6511 et seq.) to Forest Service projects and activities in a critical area, the Secretary shall make the following modifications:

(1) The authority shall apply to the entire critical area, including land that is outside of a wildland-urban interface area or that does not satisfy any of the other eligibility criteria specified in section 102(a) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 6512(a)).

(2) All projects and activities of the Forest Service, including necessary connected actions (as described in section 1508.25(a)(1) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation)), shall be considered to be authorized hazardous fuel reduction projects for purposes of applying the title.

(d) SMALLER PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a project conducted in a critical area in accordance with this section that comprises less than 10,000 acres shall be—

(A) considered an action categorically excluded from the requirements for an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under section 1508.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation); and

(B) exempt from the special administrative review process under section 105 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6515).

(2) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN AREAS.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to—

(A) a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System;

(B) any Federal land on which, by Act of Congress or Presidential proclamation, the removal of vegetation is restricted or prohibited;

(C) a congressionally designated wilderness study area; or

(D) an area in which activities under paragraph (1) would be inconsistent with the applicable land and resource management plan.

(e) FOREST MANAGEMENT PLANS.—All projects and activities carried out in a critical area pursuant to this subtitle shall be consistent with the land and resource management plan established under section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604) for the unit of the National Forest System containing the critical area.

SEC. 8304. GOOD NEIGHBOR AUTHORITY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE STATE.—The term ''eligible State'' means a State that contains National Forest System land.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(3) STATE FORESTER.—The term ''State forester'' means the head of a State agency with jurisdiction over State forestry programs in an eligible State.

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AND CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement or contract (including a sole source contract) with a State forester to authorize the State forester to provide the forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration and protection services described in paragraph (2) on National Forest System land in the eligible State.

(2) AUTHORIZED SERVICES.—The forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration and protection services referred to in paragraph (1) include the conduct of—

(A) activities to treat insect infected trees;

(B) activities to reduce hazardous fuels; and

(C) any other activities to restore or improve forest, rangeland, and watershed health, including fish and wildlife habitat.

(3) STATE AS AGENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (6), a cooperative agreement or contract entered into under paragraph (1) may authorize the State forester to serve as the agent for the Secretary in providing the restoration and protection services authorized under that paragraph.

(4) SUBCONTRACTS.—In accordance with applicable contract procedures for the eligible State, a State forester may enter into subcontracts to provide the restoration and protection services authorized under a cooperative agreement or contract entered into under paragraph (1).

(5) TIMBER SALES.—Subsections (d) and (g) of section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a) shall not apply to services performed under a cooperative agreement or contract entered into under paragraph (1).

(6) RETENTION OF NEPA RESPONSIBILITIES.—Any decision required to be made under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to any restoration and protection services to be provided under this section by a State forester on National Forest System land shall not be delegated to a State forester or any other officer or employee of the eligible State.

(7) APPLICABLE LAW.—The restoration and protection services to be provided under this section shall be carried out on a project-to-project basis under existing authorities of the Forest Service.

Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 8401. REVISION OF STRATEGIC PLAN FOR FOREST INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS.

(a) REVISION REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall revise the strategic plan for forest inventory and analysis initially prepared pursuant to section 3(e) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1642(e)) to address the requirements imposed by subsection (b).

(b) ELEMENTS OF REVISED STRATEGIC PLAN.—In revising the strategic plan, the Secretary of Agriculture shall describe in detail the organization, procedures, and funding needed to achieve each of the following:

(1) Complete the transition to a fully annualized forest inventory program and include inventory and analysis of interior Alaska.

(2) Implement an annualized inventory of trees in urban settings, including the status and trends of trees and forests, and assessments of their ecosystem services, values, health, and risk to pests and diseases.

(3) Report information on renewable biomass supplies and carbon stocks at the local, State, regional, and national level, including by ownership type.

(4) Engage State foresters and other users of information from the forest inventory and analysis in reevaluating the list of core data variables collected on forest inventory and analysis plots with an emphasis on demonstrated need.

(5) Improve the timeliness of the timber product output program and accessibility of the annualized information on that database.

(6) Foster greater cooperation among the forest inventory and analysis program, research station leaders, and State foresters and other users of information from the forest inventory and analysis.

(7) Promote availability of and access to non-Federal resources to improve information analysis and information management.

(8) Collaborate with the Natural Resources Conservation Service, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and United States Geological Survey to integrate remote sensing, spatial analysis techniques, and other new technologies in the forest inventory and analysis program.

(9) Understand and report on changes in land cover and use.

(10) Expand existing programs to promote sustainable forest stewardship through increased understanding, in partnership with other Federal agencies, of the over 10 million family forest owners, their demographics, and the barriers to forest stewardship.

(11) Implement procedures to improve the statistical precision of estimates at the sub-State level.

(c) SUBMISSION OF REVISED STRATEGIC PLAN.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall submit the revised strategic plan to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives

and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

SEC. 8402. FOREST SERVICE PARTICIPATION IN ACES PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, may use funds derived from conservation-related programs executed on National Forest System lands to utilize the Agriculture Conservation Experienced Services Program established pursuant to section 1252 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3851) to provide technical services for conservation-related programs and authorities carried out by the Secretary on National Forest System lands.

SEC. 8403. GREEN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER RESEARCH UNDER FOREST AND RANGELAND RENEWABLE RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT OF 1978.

(a) ADDITIONAL FORESTRY AND RANGELAND RESEARCH AND EDUCATION HIGH PRIORITY.—Section 3(d)(2) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1642(d)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) Science and technology transfer, through the Forest Products Laboratory, to demonstrate the beneficial characteristics of wood as a green building material, including investments in life cycle assessment for wood products.''.

(b) RESEARCH FACILITIES AND COOPERATION.—Section 4 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1643) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate an annual report describing, for the period covered by the report—

''(1) the research conducted in furtherance of the research and education priority specified in section 3(d)(2)(F);

''(2) the number of buildings the Forest Service has built with wood as the primary structural material; and

''(3) the investments made by the Forest Service in green building wood promotion.''.

SEC. 8404. EXTENSION OF STEWARDSHIP CONTRACTS AUTHORITY REGARDING USE OF DESIGNATION BY PRESCRIPTION TO ALL THINNING SALES UNDER NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976.

Subsection (g) of section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) Designation, including but not limited to, marking when necessary, designation by description, or designation by prescription, and supervision of harvesting of trees, portions of trees, or forest products shall be conducted by persons employed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Such persons shall have no personal interest in the purchase or harvest of such products and shall not be directly or indirectly in the employment of the purchaser thereof. Designation by prescription and designation by prescription shall be considered valid methods for designation, and may be supervised by use of post-harvest cruise, sample weight scaling, or other methods determined by the Secretary to be appropriate.''.

SEC. 8405. REIMBURSEMENT OF FIRE FUNDS EXPENDED BY A STATE FOR MANAGEMENT AND SUPPRESSION OF CERTAIN WILDFIRES.

(a) DEFINITION OF STATE.—In this section, the term ''State'' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(b) REIMBURSEMENT AUTHORITY.—If a State seeks reimbursement for amounts expended for resources and services provided to another State for the management and suppression of a wildfire, the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to subsections (c) and (d)—

(1) may accept the reimbursement amounts from the other State; and

(2) shall pay those amounts to the State seeking reimbursement.

(c) MUTUAL ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT.—As a condition of seeking and providing reimbursement under subsection (b), the State seeking reimbursement and the State providing reimbursement must each have a mutual assistance agreement with the Forest Service or an agency of the Department of the Interior for providing and receiving wildfire management and suppression resources and services.

(d) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe the terms and conditions determined to be necessary to carry out subsection (b).

(e) EFFECT ON PRIOR REIMBURSEMENTS.—Any acceptance of funds or reimbursements made by the Secretary of Agriculture before the date of enactment of this Act that otherwise would have been authorized under this section shall be considered to have been made in accordance with this section.

SEC. 8406. ABILITY OF NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LANDS TO MEET NEEDS OF LOCAL WOOD PRODUCING FACILITIES FOR RAW MATERIALS.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a report containing—

(1) an assessment of the raw material needs of wood producing facilities located within the boundaries of each unit of the National Forest System or located outside of the unit, but within 100 miles of such boundaries;

(2) the volume of timber which would be available if the unit of the National Forest System annually sold its Allowable Sale Quantity in the current Forest Plan;

(3) the volume of timber actually sold and harvested from each unit of the National Forest System for the previous decade,

(4) a comparison of the volume actually sold and harvested from the previous decade to the Allowable Sale Quantity calculated in that decade by preceding or current forest plans; and

(5) an assessment of the ability of each unit of National Forest System to meet the needs of these facilities for raw materials.

SEC. 8407. REPORT ON THE NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM ROADS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the following:

(1) The total mileage of National Forest System roads and trails not meeting forest plan standards and guidelines.

(2) The total amount, in dollars, of Capital Improvement & Maintenance deferred maintenance needs for National Forest System roads, including a five-year analysis in the trend in total deferred maintenance costs.

(3) The sources of funds used for capital improvement & maintenance roads, including appropriated funds, mandatory funds, and receipts from activities on National Forest System lands.

(4) The impact of road closures on recreational activities and timber harvesting.

(5) The impact on land acquisitions, whether through fee acquisition, donation, or easement, on the maintenance backlog.

TITLE IX—ENERGY

SEC. 9001. DEFINITION OF RENEWABLE ENERGY SYSTEM.

Section 9001 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8101) is amended by—

(1) striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(4) BIOBASED PRODUCT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'biobased product' means a product determined by the Secretary to be a commercial or industrial product (other than food or feed) that is—

''(i) composed, in whole or in significant part, of biological products, including renewable domestic agricultural materials and forestry materials; or

''(ii) an intermediate ingredient or feedstock.

''(B) INCLUSION.—The term 'biobased product', with respect to forestry materials, includes forest products that meet biobased content requirements, notwithstanding the market share the product holds, the age of the product, or whether the market for the product is new or emerging.'';

(2) redesignating paragraphs (9), (10), (11), (12), (13), and (14) as paragraphs (10), (11), (12), (13), (14), and (16);

(3) inserting after paragraph (8), the following new paragraph:

''(9) FOREST PRODUCT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'forest product' means a product made from materials derived from the practice of forestry or the management of growing timber.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'forest product' includes—

''(i) pulp, paper, paperboard, pellets, lumber, and other wood products; and

''(ii) any recycled products derived from forest materials.''; and

(4) inserting after paragraph (14) (as so redesignated), the following new paragraph:

''(15) RENEWABLE ENERGY SYSTEM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the term 'renewable energy system' means a system that—

''(i) produces usable energy from a renewable energy source; and

''(ii) may include distribution components necessary to move energy produced by such system to the initial point of sale.

''(B) LIMITATION.—A system described in subparagraph (A) may not include a mechanism for dispensing energy at retail.''.

SEC. 9002. BIOBASED MARKETS PROGRAM.

Section 9002(h) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8102(h)) is amended by—

(1) striking ''(h) FUNDING.—'' and all that follows through ''to carry out this section, there'' and inserting ''(h) FUNDING.—There''; and

(2) striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 9003. BIOREFINERY ASSISTANCE.

(a) PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS.—Section 9003 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8103) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking ''to eligible entities'' and all that follows through ''guarantees for loans'' and inserting ''to eligible entities guarantees for loans'';

(2) by striking subsection (d);

(3) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (d) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking ''subsection (c)(2)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (c)''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking ''subsection (h)'' and inserting ''subsection (g)''.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 9003(g) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, as redesignated by subsection (a)(3), is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1);

(3) in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''DISCRETIONARY FUNDING'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2013''; and

(B) by striking ''In addition to any other funds made available to carry out this section, there'' and inserting ''There''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 9004. REPOWERING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 9004(d) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8104(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1);

(3) in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''DISCRETIONARY FUNDING'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2013''; and

(B) by striking ''In addition to any other funds made available to carry out this section, there'' and inserting ''There''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 9005. BIOENERGY PROGRAM FOR ADVANCED BIOFUELS.

Section 9005(g) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8105(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1);

(3) in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''DISCRETIONARY FUNDING'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2013''; and

(B) by striking ''In addition to any other funds made available to carry out this section, there'' and inserting ''There''; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraph:

''(2) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 9006. BIODIESEL FUEL EDUCATION PROGRAM.

Section 9006(d) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8106(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1);

(3) in the heading of paragraph (1) (as so redesignated), by striking ''AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEAR 2013''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 9007. RURAL ENERGY FOR AMERICA PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) REPEAL OF FEASIBILITY STUDIES.—Section 9007(c) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(2) TIERED APPLICATION PROCESS.—Section 9007(c) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107(c)) is further amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) TIERED APPLICATION PROCESS.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall establish a three-tiered application, evaluation, and oversight process that varies based on the cost of the proposed project with the process most simplified for projects referred to in subparagraph (A), more comprehensive for projects referred to in subparagraph (B), and most comprehensive for projects referred to in subparagraph (C). The three tiers for such process shall be as follows:

''(A) TIER 1.—Projects for which the cost of the project funded under this subsection is not more than $80,000.

''(B) TIER 2.—Projects for which the cost of the project funded under this subsection is more than $80,000 but less than $200,000.

''(C) TIER 3.—Projects for which the cost of the project funded under this subsection is $200,000 or more.''.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 9007(g) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107(g)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (1);

(3) in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''DISCRETIONARY FUNDING'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2013''; and

(B) by striking ''In addition to any other funds made available to carry out this section, there'' and inserting ''There''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $45,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 9008. BIOMASS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 9008(h) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8108(h)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1);

(3) in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''DISCRETIONARY FUNDING'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2013''; and

(B) by striking ''In addition to any other funds made available to carry out this section, there'' and inserting ''There''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 9009. FEEDSTOCK FLEXIBILITY PROGRAM FOR BIOENERGY PRODUCERS.

Section 9010(b) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8110(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 9010. BIOMASS CROP ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 9011 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8111) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (6); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''Program to'' and all that follows through ''support the establishment'' and inserting ''Program to support the establishment'';

(B) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraph (2);

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) in clause (viii), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) by redesignating clause (ix) as clause (x); and

(iii) by inserting after clause (viii) the following new clause:

''(ix) existing project areas that have received funding under this section and the continuation of funding of such project areas to advance the maturity of such project areas; and''; and

(B) in paragraph (5)(C)(ii)—

(i) by striking subclause (III); and

(ii) by redesignating subclauses (IV) and (V) as subclauses (III) and (IV), respectively;

(4) by striking subsection (d);

(5) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(6) in subsection (e) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1);

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1);

(C) in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking ''FISCAL YEAR 2013'' and all that follows through ''There is authorized'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEAR 2013.—There is authorized''; and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as paragraph (3) and moving the margin of such paragraph (as so redesignated) two ems to the left;

(D) by inserting after paragraph (1), the following new paragraph:

''(2) FISCAL YEARS 2014 THROUGH 2018.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''; and

(E) in paragraph (3) (as redesignated by subparagraph (C)(ii) of this paragraph), by striking ''this paragraph'' and inserting ''this subsection''.

SEC. 9011. COMMUNITY WOOD ENERGY PROGRAM.

Section 9013(e) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8113(e)) is amended by striking ''carry out this section'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''carry out this section—

''(1) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2013; and

''(2) $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 9012. REPEAL OF BIOFUELS INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY.

Section 9002 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2095) is repealed.

SEC. 9013. REPEAL OF RENEWABLE FERTILIZER STUDY.

Section 9003 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2096) is repealed.

TITLE X—HORTICULTURE

SEC. 10001. SPECIALTY CROPS MARKET NEWS ALLOCATION.

Section 10107(b) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 1622b(b)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 10002. REPEAL OF GRANT PROGRAM TO IMPROVE MOVEMENT OF SPECIALTY CROPS.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 10403 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 1622c) is repealed.

SEC. 10003. FARMERS MARKET AND LOCAL FOOD PROMOTION PROGRAM.

Section 6 of the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976 (7 U.S.C. 3005) is amended—

(1) in the heading of such section, by inserting ''**AND LOCAL FOOD**'' *after* ''**FARMERS' MARKET**'';

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting ''and Local Food'' after ''Farmers' Market'';

(B) by striking ''farmers' markets and to promote''; and

(C) by striking the period and inserting ''and assist in the development of local food business enterprises.'';

(3) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(b) PROGRAM PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Program are to increase domestic consumption of, and consumer access to, locally and regionally produced agricultural products by assisting in the development, improvement, and expansion of—

''(1) domestic farmers' markets, roadside stands, community-supported agriculture programs, agritourism activities, and other direct producer-to-consumer market opportunities; and

''(2) local and regional food business enterprises that process, distribute, aggregate, and store locally or regionally produced food products.'';

(4) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) by inserting ''or other agricultural business entity'' after ''cooperative''; and

(B) by inserting '', including a community supported agriculture network or association'' after ''association'';

(5) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f);

(6) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

''(e) FUNDS REQUIREMENTS FOR ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

''(1) MATCHING FUNDS.—An entity receiving a grant under this section for a project to carry out a purpose described in subsection (b)(2) shall provide matching funds in the form of cash or an in-kind contribution in an amount equal to 25 percent of the total cost of such project.

''(2) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity may not use a grant or other assistance provided under this section for the purchase, construction, or rehabilitation of a building or structure.''; and

(7) in subsection (f) (as redesignated by paragraph (5))—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(D) $30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.'';

(B) by striking paragraphs (3) and (5);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraphs:

''(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

''(4) USE OF FUNDS.—Of the funds made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year, 50 percent of such funds shall be used for the purposes described in paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and 50 percent of such funds shall be used for the purposes described in paragraph (2) of such subsection.

''(5) LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than 3 percent of the total amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year may be used for administrative expenses.''.

SEC. 10004. ORGANIC AGRICULTURE.

(a) ORGANIC PRODUCTION AND MARKET DATA INITIATIVES.—Section 7407(d)(2) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 5925c(d)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the heading of such paragraph, by striking ''2008 THROUGH 2012'' and inserting ''2014 THROUGH 2018''; and

(2) by striking ''2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''2014 through 2018''.

(b) MODERNIZATION AND TECHNOLOGY UPGRADE FOR NATIONAL ORGANIC PROGRAM.—Section 2122 of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6521) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) MODERNIZATION AND TECHNOLOGY UPGRADE FOR NATIONAL ORGANIC PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall modernize database and technology systems of the national organic program.''.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL ORGANIC PROGRAM.—Effective October 1, 2013, section 2123(b)(6) of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6522(b)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

''(6) $11,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

(d) NATIONAL ORGANIC CERTIFICATION COST-SHARE PROGRAM.—Effective October 1, 2013, section 10606 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 6523) is repealed.

(e) EXEMPTION OF CERTIFIED ORGANIC PRODUCTS FROM PROMOTION ORDER ASSESSMENTS.—Subsection (e) of section 501 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7401) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) EXEMPTION OF CERTIFIED ORGANIC PRODUCTS FROM PROMOTION ORDER ASSESSMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of a commodity promotion law, a person that produces, handles, markets, or imports organic products may be exempt from the payment of an assessment under a commodity promotion law with respect to any agricultural commodity that is certified as 'organic' or '100 percent organic' (as defined in part 205 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations or a successor regulation).

''(2) SPLIT OPERATIONS.—The exemption described in paragraph (1) shall apply to the certified 'organic' or '100 percent organic' (as defined in part 205 of title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation) products of a producer, handler, or marketer regardless of whether the agricultural commodity subject to the exemption is produced, handled, or marketed by a person that also produces, handles, or markets conventional or nonorganic agricultural products, including conventional or nonorganic agricultural products of the same agricultural commodity as that for which the exemption is claimed.

''(3) APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall approve the exemption of a person under this subsection if the person maintains a valid organic certificate issued under the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.).

''(4) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—This subsection shall be effective until the date on which the Secretary issues an organic commodity promotion order in accordance with subsection (f).

''(5) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations concerning eligibility and compliance for an exemption under paragraph (1).''.

(f) ORGANIC COMMODITY PROMOTION ORDER.—Section 501 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7401) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) ORGANIC COMMODITY PROMOTION ORDER.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) CERTIFIED ORGANIC FARM.—The term 'certified organic farm' has the meaning given the term in section 2103 of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6502).

''(B) COVERED PERSON.—The term 'covered person' means a producer, handler, marketer, or importer of an organic agricultural commodity.

''(C) DUAL-COVERED AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term 'dual-covered agricultural commodity' means an agricultural commodity that—

''(i) is produced on a certified organic farm; and

''(ii) is covered under both—

''(I) an organic commodity promotion order issued pursuant to paragraph (2); and

''(II) any other agricultural commodity promotion order issued under section 514.

''(2) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary may issue an organic commodity promotion order under section 514 that includes any agricultural commodity that—

''(A) is produced or handled (as defined in section 2103 of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6502)) and that is certified to be sold or labeled as 'organic' or '100 percent organic' (as defined in part 205 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations or a successor regulation)); or

''(B) is imported with a valid organic certificate (as defined in such part).

''(3) ELECTION.—If the Secretary issues an organic commodity promotion order described in paragraph (2), a covered person may elect, for applicable dual-covered agricultural commodities and in the sole discretion of the covered person, whether to be assessed under the organic commodity promotion order or another applicable agricultural commodity promotion order.

''(4) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations concerning eligibility and compliance for an exemption under paragraph (1).''.

(g) DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—Section 513(1) of the Commodity Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7412(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (F) and (G), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

''(E) products, as a class, that are produced on a certified organic farm (as defined in section 2103 of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6502)) and that are certified to be sold or labeled as 'organic' or '100 percent organic' (as defined in part 205 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations or a successor regulation));''.

SEC. 10005. INVESTIGATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE ORGANIC FOODS PRODUCTION ACT OF 1990.

The Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 is amended by inserting after section 2122 (7 U.S.C. 6521) the following new section:

''SEC. 2122A. INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

''(a) EXPEDITED ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING.—The Secretary shall establish an expedited administrative hearing procedure under which the Secretary may suspend or revoke the organic certification of a producer or handler or the accreditation of a certifying agent in accordance with subsection (d). Such a hearing may be conducted in addition to a hearing conducted pursuant to section 2120.

''(b) INVESTIGATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may take such investigative actions as the Secretary considers to be necessary to carry out this title—

''(A) to verify the accuracy of any information reported or made available under this title; and

''(B) to determine, with regard to actions, practices, or information required under this title, whether a person covered by this title has committed a violation of this title.

''(2) INVESTIGATIVE POWERS.—The Secretary may administer oaths and affirmations, subpoena witnesses, compel attendance of witnesses, take evidence, and require the production of any records required to be maintained under section 2112(d) or 2116(c) that are relevant to the investigation.

''(c) UNLAWFUL ACT.—It shall be unlawful and a violation of this title for any person covered by this title—

''(1) to refuse to provide information required by the Secretary under this title; or

''(2) to violate—

''(A) a suspension or revocation of the organic certification of a producer or handler; or

''(B) a suspension or revocation of the accreditation of a certifying agent.

''(d) ENFORCEMENT.—

''(1) SUSPENSION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, after notice and opportunity for an expedited administrative hearing, suspend the organic certification of a producer, handler or the accreditation of a certifying agent if—

''(i) the Secretary, during such expedited administrative hearing, proved that—

''(I) in the case of a producer or handler, the producer or handler—

''(aa) has recklessly committed a violation of a term, condition, or requirement of the organic plan to which the producer or handler is subject; or

''(bb) has recklessly committed, or is recklessly committing, a violation of this title; or

''(II) in the case of a certifying agent, the agent has recklessly committed, or is recklessly committing, a violation of this title; or

''(ii) the producer, handler, or certifying agent has waived such expedited administrative hearing.

''(B) ISSUANCE OF SUSPENSION.—A suspension issued under this paragraph shall be issued not later than five days after the date on which—

''(i) the expedited administrative hearing referred to in clause (i) of subparagraph (A) concludes; or

''(ii) the Secretary receives notice of the waiver referred to in clause (ii) of such subparagraph.

''(C) DURATION OF SUSPENSION.—The period of a suspension issued under this paragraph shall be not more than 90 days, beginning on the date on which the Secretary issues the suspension.

''(D) CURING OF VIOLATIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not issue a suspension of a certification or accreditation under this paragraph if the producer, handler, or certifying agent subject to such suspension—

''(I) before the date on which the suspension would otherwise have been issued, cures, or corrects the deficiency giving rise to, the violation for which the certification or accreditation would have been suspended; or

''(II) within a reasonable timeframe (as determined by the Secretary), enters into a settlement with the Secretary regarding a deficiency referred to in subclause (I).

''(ii) DURING SUSPENSION.—The Secretary shall terminate the suspension of an organic certification or accreditation issued under this paragraph if the producer, handler, or certifying agent subject to such suspension cures the violation for which the certification or accreditation was suspended under this paragraph before the date on which the period of the suspension ends.

''(2) REVOCATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, after notice and opportunity for an expedited administrative hearing under this section and an expedited administrative appeal under section 2121, revoke the organic certification of a producer or handler, or the accreditation of a certifying agent if—

''(i) the Secretary, during such hearing, proved that—

''(I) in the case of a producer or handler, the producer or handler—

''(aa) has knowingly committed an egregious violation of a term, condition, or requirement of the organic plan to which the producer or handler is subject; or

''(bb) has knowingly committed, or is knowingly committing, an egregious violation of this title; or

''(II) in the case of a certifying agent, the agent has knowingly committed, or is knowingly committing, an egregious violation of this title; or

''(ii) the producer, handler, or certifying agent has waived such expedited administrative hearing and such an expedited administrative appeal.

''(B) INITIATION OF REVOCATION PROCEEDINGS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary finds, during an investigation or during the period of a suspension under paragraph (1), that a producer, handler, or certifying agent has knowingly committed an egregious violation of this title, the Secretary shall initiate revocation proceedings with respect to such violation not later than 30 days after the date on which the producer, handler, or certifying agent receives notice of such finding in accordance with clause (ii). The Secretary may not initiate revocation proceedings with respect to such violation after the date on which that 30-day period ends.

''(ii) NOTICE.—Not later than five days after the date on which the Secretary makes the finding described in clause (i), the Secretary shall provide to the producer, handler, or certifying agent notice of such finding.

''(e) APPEAL.—

''(1) SUSPENSIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The suspension of a certification or accreditation under subsection (d)(1) by the Secretary may be appealed to a United States district court in accordance with section 2121(b) not later than 30 business days after the date on which the person subject to such suspension receives notice of the suspension.

''(B) SUSPENSION FINAL AND CONCLUSIVE.—A suspension of a certification or accreditation under subsection (d)(1) by the Secretary shall be final and conclusive—

''(i) in the case of a suspension that is appealed under subparagraph (A) within the 30-day period specified in such subparagraph, on the date on which judicial review of such suspension is complete; or

''(ii) in the case of a suspension that is not so appealed, the date on which such 30-day period ends.

''(2) REVOCATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The revocation of a certification or an accreditation under subsection (d)(2) by the Secretary may be appealed to a United States district court in accordance with section 2121(b) not later than 30 business days after the date on which the person subject to such revocation receives notice of the revocation.

''(B) REVOCATION FINAL AND CONCLUSIVE.—A revocation of a certification or an accreditation under subsection (d)(2) by the Secretary shall be final and conclusive—

''(i) in the case of a revocation that is appealed under subparagraph (A) within the 30-day period specified in such subparagraph, on the date on which judicial review of such revocation is complete; or

''(ii) in the case of a revocation that is not so appealed, the date on which such 30-day period ends.

''(3) STANDARDS FOR REVIEW OF SUSPENSIONS AND REVOCATIONS.—A suspension or revocation of a certification or an accreditation under subsection (d) shall be reviewed in accordance with the standards of review specified in section 706(2) of title 5, United States Code.

''(f) NONCOMPLIANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If a person covered by this title fails to obey a revocation of a certification or an accreditation under subsection (d)(2) after such revocation has become final and conclusive or after the appropriate United States district court has entered a final judgment in favor of the Secretary, the United States may apply to the appropriate United States district court for enforcement of such revocation.

''(2) ENFORCEMENT.—If the court determines that the revocation was lawfully made and duly served and that the person violated the revocation, the court shall enforce the revocation.

''(3) CIVIL PENALTY.—If the court finds that the person violated the revocation of a certification or an accreditation under subsection (d)(2), the person shall be subject to one or more of the penalties provided in subsections (a) and (b) of section 2120.

''(g) VIOLATION OF THIS TITLE DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'violation of this title' means a violation specified in section 2120.''.

SEC. 10006. FOOD SAFETY EDUCATION INITIATIVES.

Section 10105(c) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7655a(c)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 10007. SPECIALTY CROP BLOCK GRANTS.

Section 101 of the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note; Public Law 108–465) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''subsection (j)'' and inserting ''subsection (l)''; and

(B) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018'';

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(b) GRANTS BASED ON VALUE AND ACREAGE.—Subject to subsection (c), for each State whose application for a grant for a fiscal year that is accepted by the Secretary under subsection (f), the amount of the grant for such fiscal year to the State under this section shall bear the same ratio to the total amount made available under subsection (l)(1) for such fiscal year as—

''(1) the average of the most recent available value of specialty crop production in the State and the acreage of specialty crop production in the State, as demonstrated in the most recent Census of Agriculture data; bears to

''(2) the average of the most recent available value of specialty crop production in all States and the acreage of specialty crop production in all States, as demonstrated in the most recent Census of Agriculture data.'';

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(4) an assurance that any grant funds received under this section that are used for equipment or capital-related research costs determined to enhance the competitiveness of specialty crops—

''(A) shall be supplemented by the expenditure of State funds in an amount that is not less than 50 percent of such costs during the fiscal year in which such costs were incurred; and

''(B) shall be completely replaced by State funds on the day after the date on which such fiscal year ends.'';

(4) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (l);

(5) by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsections:

''(j) MULTISTATE PROJECTS.—Not later than 180 days after the effective date of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue guidance for the purpose of making grants to multistate projects under this section for projects involving—

''(1) food safety;

''(2) plant pests and disease;

''(3) research;

''(4) crop-specific projects addressing common issues; and

''(5) any other area that furthers the purposes of this section, as determined by the Secretary.

''(k) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(1) DEPARTMENT.—The Secretary of Agriculture may not use more than 3 percent of the funds made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year for administrative expenses.

''(2) STATES.—A State receiving a grant under this section may not use more than 8 percent of the funds received under the grant for a fiscal year for administrative expenses.''; and

(6) in subsection (l) (as redesignated by paragraph (4))—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and moving the margins of such subparagraphs two ems to the right;

(B) by striking ''Of the funds'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds'';

(C) in paragraph (1) (as so designated)—

(i) in subparagraph (B) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (C) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(D) $72,500,000 for fiscal years 2014 through 2017; and

''(E) $85,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) MULTISTATE PROJECTS.—Of the funds made available under paragraph (1), the Secretary may use to carry out subsection (j), to remain available until expended—

''(A) $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

''(B) $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2015;

''(C) $3,000,000 for fiscal year 2016;

''(D) $4,000,000 for fiscal year 2017; and

''(E) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.''.

SEC. 10008. REPORT ON HONEY.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with persons affected by the potential establishment of a Federal standard for the identity of honey, shall submit to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs a report describing how an appropriate Federal standard for the identity of honey would be in the interest of consumers, the honey industry, and United States agriculture.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In preparing the report required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall take into consideration the March 2006, Standard of Identity citizens petition filed with the Food and Drug Administration, including any current industry amendments or clarifications necessary to update such petition.

SEC. 10009. BULK SHIPMENTS OF APPLES TO CANADA.

(a) BULK SHIPMENT OF APPLES TO CANADA.—Section 4 of the Export Apple Act (7 U.S.C. 584) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Apples in'' and inserting ''(a) Apples in''; and

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

''(b) Apples may be shipped to Canada in bulk bins without complying with the provisions of this Act.''.

(b) DEFINITION OF BULK BIN.—Section 9 of the Export Apple Act (7 U.S.C. 589) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) The term 'bulk bin' means a bin that contains a quantity of apples weighing more than 100 pounds.''.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue regulations to carry out the amendments made by this section.

SEC. 10010. INCLUSION OF OLIVE OIL IN IMPORT CONTROLS UNDER THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT.

Section 8e(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 608e–1(a)) is amended by inserting ''olive oil,'' after ''olives (other than Spanish-style green olives),''.

SEC. 10011. CONSOLIDATION OF PLANT PEST AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT AND DISASTER PREVENTION PROGRAMS.

(a) RELOCATION OF LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE RELATING TO NATIONAL CLEAN PLANT NETWORK.—Section 420 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7721) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

''(e) NATIONAL CLEAN PLANT NETWORK.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program to be known as the 'National Clean Plant Network' (referred to in this subsection as the 'Program').

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Under the Program, the Secretary shall establish a network of clean plant centers for diagnostic and pathogen elimination services—

''(A) to produce clean propagative plant material; and

''(B) to maintain blocks of pathogen-tested plant material in sites located throughout the United States.

''(3) AVAILABILITY OF CLEAN PLANT SOURCE MATERIAL.—Clean plant source material may be made available to—

''(A) a State for a certified plant program of the State; and

''(B) private nurseries and producers.

''(4) CONSULTATION AND COLLABORATION.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall—

''(A) consult with—

''(i) State departments of agriculture; and

''(ii) land-grant colleges and universities and NLGCA Institutions (as those terms are defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)); and

''(B) to the extent practicable and with input from the appropriate State officials and industry representatives, use existing Federal or State facilities to serve as clean plant centers.

''(5) FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the Program $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2013.''.

(b) FUNDING.—Subsection (f) of section 420 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7721) (as so redesignated) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and each fiscal year thereafter.'' and inserting a semicolon; and

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

''(5) $62,500,000 for fiscal years 2014 through 2017; and

''(6) $75,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.''.

(c) REPEAL OF EXISTING PROVISION.—Section 10202 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7761) is repealed.

(d) CLARIFICATION OF USE OF FUNDS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 420 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7721), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAW.—The use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds under this section to provide technical assistance shall not be considered an allotment or fund transfer from the Commodity Credit Corporation for purposes of the limit on expenditures for technical assistance imposed by section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714i).''.

(e) USE OF FUNDS FOR CLEAN PLANT NETWORK.—Section 420 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7721), as amended by subsections (a) and (d), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) USE OF FUNDS FOR CLEAN PLANT NETWORK.—Of the funds made available under subsection (f) to carry out this section for a fiscal year, not less than $5,000,000 shall be available to carry out the national clean plant network under subsection (e).''.

SEC. 10012. MODIFICATION, CANCELLATION, OR SUSPENSION ON BASIS OF A BIOLOGICAL OPINION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except in the case of a voluntary request from a pesticide registrant to amend a registration under section 3 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a), a registration of a pesticide may be modified, canceled, or suspended on the basis of the implementation of a Biological Opinion issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service prior to the date of completion of the study referred to in subsection (b), or January 1, 2015, whichever is earlier, only if—

(1) the modification, cancellation, or suspension is undertaken pursuant to section 6 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 136d); and

(2) the Biological Opinion complies with the recommendations contained in the study referred to in subsection (b).

(b) NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES STUDY.—The study commissioned by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency on March 10, 2011, shall include, at a minimum, each of the following:

(1) A formal, independent, and external peer review, consistent with Office of Management and Budget policies, of each Biological Opinion described in subsection (a).

(2) Assessment of economic impacts of measures or alternatives recommended in each such Biological Opinion.

(3) An examination of the specific scientific and procedural questions and issues pertaining to economic feasibility contained in the June 23, 2011, letter sent to the Administrator (and other Federal officials) by the Chairmen of the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Natural Resources, and the Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 10013. USE AND DISCHARGES OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2013''.

(b) USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.—Section 3(f) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.—Except as provided in section 402(s) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Administrator or a State may not require a permit under such Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under this Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.''.

(c) DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.—Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(s) DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.—

''(1) NO PERMIT REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a permit shall not be required by the Administrator or a State under this Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the following discharges of a pesticide or pesticide residue:

''(A) A discharge resulting from the application of a pesticide in violation of a provision of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act that is relevant to protecting water quality, if—

''(i) the discharge would not have occurred but for the violation; or

''(ii) the amount of pesticide or pesticide residue in the discharge is greater than would have occurred without the violation.

''(B) Stormwater discharges subject to regulation under subsection (p).

''(C) The following discharges subject to regulation under this section:

''(i) Manufacturing or industrial effluent.

''(ii) Treatment works effluent.

''(iii) Discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel, including a discharge resulting from ballasting operations or vessel biofouling prevention.''.

SEC. 10014. SEED NOT PESTICIDE OR DEVICE FOR PURPOSES OF IMPORTATION.

Section 17(c) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136o(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentences: ''Solely for purposes of notifications of arrival upon importation, for purposes of this subsection, seed, including treated seed, shall not be considered a pesticide or device. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as precluding or limiting the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to the importation or movement of plants, plant products, or seeds, under the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.) or the Federal Seed Act (7 U.S.C. 1551 et seq.).''.

SEC. 10015. STAY OF REGULATIONS RELATED TO CHRISTMAS TREE PROMOTION, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION ORDER.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall lift the administrative stay that was imposed by the rule entitled ''Christmas Tree Promotion, Research, and Information

Order; Stay of Regulations'' and published by the Department of Agriculture on November 17, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 71241), on the regulations in subpart A of part 214 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, establishing an industry-funded promotion, research, and information program for fresh cut Christmas trees.

SEC. 10016. STUDY ON PROPOSED ORDER PERTAINING TO SULFURYL FLUORIDE.

Not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in conjunction with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report on the potential economic and public health effects that would result from finalization of the proposed order published in the January 19, 2011, Federal Register (76 Fed. Reg. 3422) pertaining to the pesticide sulfuryl fluoride, including the anticipated impacts of such finalization on the production of an adequate, wholesome, and economical food supply and on farmers and related agricultural sectors.

SEC. 10017. STUDY ON LOCAL AND REGIONAL FOOD PRODUCTION AND PROGRAM EVALUATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(1) collect data on the production and marketing of locally or regionally produced agricultural food products;

(2) facilitate interagency collaboration and data sharing on programs related to local and regional food systems; and

(3) monitor the effectiveness of programs designed to expand or facilitate local food systems.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) collect and distribute comprehensive reporting of prices of locally or regionally produced agricultural food products;

(2) conduct surveys and analysis and publish reports relating to the production, handling, distribution, and retail sales of, and trend studies (including consumer purchasing patterns) on, locally or regionally produced agricultural food products;

(3) evaluate the effectiveness of existing programs in growing local and regional food systems, including—

(A) the impact of local food systems on job creation and economic development;

(B) the level of participation in the Farmers' Market and Local Food Promotion Program established under section 6 of the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976 (7 U.S.C. 3005), including the percentage of projects funded in comparison to applicants and the types of eligible entities receiving funds;

(C) the ability for participants to leverage private capital and a synopsis of the places from which non-Federal funds are derived; and

(D) any additional resources required to aid in the development or expansion of local and regional food systems;

(4) expand the Agricultural Resource Management Survey to include questions on locally or regionally produced agricultural food products; and

(5) seek to establish or expand private-public partnerships to facilitate, to the maximum extent practicable, the collection of data on locally or regionally produced agricultural food products, including the development of a nationally coordinated and regionally balanced evaluation of the redevelopment of locally or regionally produced food systems.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until September 30, 2018, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the progress that has been made in implementing this section and identifying any additional needs related to developing local and regional food systems.

TITLE XI—CROP INSURANCE

SEC. 11001. INFORMATION SHARING.

Section 502(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1502(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) INFORMATION.—

''(A) REQUEST.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Farm Service Agency shall, in a timely manner, provide to an agent or an approved insurance provider authorized by the producer any information (including Farm Service Agency Form 578s (or any successor form) or maps (or any corrections to those forms or maps) that may assist the agent or approved insurance provider in insuring the producer under a policy or plan of insurance under this subtitle.

''(B) PRIVACY.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), an agent or approved insurance provider that receives the information of a producer pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall treat the information in accordance with paragraph (1).

''(C) SHARING.—Nothing in this section prohibits the sharing of the information of a producer pursuant to subparagraph (A) between the agent and the approved insurance provider of the producer.''.

SEC. 11002. PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION ON VIOLATIONS OF PROHIBITION ON PREMIUM ADJUSTMENTS.

Section 508(a)(9) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(a)(9)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) PUBLICATION OF VIOLATIONS.—

''(i) PUBLICATION REQUIRED.—Subject to clause (ii), the Corporation shall publish in a timely manner on the website of the Risk Management Agency information regarding each violation of this paragraph, including any sanctions imposed in response to the violation, in sufficient detail so that the information may serve as effective guidance to approved insurance providers, agents, and producers.

''(ii) PROTECTION OF PRIVACY.—In providing information under clause (i) regarding violations of this paragraph, the Corporation shall redact the identity of the persons and entities committing the violations in order to protect their privacy.''.

SEC. 11003. SUPPLEMENTAL COVERAGE OPTION.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF SUPPLEMENTAL COVERAGE OPTION.—Paragraph (3) of section 508(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) YIELD AND LOSS BASIS OPTIONS.—A producer shall have the option of purchasing additional coverage based on—

''(A)(i) an individual yield and loss basis; or

''(ii) an area yield and loss basis;

''(B) an individual yield and loss basis, supplemented with coverage based on an area yield and loss basis to cover a part of the deductible under the individual yield and loss policy, as described in paragraph (4)(C); or

''(C) a margin basis alone or in combination with the coverages available in subparagraph (A) or (B).''.

(b) LEVEL OF COVERAGE.—Paragraph (4) of section 508(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) LEVEL OF COVERAGE.—

''(A) DOLLAR DENOMINATION AND PERCENTAGE OF YIELD.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the level of coverage—

''(i) shall be dollar denominated; and

''(ii) may be purchased at any level not to exceed 85 percent of the individual yield or 95 percent of the area yield (as determined by the Corporation).

''(B) INFORMATION.—The Corporation shall provide producers with information on catastrophic risk and additional coverage in terms of dollar coverage (within the allowable limits of coverage provided in this paragraph).

''(C) SUPPLEMENTAL COVERAGE OPTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), in the case of the supplemental coverage option described in paragraph (3)(B), the Corporation shall offer producers the opportunity to purchase coverage in combination with a policy or plan of insurance offered under this subtitle that would allow indemnities to be paid to a producer equal to a part of the deductible under the policy or plan of insurance—

''(I) at a county-wide level to the fullest extent practicable; or

''(II) in counties that lack sufficient data, on the basis of such larger geographical area as the Corporation determines to provide sufficient data for purposes of providing the coverage.

''(ii) TRIGGER.—Coverage offered under paragraph (3)(B) and clause (i) shall be triggered only if the losses in the area exceed 10 percent of normal levels (as determined by the Corporation).

''(iii) COVERAGE.—Subject to the trigger described in clause (ii), coverage offered under paragraph (3)(B) and clause (i) shall not exceed the difference between—

''(I) 90 percent; and

''(II) the coverage level selected by the producer for the underlying policy or plan of insurance.

''(iv) INELIGIBLE CROPS AND ACRES.—Crops for which the producer has elected under section 1107(c)(1) of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 to receive revenue loss coverage and acres that are enrolled in the stacked income protection plan under section 508B shall not be eligible for supplemental coverage under this subparagraph.

''(v) CALCULATION OF PREMIUM.—Notwithstanding subsection (d), the premium for coverage offered under paragraph (3)(B) and clause (i) shall—

''(I) be sufficient to cover anticipated losses and a reasonable reserve; and

''(II) include an amount for operating and administrative expenses established in accordance with subsection (k)(4)(F).''.

(c) PAYMENT OF PORTION OF PREMIUM BY CORPORATION.—Section 508(e)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(H) In the case of the supplemental coverage option authorized in subsection (c)(4)(C), the amount shall be equal to the sum of—

''(i) 65 percent of the additional premium associated with the coverage; and

''(ii) the amount determined under subsection (c)(4)(C)(vi)(II), subject to subsection (k)(4)(F), for the coverage to cover operating and administrative expenses.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation shall begin to provide additional coverage based on an individual yield and loss basis, supplemented with coverage based on an area yield and loss basis, not later than for the 2014 crop year.

SEC. 11004. PREMIUM AMOUNTS FOR CATASTROPHIC RISK PROTECTION.

Subparagraph (A) of section 508(d)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(d)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) In the case of catastrophic risk protection, the amount of the premium established by the Corporation for each crop for which catastrophic risk protection is available shall be reduced by the percentage equal to the difference between the average loss ratio for the crop and 100 percent, plus a reasonable reserve.''.

SEC. 11005. REPEAL OF PERFORMANCE-BASED DISCOUNT.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 508(d) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (3); and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 508(a)(9)(B) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(a)(9)(B)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''or'' at the end of clause (i);

(2) by striking clause (ii); and

(3) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

SEC. 11006. PERMANENT ENTERPRISE UNIT SUBSIDY.

Subparagraph (A) of section 508(e)(5) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may pay a portion of the premiums for plans or policies of insurance for which the insurable unit is defined on a whole farm or enterprise unit basis that is higher than would otherwise be paid in accordance with paragraph (2).''.

SEC. 11007. ENTERPRISE UNITS FOR IRRIGATED AND NONIRRIGATED CROPS.

Section 508(e)(5) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) NONIRRIGATED CROPS.—Beginning with the 2014 crop year, the Corporation shall make available separate enterprise units for irrigated and nonirrigated acreage of crops in counties.''.

SEC. 11008. DATA COLLECTION.

Section 508(g)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(g)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) SOURCES OF YIELD DATA.—To determine yields under this paragraph, the Corporation—

''(i) shall use county data collected by the Risk Management Agency or the National Agricultural Statistics Service, or both; or

''(ii) if sufficient county data is not available, may use other data considered appropriate by the Secretary.''.

SEC. 11009. ADJUSTMENT IN ACTUAL PRODUCTION HISTORY TO ESTABLISH INSURABLE YIELDS.

Section 508(g)(4)(B) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(g)(4)(B)) is amended by striking ''60'' each place it appears and inserting ''70''.

SEC. 11010. SUBMISSION AND REVIEW OF POLICIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 508(h) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) by striking ''(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition'' and inserting the following:

''(1) AUTHORITY TO SUBMIT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition''; and

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

''(B) REVIEW AND SUBMISSION BY CORPORATION.—The Corporation shall review any policy developed under section 522(c) or any pilot program developed under section 523 and submit the policy or program to the Board under this subsection if the Corporation, at the sole discretion of the Corporation, finds that the policy or program—

''(i) will likely result in a viable and marketable policy consistent with this subsection;

''(ii) would provide crop insurance coverage in a significantly improved form; and

''(iii) adequately protects the interests of producers.''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''A policy'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A policy''; and

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

''(B) SPECIFIED REVIEW AND APPROVAL PRIORITIES.—In reviewing policies and other materials submitted to the Board under this subsection for approval, the Board—

''(i) shall make the development and approval of a revenue policy for peanut producers a priority so that a revenue policy is available to peanut producers in time for the 2014 crop year;

''(ii) shall make the development and approval of a margin coverage policy for rice producers a priority so that a margin coverage policy is available to rice producers in time for the 2014 crop year; and

''(iii) may approve a submission that is made pursuant to this subsection that would, beginning with the 2014 crop year, allow producers that purchase policies in accordance with subsection (e)(5)(A) to separate enterprise units by risk rating for acreage of crops in counties.''.

(b) ADVANCE PAYMENTS.—Section 522(b)(2)(E) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(b)(2)(E)) is amended by striking ''50 percent'' and inserting ''75 percent''.

SEC. 11011. EQUITABLE RELIEF FOR SPECIALTY CROP POLICIES.

Section 508(k)(8)(E) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(8)(E)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) EQUITABLE RELIEF FOR SPECIALTY CROP POLICIES.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—For each of the 2011 through 2015 reinsurance years, in addition to the total amount of funding for reimbursement of administrative and operating costs that is otherwise required to be made available in each such reinsurance year pursuant to an agreement entered into by the Corporation, the Corporation shall use $41,000,000 to provide additional reimbursement with respect to eligible insurance contracts for any agricultural commodity that is not eligible for a benefit under subtitles A, B or C of title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

''(II) TREATMENT.—Additional reimbursements made under this clause shall be included as part of the base level of administrative and operating expense reimbursement to which any limit on compensation to persons involved in the direct sale and service of any eligible crop insurance contract required under an agreement entered into by the Corporation is applied.

''(III) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this clause shall be construed as statutory assent to the limit described in subclause (II).''.

SEC. 11012. BUDGET LIMITATIONS ON RENEGOTIATION OF THE STANDARD REINSURANCE AGREEMENT.

Section 508(k)(8) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(8)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) BUDGET.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall ensure that any Standard Reinsurance Agreement negotiated under subparagraph (A)(ii), as compared to the previous Standard Reinsurance Agreement—

''(I) to the maximum extent practicable, shall be budget neutral; and

''(II) in no event, may significantly depart from budget neutrality.

''(ii) USE OF SAVINGS.—To the extent that any budget savings is realized in the renegotiation of a Standard Reinsurance Agreement under subparagraph (A)(ii), and the savings are determined not to be a significant departure from budget neutrality under clause (i), the savings shall be used to increase the obligations of the Corporation under subsections (e)(2) or (k)(4) or section 523.''.

SEC. 11013. CROP PRODUCTION ON NATIVE SOD.

(a) FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE.—Section 508(o) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(o)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting '', or the producer cannot substantiate that the ground has ever been tilled,'' after ''tilled'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''INELIGIBILITY FOR'' and inserting ''REDUCTION IN''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''for benefits under—'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''for—

''(i) a portion of crop insurance premium subsidies under this subtitle in accordance with paragraph (3);

''(ii) benefits under section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333); and

''(iii) payments described in subsection (b) or (c) of section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308).''; and

(3) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(3) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—During the first 4 crop years of planting on native sod acreage by a producer described in paragraph (2)—

''(i) paragraph (2) shall apply to 65 percent of the transitional yield of the producer; and

''(ii) the crop insurance premium subsidy provided for the producer under this subtitle shall be 50 percentage points less than the premium subsidy that would otherwise apply.

''(B) YIELD SUBSTITUTION.—During the period native sod acreage is covered by this subsection, a producer may not substitute yields for the native sod acreage.

''(4) APPLICATION.—This subsection shall only apply to native sod in the Prairie Pothole National Priority Area.''.

(b) NONINSURED CROP DISASTER ASSISTANCE.—Section 196(a)(4) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333(a)(4)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''INELIGIBILITY'' and inserting ''BENEFIT REDUCTION'';

(2) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by inserting '', or the producer cannot substantiate that the ground has ever been tilled,'' after ''tilled'';

(3) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in the subparagraph heading, by striking ''INELIGIBILITY'' and inserting ''REDUCTION IN''; and

(B) in clause (i), by striking ''for benefits under—'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''for—

''(I) benefits under this section;

''(II) a portion of crop insurance premium subsidies under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) in accordance with subparagraph (C); and

''(III) payments described in subsection (b) or (c) of section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308).''; and

(4) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

''(C) ADMINISTRATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—During the first 4 crop years of planting on native sod acreage by a producer described in subparagraph (B)—

''(I) subparagraph (B) shall apply to 65 percent of the transitional yield of the producer; and

''(II) the crop insurance premium subsidy provided for the producer under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) shall be 50 percentage points less than the premium subsidy that would otherwise apply.

''(ii) YIELD SUBSTITUTION.—During the period native sod acreage is covered by this paragraph, a producer may not substitute yields for the native sod acreage.

''(D) APPLICATION.—This paragraph shall only apply to native sod in the Prairie Pothole National Priority Area.''.

(c) CROPLAND REPORT.—

(1) BASELINE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the cropland acreage in each applicable county and State, and the change in cropland acreage from the preceding year in each applicable county and State, beginning with calendar year 2000 and including that information for the most recent year for which that information is available.

(2) ANNUAL UPDATES.—Not later than January 1, 2015, and each January 1 thereafter through January 1, 2018, the Secretary of Agriculture

shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes—

(A) the cropland acreage in each applicable county and State as of the date of submission of the report; and

(B) the change in cropland acreage from the preceding year in each applicable county and State.

SEC. 11014. COVERAGE LEVELS BY PRACTICE.

Section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1508) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(p) COVERAGE LEVELS BY PRACTICE.—Beginning with the 2015 crop year, a producer that produces an agricultural commodity on both dry land and irrigated land may elect a different coverage level for each production practice.''.

SEC. 11015. BEGINNING FARMER AND RANCHER PROVISIONS.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 502(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1502(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (9) as paragraphs (4) through (10), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) BEGINNING FARMER OR RANCHER.—The term 'beginning farmer or rancher' means a farmer or rancher who has not actively operated and managed a farm or ranch with a bona fide insurable interest in a crop or livestock as an owner-operator, landlord, tenant, or sharecropper for more than 5 crop years, as determined by the Secretary.''.

(b) PREMIUM ADJUSTMENTS.—Section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(5)(E), by inserting ''and beginning farmers or ranchers'' after ''limited resource farmers'';

(2) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) PREMIUM FOR BEGINNING FARMERS OR RANCHERS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection regarding payment of a portion of premiums, a beginning farmer or rancher shall receive premium assistance that is 10 percentage points greater than premium assistance that would otherwise be available under paragraphs (2) (except for subparagraph (A) of that paragraph), (5), (6), and (7) for the applicable policy, plan of insurance, and coverage level selected by the beginning farmer or rancher.''; and

(3) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(ii) in clause (ii)(III), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) if the producer is a beginning farmer or rancher who was previously involved in a farming or ranching operation, including involvement in the decisionmaking or physical involvement in the production of the crop or livestock on the farm, for any acreage obtained by the beginning farmer or rancher, a yield that is the higher of—

''(I) the actual production history of the previous producer of the crop or livestock on the acreage determined under subparagraph (A); or

''(II) a yield of the producer, as determined in clause (i).''; and

(B) in paragraph (4)(B)(ii) (as amended by section 11009)—

(i) by inserting ''(I)'' after ''(ii)'';

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(II) in the case of beginning farmers or ranchers, replace each excluded yield with a yield equal to 80 percent of the applicable transitional yield.''.

SEC. 11016. STACKED INCOME PROTECTION PLAN FOR PRODUCERS OF UPLAND COTTON.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF STACKED INCOME PROTECTION PLAN FOR PRODUCERS OF UPLAND COTTON.—The Federal Crop Insurance Act is amended by inserting after section 508A (7 U.S.C. 1508a) the following new section:

''SEC. 508B. STACKED INCOME PROTECTION PLAN FOR PRODUCERS OF UPLAND COTTON.

''(a) AVAILABILITY.—Beginning not later than the 2014 crop of upland cotton, the Corporation shall make available to producers of upland cotton an additional policy (to be known as the 'Stacked Income Protection Plan'), which shall provide coverage consistent with the Group Risk Income Protection Plan (and the associated Harvest Revenue Option Endorsement) offered by the Corporation for the 2011 crop year.

''(b) REQUIRED TERMS.—The Corporation may modify the Stacked Income Protection Plan on a program-wide basis, except that the Stacked Income Protection Plan shall comply with the following requirements:

''(1) Provide coverage for revenue loss of not less than 10 percent and not more than 30 percent of expected county revenue, specified in increments of 5 percent. The deductible is the minimum percent of revenue loss at which indemnities are triggered under the plan, not to be less than 10 percent of the expected county revenue.

''(2) Be offered to producers of upland cotton in all counties with upland cotton production—

''(A) at a county-wide level to the fullest extent practicable; or

''(B) in counties that lack sufficient data, on the basis of such larger geographical area as the Corporation determines to provide sufficient data for purposes of providing the coverage.

''(3) Be purchased in addition to any other individual or area coverage in effect on the producer's acreage or as a stand-alone policy, except that if a producer has an individual or area coverage for the same acreage, the maximum coverage available under the Stacked Income Protection Plan shall not exceed the deductible for the individual or area coverage.

''(4) Establish coverage based on—

''(A) the expected price established under existing Group Risk Income Protection or area wide policy offered by the Corporation for the applicable county (or area) and crop year; and

''(B) an expected county yield that is the higher of—

''(i) the expected county yield established for the existing area-wide plans offered by the Corporation for the applicable county (or area) and crop year (or, in geographic areas where area-wide plans are not offered, an expected yield determined in a manner consistent with those of area-wide plans); or

''(ii) the average of the applicable yield data for the county (or area) for the most recent 5 years, excluding the highest and lowest observations, from the Risk Management Agency or the National Agricultural Statistics Service (or both) or, if sufficient county data is not available, such other data considered appropriate by the Secretary.

''(5) Use a multiplier factor to establish maximum protection per acre (referred to as a 'protection factor') of not less than the higher of the level established on a program wide basis or 120 percent.

''(6) Pay an indemnity based on the amount that the expected county revenue exceeds the actual county revenue, as applied to the individual coverage of the producer. Indemnities under the Stacked Income Protection Plan shall not include or overlap the amount of the deductible selected under paragraph (1).

''(7) In all counties for which data are available, establish separate coverage levels for irrigated and non-irrigated practices.

''(c) PREMIUM.—Notwithstanding section 508(d), the premium for the Stacked Income Protection Plan shall—

''(1) be sufficient to cover anticipated losses and a reasonable reserve; and

''(2) include an amount for operating and administrative expenses established in accordance with section 508(k)(4)(F).

''(d) PAYMENT OF PORTION OF PREMIUM BY CORPORATION.—Subject to section 508(e)(4), the amount of premium paid by the Corporation for all qualifying coverage levels of the Stacked Income Protection Plan shall be—

''(1) 80 percent of the amount of the premium established under subsection (c) for the coverage level selected; and

''(2) the amount determined under subsection (c)(2), subject to section 508(k)(4)(F), for the coverage to cover administrative and operating expenses.

''(e) RELATION TO OTHER COVERAGES.—The Stacked Income Protection Plan is in addition to all other coverages available to producers of upland cotton.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 508(k)(4)(F) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(4)(F)) is amended by inserting ''or authorized under subsection (c)(4)(C) or section 508B'' after ''of this subparagraph''.

SEC. 11017. PEANUT REVENUE CROP INSURANCE.

The Federal Crop Insurance Act is amended by inserting after section 508B, as added by the previous section, the following new section:

''SEC. 508C. PEANUT REVENUE CROP INSURANCE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective beginning with the 2014 crop year, the Risk Management Agency and the Corporation shall make available to producers of peanuts a revenue crop insurance program for peanuts.

''(b) EFFECTIVE PRICE.—Subject to subsection (c), for purposes of the revenue crop insurance program and the multiperil crop insurance program under this Act, the effective price for peanuts shall be equal to the Rotterdam price index for peanuts, as adjusted to reflect the farmer stock price of peanuts in the United States.

''(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The effective price for peanuts established under subsection (b) may be adjusted by the Risk Management Agency and the Corporation to correct distortions.

''(2) ADMINISTRATION.—If an adjustment is made under paragraph (1), the Risk Management Agency and the Corporation shall—

''(A) make the adjustment in an open and transparent manner; and

''(B) submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the reasons for the adjustment.''.

SEC. 11018. AUTHORITY TO CORRECT ERRORS.

Section 515(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1515(c)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary'';

(2) in the second sentence, by striking ''Beginning with'' and inserting the following:

''(2) FREQUENCY.—Beginning with''; and

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

''(3) CORRECTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the corrections permitted by the Corporation as of the date of enactment of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, the Corporation shall allow an agent or an approved insurance provider, subject to subparagraph (B)—

''(i) within a reasonable amount of time following the applicable sales closing date, to correct unintentional errors in information that is provided by a producer for the purpose of obtaining coverage under any policy or plan of insurance made available under this subtitle to ensure that the eligibility information is correct;

''(ii) within a reasonable amount of time following—

''(I) the acreage reporting date, to correct unintentional errors in factual information that is

provided by a producer after the sales closing date to reconcile the information with the information reported by the producer to the Farm Service Agency; or

''(II) the date of any subsequent correction of data by the Farm Service Agency made as a result of the verification of information; and

''(iii) at any time, to correct unintentional errors that were made by the Farm Service Agency or an agent or approved insurance provider in transmitting the information provided by the producer to the approved insurance provider or the Corporation.

''(B) LIMITATION.—In accordance with the procedures of the Corporation, correction to the information described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) may only be made if the corrections do not allow the producer—

''(i) to avoid ineligibility requirements for insurance;

''(ii) to obtain, enhance, or increase an insurance guarantee or indemnity, or avoid premium owed, if a cause of loss exists or has occurred before any correction has been made; or

''(iii) to avoid an obligation or requirement under any Federal or State law.

''(C) EXCEPTION TO LATE FILING SANCTIONS.—Any corrections made pursuant to this paragraph shall not be subject to any late filing sanctions authorized in the reinsurance agreement with the Corporation.''.

SEC. 11019. IMPLEMENTATION.

Section 515 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1515) is amended—

(1) in subsection (j), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall maintain and upgrade the information management systems of the Corporation used in the administration and enforcement of this subtitle.

''(B) REQUIREMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In maintaining and upgrading the systems, the Secretary shall ensure that new hardware and software are compatible with the hardware and software used by other agencies of the Department to maximize data sharing and promote the purposes of this section.

''(ii) ACREAGE REPORT STREAMLINING INITIATIVE PROJECT.—As soon as practicable, the Secretary shall develop and implement an acreage report streamlining initiative project to allow producers to report acreage and other information directly to the Department.''; and

(2) in subsection (k), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (j)(1), the Corporation may use, from amounts made available from the insurance fund established under section 516(c), not more than—

''(i)(I) for fiscal year 2014, $25,000,000; and

''(II) for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2018, $10,000,000; or

''(ii) if the Acreage Crop Reporting Streamlining Initiative (ACRSI) project is substantially completed by September 30, 2015, not more than $15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2018.

''(B) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall notify the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate of the substantial completion of the Acreage Crop Reporting Streamlining Initiative (ACRSI) project not later than July 1, 2015.''.

SEC. 11020. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, PRIORITIES.—Section 522(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(c)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading by striking ''CONTRACTING'';

(2) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''may enter into contracts to carry out research and development to'' and inserting ''may conduct activities or enter into contracts to carry out research and development to maintain or improve existing policies or develop new policies to'';

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''conduct research and development or'' after ''The Corporation may''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''conducting research and development or'' after ''Before'';

(4) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''after expert review in accordance with section 505(e)'' after ''approved by the Board''; and

(5) in paragraph (6), by striking ''a pasture, range, and forage program'' and inserting ''policies that increase participation by producers of underserved agricultural commodities, including sweet sorghum, biomass sorghum, rice, peanuts, sugarcane, alfalfa, and specialty crops''.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 522(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''(A) AUTHORITY.—'' and inserting ''(A) CONDUCTING AND CONTRACTING FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''conduct research and development and'' after ''the Corporation may use to''; and

(C) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''conduct research and development and'' after ''for the fiscal year to'';

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking ''to provide either reimbursement payments or contract payments''; and

(3) by striking paragraph (4).

SEC. 11021. ADDITIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 522(c) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (17) as paragraph (24); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (16), the following new paragraphs:

''(17) MARGIN COVERAGE FOR CATFISH.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall offer to enter into a contract with a qualified entity to conduct research and development regarding a policy to insure producers against reduction in the margin between the market value of catfish and selected costs incurred in the production of catfish.

''(B) ELIGIBILITY.—Eligibility for the policy described in subparagraph (A) shall be limited to freshwater species of catfish that are propagated and reared in controlled or selected environments.

''(C) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Board shall review the policy described in subparagraph (B) under subsection 508(h) and approve the policy if the Board finds that the policy—

''(i) will likely result in a viable and marketable policy consistent with this subsection;

''(ii) would provide crop insurance coverage in a significantly improved form;

''(iii) adequately protects the interests of producers; and

''(iv) the proposed policy meets other requirements of this subtitle determined appropriate by the Board.

''(18) BIOMASS AND SWEET SORGHUM ENERGY CROP INSURANCE POLICIES.—

''(A) AUTHORITY.—The Corporation shall offer to enter into 1 or more contracts with qualified entities to carry out research and development regarding—

''(i) a policy to insure biomass sorghum that is grown expressly for the purpose of producing a feedstock for renewable biofuel, renewable electricity, or biobased products; and

''(ii) a policy to insure sweet sorghum that is grown for a purpose described in clause (i).

''(B) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Research and development with respect to each of the policies required in subparagraph (A) shall evaluate the effectiveness of risk management tools for the production of biomass sorghum or sweet sorghum, including policies and plans of insurance that—

''(i) are based on market prices and yields;

''(ii) to the extent that insufficient data exist to develop a policy based on market prices and yields, evaluate the policies and plans of insurance based on the use of weather indices, including excessive or inadequate rainfall, to protect the interest of crop producers; and

''(iii) provide protection for production or revenue losses, or both.

''(19) STUDY ON SWINE CATASTROPHIC DISEASE PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall contract with a qualified person to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of insuring swine producers for a catastrophic event.

''(B) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the study conducted under subparagraph (A).

''(20) WHOLE FARM DIVERSIFIED RISK MANAGEMENT INSURANCE PLAN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall conduct activities or enter into contracts to carry out research and development to develop a whole farm risk management insurance plan, with a liability limitation of $1,250,000, that allows a diversified crop or livestock producer the option to qualify for an indemnity if actual gross farm revenue is below 85 percent of the average gross farm revenue or the expected gross farm revenue that can reasonably be expected of the producer, as determined by the Corporation.

''(B) ELIGIBLE PRODUCERS.—The Corporation shall permit producers (including direct-to-consumer marketers and producers servicing local and regional and farm identity-preserved markets) who produce multiple agricultural commodities, including specialty crops, industrial crops, livestock, and aquaculture products, to participate in the plan in lieu of any other plan under this subtitle.

''(C) DIVERSIFICATION.—The Corporation may provide diversification-based additional coverage payment rates, premium discounts, or other enhanced benefits in recognition of the risk management benefits of crop and livestock diversification strategies for producers that grow multiple crops or that may have income from the production of livestock that uses a crop grown on the farm.

''(D) MARKET READINESS.—The Corporation may include coverage for the value of any packing, packaging, or any other similar on-farm activity the Corporation determines to be the minimum required in order to remove the commodity from the field.

''(E) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results and feasibility of the research and development conducted under this paragraph, including an analysis of potential adverse market distortions.

''(21) STUDY ON POULTRY CATASTROPHIC DISEASE PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall contract with a qualified person to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of insuring poultry producers for a catastrophic event.

''(B) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the study conducted under subparagraph (A).

''(22) POULTRY BUSINESS INTERRUPTION INSURANCE POLICY.—

''(A) AUTHORITY.—The Corporation shall offer to enter into a contract or cooperative agreement with a university or other legal entity to carry out research and development regarding a policy to insure the commercial production of poultry against business interruptions caused by integrator bankruptcy.

''(B) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—As part of the research and development conducted pursuant to a contract or cooperative agreement entered into under subparagraph (A), the entity shall—

''(i) evaluate the market place for business interruption insurance that is available to poultry growers;

''(ii) determine what statutory authority would be necessary to implement a business interruption insurance through the Corporation;

''(iii) assess the feasibility of a policy or plan of insurance offered under this subtitle to insure against losses due to the bankruptcy of an business integrator; and

''(iv) analyze the costs to the Federal Government of a Federal business interruption insurance program for poultry growers.

''(C) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph, the terms 'poultry' and 'poultry grower' have the meanings given those terms in section 2(a) of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 182(a)).

''(D) DEADLINE FOR CONTRACT OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall enter into the contract or cooperative agreement required by subparagraph (A).

''(E) DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the research and development conducted pursuant to the contract or cooperative agreement entered into under subparagraph (A).

''(23) STUDY OF FOOD SAFETY INSURANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation shall offer to enter into a contract with 1 or more qualified entities to conduct a study to determine whether offering policies that provide coverage for specialty crops from food safety and contamination issues would benefit agricultural producers.

''(B) SUBJECT.—The study described in subparagraph (A) shall evaluate policies and plans of insurance coverage that provide protection for production or revenue impacted by food safety concerns including, at a minimum, government, retail, or national consumer group announcements of a health advisory, removal, or recall related to a contamination concern.

''(C) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the study conducted under subparagraph (A).''.

SEC. 11022. PROGRAM COMPLIANCE PARTNERSHIPS.

Paragraph (1) of section 522(d) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1522(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subsection is to authorize the Corporation to enter into partnerships with public and private entities for the purpose of either—

''(A) increasing the availability of loss mitigation, financial, and other risk management tools for producers, with a priority given to risk management tools for producers of agricultural commodities covered by section 196 of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7333), specialty crops, and underserved agricultural commodities; or

''(B) improving analysis tools and technology regarding compliance or identifying and using innovative compliance strategies.''.

SEC. 11023. PILOT PROGRAMS.

Section 523(a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1523(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting '', at the sole discretion of the Corporation,'' after ''may''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (5).

SEC. 11024. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR DEPARTMENT PROGRAMS.—Section 508(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (7); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (8) through (11) as paragraphs (7) through (10), respectively.

(b) EXCLUSIONS TO ASSISTANCE FOR LOSSES DUE TO DROUGHT CONDITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 531(d)(3)(A) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1531(d)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(A) ELIGIBLE LOSSES.—'' and all that follows through ''An eligible'' in clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(A) ELIGIBLE LOSSES.—An eligible'';

(B) by striking clause (ii); and

(C) by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 901(d)(3)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2497(d)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(A) ELIGIBLE LOSSES.—'' and all that follows through ''An eligible'' in clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(A) ELIGIBLE LOSSES.—An eligible'';

(B) by striking clause (ii); and

(C) by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately.

TITLE XII—MISCELLANEOUS

Subtitle A—Livestock

SEC. 12101. NATIONAL SHEEP INDUSTRY IMPROVEMENT CENTER.

Section 375(e)(6)(C) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2008j(e)(6)(C)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 12102. REPEAL OF CERTAIN REGULATIONS UNDER THE PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT, 1921.

(a) REPEAL OF CERTAIN REGULATION REQUIREMENT.—Section 11006 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2120) is repealed.

(b) REPEAL OF CERTAIN EXISTING REGULATION.—Subsection (n) of section 201.2 of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations, is repealed.

(c) PROHIBITION ON ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN REGULATIONS OR ISSUANCE OF SIMILAR REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture shall not—

(1) enforce subsection (n) of section 201.2 of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations;

(2) finalize or implement sections 201.2(l), 201.2(t), 201.2(u), 201.3(c), 201.210, 201.211, 201.213, and 201.214 of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations, as proposed to be added by the proposed rule entitled ''Implementation of Regulations Required Under Title XI of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008; Conduct in Violation of the Act'' published by the Department of Agriculture on June 22, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 35338); or

(3) issue regulations or adopt a policy similar to the provisions—

(A) referred to in paragraph (1) or (2); or

(B) rescinded by the Secretary pursuant to section 742 of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6).

SEC. 12103. TRICHINAE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM.

(a) ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION PROCESS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall amend the rule made under paragraph (2) of section 11010(a) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8304(a)) to implement the voluntary trichinae certification program established under paragraph (1) of such section, to include a requirement to establish an alternative trichinae certification process based on surveillance or other methods consistent with international standards for categorizing compartments as having negligible risk for trichinae.

(b) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than one year after the date on which the international standards referred to in subsection (a) are adopted, the Secretary shall finalize the rule amended under such subsection.

(c) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 10405(d)(1) of the Animal Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 8304(d)(1)) is amended in subparagraphs (A) and (B) by striking ''2012'' each place it appears and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 12104. NATIONAL AQUATIC ANIMAL HEALTH PLAN.

Section 11013(d) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8322(d)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

SEC. 12105. COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Office of the Chief Economist, shall conduct an economic analysis of the proposed rule entitled ''Mandatory Country of Origin Labeling of Beef, Pork, Lamb, Chicken, Goat Meat, Wild and Farm-raised Fish and Shellfish, Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Peanuts, Pecans, Ginseng and Macadamia Nuts'' published by the Department of Agriculture on March 12, 2013 (76 Fed. Reg. 15645).

(b) CONTENTS.—The economic analysis described in subsection (a) shall include, with respect to the labeling of beef, pork, and chicken, an analysis of the impact on consumers, producers, and packers in the United States of—

(1) the implementation of subtitle D of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1638 et seq.); and

(2) the proposed rule referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 12106. NATIONAL ANIMAL HEALTH LABORATORY NETWORK.

Subtitle E of title X of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after section 10409 (7 U.S.C. 8308) the following new section:

''SEC. 10409A. NATIONAL ANIMAL HEALTH LABORATORY NETWORK.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into contracts, grants, cooperative agreements, or other legal instruments with eligible laboratories for any of the following purposes:

''(1) To enhance the capability of the Secretary to detect, and respond in a timely manner to, emerging or existing threats to animal health and to support the protection of public health, the environment, and the agricultural economy of the United States.

''(2) To provide the capacity and capability for standardized—

''(A) test procedures, reference materials, and equipment;

''(B) laboratory biosafety and biosecurity levels;

''(C) quality management system requirements;

''(D) interconnected electronic reporting and transmission of data; and

''(E) evaluation for emergency preparedness.

''(3) To coordinate the development, implementation, and enhancement of national veterinary diagnostic laboratory capabilities, with special emphasis on surveillance planning and vulnerability analysis, technology development and validation, training, and outreach.

''(b) ELIGIBILITY.—An eligible laboratory under this section is a diagnostic laboratory meeting specific criteria developed by the Secretary, in consultation with State animal health

officials and State and university veterinary diagnostic laboratories.

''(c) PRIORITY.—To the extent practicable and to the extent capacity and specialized expertise may be necessary, the Secretary shall give priority to existing Federal, State, and university facilities.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 12107. REPEAL OF DUPLICATIVE CATFISH INSPECTION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the date of the enactment of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.), section 11016 of such Act (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2130) and the amendments made by such section are repealed.

(b) APPLICATION.—The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) and the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) shall be applied and administered as if section 11016 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2130) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.) and the amendments made by such section had not been enacted.

SEC. 12108. NATIONAL POULTRY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall ensure that the Department of Agriculture continues to administer the diagnostic surveillance program for H5/H7 low pathogenic avian influenza with respect to commercial poultry under section 146.14 of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation) without amending the regulations in section 147.43 of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation) with respect to the governance of the General Conference Committee established under such section. The Secretary of Agriculture shall maintain—

(1) the operations of the General Conference Committee—

(A) in the physical location at which the Committee was located on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) with the organizational structure within the Department of Agriculture in effect as of such date; and

(2) the funding levels for the National Poultry Improvement Plan for Commercial Poultry (established under part 146 of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations or a successor regulation) at the fiscal year 2013 funding levels for the Plan.

SEC. 12109. REPORT ON BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS IN TEXAS.

Not later than December 31, 2014, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on the incidence of bovine tuberculosis in cattle in Texas. The report shall cover the period beginning on January 1, 1997, and ending on December 31, 2013.

Subtitle B—Socially Disadvantaged Producers and Limited Resource Producers

SEC. 12201. OUTREACH AND ASSISTANCE FOR SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS AND RANCHERS AND VETERAN FARMERS AND RANCHERS.

(a) OUTREACH AND ASSISTANCE FOR SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS AND RANCHERS AND VETERAN FARMERS AND RANCHERS.—Section 2501 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''**AND VETERAN FARMERS AND RANCHERS**'' *after* ''**RANCHERS**''*;*

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and veteran farmers or ranchers'' after ''ranchers'';

(B) in paragraph (2)(B)(i), by inserting ''and veteran farmers or ranchers'' after ''ranchers''; and

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the heading of such subparagraph, by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018'';

(II) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(III) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''; and

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

''(E) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.'';

(3) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting ''or veteran farmers and ranchers'' after ''socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers'';

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting ''veteran farmers or ranchers and'' before ''members''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting ''veteran farmers or ranchers and'' before ''members''; and

(5) in subsection (e)(5)(A)—

(A) in clause (i), by inserting ''and veteran farmers or ranchers'' after ''ranchers''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by inserting ''and veteran farmers or ranchers'' after ''ranchers''.

(b) DEFINITION OF VETERAN FARMER OR RANCHER.—Section 2501(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) VETERAN FARMER OR RANCHER.—The term 'veteran farmer or rancher' means a farmer or rancher who served in the active military, naval, or air service, and who was discharged or released from the service under conditions other than dishonorable.''.

SEC. 12202. OFFICE OF ADVOCACY AND OUTREACH.

Paragraph (3) of section 226B(f) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6934(f)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection—

''(A) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2013; and

''(B) $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 12203. SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS AND RANCHERS POLICY RESEARCH CENTER.

Section 2501 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279), as amended by section 12201, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS AND RANCHERS POLICY RESEARCH CENTER.—The Secretary shall award a grant to a college or university eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321 et seq.), including Tuskegee University, to establish a policy research center to be known as the 'Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Policy Research Center' for the purpose of developing policy recommendations for the protection and promotion of the interests of socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers.''.

Subtitle C—Other Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 12302. GRANTS TO IMPROVE SUPPLY, STABILITY, SAFETY, AND TRAINING OF AGRICULTURAL LABOR FORCE.

Subsection (d) of section 14204 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2008q–1) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; and

''(2) $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

SEC. 12303. PROGRAM BENEFIT ELIGIBILITY STATUS FOR PARTICIPANTS IN HIGH PLAINS WATER STUDY.

Section 2901 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1818) is amended by striking ''this Act or an amendment made by this Act'' and inserting ''this Act, an amendment made by this Act, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, or an amendment made by the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013''.

SEC. 12304. OFFICE OF TRIBAL RELATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 is amended by adding after section 308 (7 U.S.C. 3125a note; Public Law 103–354) the following new section:

''SEC. 309. OFFICE OF TRIBAL RELATIONS.

''The Secretary shall establish in the Office of the Secretary an Office of Tribal Relations to advise the Secretary on policies related to Indian tribes.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (9), as added by section 4207, the following new paragraph:

''(10) the authority of the Secretary to establish in the Office of the Secretary the Office of Tribal Relations in accordance with section 309; and''.

SEC. 12305. MILITARY VETERANS AGRICULTURAL LIAISON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 is amended by inserting after section 218 (7 U.S.C. 6918) the following new section:

''SEC. 219. MILITARY VETERANS AGRICULTURAL LIAISON.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary shall establish in the Department the position of Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison.

''(b) DUTIES.—The Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison shall—

''(1) provide information to returning veterans about, and connect returning veterans with, beginning farmer training and agricultural vocational and rehabilitation programs appropriate to the needs and interests of returning veterans, including assisting veterans in using Federal veterans educational benefits for purposes relating to beginning a farming or ranching career;

''(2) provide information to veterans concerning the availability of and eligibility requirements for participation in agricultural programs, with particular emphasis on beginning farmer and rancher programs;

''(3) serve as a resource for assisting veteran farmers and ranchers, and potential farmers and ranchers, in applying for participation in agricultural programs; and

''(4) advocate on behalf of veterans in interactions with employees of the Department.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (10), as added by section 12304, the following new paragraph:

''(11) the authority of the Secretary to establish in the Department the position of Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison in accordance with section 219.''.

SEC. 12306. PROHIBITION ON KEEPING GSA LEASED CARS OVERNIGHT.

Effective immediately, a Federal employee of a State office of the Farm Service Agency in the field and non-Federal employees of county and area committees established under section 8(b)(5) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)(5)) shall keep leased interagency motor pool vehicles at a location listed on the General Services Administration inventory of owned and leased properties or a location owned or leased by the Department of

Agriculture overnight unless the employee assigned the vehicle is on overnight, approved travel status involving per diem.

SEC. 12307. NONINSURED CROP ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333), as amended by section 11013(b), is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) COVERAGES.—In the case of an eligible crop described in paragraph (2), the Secretary of Agriculture shall operate a noninsured crop disaster assistance program to provide coverages based on individual yields (other than for valueloss crops) equivalent to—

''(i) catastrophic risk protection available under section 508(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(b)); or

''(ii) additional coverage available under subsections (c) and (h) of section 508 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1508) that does not exceed 65 percent.

''(B) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall carry out this section through the Farm Service Agency (referred to in this section as the 'Agency').''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(II) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii); and

(III) by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

''(ii) for which additional coverage under subsections (c) and (h) of section 508 of that Act (7 U.S.C. 1508) is not available; and''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''sweet sorghum, biomass sorghum,'' before ''and industrial crops'';

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting ''Subject to subsection (l), the Secretary''; and

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

''(l) PAYMENT EQUIVALENT TO ADDITIONAL COVERAGE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make available to a producer eligible for noninsured assistance under this section a payment equivalent to an indemnity for additional coverage under subsections (c) and (h) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508) that does not exceed 65 percent of the established yield for the eligible crop on the farm, computed by multiplying—

''(A) the quantity that is not greater than 65 percent of the established yield for the crop, as determined by the Secretary, specified in increments of 5 percent;

''(B) 100 percent of the average market price for the crop, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(C) a payment rate for the type of crop, as determined by the Secretary, that reflects—

''(i) in the case of a crop that is produced with a significant and variable harvesting expense, the decreasing cost incurred in the production cycle for the crop that is, as applicable—

''(I) harvested;

''(II) planted but not harvested; or

''(III) prevented from being planted because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster, as determined by the Secretary; or

''(ii) in the case of a crop that is produced without a significant and variable harvesting expense, such rate as shall be determined by the Secretary.

''(2) PREMIUM.—To be eligible to receive a payment under this subsection, a producer shall pay—

''(A) the service fee required by subsection (k); and

''(B) a premium for the applicable crop year that is equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

''(i) the number of acres devoted to the eligible crop;

''(ii) the established yield for the eligible crop, as determined by the Secretary under subsection (e);

''(iii) the coverage level elected by the producer;

''(iv) the average market price, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(v) .0525.

''(3) LIMITED RESOURCE, BEGINNING, AND SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS.—The additional coverage made available under this subsection shall be available to limited resource, beginning, and socially disadvantaged producers, as determined by the Secretary, in exchange for a premium that is 50 percent of the premium determined for a producer under paragraph (2).

''(4) PREMIUM PAYMENT AND APPLICATION DEADLINE.—

''(A) PREMIUM PAYMENT.—A producer electing additional coverage under this subsection shall pay the premium amount owed for the additional coverage by September 30 of the crop year for which the additional coverage is purchased.

''(B) APPLICATION DEADLINE.—The latest date on which additional coverage under this subsection may be elected shall be the application closing date described in subsection (b)(1).

''(5) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Additional coverage under this subsection shall be available beginning with the 2015 crop.''.

SEC. 12308. ENSURING HIGH STANDARDS FOR AGENCY USE OF SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR FINAL GUIDELINES.—Not later than January 1, 2014, each Federal agency shall have in effect guidelines for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of scientific information relied upon by such agency.

(b) CONTENT OF GUIDELINES.—The guidelines described in subsection (a), with respect to a Federal agency, shall ensure that—

(1) when scientific information is considered by the agency in policy decisions—

(A) the information is subject to well-established scientific processes, including peer review where appropriate;

(B) the agency appropriately applies the scientific information to the policy decision;

(C) except for information that is protected from disclosure by law or administrative practice, the agency makes available to the public the scientific information considered by the agency;

(D) the agency gives greatest weight to information that is based on experimental, empirical, quantifiable, and reproducible data that is developed in accordance with well-established scientific processes; and

(E) with respect to any proposed rule issued by the agency, such agency follows procedures that include, to the extent feasible and permitted by law, an opportunity for public comment on all relevant scientific findings;

(2) the agency has procedures in place to make policy decisions only on the basis of the best reasonably obtainable scientific, technical, economic, and other evidence and information concerning the need for, consequences of, and alternatives to the decision; and

(3) the agency has in place procedures to identify and address instances in which the integrity of scientific information considered by the agency may have been compromised, including instances in which such information may have been the product of a scientific process that was compromised.

(c) APPROVAL NEEDED FOR POLICY DECISIONS TO TAKE EFFECT.—No policy decision issued after January 1, 2014, by an agency subject to this section may take effect prior to such date that the agency has in effect guidelines under subsection (a) that have been approved by the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

(d) POLICY DECISIONS NOT IN COMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), a policy decision of an agency that does not comply with guidelines approved under subsection (c) shall be deemed to be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, and otherwise not in accordance with law.

(2) EXCEPTION.—This subsection shall not apply to policy decisions that are deemed to be necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or because of another emergency.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) AGENCY.—The term ''agency'' has the meaning given such term in section 551(1) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) POLICY DECISION.—The term ''policy decision'' means, with respect to an agency, an agency action as defined in section 551(13) of title 5, United States Code, (other than an adjudication, as defined in section 551(7) of such title), and includes—

(A) the listing, labeling, or other identification of a substance, product, or activity as hazardous or creating risk to human health, safety, or the environment; and

(B) agency guidance.

(3) AGENCY GUIDANCE.—The term ''agency guidance'' means an agency statement of general applicability and future effect, other than a regulatory action, that sets forth a policy on a statutory, regulatory, or technical issue or on an interpretation of a statutory or regulatory issue.

SEC. 12309. EVALUATION REQUIRED FOR PURPOSES OF PROHIBITION ON CLOSURE OR RELOCATION OF COUNTY OFFICES FOR THE FARM SERVICE AGENCY.

(a) PROHIBITION ON CLOSURE OR RELOCATION OF OFFICES WITH HIGH WORKLOAD VOLUME.—Section 14212 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 6932a) is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(a) PROHIBITION ON CLOSURE OR RELOCATION OF OFFICES WITH HIGH WORKLOAD VOLUME.—The Secretary of Agriculture may not close or relocate a county or field office of the Farm Service Agency in a State if the Secretary determines, after conducting the evaluation required under subsection (b)(1)(B), that the office has a high workload volume compared with other county offices in the State.''.

(b) WORKLOAD EVALUATION.—Section 14212(b)(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6932a(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and moving the margins of such clauses two ems to the right;

(2) by striking ''the Farm Service Agency, to the maximum extent practicable'' and inserting ''the Farm Service Agency—

''(A) to the maximum extent practicable'';

(3) in clause (ii) (as redesignated by paragraph (1))—

(A) by inserting ''as of the date of the enactment of this Act'' after ''employees''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(B) conduct and complete an evaluation of all workload assessments for Farm Service Agency county offices that were open and operational as of January 1, 2012, during the period that begins on a date that is not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 and ends on the date that is 18 months after such date of enactment.''.

(c) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Section 14212(b)(2) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6932a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''After the period referred to in subsection (a)(1), the Secretary of Agriculture may not close a county or field office of the Farm Service Agency unless—'' and inserting ''After

carrying out each of the activities required under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Agriculture shall, before closing a county or field office of the Farm Service Agency—'';

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''the Secretary holds'' and inserting ''hold''; and

(3) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''the Secretary notifies'' and inserting ''notify''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 14212(b)(1) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 6932a(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''After the period referred to in subsection (a)(1), the Secretary'' and inserting ''The Secretary''.

SEC. 12310. ACER ACCESS AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Agriculture may make competitive grants to States, tribal governments, and research institutions to support the efforts of such States, tribal governments, and research institutions to promote the domestic maple syrup industry through the following activities:

(1) Promotion of research and education related to maple syrup production.

(2) Promotion of natural resource sustainability in the maple syrup industry.

(3) Market promotion for maple syrup and maple-sap products.

(4) Encouragement of owners and operators of privately-held land containing species of trees in the genus Acer—

(A) to initiate or expand maple-sugaring activities on the land; or

(B) to voluntarily make the land available, including by lease or other means, for access by the public for maple-sugaring activities.

(b) APPLICATION.—In submitting an application for a competitive grant under this section, a State, tribal government, or research institution shall include—

(1) a description of the activities to be supported using the grant funds;

(2) a description of the benefits that the State, tribal government, or research institution intends to achieve as a result of engaging in such activities; and

(3) an estimate of the increase in maple-sugaring activities or maple syrup production that the State, tribal government, or research institution anticipates will occur as a result of engaging in such activities.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed so as to preempt a State or tribal government law, including a State or tribal government liability law.

(d) DEFINITION OF MAPLE-SUGARING.—In this section, the term ''maple-sugaring'' means the collection of sap from any species of tree in the genus Acer for the purpose of boiling to produce food.

(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

SEC. 12311. REGULATORY REVIEW BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

(a) REVIEW OF REGULATORY AGENDA.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall review publications that may give notice that the Environmental Protection Agency is preparing or plans to prepare any guidance, policy, memorandum, regulation, or statement of general applicability and future effect that may have a significant impact on a substantial number of agricultural entities, including—

(1) any regulatory agenda of the Environmental Protection Agency published pursuant to section 602 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) any regulatory plan or agenda published by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to an Executive order, including Executive Order 12866; and

(3) any other publication issued by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Office of Management and Budget that may reasonably be foreseen to contain notice of plans by the Environmental Protection Agency to prepare any guidance, policy, memorandum, regulation, or statement of general applicability and future effect that may have a significant impact on a substantial number of agricultural entities.

(b) INFORMATION GATHERING.—For a publication item reviewed under subsection (a) that the Secretary determines may have a significant impact on a substantial number of agricultural entities, the Secretary shall—

(1) solicit from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency any information the Administrator may provide to facilitate a review of the publication item;

(2) utilize the Chief Economist of the Department of Agriculture to produce an economic impact statement for the publication item that contains a detailed estimate of potential costs to agricultural entities;

(3) identify individuals representative of potentially affected agricultural entities for the purpose of obtaining advice and recommendations from such individuals about the potential impacts of the publication item; and

(4) convene a review panel for analysis of the publication item that includes the Secretary, any full-time Federal employee of the Department of Agriculture appointed to the panel by the Secretary, and any employee of the Environmental Protection Agency or the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs within the Office of Management and Budget that accepts an invitation from the Secretary to participate in the panel.

(c) DUTIES OF THE REVIEW PANEL.—A review panel convened for a publication item under subsection (b)(4) shall—

(1) review any information or material obtained by the Secretary and prepared in connection with the publication item, including any draft proposed guidance, policy, memorandum, regulation, or statement of general applicability and future effect;

(2) collect advice and recommendations from agricultural entity representatives identified by the Administrator after consultation with the Secretary;

(3) compile and analyze such advice and recommendations; and

(4) make recommendations to the Secretary based on the information gathered by the review panel or provided by agricultural entity representatives.

(d) COMMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date the Secretary convenes a review panel pursuant to subsection (b)(4), the Secretary shall submit to the Administrator comments on the planned or proposed guidance, policy, memorandum, regulation, or statement of general applicability and future effect for consideration and inclusion in any related administrative record, including—

(A) a report by the Secretary on the concerns of agricultural entities;

(B) the findings of the review panel;

(C) the findings of the Secretary, including any adopted findings of the review panel; and

(D) recommendations of the Secretary.

(2) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish the comments in the Federal Register and make the comments available to the public on the public Internet website of the Department of Agriculture.

(e) WAIVERS.—The Secretary may waive initiation of the review panel under subsection (b)(4) as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(f) DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURAL ENTITY.—In this section, the term ''agricultural entity'' means any entity involved in or related to agricultural enterprise, including enterprises that are engaged in the business of production of food and fiber, ranching and raising of livestock, aquaculture, and all other farming and agricultural related industries.

SEC. 12312. AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY DEFINITION.

Section 513(1) of the Commodity Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7412(1)), as amended by section 10004(g), is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) (as added or redesignated by such section 10004(g), as the case may be) as subparagraphs (F), (G), and (H), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

''(E) the products of natural stone;''.

SEC. 12313. PROHIBITION ON ATTENDING AN ANIMAL FIGHTING VENTURE OR CAUSING A MINOR TO ATTEND AN ANIMAL FIGHTING VENTURE.

Section 26(a)(1) of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2156(a)(1)) is amended by striking the period and inserting ''or to knowingly attend or knowingly cause a minor to attend an animal fighting venture.''.

SEC. 12314. PROHIBITION AGAINST INTERFERENCE BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WITH PRODUCTION OR MANUFACTURE OF ITEMS IN OTHER STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States, the government of a State or locality therein shall not impose a standard or condition on the production or manufacture of any agricultural product sold or offered for sale in interstate commerce if—

(1) such production or manufacture occurs in another State; and

(2) the standard or condition is in addition to the standards and conditions applicable to such production or manufacture pursuant to—

(A) Federal law; and

(B) the laws of the State and locality in which such production or manufacture occurs.

(b) AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''agricultural product'' has the meaning given such term in section 207 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1626).

SEC. 12315. INCREASED PROTECTION FOR AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Record runoff occurred in the Missouri River basin during 2011 as a result of historic rainfall over portions of the upper basin coupled with heavy plains and mountain snowpack.

(2) Runoff above Sioux City, Iowa, during the 5-month period of March through July totaled an estimated 48.4 million acre-feet (referred to in this section as ''MAF''). This runoff volume was more than 20 percent greater than the design storm for the Missouri River Mainstem Reservoir System (referred to in this section as the ''System''), which was based on the 1881 runoff of 40.0 MAF during the same 5-month period.

(3) During the 2011 runoff season, nearly 61 million acre-feet of water entered the Missouri River system, far surpassing the previous record of 49 MAF in runoff that was set during the flood of 1997.

(4) Given the incredible amount of water entering the System, the summer months were spent working to evacuate as much water from the System as possible, ultimately leading to record high water releases from Gavins Point Dam of 160,000 cubic feet per second, a rate that more than doubled the previous release record of 70,000 cubic feet per second set in 1997.

(5) For nearly four months, those extremely high releases from Gavins Point were maintained, resulting in severe and sustained flooding, with much of western Iowa and eastern Nebraska as well as portions of South Dakota, Kansas, and Missouri inundated by a flooding river three to five feet deep, up to 11 miles wide, and flowing at a rate of 4 to 11 miles per hour.

(6) Thousands of homes and businesses were damaged or destroyed and hundreds of millions of dollars in damage was done to roads and other public infrastructure.

(7) In addition to the homes, businesses, and infrastructure impacted by the flooding, hundreds of thousands of acres of cropland were affected.

(8) The Department of Agriculture has estimated that 400,000 to 500,000 acres of some of the most productive crop land in the world was flooded in 2011.

(9) Local Farm Services Agency representatives have estimated that $82,100,000 was lost in 2011 alone due to damaged or lost crops and unplanted acres.

(10) Not only did the flooding eliminate the 2011 crop, but it is highly unlikely that many farmers will be able to put that land back into production at any point in the near future.

(11) Producers will have to contend with large piles of sand, silt, and other debris that have been deposited in their fields, meaning the impact of the 2011 flood will be felt in the agricultural communities up and down the Missouri River for many years to come.

(12) Currently, the amount of storage capacity in the System that is set aside for flood control is based upon the vacated space required to control the 1881 flood, because prior to the 2011 flood, the 1881 flood was seen as the ''high water mark''.

(13) Given the historic flooding that took place in 2011, it is clear that that year's flooding now represents a new ''high water mark'', surpassing the flooding of even the 1881 flood.

(14) It is important that the flood control related functions of the System management be adjusted to reflect the reality of the 2011 flood as the new ''worst case scenario'' for flooding along the Missouri River.

(15) System management may begin to be adjusted to account for the 2011 flood through a recalculation of the amount of storage space within the System that is allocated to flood control, using the model not of the 1881 flood, but of the greatest flood experienced—the flood of 2011.

(16) As a result of the flooding in 2011, many States received disaster declarations from the Department of Agriculture to help farmers and producers recover from the damage done by the high water.

(17) Though helpful, even the assistance provided by the Department of Agriculture will not provide many in the agriculture community with the resources to put their land back into production any time soon.

(18) Without the protection that will come from a fundamental change in the System's flood control storage allocations, farmers, producers, and other agricultural interests who may be in a position to restart their operations will find it difficult to justify doing so, given the fact that they will not be protected from similar flooding in the future.

(b) UPDATED MANAGEMENT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER TO PROTECT AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS.—In order to strengthen the agricultural economy, revitalize the rural communities, and conserve the natural resources of the Missouri River basin, the Congress directs that the Secretary of Agriculture take action to promote immediate increased flood protection to farmers, producers, and other agricultural interests in the Missouri River basin by working within its jurisdiction to support efforts—

(1) to recalculate the amount of space within the System that is allocated to flood control storage using the 2011 flood as the model; and

(2) to increase the Missouri River's channel capacity between the reservoirs and below Gavins Point.

SEC. 12316. INCREASED PROTECTION FOR AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS IN THE BLACK DIRT REGION.

In order to strengthen the agricultural economy, revitalize the rural communities, and conserve the natural resources of the Black Dirt region, the Congress directs that the Secretary of Agriculture take action to promote immediate increased flood protection to farmers, producers, and other agricultural interests around the Wallkill River and in the Black Dirt region.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 113–117 and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of House Resolution 271.

Except as specified in the order of the House of today, each amendment printed in part B of House Report 113–117 shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by its proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Agriculture or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of House Report 113–117 not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 1101(c), 1105, 1106, 1107, 1108, and 1109.

In section 1501(f), add the following new paragraph:

(4) DELAY IN INITIAL PAYMENTS.—Payments required under this section for fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014 shall not be distributed before October 1, 2014.

Strike sections 4005, 4007, 4018, and 4027.

Strike section 11003.

In section 11016(a), strike ''2014'' after ''Beginning not later than the'' and insert ''2015''.

In section 11016(d)(1), strike ''80 percent'' and insert ''65 percent''.

In section 11017, strike ''2014'' after ''Effective beginning with the'' and insert ''2015''.

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

SEC. 11025. CAP ON OVERALL RATE OF RETURN FOR CROP INSURANCE PROVIDERS AND ON REIMBURSEMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATING EXPENSES.

(a) CAP ON OVERALL RATE OF RETURN.—Section 508(k)(3) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act 26 (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(3)) is amended—

(1) by designating paragraph (3) as subparagraph (A) and, before such subparagraph, by inserting ''(3) RISK.—''; and

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

''(B) CAP ON OVERALL RATE OF RETURN.—The target rate of return for all the companies combined for the 2013 and subsequent reinsurance years shall be 12 percent of retained premium.''.

(b) ADDITIONAL CAP ON REIMBURSEMENTS.—Section 508(k)(4) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(G) ADDITIONAL CAP ON REIMBURSEMENTS.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) through (F), total reimbursements for administrative and operating costs for the 2013 insurance year for all types of policies and plans of insurance shall not exceed $900,000,000. For each subsequent insurance year, the dollar amount in effect pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be increased by the same inflation factor as established for the administrative and operating costs cap in the 2011 Standard Reinsurance Agreement.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma will be recognized.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD a list of cosponsors to McGovern amendment No. 1.

Cosponsors

DeLauro, Negrete McLeod, Jackson Lee, Moore, Connolly, Grijalva, Schakowsky, Delaney, Wilson, Grayson, Meeks, Chu, Lee, Conyers, Wasserman Schultz, Deutch, Esty, Capuano, Tsongas, Fudge, Cárdenas.

Langevin, Doggett, Ellison, Welch, DelBene, Cicilline, Doyle, Bonamici, Gallego, Blumenauer, Holt, Kennedy, Horsford, DeGette, Courtney, Pallone, Serrano, Tonko, Kilmer, Pingree, Hastings.

Edwards, DeFazio, Cohen, Sires, McDermott, Brown (FL), Clarke, Tierney, Veasey, Gene Green, Johnson (GA), Norton, Frankel, Titus, Pocan, Sarbanes, Danny Davis (IL), Roybal-Allard, Brady (PA), Lowenthal, Ben Ray Luján.

Crowley, Matsui, Beatty, Meng, Waters, Honda, Al Green, Himes, Bera, Huffman, Engel, Kuster, O'Rourke, Jeffries, Rush, Loebsack, Castor, Smith (WA), Markey, Payne Jr.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGovern amendment.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and in opposition to some of the arguments we have heard against the program.

First, I want to point out that the average SNAP recipient receives assistance for less than one year. And, more importantly, the

people who do depend on assistance for a longer period of time are populations such as the elderly, children, or the disabled: people who can't work their way out of poverty as easily.

The SNAP program faces a great deal of criticism, but I believe much of it is undeserved. The program is not perfect, but a few bad actors should not give us reason to push millions out of the system. The simple fact is, SNAP is not an isolate acronym. It represents real children and hardworking families who are just trying to make ends meet.

About 1 in 10 Minnesota residents receive SNAP benefits. That might be below the national average, but for those Minnesotans who do receive benefits, they are absolutely critical. In my state, more than 68 percent of all SNAP participants are in families with children. More than ¼ of all SNAP participants are in families with elderly or disabled members. And finally, 44 percent of all SNAP participants in Minnesota are in working families.

Now is not the time to rip assistance away from those who need it most. I will join Congressman MCGOVERN in voting to restore funding for SNAP.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGovern amendment.

Mr. Chair, cuts to SNAP will devastate the most vulnerable in our communities.

550,000 Minnesotans rely on SNAP to put food on their tables.

Cuts to SNAP take away benefits for 32,000 Minnesotans.

While the FARRM Bill gives hundreds of billions of dollars to producers and processors at the very top, it balances these benefits on the backs of America's poorest citizens.

These cuts are not just statistics. They are the stories of real people in my District.

Jessica, a single mother whose SNAP benefits are essential in keeping her children clothed, fed, and in school while she takes online classes towards a degree, and works as a housekeeper. She would be living on $47 a month without the help of SNAP.

Justina and her husband, a homeless couple in Minneapolis, are both unable to work due to disability and are expecting a child. Justina relies on SNAP to stay healthy and strong throughout her pregnancy, and could not afford adequate nutrition without the help. Justina's life and the life of her baby depend on this program.

Lashonda, a mother of three who works hard at a minimum wage job and still lives below the poverty line. Without SNAP, she would have to choose between food, heat, and electricity. She depends on the SNAP program to keep the lights and heat on in her small apartment, and without it she could not provide for her family.

SNAP is good policy. SNAP works. SNAP saves lives. Do not cut funding for this program.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

This is a debate about values and priorities.

This amendment would restore the $20.5 billion in cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, formerly known as ''food stamps.'' It would restore those cuts by eliminating or reducing some of the wasteful, excessive subsidies to the highly profitable big agribusiness. Not only that, the amendment would actually reduce the deficit by $12 billion beyond the base bill.

At a time when millions of Americans are struggling with unemployment, with poverty and with hunger, the FARRM Bill before us today would cause 2 million of our neighbors to lose their SNAP benefits. It would kick 210,000 kids off of the free school breakfast and lunch program. That's a rotten thing to do.

Mr. LUCAS and others will argue that these SNAP cuts will only force poor people to fill out a few more forms, to jump through a few more hoops to get the assistance that they need to qualify for.

Let's think about that for a minute.

Aren't we a country that reaches out to those in need? When Americans see their neighbors having a hard time, don't we show up to help without being asked? Our churches and our food banks are doing extraordinary work, but they are already stretched to the limits.

Values and priorities.

Critics of the SNAP program talk about waste, fraud and abuse, but SNAP is one of the most efficiently run government programs we have, and some of the errors in SNAP are as a result of people getting less help than they qualify for. The base bill would cut $2 billion per year from a program that helps struggling families put food on the table—$2 billion.

□ 1500

I would remind my colleagues that we spend more than $2 billion every single week propping up a corrupt Karzai government in Afghanistan. Some people who have no problem with nation-building in Afghanistan, turn their backs on nation building here at home.

Values and priorities.

Fifty million Americans struggle with hunger; 17 million of those are our children. Hunger costs our Nation dearly. There is over $100 billion a year in avoidable health care costs, lost productivity, and hungry kids who can't learn in school. SNAP is one tool to address hunger in America. Like every other human endeavor, it is not perfect. It can be improved. But it would be shortsighted and cruel to make hunger worse in America, which is exactly what this bill would do.

If we want to reduce spending on SNAP, the best way to do that is to strengthen our economy, to invest in putting people back to work.

Values and priorities.

Mr. Chair, let us stay true to our values of compassion and decency and justice. Let us give priority to those among us who are struggling in these hard times, to the least of these.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the subcommittee chairman of primary jurisdiction from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee for yielding, and I want to also thank him for his leadership on this bill.

This is a carefully balanced bill that we have, and I don't challenge the convictions of the gentleman from Massachusetts. We've had enough exchanges on this topic to know that we have a difference of opinion without a difference in disagreeable personalities by any means.

However, when I came to this Congress a little more than a decade ago, I was looking already at this growth in, then, food stamps. The number that I memorized at the time was that there were 19 million people on food stamps. That was a lot of people. Our population hasn't grown so much that it ought to grow to 48 million people. But when we see the expansion of the dependency class in America and you add this to the 79 other means-tested welfare programs that we have in the United States and each time you add another brick to that wall, it's a barrier to people that might go out and succeed.

We're of the same heart here. We don't want people who need them and people who deserve them to go without SNAP benefits. On the other hand, we don't want to hand these out to people that are gaming the system, so to speak. So we've tightened the qualifications down on SNAP, and we've done so for a number of reasons. One of them is reports of a neon sign up on a tattoo parlor that says, ''We take EBT cards.'' You also have the report of an individual who bailed himself out of jail with an EBT card. I don't think that we want to borrow money from the Chinese to fund such a thing. I think those people can figure out how to bail themselves out and how to pay for their own tattoos.

Instead, we tighten this down, and it's a savings of $20.5 billion. It was a tough enough negotiation to get to that point. I don't know what the gentleman from Massachusetts would say is enough, and maybe I don't know what I would say is too little. Someplace in between his opinion and mine is where we've settled today on this $20.5 billion that came out of this top line that is roughly 80 percent of the overall benefits that are in this bill.

It's carefully balanced. It's carefully negotiated. It's something that has had the cooperation with the ranking member, as well. And I think it's an important thing for us to understand that you can't simply be spending advertising dollars out there to sign more people up on food stamps. That's what

our Secretary of Agriculture has been doing. In this bill, we eliminate the advertising to sign people up on food stamps. That's a good thing. If people need it, they're going to figure out how to sign up without somebody knocking on their door and advertising in the newspaper, on the radio, or on the TV.

So we tighten up the system. We keep the resources for the people that need them, and we reduce this to say it's a 2.5 percent reduction in this massive growth from 19 million to 48 million. That's not too much to ask.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Let me again remind my colleagues that the reason why we've seen an uptick in the number of people registered for SNAP is because we are coming out of this recession, the worst economy we've had since the Great Depression.

The gentleman from Iowa says it's a carefully negotiated, carefully studied compromise. We didn't have a single hearing on it, not in his subcommittee and not in the full committee. And the people we're talking about here are people who are good, honorable, decent Americans who are going to lose their benefit.

The Congressional Budget Office says 2 million people will lose their benefits. These aren't targeted at people who somehow abuse the system. These are just 2 million people who lose their benefits, 200,000 kids off the free breakfast and lunch. That's wrong.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE).

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman LUCAS for yielding.

SNAP is an incredibly important program in the United States. I don't think there's anybody that I've met on my side of the aisle or on theirs—and I particularly appreciate Mr. MCGOVERN's position on the fact that we need to make sure that hungry children in this country get food to eat. We want them to have good, healthy meals.

On behalf of the taxpayer, however, the data doesn't support that we continue to increase funding for SNAP. In fact, if you follow the red line here, that's unemployment in America. You see during the recession unemployment went up, as did SNAP spending. It was almost exactly at the same ratio. And as the economy began to recover and unemployment went down, as did poverty go down, SNAP funding continued to go up. In fact, from 2008 to 2011, SNAP funding went up 119 percent while poverty went up only 16 percent. Between 2010 and 2011, poverty actually went down while SNAP spending went up.

It's not just an either/or, Mr. Chairman, that we can either provide food for the poor or charge the taxpayer money. We need to do both. But as fiduciaries of the taxpayers' dollars, we must do it reasonably.

We don't want any child to go without food, but we recognize that the economy has begun to recover since 2009, where we were spending only $53 billion on SNAP. ''Only'' is the appropriate word. Today we're going to be spending $82 billion on SNAP. Unemployment went from 10.2 percent in 2009 down to 7.6 percent today. Under this basis, I wonder at what point could we ever have SNAP go down.

Here's the reality. We keep talking about $20 billion. In fact, next year, with a $2 billion cut annually, we won't even roll SNAP back effectively 1 year.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I'm proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, a member of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. SCHRADER.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I believe strongly that we've got a deficit problem. I think most Americans agree with that. But I don't think most Americans would agree that we balance our deficit on the backs of the most vulnerable people out there, particularly the children. As was alluded to a moment ago by my good friend from Wisconsin, half the people on food stamps are children. They didn't get a job. They're still hungry.

The other point I think that is well-known by Americans is that while unemployment may have gone down, there's a lot of underemployed people and there are a lot of people that have given up searching for work because the recession lingers.

The real world is that the SNAP program is a lagging indicator. People struggle. They try and keep their job, they go into savings, they rely on friends; and then after several years, they lose their house, maybe they've already lost their job, and then they need food stamps.

I think it's egregious that we would deny them that.

There may be some inefficiencies in the program. We've been working on that for years. There's an error rate in my home State of Oregon that we're proud to say we've driven down. We were guilty of not overseeing the program. That's been driven down. We should be rewarding good behavior, not penalizing it at the end of the day.

I still have over 20 percent of my folks in Oregon that are on food stamps, and that has not changed. That's not because they're glad to be on food stamps. My folks want a job. They want to be able to feed their own families. But the real world is this was a horrible recession, the worst recession since the Great Depression, and you don't balance that budget on the backs of these kids.

If we had had a chance to vote on another food stamp bill that may have gotten down to the Senate levels of reductions, I think you wouldn't see some folks here worried about it. But this is the only game in town in trying to protect vulnerable Americans.

There's other ways to cut the program. The direct payments that we did in the Agriculture Committee, that's the way to go about it, not with the most vulnerable population.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

□ 1510

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Chairman, the changes made to SNAP are directed at reducing fraud, not at those in true need. And affecting inefficiencies that we've been dealing with for years, we have a chance to affect those inefficiencies right now in this year's farm bill, not 5 years from now.

Without the changes proposed by the committee, and made with bipartisan support, Congress tells the American people that taxpayers should support fraudulent payments. Are we seriously debating a 2 percent reduction that centers on fraud elimination and ensuring that those we help actually qualify?

This farm bill eliminates advertising for food stamps, eliminates recruitment bonuses and payments to lottery winners, all of which divert funds away from the program's actual goal. Any individual can apply or reapply by simply meeting the income and asset requirements. These are simple, commonsense reforms that save taxpayers billions and continue to protect those truly in need. I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I insert in the RECORD CBO's statement that shows the number of people on SNAP going from 47 million to 34 million over the next 10 years.

CBO'S FEBRUARY 2013 BASELINE FOR THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
BASELINE											
Budget Authority	82,563	79,574	79,075	79,107	77,774	76,323	75,086	74,093	73,361	72,914	72,776
Outlays	82,472	79,672	79,091	79,106	77,816	76,368	75,125	74,124	73,384	72,928	72,780
PROGRAM COMPONENTS (budget authority)											
Total Benefits	76,370	73,198	72,663	72,551	71,066	69,455	68,058	66,898	65,994	65,371	65,052
Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico and AS	2,009	2,009	1,966	2,005	2,045	2,086	2,128	2,171	2,214	2,258	2,303
Administrative Costs/Other	4,185	4,368	4,446	4,551	4,663	4,782	4,900	5,025	5,153	5,285	5,420
MAJOR ASSUMPTIONS											
Average monthly benefits (dollars per person)	133.42	128.15	130.22	133.46	136.77	140.14	143.58	147.09	150.67	154.32	158.05

CBO'S FEBRUARY 2013 BASELINE FOR THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—Continued

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Average monthly, participation (millions of people)	47.7	47.6	46.5	45.3	43.3	41.3	39.5	37.9	36.5	35.3	34.3
Thrifty Food Plan estimated change June/June preceding year lagged [3]	102.6%	102.5%	101.6%	102.0%	102.0%	102.0%	102.0%	102.0%	102.0%	102.0%	102.0%
Unemployment rate fiscal year average	7.9%	7.9%	7.3%	6.5%	5.7%	5.5%	5.5%	5.4%	5.4%	5.3%	5.3%

Notes: Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.
AS = American Samoa
[3] The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) raised the maximum benefit to 113.6% of the Thrifty Food Plan in FY 2009 and froze it at that level until regular inflation adjustments exceed it. Subsequent legislation sunsets that increase after October 31, 2013. FY 2014 number below includes the full year effect for Puerto Rico block grant.
Estimated spending from ARRA (in millions) $6,113, 374.

DETAIL OF SNAP BUDGET AUTHORITY OTHER THAN BENEFITS AND NUTRITION ASSISTANCE FOR PUERTO RICO AND AMERICAN SAMOA

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
State Administration Other Than E&T	3,068	3,123	3,182	3,261	3,347	3,438	3,527	3,623	3,721	3,821	3,925
Employment and Training (E&T)	323	327	331	336	342	349	355	362	368	376	383
Other Program Costs	124	123	125	128	131	135	138	142	145	149	153
Nutrition Education	285	401	407	416	425	434	444	454	464	475	486
Northern Mariana Islands	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Community Food Projects	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Program Access Grants	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Emergency Food Assistance Commodities	267	274	278	284	289	295	301	307	313	320	326
Food Donations on Indian Reservations	96	99	101	104	107	109	112	115	119	122	125
Total	4,185	4,368	4,446	4,551	4,663	4,782	4,900	5,025	5,153	5,285	5,420
DETAIL OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING FUNDS, BUDGET AUTHORITY											
100 Percent Federal Funds	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99
50 Percent Federal Funds	224	228	232	237	243	250	256	263	269	277	284
Total Budget Authority	323	327	331	336	342	349	355	362	368	376	383

Note: Details may not sum to totals because of rounding.

I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Democratic leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding; but more importantly, I thank him for his outstanding leadership for helping us live the Bible here in the Congress. He has been a relentless, dissatisfied, persistent champion for feeding the hungry in America and throughout the world. He is the living example, personification of the Gospel of Matthew, and I appreciate the statements you made earlier about priorities and the least of our brethren.

I thank you, Mr. MCGOVERN, for your leadership day in and day out of the task force on hunger and working with Congresswoman DELAURO, an appropriator, who shares your value on this subject. You both have been magnificent.

And I thank you as a mom, because we all have our motivation for going into politics or deciding that we're going to run for office, and my motivation can be described in three words: the children, the children, the children. As a mother of five myself and as a grandmother, I know how children thrive when they have the attention, the love, the food, and the care that they need.

It is always a wonderment to me that in this, the greatest country that ever existed in the history of the world, that one in four or one in five children goes to sleep hungry at night. So it is another wonderment to me why we should even have to have this conversation on the floor of the House as to whether we, as a nation, are prepared to feed our children.

We are all familiar with the comment, ''from the mouths of babes.'' From the mouth of babes. It's sometimes followed by ''come gems.'' In this case, ''from the mouths of babes comes food.'' Food to live, to be sustained, to be healthy, food to study and do well in school, food to have respect in their family and their friends and all the rest.

What's really interesting about it, though, for all the sentiment that is involved about feeding the children of our country, it makes economic sense to do so as well. The CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, says that rate increases of SNAP benefits is one of the two best options to boost growth and jobs in a weak economy. For every $1 invested in the SNAP program, for every $1 invested in that initiative, $1.70 is injected into the economy for economic activity. This purchasing power given to families who will spend it immediately because this is a necessity, this purchasing, injects demand into the economy, creating jobs. Don't take it from me. The Congressional Budget Office says this is one of the two best ways to boost growth.

Another economic aspect of this is that, as has been said over and over again, nearly 20 million children—20 million children—are the beneficiaries of food stamps.

Why do those families need food stamps? Well, some of them are families that are making the minimum wage. In fact, if you're a family of four and you have two wage earners, Mr. Chairman, the income you make from two wage earners making the minimum wage still has you below the poverty line and eligible for food stamps. Two wage earners making the minimum wage cannot afford to put food on the table; hence, they qualify for food stamps.

These food stamps in some ways are subsidizing a too low minimum wage in our country. So, speaking of the children, the children, the children, I hope that one of the other things that we will do here is to raise minimum wage, because that is the decent thing to do.

But many of the same people who want to cut food stamps—in fact, 2 million families out of food stamps—are the same people who are opposed to increasing the minimum wage. So it's a question of fairness. It's a question of decency. It's a question of respect for all of God's children. It's also a question of doing the right thing not only for the children but for our economy—$1.70 of economic growth injected for every $1 spent on food stamps.

Now, to cut food stamps and, therefore, reduce that economic growth might be considered one of the least smart ideas that you will hear here, but there is so much competition for that designation that it just fits comfortably among initiatives to suppress the wages and to cut food stamps. It's all part of a package, and it is not a pretty sight.

That's why, Mr. MCGOVERN, your relentless, persistent, dissatisfied advocacy is such a beautiful thing in this arena where people take very lightly cutting 2 million people off of food stamps.

I urge our colleagues to support the McGovern amendment.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Ag Committee has worked diligently in a bipartisan manner to craft these reforms to the food stamp program that this amendment would strip out totally. The argument that somehow we can food stamp our way into a great economy is a bit false in the sense that it doesn't reflect that we are

borrowing 40 cents of every dollar that we are putting into the program.

The families that the previous speaker referenced will still remain on food stamps. If you qualify on the income and asset side, you'll stay on the program. If you make too much money to qualify directly for food stamps, those are the folks who will be getting out as part of the $20 billion that we'll save in this program. It's a 2 percent reduction. I'm hard pressed to understand how we could have a near 5 percent reduction in the beneficiaries by cutting only 2 percent of the spending. We'll trim it from $80 billion a year to $78 billion a year.

Much of the conversation you'll hear and justification for not going along with these reforms sounds like we're gutting and destroying the entire program. We are not. These are modest reforms that we believe are appropriate at this time, and I urge my colleagues to vote against the McGovern amendment and support what the bipartisan Committee on Agriculture did.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) who has been a champion on this issue, and I'm proud that she's here.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank Congressman MCGOVERN for yielding and also for your tremendous leadership, not only in preserving our safety net, but your tireless work to eliminate hunger, which really should be an oxymoron in America.

I'm a proud cosponsor and rise in strong support of this amendment to safeguard hungry children and families across America.

Mr. Chairman, this farm bill would make heartless and harmful cuts to our Nation's frontline defense against hunger, the SNAP program. Oftentimes, people need a safety net, a bridge over troubled waters to help them through difficult economic times.

□ 1520

And yet these huge cuts come, even while they preserve wasteful subsidies for huge agribusiness, that really don't need corporate subsidies to continue with their huge profits.

Taking away food from hungry children hurts their health, their educational outcome, and restricts their economic prospects for their entire adult lives. And the Federal Government will end up paying more for their health care and their education, and get less revenue from their taxes.

As a former food stamp recipient, I know for a fact no one wants to be on food stamps. People want to work.

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

Mr. YOHO. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to Mr. MCGOVERN's amendment because the amount removed from the food stamp program will not remove one calorie off anyone's plate that deserves it or requires this assistance.

And I know the importance, personally, of having to go on food stamps. When my wife and I first got married, we were 19½. The interest rates in the economy went to 20 percent, and we had to get on food stamps for a short period of time. So I understand the need for those.

But yet let's look at the facts here. Out of the whole bill, of $940 billion being spent over 10 years we're looking at here, 80 percent of that goes to the food stamp program, which is approximately $752 billion. Eighty percent of the farm bill is going to that. Only 20 percent is actually going to the farmers, and we've cut that drastically over the last couple of years.

And so this is just a commonsense approach of reducing the amount of money that we're spending in this country. And I stand in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Let me just say to my colleague a few minutes ago who was up on this floor and talking against the food stamp program and against the McGovern amendment, I think it's important to note this is not my making this up, but this is an individual who has received almost $4.7 million in farm subsidies since 1995, including nearly $1.2 million in direct payments.

Now, I don't know whether that is a program that is means tested, that's asset tested, and that has a cap on it. No, this is free money for people who serve in this body. And these are the same folks who want to cut the food stamp program.

I rise in strong support of this amendment to replace those deep cuts to the food stamp program, which is our Nation's most important anti-hunger program. All across the country, cities, suburbs, rural communities, from the coast to the heartland, nearly 50 million Americans are struggling with hunger, and almost 20 million of them are our children. No part of the country is immune.

We should not destroy what has been a longstanding, bipartisan tradition to give crucial nutrition assistance. This is what this farm bill does. It cuts out the nutrition program for 2 million people, a million of whom are children.

And the research has shown us that the food stamp program is the most effective program pushing against the steep rise in poverty. Ninety-nine percent of recipients live under the poverty line. They're not getting $4.7 million in subsidies from the Federal Government.

By the way, when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about waste, fraud and abuse, this is a program with a 3.8 percent error rate. I defy you to go to any other agency of the Federal Government and find that they have as low an error rate.

You want to talk about a program that really ought to be challenged in this farm bill?

Let's take a look at the crop insurance program. Look at the crop insurance program.

Support the McGovern amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire about how much time remains on both sides on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. That being the case, Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's worth noting that, when the Ag Committee put this bill together, a bill which had bipartisan support, overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle in the process, we understood that reform had to be achieved across the board.

We have reforms in the commodity title. The direct payment program goes away. We have reforms in the conservation program, $6 billion worth of savings through reforms. And, yes, we address the nutrition title.

We tried, in good faith, to pick programs that would not, in the eyes of the committee as a whole, create huge hardship on citizens.

How did we do that?

Well, categorical eligibility. If you receive some other Federal welfare benefit, under present law, you automatically get food stamps. We simply say, you have to apply. Demonstrate your income, demonstrate your assets. If you qualify, we help you. But you've got to prove you qualify.

Now, some may argue about what those assets and income levels are, but that's not the debate today. It's automatic food stamps.

Something called LIHEAP, where a number of States use the flexibility of the '96 law to say we'll help you with your home heating, and then you can automatically qualify for food stamps. There are actually some States that send out a dollar to qualify for a free month's worth of automatic food stamps.

We simply say in the bill, States, if you want to do this, power to you. But put $20 a month out. Buy more than just a cup or a pint of home heating oil. Actually put something up. That saves about $8 billion.

We tried very hard to come up with ways that would not deny the needy the help they need but, by the same token, make sure those who qualified got the help. That's only fair to the recipients who need help. It's only fair to their fellow citizens who pay for that help.

We tried, in the best way we could, to achieve reform and to help those who need the help.

Now, will these CBO numbers be in fruition when it's all calculated?

I suspect a number of people who receive automatic food stamps will be eligible. They'll fill out the paperwork,

they'll demonstrate the need, they'll qualify.

But I can only work with the CBO numbers that are given to me under the rules of the House. And the rules say these two changes save $20.5 billion, half of the approximate $40 billion we save out of the overall FARRM Bill.

It's tough economic times. It's a challenging Federal budget. We're trying to do the right thing. We're trying to do it in the most difficult of circumstances.

I respect my friends, my colleagues. We just happen to disagree about how the policy will work. I sincerely believe the perspective I've offered is accurate. If my friends are accurate and I'm wrong, then we'll address this issue sometime in the very near future. If I'm right, then the people who need help will continue to get help. The Treasury will have $20-some billion of a $40 billion package to spend in other places.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, because of prior cuts in the program already, even if we do nothing in terms of this farm bill, in terms of reducing SNAP, a family of three, on average, would lose about $30 a month in SNAP benefits. That's if we do nothing. They're already going to receive a reduction come November.

Then, on top of that is what we have in this farm bill. The CBO says that 2 million people will be thrown off the benefit. They say that over 200,000 kids will lose their free breakfast and lunch at school.

I have great respect for Chairman LUCAS. I wanted very much to support a bill that he put together; but, to me, this cut is too big and is too harsh and is going to hurt too many people.

All of us came here to help people. We all came here to help our constituents, rich and poor alike. But this here will hurt people, and that is why I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

This cut is too big. It is too harsh. We don't need to do this. The price for a farm bill should not be to result in more hunger in America. We can do so much better. Our country is better than this.

So I urge all my colleagues, Republican and Democrat, to come together and support this amendment. Let's not make hunger worse in America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the McGovern amendment, which I am proud to cosponsor, and I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his leadership on this issue of vital importance to my constituents and to struggling families across the country.

It has been nearly six months since we voted on an eight month Farm Bill extension, and in that time I have spoken with people across Oregon's First Congressional District about their priorities. In those conversations, three central goals emerged for reauthorization. Provide certainty to the agriculture community through a five year extension, support specialty crop producers in Oregon, and fully fund the nutrition programs that provide a safety net for our friends and neighbors who are still trying to bounce back from the hard times of the latest economic recession.

The bill before us today accomplishes two of these goals, but on the third, it falls absolutely flat. To remove more than $20 billion from the SNAP program at a time when economic conditions mean that even more families are becoming eligible, is irresponsible and unfair.

Our economy continues to recover, but millions of American children and families remain in poverty. According to the Oregon Food Bank, the SNAP cuts in this year's farm bill will cause about 90,000 Oregonians to lose the assistance they rely on to put food on the table. If we're really concerned about the cost of this program, we should focus addressing the root cause. Let's cut poverty, not nutrition assistance.

For this reason I have joined the gentleman from Massachussetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, in cosponsoring this amendment that will restore funding for the SNAP program in the bill. I urge compassion for those families who are still struggling and ask that my colleagues vote in favor of the amendment.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chair, the proposed SNAP cuts in this bill will be devastating to our most vulnerable populations.

Many of the poorest Americans depend on SNAP as their only means of assistance to feed their families.

We should not turn our backs on low-income families, children, seniors and disabled.

Today, I was told a story about one of my constituents—a mother who receives a very small amount of food stamp assistance.

She said that if SNAP is cut, her kids will starve. Period.

This is the reality that so many families face, including the 2 million this bill would leave to face hunger if this amendment is not adopted.

In Franklin County, Ohio alone, there are an estimated 59,450 kids who live daily with the threat of hunger.

Without inclusion of this amendment, the current farm bill will destroy our efforts to relieve hunger within our districts and will dramatically increase the number of children, families, and older adults who are already struggling and push them to below the poverty level.

This is a commonsense amendment.

It will restore the $20.5 billion cuts in SNAP by offsetting the Farm Risk Management Election Program and the Supplemental Coverage Option.

We cannot leave our most vulnerable children and families without basic access to food.

If we do, I think we violate a core American value.

I urge my colleagues to vote to save SNAP by supporting the McGovern amendment.

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

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

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

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

□ 1530

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GIBBS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, beginning on line 21, strike ''total acres planted for the year'' and insert ''base acres''.

Page 21, strike lines 1 through 22 and insert the following:

(16) REFERENCE PRICE.—The term ''reference price'', with respect to a covered commodity for a crop year, means the product obtained by multiplying—

(A) 55 percent; by

(B) the average of the national marketing year average price for the five most recent crop years, excluding each of the crop years with the highest and lowest prices.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer the Gibbs-Kind amendment to title I of the FARRM Bill that sets the target price for all crops at 55 percent of the 5-year rolling Olympic average and changes the acreage available for target price support to 85 percent of the farmer's base acres.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I seek to claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. GIBBS. At this time, I yield 90 seconds to Representative KIND from the great State of Wisconsin.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Ohio for yielding me this time.

I thought his summary was very accurate on what our amendment would do. What Mr. GIBBS didn't point out, though, is this would also save $12 billion over 10 years by a more fiscally responsible approach, one that we feel is market-based, and one that we think is economically feasible, one that also maintains an important safety net for farmers if commodity prices do drop.

But, listen, the supporters of the Price Loss Coverage program, as currently drafted, will claim the program is necessary to ensure farmers have a safety net for when the market collapses. But, instead, the program in the FARRM Bill before us sets target prices so high that some commodities are guaranteed an 8 percent profit. We don't guarantee any other business in

the country that type of a profit margin other than crop insurance companies that are guaranteed a 14 percent profit under this bill.

By setting the target prices for programs at this historically high level, it will all but ensure a much higher likelihood of government payouts in the future.

In fact, implementation of the Price Loss Coverage program will already require government payouts for the five top commodity crops. Rice alone would pay out $14 per hundred while the current price is at $10.50 today. So it's outrageous that while we're cutting over $20 billion in the nutrition title of the FARRM Bill, we're adding on this additional high target price with additional taxpayer subsidies in an area where it's not economically needed or feasible.

And since farmers receive these payouts on their planted acres, we are encouraging them to overplant and to plant marginal lands that probably wouldn't be brought into production anyway because their losses would be covered and the profit margin would be assured.

Also, given the fact that we're still trying to work our way out of the WTO complaint from Brazil on the cotton subsidy program, this program sets up another potential WTO trade case against us.

I encourage our colleagues to keep working with us to improve the program.

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to myself.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to talk a little bit. Back in the 1995 farm bill, Congress made a decision to move the programs to be more market-oriented, where farmers would plant towards the market and not towards the program.

As past-State Farm Bureau president and also a farmer, when I talk to my farmer colleagues, they want the check to come from the market and not the government. And my fear is, my concern is that the House-marked bill will distort the market prices by setting the target prices, as Representative KIND said, too high.

Let's take corn, for example. We had a drought. We saw the prices scoot up to very high levels. Well, we're seeing some rainfall, the weather kind of moderates over and averages out over a several-year period, and it's possible we could see the prices of corn, for example, come down and drop below these very high-set target rates, and farmers could still be profitable, still be making some money on a per-bushel basis, depending on their yield—yield has to be a factor. And when you have price loss coverage, yield is not factored in, where they could actually still be making some money on a per-bushel basis per acre and still get a government payout. That's market distortion.

It's interesting to note that the organizations that support my amendment, the National Corn Growers, the Soybean Association, many national organizations and State organizations that represent thousands of farmers out there strongly support my amendment, which, as Representative KIND said, cuts $12 billion from the committee-marked bill.

You find that kind of odd. The reason is they don't want to go back to the previous policies of 1995 where we have market distortions and farmers are planting for the program and the market is not dictating it, and they never get out of that rut.

Another concern I have is WTO concerns. When we change this to planted acres, direct benefits paid to planted acres, that's ripe for a WTO complaint and for a trade war. And this will increase, I believe, overplanting and farmers reacting for the wrong reasons and not the market reasons.

So, on that basis, Mr. Chairman, with the strong support of many of the national commodity organizations that represent thousands of farmers and strongly do not want this, we can save taxpayers $12 billion and keep a market-oriented bill and not risk exposure to taxpayers if the markets collapse to more historical levels.

Mr. KIND. Will the gentleman yield an additional 30 seconds?

Mr. GIBBS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KIND. I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue. As the former past Farm Bureau president in the State of Ohio and someone who is intimately familiar with these commodity programs, his lead has been crucial. He knows how the market works. And I think this program is setting up a lot of market distortions, unnecessary taxpayer subsidies that aren't economically justifiable. Our Amendment is a way of providing a safety net in a fiscally responsible manner. I hope we can continue working with the leadership of this committee to make this right.

Mr. GIBBS. I think it is very important that we do have a safety net. But the safety net can't be at a level where prices are set at or close or even above the cost of production. That distorts markets. But we need a safety net to protect our American farmers and our rural communities and continue to ensure that we have the safest and most affordable food supply in the world.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I my consume.

If Mr. GIBBS is willing, I'd like to request that he withdraw his amendment with my commitment that we would continue to work on these issues as we move forward to produce an equitable and market-oriented farm bill.

I yield to the gentleman for any response he might have.

Mr. GIBBS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With that commitment, I will respectfully withdraw my amendment from consideration, and I look forward to working with you and the rest of the committee, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the gentleman's time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MS. HERRERA BEUTLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 55 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 123___. SILVICULTURAL ACTIVITIES.

Section 402(l) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342(l)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) SILVICULTURAL ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) NPDES PERMIT REQUIREMENTS FOR SILVICULTURAL ACTIVITIES.—The Administrator shall not require a permit or otherwise promulgate regulations under this section or directly or indirectly require any State to require a permit under this section for a discharge of stormwater runoff resulting from the conduct of the following silviculture activities: nursery operations, site preparation, reforestation and subsequent cultural treatment, thinning, prescribed burning, pest and fire control, harvesting operations, surface drainage, and road use, construction, and maintenance.

''(B) PERMITS FOR DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL.—Nothing in this paragraph exempts a silvicultural activity resulting in the discharge of dredged or fill material from any permitting requirement under section 404.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I'm here today to join in the effort to promote this farm bill and request that my amendment be added to it.

I'm here to protect millions of jobs across the country, millions—110,000 in my home State of Washington alone—by doing something we don't hear much of in this Chamber, particularly on this side of the aisle. I'm here to say that I agree with the EPA. With respect to treating forest roads, the EPA has it right and has had it right now for nearly 40 years.

This bipartisan amendment that I'm very proud to offer with my colleague, KURT SCHRADER, simply codifies the EPA's silviculture rule that says mud and rock runoff from forest roads should not be categorized the same as industrial parking lots or factories. It makes no changes to the Clean Water Act, nor does it restrict the EPA from enforcing current law.

In a recent Ninth Circuit Court decision, a judge—not the EPA—decided this rule needed to be changed and directed the EPA to require NPDES permits for all forest roads on public or private land. This ruling would have

cost private, Federal, and State and tribal landowners billions of dollars, and it would have helped kill thousands of jobs across the country.

Fortunately, the U.S. Supreme Court ultimately overturned this outrageous ruling and also believes the EPA treatment of forest roads is the correct approach.

□ 1540

However, extremist lawsuits continue to roll in, and all of them are threatening the viability of forests by potentially costing private and public landowners millions in unnecessary, unscientifically proven expenses.

Mr. Chairman, unless Congress acts, our forests will remain under the attack of baseless lawsuits that simply serve no purpose in protecting our rivers, streams, and waterways but are highly effective in killing real jobs. We're talking about jobs in wood product manufacturing: pulp, paper, forest harvesting, forest management, and the list goes on.

This provision enjoys a wide range of bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate. I urge my colleagues to stand with private landowners, job creators, Republicans and Democrats in Congress, the administration, and the Supreme Court in supporting this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHRADER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that's long overdue. I join in support of my colleague and friend from Washington State to lend a little rationality to the discussion about how we operate in our forests.

This legislation hopefully would not be necessary. As the gentlewoman alluded to, we've had a Supreme Court decision that would seem to indicate that the EPA rule for the last 37 years has been a good rule. Indeed, agriculture and forestry aren't classically nonpoint source polluters. They are not a factory; they are not a municipality's sewer system. They are nonpoint source emitters, if you will. I think that's the way to look at this. When you have a decision by the Supreme Court, I think it's time to hopefully verify that decision.

The concern I have and the reason why this legislation is necessary is that, while it agreed that the rule should stand, it did not really rule on the merits of the issue. We're already facing additional lawsuits from different organizations that have a misguided view of what actually goes on in the forest system.

And I find it particularly egregious that when there is a great concern about forest runoff, agricultural runoff into our streams and our rivers, that when the industry steps up and does the right thing by pushing culverts, making the roads safer and cleaner, dumping that stuff onto the forest floor, not in the river, that they get sued and asked to come up with additional permits that would cost jobs and not help us get out of this Great Recession.

So I am a strong proponent of this amendment—I think it will get overwhelming support in this great, august body—and look forward to bringing it forward.

I urge an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. I thank my colleagues from Oregon and Washington for their work on this amendment, bringing it forward. Look, this is extraordinarily important to men and women who work in the woods in the Northwest and across the United States.

As you've heard, for nearly four decades the Environmental Protection Agency said that driving down a forest road was not the same as pumping raw sewage into a river. They're much different activities. This amendment would prevent the Federal Government from subjecting forested communities and businesses to further costly permits for everyday activities like driving down a road.

Rural forested communities in the Northwest have been hurting for a very long time. Those who live there, we know about all the high unemployment rate, we know about the high poverty rate, we know about the percentage of kids on free and reduced lunch because of burdensome Federal regulations that have shut down activity on our Federal forests. Now lawsuits threaten to do this on our private forests as well. The last thing we need is more costly and lawsuit-prone regulations that will further impact rural communities and the good people who live there that simply want the opportunity to work in the woods, raise their families, and grow in the communities.

Passing this bipartisan amendment will provide some certainty moving forward for rural forested communities, forest managers, and the people who work in the woods. So I urge my colleagues to stand for jobs, stand for rural America, and vote for this bipartisan amendment.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the gentlelady and simply want to note for the record that I support this amendment, this bipartisan amendment. We should all vote for it.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. With that, I urge my colleagues to join in this bipartisan, bicameral effort to protect jobs and protect our forest health.

I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

Ms. FOXX. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 1107, add the following new subsection:

(e) CAP ON TOTAL OBLIGATIONS AND EXPENDITURES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the total amount of price loss coverage payments and revenue loss coverage payments made under this section during the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2020 shall not exceed $16,956,500. Producer agreements required by section 1108 shall specifically state that payments made under this section shall be reduced as necessary to comply with this subsection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is one I've taken to calling the ''Spending Safeguard'' amendment, because it will protect taxpayers in the event CBO predictions relating to the Farm Risk Management Election program are horribly wrong.

This particular program is basically an expansion of overly generous crop insurance subsidies for producers, and it's predicted to cost about $23 billion over 10 years. But it could potentially cost more—much more. That's because the program's costs are linked to high target price estimates that well exceed historical averages. If prices fall, taxpayers will be forced to make up the difference.

As many of us are aware, the 2008 farm bill cost taxpayers 51 percent more than its drafters predicted. None of us, from Members of Congress to the budget wizards at CBO, can predict the future. That is why we must put a safeguard in place to prevent unappropriated spending from eating taxpayers alive.

My amendment will cap spending on this program at 110 percent of CBO predicted levels for the first 5 years in which payments are dispersed—fiscal years 2016 through 2020. If CBO predictions are reasonably accurate, nothing will happen; but if the predictions are horribly wrong, this amendment ensures taxpayers won't be forced to pay for another costly Washington mistake.

This is a simple amendment, but one that I hope will set an important precedent. If Congress creates new mandatory spending programs, it must put a mechanism in place to make sure costs don't spiral out of control.

As our national debt approaches $17 trillion, we simply can't afford to create new, open-ended, mandatory spending programs and set them on autopilot.

When I talk to constituents about the Federal budget, nearly all are puzzled by the concept of mandatory spending. Virtually no one of any political stripe can understand the idea of creating a law one year that imposes an unlimited, unchecked, unaccountable lien on the Treasury for all time.

Even with all the handwringing over the discretionary spending reductions called for in sequestration, we all know that, in the end, budgetary problems on the spending side of the ledger will never be resolved until we confront mandatory spending.

My amendment quells all of the uncertainties created by mandatory spending with one beautifully simple proposal that, for the first time in the memory of everyone we've talked to, puts a finite number on an otherwise infinite liability.

To be clear, this amendment applies only to one single provision—the Farm Risk Management Election program. It does not apply to SNAP and will not affect food stamp benefits or other mandatory spending programs in any way.

My amendment will safeguard taxpayers if the Farm Risk Management Election program ends up costing significantly more than advertised, prevent automatic and unappropriated spending under this program from skyrocketing, and set a striking new precedent for fiscal responsibility.

This amendment should pass with broad, bipartisan support, Mr. Chairman. Over the past few days, I've noticed that many of my Democratic colleagues share my concern about the uncertain budgetary impacts of this program. Republicans and Democrats alike should rally around this idea, which simultaneously protects taxpayers and ensures the fiscal viability of this program.

The time has come to put an end to reckless, unchecked, mandatory spending programs in the farm bill. This amendment may make those unaccustomed to the way things are done uncomfortable, but the simple truth is that the way things are done just doesn't work anymore—in fact, it never has.

Congresses of old had no problem creating obligations for future generations to fulfill. Today we have an opportunity to change course, to set things right, to take the first step toward reining in out-of-control mandatory spending. I urge my colleagues to take this step with me and support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment and ask my colleagues to join me in rejecting it.

I appreciate the intent of the gentlelady's amendment, which is obviously to restrain Federal spending, but being fiscally responsible has been my focus from the very beginning.

□ 1550

That is why we brought forth a bill that cuts traditional farm spending by $23 billion. That's 36 percent.

Over the last 17 years, farmers have received substantial fixed payments with 100 percent certainty. We eliminated those payments and replaced them with a risk management framework that provides support only when farmers face significant losses. Under this amendment, farmers would go from 100 percent guaranteed direct loans to a 100 percent guarantee that the safety net would fall short when they need it the most.

I urge my colleagues to consider a few key points:

Number one, we built restraint into the new farm policies. The reference prices are all below cost of production estimates. Farmers are only paid 80 on 85 percent of their acres. In the case of the PLC, they are only paid on 90 percent of their yield. Total payments on a farm are kept at total historic program acres. Ensuring that no new acres are added to the program, we have very binding payment limitations and reduced AGI limits. And if that weren't enough, the formulas that established assistance levels are constrained themselves.

Second, the programs are designed to only turn on when they're needed. The assistance is provided directly in proportion to need. We are no longer making payments for the sake of making payments. Even though it is incredibly unlikely that spending levels were ever to reach 110 percent of CBO's projected spending levels, it would be so because there has been a catastrophic drop in the market.

And the third and final point on this amendment—and I say this respectfully to my dear friend—it would be an absolute nightmare to administer. Some would say administering it is the administration's problem; but unlike a lot of legislation that flows through this town, every provision of this bill has undergone extensive technical review to ensure its ability to be implemented. Every crop is on its own marketing year and every State has a slightly different growing season. Administering an overall program cap on a risk management tool that is designed to respond to unique risk management challenges is an incredibly challenging problem. It will tie USDA in knots.

I argue that there's a great discussion to have when we debate the technical merits of the Budget Act, but let's use the newly reformed farm safety net as a testing ground for—let's just not do that. Let's just not use it for this experiment.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am really disappointed in the chairman of the Agriculture Committee's response to this amendment. This is a really good amendment that will help us be able to predict in the future how much money is going to be spent. It will hold the CBO accountable.

If the numbers presented to us are accurate, this will never hit. I believe the chairman did not dispute my comments that the last farm bill went over budget 51 percent. We are constantly hearing that the CBO predicted something and comes in with a totally different number.

If by any chance the CBO is wrong here, then the chairman will do good work in getting us to understand why more money needs to be appropriated for these programs.

I applaud the chairman for what he has done, identifying problems and appropriate solutions, but this is a good amendment. It deserves to be passed, it has bipartisan support, and it will take us in the right direction.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I also rise respectfully in opposition to the gentlelady's amendment.

My district located in the Mississippi Delta region grows nearly half all rice produced in the United States. This amendment jeopardizes the safety net row crop producers in my district depend on to manage risk and stay in business.

Given the fact that price volatility is the primary risk mid-South farmers face, and the cost of production is extremely high, the Price Loss Coverage program is the only viable option to provide producers adequate protection. Leading experts and ag economists at Texas A&M University show the average cost of production for rice is $14.92 per hundredweight. The $14 per hundredweight reference price established in the FARRM Bill is realistic and will not kick in unless the producer experiences a loss.

What is more, CBO projections already take into account the probability of price movements that can impact the overall cost productions of the PLC policy, and U.S. farm policy has come in well under budget projections for at least the last 7 years. This amendment is unnecessary and will do nothing but create more uncertainty for agriculture producers.

The House Agriculture Committee has made a good-faith bipartisan effort

to craft a farm bill that reflects a farmer's risk across all regions of the country. This amendment is a step backwards.

With all due respect, I urge my colleagues to oppose the gentlelady's amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 1107(b), add the following new paragraph:

(8) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a study reviewing the climate impacts of the availability of price loss coverage, including (but not limited to) the impact from increased crop production, land use change, farm equipment use, and increased input of agricultural chemicals.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It would simply ask us to learn more. It would ask us to know more than we know now about an important subject affecting our society and, indeed, our whole world.

In fact, my amendment would simply require a study to review climate impacts of the Price Loss Coverage program. I can't understand why we wouldn't want to know the effects of such a program. I think learning more so that we can do better is a good idea.

Climate change is a defining issue of this century. It is negatively impacting our economy, our health, and security. There is an international consensus that climate change is real, is caused and influenced by mankind, and is affecting our world in a negative way.

Decisions Congress makes on this day, Mr. Chairman, in this farm bill, in fact, will have a direct impact on greenhouse gas emissions in the United States; and, of course, this world doesn't know the borders that these nations do, so it will affect the entire globe.

Agriculture does contribute to climate change. In fact, 8 percent of all U.S. greenhouse gas emissions come from agriculture. Agriculture also brings great gains to humanity as well.

We need to understand what greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture mean so that we can formulate better policy and utilize better technology. The emissions from agriculture result from fertilizer application, livestock, land use, soil management, farm equipment, and rice production.

The new Price Loss Coverage program provides farmers raising major crops with subsidies if the crop prices drop below current historic levels. Farmers are already plowing up marginal lands and native grasslands in response to record crop prices and crop insurance subsidies; 23 million acres of natural land were plowed up between 2008 and 2011. Almost 20 million of these were corn, soybeans, and wheat alone.

The Price Loss Coverage program will further incentivize increased crop production.

Converting land to cropland releases millions of tons of CO_2 in the United States every year. Converting more land to agriculture will increase greenhouse gas emissions. But, Mr. Chairman, we don't know how much, we don't know the extent, we don't know the effects. It is important that we do know so that we can incentivize more green-friendly agriculture production methods so that we can know the impact in our world, and we can know why it is important to take action now in this farm bill today.

A study shouldn't harm anybody, and I urge support for this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that I have the greatest respect for my good colleague from Minnesota, but at the present time and in the present set of circumstances, I must, in good faith, oppose his amendment. I believe he is very sincere in his efforts, but, again, I must oppose his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of part II of subtitle D of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 1487. REPEAL OF PERMANENT PRICE SUPPORT AUTHORITY FOR MILK.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1446) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''milk,''; and

(2) by striking subsections (c) and (d).

(b) EXCLUSION FROM PRICE SUPPORT FOR OTHER NONBASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES.—Section 301 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1447) is amended by inserting ''(other than milk)'' after ''agricultural commodity''.

Page 144, lines 19 and 20, strike ''during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act through December 31, 2018''.

Page 145, lines 8, 9, and 10, strike ''during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act through December 31, 2018''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, 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, my amendment would simply repeal the outdated and expensive dairy price support law enacted as part of the Agriculture Act of 1949.

This provision created a commodity support policy for dairy production that, though suspended upon the enactment of each farm bill that has been reauthorized, it still remains on the books as permanent law. That this old law is still technically in effect is a problem for two reasons:

First, the price support calculations essentially establish a ''floor'' for milk prices, which is set at twice the current market price. This means that the Federal Government would be required to step in and purchase surplus milk at double the current purchase price, which would drive up costs for taxpayers but would also result in a higher cost at the grocery store, potentially making a typical gallon of milk cost $7. This will hurt the most vulnerable in our society—poor children and seniors on a limited income.

This potential and likely unintended consequence is troubling, but more troubling is that this old law threatens to rear its ugly head every time the farm bill expires before it is reauthorized. In fact, we faced this very issue at the beginning of this year, though it was buried in the larger ''fiscal cliff'' deal that passed on January 1.

Mr. Chairman, in this time of congressional gridlock, we've seen bailouts, failed stimulus bills, near-government shutdowns, and panic about sequestration and tax hikes. The last thing we need is one more ''cliff'' for Americans to fall off of.

This law is outdated, it is unused and is ultimately a nuisance which requires a patch every time Congress fails to renew the larger farm bill, which, unfortunately, is a frequent occurrence.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the chairman.

When I was chairman and did the last farm bill, we maintained the permanent law, and we did it for a reason, which is that it is very hard to get these farm bills done, and sometimes you need some motivation to get people to move. That's the main reason we left it there.

I have a question of the author of the amendment if he would be willing to engage me in a discussion.

I guess I was curious as to why you are only repealing the dairy provision of the permanent law and not the entire permanent law. Is there some reason for that?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. The reason is that the milk price support is actually a ''floor'' for the cost at which the government buys surplus milk. What that will do is raise the cost that the government is going to have to pay for this surplus milk, which is just going to cost the taxpayers more money.

Mr. PETERSON. What it does is it sets the price of dairy at 85 percent of parity, and that would have been about 39 bucks. It also sets the price of wheat and corn and soybeans at anywhere from—I don't know. It's 80 to 95 percent of parity. Those prices are just as problematic. You know what happened last December. The law expired on September 30, but nothing actually happens until that current year's crop is harvested. Wheat does not harvest until May, and corn doesn't harvest until October or November, but milk is harvested every day. That's why it became an issue.

So I am against getting rid of the permanent law, but I was just curious as to why you picked on just dairy. I mean, I see your point that you're going to raise costs to the government, but if you want to really raise costs to the government, support the Goodlatte-Scott amendment because that's really going to stick it to the government.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself my remaining time.

I thank my colleagues for having a good faith discussion. I do appreciate the point that the ranking member brings. If we're going to address one part of the '49 Act, we probably should address all of it. There have been ongoing discussions as long as I've been here about how to do that.

Many provisions of Federal law have an underlying base law. We do laws then that build off of that, and when they expire you revert to permanent law. That's the case of the '49 law. Maybe the 2013 farm bill should become the permanent law to give us at least a realistic, modern thing to come from, but that's probably a discussion for a different amendment.

I would say, quite simply, that I respect my colleague but that I, too, cannot vote to undo things by piecemeal. I've got to have a systematic way about it.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. From the comments my good friend from Minnesota and my good friend from Oklahoma stated, maybe we should repeal the whole '49 law. I would be all in favor of working with both gentlemen to try to find some way to do that. I'm sure both gentlemen would be very eager to not have the incentive to go back to that law as a piecemeal way of trying to deal with these problems.

My friend from Minnesota is exactly right. I used to farm. I've been a dairy farmer. I had Holstein cows. I was a true farmer—I've raised feeder steers; I've hay-farmed; I've truck-farmed; and I've row-cropped. I know agriculture. I wasn't a gentleman farmer. I'd climb in the back of the combine between stops and change the air drum. So I know agriculture.

I know the biggest problem agriculture faces today is the regulation, particularly from EPA. I'd like to see those regulations rolled back because that would help our agriculture more than any other thing that we could do, and I would be all in favor of doing that.

The reason I brought the milk part of the old law forward was exactly the reason my good friend from Minnesota stated, in that you have to milk cows not once a day but at least twice a day, sometimes three. The milk support price that is guaranteed in this underlying law will raise costs if we go back to that and it stays in place. If we don't have the farm bill suspended or reauthorized, then what happens is the Federal Government is going to pay much higher prices for milk, and that's going to increase the cost in the grocery store for all Americans, and it's going to hurt the poor people, particularly poor children and senior citizens.

Mr. Chair, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 20 seconds remaining.

□ 1610

Mr. PETERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PETERSON. Just a point. I understand what you're saying, but you need to look at the Goodlatte-Scott amendment. What it does is allow them to buy insurance at $18 a hundredweight, and if the price goes to $11 like it did in 2009, the taxpayers are on the hook. So you've got the same problem going on with what Goodlatte and Scott are trying to do in this bill.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. ENYART

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 1502. NATIONAL DROUGHT COUNCIL AND NATIONAL DROUGHT POLICY ACTION PLAN.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COUNCIL.—The term ''Council'' means the National Drought Council established by this section.

(2) DROUGHT.—The term ''drought'' means a natural disaster that is caused by a deficiency in precipitation—

(A) that may lead to a deficiency in surface and subsurface water supplies (including rivers, streams, wetlands, ground water, soil moisture, reservoir supplies, lake levels, and snow pack); and

(B) that causes or may cause—

(i) substantial economic or social impacts; or

(ii) physical damage or injury to individuals, property, or the environment.

(3) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ''Indian tribe'' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(4) MEMBER.—The term ''member'', with respect to the National Drought Council, means a member of the Council specified or appointed under this section or, in the absence of the member, the member's designee.

(5) MITIGATION.—The term ''mitigation'' means a short- or long-term action, program, or policy that is implemented in advance of or during a drought to minimize any risks and impacts of drought.

(6) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' ″means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(7) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the several States, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands.

(8) TRIGGER.—The term ''trigger'' means the thresholds or criteria that must be satisfied before mitigation or emergency assistance may be provided to an area—

(A) in which drought is emerging; or

(B) that is experiencing a drought.

(9) WATERSHED.—The term ''watershed'' means a region or area with common hydrology, an area drained by a waterway that

drains into a lake or reservoir, the total area above a given point on a stream that contributes water to the flow at that point, or the topographic dividing line from which surface streams flow in two different directions. In no case shall a watershed be larger than a river basin.

(10) WATERSHED GROUP.—The term ''watershed group'' means a group of individuals, formally recognized by the appropriate State or States, who represent the broad scope of relevant interests within a watershed and who work together in a collaborative manner to jointly plan the management of the natural resources contained within the watershed.

(b) EFFECT OF SECTION.—This section does not affect—

(1) the authority of a State to allocate quantities of water under the jurisdiction of the State; or

(2) any State water rights established as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) NATIONAL DROUGHT COUNCIL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture a council to be known as the ''National Drought Council''.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall be composed of—

(i) the Secretary (or the designee of the Secretary);

(ii) the Secretary of Commerce (or the designee of the Secretary of Commerce);

(iii) the Secretary of the Army (or the designee of the Secretary of the Army);

(iv) the Secretary of the Interior (or the designee of the Secretary of the Interior);

(v) the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (or the designee of the Director);

(vi) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (or the designee of the Administrator);

(vii) 4 members appointed by the Secretary, in coordination with the National Governors Association, each of whom shall be the Governor of a State (or the designee of the Governor) and who collectively shall represent the geographic diversity of the Nation;

(viii) 1 member appointed by the Secretary, in coordination with the National Association of Counties;

(ix) 1 member appointed by the Secretary, in coordination with the United States Conference of Mayors;

(x) 1 member appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, in coordination with Indian tribes, to represent the interests of tribal governments; and

(xi) 1 member appointed by the Secretary, in coordination with the National Association of Conservation Districts, to represent local soil and water conservation districts.

(B) DATE OF APPOINTMENT.—The appointment of each member of the Council shall be made not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) TERM; VACANCIES.—

(A) TERM.—A non-Federal member of the Council appointed under paragraph (2) shall be appointed for a term of two years.

(B) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Council—

(i) shall not affect the powers of the Council; and

(ii) shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(C) TERMS OF MEMBERS FILLING VACANCIES.—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the member's predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term.

(4) MEETINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall meet at the call of the co-chairs.

(B) FREQUENCY.—The Council shall meet at least semiannually.

(5) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Council shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings or conduct other business.

(6) COUNCIL LEADERSHIP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There shall be a Federal co-chair and non-Federal co-chair of the Council.

(B) APPOINTMENT.—

(i) FEDERAL CO-CHAIR.—The Secretary shall be Federal co-chair.

(ii) NON-FEDERAL CO-CHAIR.—The non-Federal members of the Council shall elect, on a biannual basis, a non-Federal co-chair of the Council from among the members appointed under paragraph (2).

(d) DUTIES OF THE COUNCIL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall— (A) not later than one year after the date of the first meeting of the Council, develop a comprehensive National Drought Policy Action Plan that—

(i)(I) delineates and integrates responsibilities for activities relating to drought (including drought preparedness, mitigation, research, risk management, training, and emergency relief) among Federal agencies; and

(II) ensures that those activities are coordinated with the activities of the States, local governments, Indian tribes, and neighboring countries;

(ii) is consistent with—

(I) this Act and other applicable Federal laws; and

(II) the laws and policies of the States for water management;

(iii) is integrated with drought management programs of the States, Indian tribes, local governments, watershed groups, and private entities; and

(iv) avoids duplicating Federal, State, tribal, local, watershed, and private drought preparedness and monitoring programs in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) evaluate Federal drought-related programs in existence on the date of enactment of this Act and make recommendations to Congress and the President on means of eliminating—

(i) discrepancies between the goals of the programs and actual service delivery;

(ii) duplication among programs; and

(iii) any other circumstances that interfere with the effective operation of the programs;

(C) make recommendations to the President, Congress, and appropriate Federal Agencies on—

(i) the establishment of common interagency triggers for authorizing Federal drought mitigation programs; and

(ii) improving the consistency and fairness of assistance among Federal drought relief programs;

(D) encourage and facilitate the development of drought preparedness plans under subtitle C, including establishing the guidelines under this section;

(E) based on a review of drought preparedness plans, develop and make available to the public drought planning models to reduce water resource conflicts relating to water conservation and droughts;

(F) develop and coordinate public awareness activities to provide the public with access to understandable and informative materials on drought, including—

(i) explanations of the causes of drought, the impacts of drought, and the damages from drought;

(ii) descriptions of the value and benefits of land stewardship to reduce the impacts of drought and to protect the environment;

(iii) clear instructions for appropriate responses to drought, including water conservation, water reuse, and detection and elimination of water leaks;

(iv) information on State and local laws applicable to drought; and

(v) opportunities for assistance to resource-dependent businesses and industries in times of drought; and

(G) establish operating procedures for the Council.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this subsection, the Council shall consult with groups affected by drought emergencies.

(3) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(A) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the first meeting of the Council, and annually thereafter, the Council shall submit to Congress a report on the activities carried out under this section.

(ii) INCLUSIONS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The annual report shall include a summary of drought preparedness plans.

(II) INITIAL REPORT.—The initial report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include any recommendations of the Council.

(B) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than seven years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Council shall submit to Congress a report that recommends—

(i) amendments to this section; and

(ii) whether the Council should continue.

(e) POWERS OF THE COUNCIL.—

(1) HEARINGS.—The Council may hold hearings, meet and act at any time and place, take any testimony and receive any evidence that the Council considers advisable to carry out this section.

(2) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Council may obtain directly from any Federal agency any information that the Council considers necessary to carry out this section.

(B) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), on request of the Secretary or the non-Federal co-chair of the Council, the head of a Federal agency may provide information to the Council.

(ii) LIMITATION.—The head of a Federal agency shall not provide any information to the Council that the Federal agency head determines the disclosure of which may cause harm to national security interests.

(3) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Council may use the United States mail in the same manner and under the same conditions as other agencies of the Federal Government.

(4) GIFTS.—The Council may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

(f) COUNCIL PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

(1) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

(A) NON-FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—A member of the Council who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall serve without compensation.

(B) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—A member of the Council who is an officer or employee of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to the compensation received for services of the member as an officer or employee of the Federal Government.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—A member of the Council shall be allowed travel expenses at rates authorized for an employee of an agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in the performance of the duties of the Council.

(g) TERMINATION OF COUNCIL.—The Council shall terminate at the end of the eighth fiscal year beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ENYART) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to offer an amendment to this bill to help agriculture in southern Illinois, my State of Illinois and, indeed, in the entire Nation the next time drought strikes.

After Hurricane Sandy, the drought of 2012 was the second most costly natural disaster in the world. The drought cost upwards of $35 billion in total losses. It devastated southern Illinois crops and crops throughout the Midwest. The fact that there is no national response or preparedness plan for drought increases these costs by at least 25 percent. Indeed, FEMA is not even authorized to address drought even when areas are declared natural disasters due to drought.

In the 110th Congress, my colleague from Florida, Congressman ALCEE HASTINGS, offered legislation to establish a national drought council. I applaud his foresight and his work, which was included in the House version of the farm bill. Unfortunately, House and Senate conferees failed to include it in the final bill. Had it been included, perhaps the Federal response to last year's drought would have been streamlined and devastating losses mitigated.

My amendment, which is based on Congressman HASTINGS' work, would give the Secretary of Agriculture an important tool to help our farmers more quickly. The council would be tasked to develop a comprehensive national drought action plan that defines responsibilities for drought preparedness, mitigation, research, risk management, training, and emergency relief programs. The plan provides guidance to Federal agencies to ensure their activities are coordinated with the activities of States, local governments, Indian tribes, and neighboring countries.

Through an annual report to Congress, the council will make recommendations to eliminate duplication and to establish common interagency triggers to authorize Federal drought programs.

Based on a review of drought preparedness plans, the council will develop and make available to the public drought planning models. What this appointed council would not do is draw a paycheck, establish a new office, or increase the Federal bureaucracy.

It's not a question of will a drought strike; it's a question of when. When it does, we need to be better prepared.

I urge adoption of this amendment and ask the support of my colleagues.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENYART. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the gentleman.

I simply want to note, as being an Oklahoman, I have an appreciation for drought issues, and I thank the gentleman for bringing this important topic to our attention. I think we should all vote for the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 1603, add the following new subsection:

(d) EFFECT OF CORN SALES TO ETHANOL PRODUCTION FACILITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a producer on a farm that sells corn, directly or through a third party, to an ethanol production facility is ineligible to receive any payment or benefit described in section 1001D(b)(2) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-3a(b)(2)) for that corn.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I bring amendment No. 7 to the consideration of the House here as we debate this very important issue.

When I think about the issue that's before us—I know there are a lot of good Members on both sides of it, for and against, and there's going to be a lot great debate about whether or not this bill should move forward in any fashion or another.

There's one particular portion that I really wanted to discuss today, and it deals with the incentives and the benefits that go to corn producers for the production of corn that goes to ethanol. To me, I don't believe that is something that should be provided to these producers whatsoever, these incentives or benefits.

In fact, when the bill was originally crafted many years ago back in 1933, I have to ask: Did the original architects of the farm bill ever imagine that what they were creating at that time would go to benefit the producers of corn that would go to fuel and not food?

So my amendment is rather simple. It just eliminates the opportunity for any producer to benefit from producing corn that would go to fuel. Instead, it focuses back on what the original intent of the legislation was, and that was to exclusively be for food production or feed production.

So as we debate this bill, folks are going to be on all different sides of all these amendments. I think it's really important to get back to the original intent. If you're going to support the bill, get back to the original intent of what was intended back in 1933 and the years since then.

But let me just remind the House of why this is so important. Estimates tell us that more than one-third of all our corn in the United States is used for feed livestock; another 13 percent is exported, mostly for feed livestock; but another 40 percent of all corn produced in this Nation is for ethanol. And of all of that, nearly half of all corn in our Nation that is produced, those producers receive those same benefits that those that were intending to create corn for food and feed would benefit from, as well.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is rather simple. I would urge the House's consideration of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition.

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

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

I would note to my colleague that I appreciate his issue of concern. I appreciate what I think he is trying to do. But in the nature of the FARRM Bill and the nature of the debate we're at right now, this is not really the environment, and I would ask him to consider withdrawing his amendment in good faith for a discussion sometime in the near future.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I thank the chairman. I thank you for your good work on this. I know we've all had a lot of discussions, and I'll take you for your word that we can continue this conversation, because I think it's a very important topic.

With your intent that I know to be true, that we can continue this, I would be willing to withdraw the amendment and continue the debate at a further time.

Mr. LUCAS. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my intention would be to withdraw the amendment. But let me just close with this and say that, as we debate the various policies within this bill, it is very important to note that there are areas such as this in which I hear the other side talk about the importance of food being provided for our citizens all across the country. I don't disagree with them at all. I think that's very important.

So, therefore, why would we, as a House, stand to incentivize those who are producing nearly half of the corn that could be going to the food supply of our great Nation, but incentivize half the corn, almost, in our Nation rather for fuel instead of food?

I look forward to continuing this debate, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

□ 1620

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 162, line 14, strike the closed quotation mark and the final period.

Page 162, after line 14, insert the following:

''(3) RESERVATION.—Effective beginning in fiscal year 2015, the Secretary, to the maximum extent feasible, shall manage the conservation reserve to ensure that, on an annual basis, not less than 20.5 percent of land maintained in the program shall be—

''(A) described in subparagraphs (B) through (E) of subsection (b)(4); and

''(B) enrolled under—

''(i) the special conservation reserve enhancement program authority under section 1234(f)(4); or

''(ii) the pilot program for the enrollment of wetland and buffer acreage under section 1231B.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, the Conservation Reserve Program has sparked major improvements in water quality, wildlife habitat and wetlands. However, high crop and land prices are spurring landowners to once again pull millions of vulnerable acres back under the plow as their CRP leases expire.

In the last 10 years, we've seen a number of acres equal to the area of the State of Indiana taken out of the Conservation Reserve Program and put back into production. This means that the CRP's environmental benefits are not well leveraged, and taxpayer dollars don't earn the return they should because they've spent 5 years protecting land simply to have it disappear at the end of the easement period.

This amendment makes a set of simple revenue-neutral changes to the CRP to provide more lasting protection of water, wildlife, and soil, and to make sure that we are fully leveraging Federal spending. It requires, to the extent possible, 20 percent of the funds dedicated to the Conservation Reserve Program to be used in the Continuous Conservation Reserve Program, the CCRP, and the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, CREP. These programs are a subset of the Conservation Reserve Program and help leverage State matching funds to produce even greater conservation benefits.

In particular, the CREP program gives States flexibility to target high-priority conservation and environmentally sensitive areas, which helps coordinate Federal and local priorities and spending and ensures that any spending is targeted to produce the best results.

The Continuous Conservation Reserve Program is a program that is consistently oversubscribed that helps farmers re-enroll in the program continuously, rather than just once a year. Adding acreage to this program gives farmers more flexibility. It also protects the long-term conservation benefits of the CRP program so that taxpayers get what they pay for. These small changes are revenue neutral and will help CRP produce better outcomes for the environment and for taxpayers, leverage State matching funds, and provide long-term stability for farmers.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

H.R. 1947 will step down the acreage cap of the CRP program from 32 million acres to 24 million acres. Designating in law the required amount of acres for subprograms of CRP will reduce the FSA's flexibility in administering the program. I do understand that the set-aside in the amendment is consistent with how FSA currently runs the program. However, when crafting the conservation title, we tried to leave as much flexibility as possible. I fear the set-aside could limit future general sign-ups or tie FSA's hands in future targeted initiatives.

I will work with the gentleman to ensure that CRP targets the most environmentally sensitive lands, but I must urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure Mr. BLUMENAUER that the chairman and I share his concerns and philosophy. But in my judgment, this is not an amendment that is necessary because there has never been a situation that I'm aware of where the continuous sign-up has been limited by anything going on. In fact, they can't get enough continuous acres signed up to meet the goals that they've had. The same thing with the CREP acres.

So the Department has administratively always made room for any continuous and any CREP requests that are out there. There's never been a limitation. There's never been a backlog. There's never been any impediment to signing up these acres.

The issue we have now with CRP is these high land prices and high commodity prices. You're right about that. And we are seeing acres come out all over the country, and that concerns me. I've been the biggest champion of CRP, and I reluctantly agreed to lower these acres to 24 million acres because that's what's going to happen anyway. These acres are going to be reduced. But it's not going to be continuous, and it's not going to be in CREP. It's going to be in the regular CRP program. And if I could figure out how to stop that, I would. But you'd have to literally triple or quadruple the amount of money that's paid for the general sign-up in order to get those acres back into the program, given my understanding of what's going on.

So, you know, I just don't see why we need to have this in there. We have always accommodated this. If we're going to do anything in CRP, what we should be doing is figuring out how we can raise the rental rates to get the general CRP sign-up back up to where it needs to be. I'm very concerned about losing this big tract CRP because this is what has brought wildlife around the country back, and we're losing it.

Anyway, there is not an impediment to continuous or CREP, and there won't be in the future. If there is anything left over that isn't up to the 24 million acres, it's going to be out of the general sign-up. It isn't going to be out of CREP or continuous. So I oppose the amendment. I don't think there is any reason to do this because the Department has been taking care of it.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon as 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to help focus on more long-lasting protection for the water, wildlife, and soil. I appreciate what the ranking member said in terms of issues for additional funding for wildlife habitat, and I have another amendment coming forward which I think helps address that.

In the meantime, having an opportunity here to—and I mentioned in the amendment ''to the extent possible,'' the 20 percent is dedicated for the Continuous Reserve Program and the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program. Being able to focus and leverage the local funds seems to me to provide long-term stability and leveraging the State matching. I see my colleague from Virginia is here, but he wants to speak to the next amendment.

I respectfully request that Members join with me in an amendment that is supported by the Environmental Working Group, the National Sustainable Agricultural Coalition, Defenders of Wildlife, Pew Trust, Organic Trade Association, Slow Food, Food Democracy

Now, Organic Consumers Union, and Union of Concerned Scientists. Allowing us to be able to move forward in this regard, I think, would be a positive. I didn't hear any compelling reasons from my friends other than they thought it would be taken care of. I think this amendment will ensure that it will move forward and respectfully ask that it be approved.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 1630

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 197, strike line 18 and all that follows through page 198, line 10 and insert the following:

SEC. 2201. PURPOSES.

Section 1240 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1240. PURPOSES.

''The purpose of the environmental quality incentives program established by this chapter is to assist producers in implementing conservation systems, practices, and activities on their operations in order to—

''(1) improve water quality, with special emphasis on reducing nutrient pollution and protecting sources of drinking water;

''(2) avoid, to the maximum extent practicable, the need for resource and regulatory programs by assisting producers in protecting soil, water, air, and related natural resources and meeting environmental quality criteria established by Federal, State, tribal, and local agencies;

''(3) conserve ground and surface water to sustain or improve in-stream flows;

''(4) enhance soil quality;

''(5) control invasive species;

''(6) enhance critical aquatic and terrestrial wildlife habitat for at-risk species;

''(7) reduce the amount and toxicity of pesticides and other agricultural chemicals found on food and in water or the air;

''(8) reduce the nontherapeutic use of medically important antibiotics in food-producing animals in order to preserve the effectiveness of antibiotics used in the treatment of human and animal disease;

''(9) help producers adapt to a changing and unpredictable climate and increase resiliency to climate change impacts, including rising temperatures and extreme weather events, while reducing greenhouse gas emissions; and

''(10) address additional priority resource concerns, as determined by the Secretary.''.

Page 198, line 19, strike ''10 years'' and insert ''5 years''.

Page 198, after line 19, insert the following:

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) PRIORITY.—If the Secretary determines that the environmental values of two or more applications for payments are comparable, the Secretary shall assign a higher priority to a program application which will achieve the environment and conservation values using practices and systems the assessed cost of which is lower.'';

(4) by amending subsection (d)(3) to read as follows:

''(3) INCREASED PAYMENTS FOR CERTAIN PRACTICES.—The Secretary shall provide supplemental payments and enhanced technical assistance to producers implementing land management and vegetative practices at a level that, as determined by the Secretary, results in highly cost-effective treatment of priority resource concerns, including—

''(A) residue and tillage management;

''(B) contour farming;

''(C) cover cropping;

''(D) integrated pest management;

''(E) nutrient management;

''(F) stream corridor improvement;

''(G) invasive plant species control;

''(H) contour buffer strips;

''(I) riparian herbaceous and forest buffers;

''(J) filterstrips;

''(K) stream habitat improvement and management;

''(L) grassed waterways;

''(M) wetland restoration and enhancement;

''(N) pollinator habitat; or

''(O) conservation crop rotation.'';

Page 199, after line 16, insert the following:

(4) by adding at the end of subsection (d) the following new paragraph:

''(7) LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS FOR CERTAIN PRACTICES.—A producer who owns or operates a large confined animal feeding operation (as defined by the Secretary) shall not be eligible for payments under this chapter to construct an animal waste management facility or any associated waste transport or transfer device.''.

Page 199, line 21, strike ''60 percent'' and insert ''50 percent''.

Page 200, line 2, strike ''5 percent'' and insert ''not less than 10 percent''.

Page 200, line 17, strike ''and'' and insert the following:

(6) by amending subsection (h) to read as follows:

''(h) WATER CONSERVATION OR IRRIGATION EFFICIENCY PRACTICE.—

''(1) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS.—The Secretary may provide payments under this subsection to a producer for a water conservation or irrigation practice that promotes ground and surface water conservation on the agricultural operation of the producer by—

''(A) improvements to irrigation systems;

''(B) enhancement of irrigation efficiencies;

''(C) conversion of the agricultural operation to—

''(i) the production of less water-intensive agricultural commodities; or

''(ii) dryland farming;

''(D) improvement of the storage and conservation of water through measures such as water banking and groundwater recharge;

''(E) enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat associated with irrigation systems including pivot corners and areas with irregular boundaries;

''(F) enhancement of in-stream flows in associated rivers and streams; or

''(G) establishment of other measures, as determined by the Secretary, that improve groundwater and surface water conservation in agricultural operations.

''(2) PRIORITY.—In providing payments to a producer for a water conservation or irrigation practice, the Secretary shall give priority to applications in which—

''(A) consistent with the law of the State in which the eligible land of the producer is located, there is a reduction in water use in the operation of the producer; and

''(B) the practice reduces the amount of water consumed in a producer's operation or reduces the amount of water diverted without increasing the water consumed.

''(3) DUTY OF PRODUCERS.—The Secretary may not provide payments to a producer for a water conservation or irrigation practice under this chapter unless the producer agrees not to use any associated water savings to bring new land, other than incidental land needed for efficient operations, under irrigated production, unless the producer is participating in a watershed-wide project that will effectively conserve water, as determined by the Secretary.'';

(7) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''subsection'' and inserting ''chapter'';

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—As a condition for receiving payments under this chapter, a producer shall agree to develop and implement conservation practices for certified organic production that are consistent with the regulations promulgated under the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.) and the purposes of this chapter.'';

(C) by striking paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraphs:

''(3) COORDINATION WITH ORGANIC CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall establish a transparent means by which producers may initiate organic certification under the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.) while participating in a contract under this chapter.

''(4) PLANNING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide planning assistance to producers transitioning to certified organic production consistent with the requirements of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.) and the purposes of this chapter.

''(B) AVOIDANCE OF DUPLICATION.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, eliminate duplication of planning activities for a producer participating in a contract under this chapter and initiating or maintaining organic certification consistent with the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.).''; and

Page 201, line 8, strike the closed quotation mark and the final period.

Page 201, after line 8, insert the following:

''(k) PAYMENTS FOR CONSERVATION PRACTICES RELATED TO ANTIBIOTIC USE.—

''(1) PAYMENTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall provide payments under this chapter to livestock producers for three years, to assist in a transition to modified animal management and production systems, for practices leading to the reduction in the need for antibiotics, including modification of systems and spaces to—

''(A) improve sanitation;

''(B) improve ventilation; or

''(C) support the implementation of improved animal management techniques at the operation.

''(2) DUTY OF PRODUCER.—The Secretary shall not make payments under this chapter for practices related to antibiotic use unless the producer agrees to provide information to the Secretary documenting the resulting

reduction in antibiotic use in the operation of the producer.

''(1) COMPREHENSIVE CONSERVATION PLANNING.—The Secretary shall provide technical and financial assistance to producers under the program to develop a comprehensive conservation plan for the agricultural operation of the producer.''.

Page 201, strike lines 9 through 17 and insert the following:

SEC. 2203. EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS.

(a) EVALUATION CRITERIA.—Section 1240C(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–3(a)) is amended by striking '', national, State, and local conservation priorities'' and inserting ''priority resource concerns identified under subsection (d)''.

(b) PRIORITIZATION OF APPLICATIONS.—Section 1240C(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–3(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''achieving the anticipated environmental benefits of the project'' and inserting ''priority resource concerns identified under subsection (d)'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''designated resource concern or resource concerns'' and inserting ''priority resource concerns identified under subsection (d), including, in the case of applications from nutrient-impacted watersheds, the degree to which nutrient loadings would be reduced as a result of the proposed project''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking ''purpose of the environmental quality incentives program specified in section 1240(1)'' and inserting ''purposes of the program''.

(c) GROUPING OF APPLICATIONS.—Section 1240C(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–3(c)) is amended by striking ''for evaluation purposes or otherwise evaluate applications relative to other applications for similar farming operations'' and inserting ''proposing to address the same priority resource concerns for evaluation purposes''.

(d) PRIORITY RESOURCE CONCERNS.—Section 1240C of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–3) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) PRIORITY RESOURCE CONCERNS.—For the purposes of this section, the Secretary shall identify priority resource concerns in a particular watershed or other appropriate region or area within a State.''.

Beginning on page 201, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 202, line 8 and insert the following:

SEC. 2205. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY INCENTIVES PROGRAM PLAN.

(a) PLAN OF OPERATIONS.—Section 1240E(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–5(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) PLAN OF OPERATIONS.—To be eligible to receive payments under the program, a producer shall submit to the Secretary for approval a plan of operations that—

''(1) specifies the priority resource concerns to be addressed;

''(2) specifies the type, number, and sequencing of conservation systems, practices, or activities to be implemented to address the priority resource concerns;

''(3) includes such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary to carry out the program, including a description of the purposes to be met by the implementation of the plan and a statement of how the plan will achieve or take significant steps toward achieving the relevant resource management system quality criteria;

''(4) in the case of a confined livestock feeding operation, provides for development and implementation of a comprehensive nutrient management plan, if applicable;

''(5) in the case of a producer located within a nutrient-impacted watershed, identifies methods by which the producer will limit nutrient loss; and

''(6) in the case of forest land, is consistent with the provisions of a forest management plan that is approved by the Secretary, which may include—

''(A) a forest stewardship plan described in section 5 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103a);

''(B) another practice plan approved by the State forester; or

''(C) another plan determined appropriate by the Secretary.''.

(b) AVOIDANCE OF DUPLICATION.—Section 1240E(b)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–5(b)(1))) is amended by striking ''plan of operations'' and inserting ''resource management system plan''.

SEC. 2206. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.

Section 1240F(2) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–6(2)) is amended by striking ''information'' and inserting ''technical assistance, information,''.

SEC. 2207. LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS.

Section 1240G of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–7) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1240G. LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS.

''(a) LIMITATION ON TOTAL PAYMENTS.—Subject to subsection (b), a person or legal entity may not receive, directly or indirectly, cost-share or incentive payments under this chapter, in the aggregate, for all contracts entered into under this chapter by the person or entity (excluding funding arrangements with federally recognized Native American Indian Tribes or Alaska Native Corporations under section 1240B(h)), regardless of the number of contracts entered into under this chapter by the person or entity, that—

''(1) during any fiscal year exceed $30,000; and

''(2) during any five-year period exceed $150,000.

''(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—In the case of contracts under this chapter for projects of special environmental significance, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary may waive the limitation otherwise applicable under subsection (a)(1).

''(c) PREVENTION OF DUPLICATION.—The Secretary shall not approve a contract or provide payments to any individual for a practice that has already been paid for as part of a previously approved and completed contract for any particular parcel of land.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield myself 2½ minutes.

I appreciate the Rules Committee having made this amendment in order. It makes important revenue-neutral changes to the EQIP program to protect the original intent of the program, to use tax dollars better to help more farmers, and to produce better results for the taxpayers.

In difficult budget times, we must prioritize maximizing value and saving money. This amendment makes several changes to the Environmental Quality Incentives Program to restore the 1996 language. It implements stricter payment limits to make sure we're not spending too much money on any one project. And at a time when demand for conservation funding is as much as four times greater than the supply, we can't afford to let a few huge projects crowd out available funding.

This amendment also reinstates the original 1996 EQIP language which eliminated spending for factory farms. That language was included in 1996 because Members were nervous that too much of the EQIP would end up going to just a few family farm projects, and they were right.

The legislation also provides additional support for farmers who want to transition to production techniques that use fewer pesticides or antibiotics. As the United States doctors and scientists become increasingly concerned about the use of nontherapeutic antibiotics in meat production, we should be doing everything we can to make it easier for farmers and ranchers to reduce their dependence on antibiotics.

Finally, it clarifies that EQIP is intended to be used as a short-term program and protects the Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program set-aside, which has been in place since the program began.

The opposition comes from those who are using conservation dollars for purposes that most Americans would not consider to be conservation related. Recent data shows that one in four EQIP dollars in the last 10 years has been spent on large structural projects that produce limited conservation benefits and are extremely expensive. I noted in the press this last week one project, almost $2 million, yet the average is about $13,500.

I appreciate the opportunity to start this discussion and think about how best to spend limited conservation dollars for maximum conservation benefits. I respectfully suggest that that's to be found with this amendment, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The conservation title has gone through many reforms by combining and eliminating duplicative programs. The result, I believe, is a fair, balanced, and flexible conservation title that addresses the natural resource concerns of farmers, ranchers, and landowners. However, the gentleman's amendment seeks to undo this balance by stripping the EQIP program of the authorities that make it unique.

The EQIP program is arguably the most successful conservation program administered by the NRCS. Through cost share assistance, these programs help farmers and ranchers meet and exceed national, State, and local environmental regulations.

Known as the bricks and mortar of the program, farmers and ranchers depend on EQIP for assistance to build waste storage facilities, eliminate nutrient runoff, and purchase equipment like methane digesters.

The gentleman's amendment would fundamentally change EQIP with arbitrary limits that would reduce livestock producers' participation and restrict the types of conservation programs that could be implemented. With EPA and environmental groups targeting livestock operations, we should not diminish the program's current authorities.

The amendment would make EQIP no different than any other working lands program and eliminate an essential tool that farmers and ranchers depend on to meet increasing environmental regulations.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield 75 seconds to my friend from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment because it would improve the Environmental Quality Incentives Program by targeting support for the smaller and midsize farms where the investment will buy a bigger bang for the buck.

Just 1 percent of agribusinesses get more than 20 percent of EQIP payments, and about 70 percent of that funding is used to build structures to store manure and lay irrigation pipeline, purchase sprinkler systems and other equipment.

This amendment doesn't do anything to prohibit or restrict large farming operations. In fact, the limits in this amendment would have impacted less than half a percent of all EQIP contracts between 1997 and 2010, where we have statistics.

Our limited Federal funding, I think, would be better targeted by helping small and midsize farms engage in more sustainable practices, such as transitioning to farming methods that use fewer antibiotics and pesticides.

I think it makes sense to target where we can get the biggest bang for the buck because more intensive production practices, if not properly managed and mitigated, contaminate our drinking water, pollute the air, and diminish the quality of the soil, placing future production yields at risk.

And it seems to me in austere budget times we ought not cut or do away with conservation incentives but, instead, make them more efficient. And that's what the gentleman's amendment would do, so I rise in support of it. I think it's a good amendment. It helps small and medium-sized farms.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee, Mr. PETERSON.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentleman.

I rise in opposition to the amendment, not that I disagree with the intent here, and I think that if you look at the EQIP program, you will see that it has primarily been utilized by smaller producers around the country. But I just want to give you an example of the real world here of how this works in my district.

We have the Sauk River in my district, which is a beautiful river that has probably 100 dairy farms located alongside this river. These dairy farms have been there for 75, 100 years. You know, these have been in the family. A lot of these farms are 50 cows, 75 cows, probably 100 cows would be the largest one. So these are small family farms. They've been in their families for generations.

The problem is that the barns and the pastures and the barnyards were located next to the river, all along this river. That's just how they did things 75 years ago. And so what happened is that river got polluted from the manure running off, and the Sauk Lake, which is a beautiful lake, became overfertilized and it grew up with weeds and so forth. And you've seen that in the Chesapeake Bay and so forth.

Well, what we did is we went in there with EQIP money and moved these barnyards and moved these cattle out away from the river. We didn't build any huge structures or anything. We built some to try to dam up things and so forth.

But the point is that, even with the limitations that we had on that of the $300,000, we still had to—this was not a cheap thing to do on these farms, and these weren't big farms. So it took us 2, 3, 4 years to move each of these operations, and to move 100 of them, you know, took us, I don't know, 20, 25 years. But we have basically accomplished that, and we've cleaned up the river, cleaned up the lake.

And if you had this amendment, we'd never be able to get that done. We wouldn't have—$30,000 a year would not get us anywhere near what we needed to do to get that accomplished in that area. And that's just one example.

So the NRCS people and the FSA people that are involved in this, you know, they monitor these things. They're kind of prioritizing where they go. And you can see, when you look at the statistics, they've been focusing on the smaller projects. But there are times when you have to deal with things that have been put out there, not because of anybody doing anything with any ill intent, it's just what they did 100 years ago, and we're trying to clean it up.

So I would caution the Members to be careful about putting any limitations on these programs because a lot of times it can have a consequence that wasn't intended. So I oppose this amendment and would urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

□ 1640

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. I support this amendment. We've seen natural disasters from droughts to heat waves to floods affecting farmers from coast to coast because of the climate change issue. We spend billions of dollars on crop insurance subsidies to cover the cost of these climate disasters.

This amendment expands and improves the USDA Environmental Quality Incentives Program to bring support to farmers to adjust to a changing climate. It adds climate mitigation as an eligible EQIP program expense. I think it makes sense, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate my friend's joining me. The crux of this issue is, who's going to get the benefit? There were over 300,000 contracts, and 92 projects took 20 percent of the money. This amendment would target it for those far greater number. Most of the large, confined animal feedlot operations manage on their own—the rest of them can. Focus it for people who need it the most, not have a bunch of the money sucked up by large, industrial agricultural activities.

Provide more benefit for more farmers and ranchers. Approve this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 201, line 8, strike the closed quotation mark and the final period.

Page 201, after line 8, insert the following:

''(k) FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY IRRIGATION ASSOCIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into an alternative funding arrangement with an eligible irrigation association if the Secretary determines that—

''(A) the purposes of the program will be met by such an arrangement; and

''(B) statutory limitations regarding contracts with individual producers will not be exceeded by any member of the irrigation association.

''(2) ELIGIBLE IRRIGATION ASSOCIATIONS.—In this subsection, the term 'eligible irrigation association' means an irrigation association that is—

''(A) comprised of producers; and

''(B) a local government entity, but does not have the authority to impose taxes or levies.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. For many years, local farmers in New Mexico have been asking for an amendment that would allow local acequia and community ditch associations to access EQIP funds. An ''acequia'' is a centuries-old irrigation structure that is still in use today in primarily Hispanic communities across New Mexico, and it is governed by a small board made up of private landowners.

The board of private landowners, also called the acequia and community ditch association, is in charge of administering maintenance of the irrigation infrastructure, which often requires work on sections of infrastructure residing on private land. Because of current EQIP rules, individual producers can apply for assistance under the program but are not allowed to include the community ditch association to help with the work, even though the community ditch association is charged with maintaining the infrastructure for all water users.

Mr. Chairman, you can see the dilemma that we're facing in New Mexico.

This translates into burdensome roadblocks to improve conservation practices or manage scarce water resources.

Mr. Chairman, in New Mexico, we are seeing one of the worst droughts in our history, and improving water use and conservation practices are key to keeping our agricultural communities alive.

The Natural Resources Conservation Service, NRCS, charged with administering the EQIP program, has indicated this language in my amendment would create the administrative efficiency needed when working with small producers in New Mexico who irrigate their crops via acequia and community ditches.

This amendment does not open up the program to large irrigation districts or government entities but simply affords local Hispanic farmers in rural New Mexico equal eligibility to compete for funding. Acequia community ditch associations, which are comprised solely of private landowners, do not have the authority to impose taxes or levees, and are in need of this clarifying language.

Mr. Chairman, these programs are put together State by State and funded State by State, and it's my hope that through the work with the committee staff—and, Mr. Chairman, I really want to thank the minority staff and the majority staff because they really took the time with my team to take a look at this, and I think everyone understands the need, although there still may be some questions.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. The chair would just note to the gentleman that I think he's got a very interesting concept here. Clearly, we need to talk more about this as we go along. But if my ranking member would nod his head over there, I certainly would be willing to accept this amendment.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I thank everyone for their help on this.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition to offer an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 256, after line 17, insert the following:

SEC. 2507. EMERGENCY WATERSHED PROTECTION PROGRAM.

Section 403 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2203) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''In evaluating requests for assistance under this section, the Secretary shall give priority consideration to projects that address runoff retardation and soil-erosion preventive measures needed to mitigate the risks and remediate the effects of catastrophic wildfire on land that is the source of drinking water for landowners and land users.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee for the opportunity to be here and for his leadership on this amendment, and also Congressman JARED POLIS from Colorado. We worked together on this Emergency Watershed Protection Program.

Over the past couple of years, we've seen incredible wildfires ravage the West in New Mexico, in Colorado, in Wyoming, in Montana, and the Northwest. Millions of acres have been lost. Just this past month alone, over 500 homes have been lost in Colorado in the Black Forest fire.

We know one thing occurs as a result of wildfires, and it's not just the event that occurs during the fire, and it's not just the impact of the burning itself of the fire to the homes, but it's what happens in the days, months and years following a forest fire that leads to millions of dollars worth of damage from a single incident.

In the case of the Hyde Park fire last year, in the case of the Waldo Canyon fire last year and indeed in the case of the Black Forest fire coming up in the coming weeks, we know that when there's moisture, when there's rain and when there's snow, erosion will occur. I'm holding a vial of sediment from a river. It looks like dirt. It's black. But it actually came from a river after a forest fire in Colorado. Millions of dollars of damage has been done to the ecosystem as a result of a fire making runoff destroy transportation systems, clog culverts and impact drinking water systems.

The Emergency Watershed Protection Program has been a critical program that helps communities prepare for and mitigate damage from natural disaster. As wildfires continue to hit the Western United States, this program will continue to do great good.

Last year was an unusually devastating year for wildfires in the United States. Across the country, 67,000 wildfires burned over 9 million acres. Significant wildfires occurred in almost every State of the Nation.

Our amendment today is simple. It requires the Secretary of Agriculture to give priority consideration for the use of the Emergency Watershed Protection funding for projects that prevent and mitigate the impacts of catastrophic wildfires. It does not prevent Emergency Watershed Program funding from being used for other types of disasters, but the EWP program has aided countless communities to protect public safety in the wake of the West's most destructive wildfires.

Before a wildfire, the Emergency Watershed Protection Program helps communities mitigate future wildfire damage by protecting critical watersheds. After a wildfire, EWP helps communities stabilize burned slopes to protect drinking water and infrastructure, prevent erosion and minimize potential hazards that cause immediate threats to people and property.

The amendment is supported by the entire Colorado House delegation, and I thank Congressman POLIS for his support and work on this amendment. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield 4¾ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

□ 1650

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. While I'm not in opposition to the proposed amendment, I do have an amendment that I had planned to offer. However, the process is going so fast and I was not here in time, but it speaks to the Wetlands Reserve Program at USDA,

commonly referred to as the WRP program.

To date, WRP has restored over 2.5 million acres with over 12,000 private landowners. WRP benefits private landowners by restoring land that should have never been cleared for agriculture. The public benefits from the reduced financial demand for disaster assistance and/or crop insurance funds from lands that experience repeated losses; significant long-term conservation benefits obtained from the protection of wildlife habitat; the improvement of water quality; the increase of flood storage; and the reduction of soil erosion.

The House farm bill we are considering today consolidates into a new Agricultural Conservation Easement Program. This new program will consist of agricultural easements and wetlands easements.

The components of the amendment that I have offered today are simple. First, it makes the ownership eligibility requirement for wetland easements equal to the other conservation programs by returning to the pre-2008 farm bill requirements of 1-year ownership instead of 7 years.

My amendment's last change excludes the wettest soils from the county enrollment caps. Soils in these classes frequently flood and retain moisture at levels that severely impair or prevent farming. By allowing the lands that are the least economical to farm to be enrolled in a wetland easement, we will save in potential publicly funded disaster assistance and reduce the overall cost of crop insurance.

Mr. Chairman, all of these changes have been adopted in the Senate farm bill. The WRP is reshaping how wetland conservation is carried out on private lands and is doing so in a cost-effective manner.

Had I had the opportunity, I would have offered this amendment. However, after consultation with the chair and ranking member, there is agreement that I will withdraw the amendment, and we will ensure that these important changes are considered in conference.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the chairman, and at this point I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Colorado (Mr. POLIS). Congressman POLIS and I have worked closely together over the past couple of years as wildfires have affected our districts. His district currently has a wildfire burning as we enter this debate right now.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) is recognized for the remainder of the time, 2 minutes.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

There is a new fire near Bailey, Colorado. In addition, just in this last week, the Black Forest fire has already destroyed 500 homes and killed two Coloradans. Last year was an unusually devastating year for wildfires, where there were 67,000 wildfires across the country.

Look, this Emergency Watershed Protection Program is absolutely critical for communities that are impacted by fires. That's why our entire delegation from Colorado—Democrats, Republicans—led by Mr. GARDNER and I are all cosponsors of this amendment.

I'm proud to offer this commonsense amendment which would simply require that the Secretary of Agriculture give priority consideration to emergency watershed project funding for projects that prevent and mitigate the impacts of catastrophic wildfires. It simply establishes that as a priority.

For those of us who come from communities that have been impacted, we see firsthand the need for these funds to help protect drinking water, to help prevent erosion, to minimize potential hazards that can cause additional threats to people and property long after the fires have been extinguished. Now, we know we can't stop wildfires, but we can take measures to reduce their impacts on our communities both before and after the wildfire.

To be clear, this amendment doesn't prevent emergency watershed protection funding from being used for other types of disasters—and it will. It just stipulates that in the wake of severe fire emergencies, the Secretary of Agriculture will give priority to considering emergency watershed projects that impact these areas.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Gardner-Polis-Lamborn-Coffman-Perlmutter-DeGette-Tipton amendment—I don't think I've ever said all of our names before. I say to the gentleman from Colorado, our entire delegation is standing strong behind this amendment. I hope that we adopt amendment 119, the Emergency Watershed Protection amendment.

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

I appreciate the endeavor of the delegation from Colorado. I understand they're dealing with very challenging circumstances out there. I'm not necessarily sure this is the final form this language should be in, but I would suggest to my colleagues that we support them and that we pass this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk as the designee of the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 260, line 11, strike the closed quotation mark and the final period.

Page 260, after line 11, insert the following:

"(3) PRIORITY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the delivery of technical assistance under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590a et seq.), the Secretary shall give priority to producers who request technical assistance from the Secretary in order to comply for the first time with the requirements of subtitle B and subtitle C of this title as a result of the amendments made by section 2801 of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

"(B) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report regarding the extent to which the conservation compliance requirements contained in the amendments made by section 2801 of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 apply to and impact specialty crop growers, including national analysis and surveys to determine the extent of specialty crop acreage on highly erodible land and wetlands.".

Page 274, after line 18, insert the following:

Subtitle H—Highly Erodible Land and Wetland Conservation for Crop Insurance

SEC. 2801. HIGHLY ERODIBLE LAND AND WETLAND CONSERVATION FOR CROP INSURANCE.

(a) HIGHLY ERODIBLE LAND PROGRAM INELIGIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1211(a)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3811(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking "or" at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by adding "or" at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(E) any portion of the premium paid by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for a policy or plan of insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.), on the condition that if a person is determined to have committed a violation under this subsection during a crop year, ineligibility under this subparagraph shall—

"(i) only apply to reinsurance years subsequent to the date of final determination of a violation, including all administrative appeals; and

"(ii) not apply to the existing reinsurance year or any reinsurance year prior to the date of final determination.".

(2) EXEMPTIONS.—Section 1212(a)(2) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3812(a)(2)) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking "(2) If," and inserting the following:

"(2) ELIGIBILITY BASED ON COMPLIANCE WITH CONSERVATION PLAN.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If,";

(B) in the second sentence, by striking "In carrying" and inserting the following:

"(B) MINIMIZATION OF DOCUMENTATION.—In carrying"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) CROP INSURANCE.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 1211(a)—

"(I) in the case of a person that is subject to section 1211 for the first time after May 1, 2013, due to the amendment made by section 2801(a) of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, any person who produces an agricultural commodity on the land that is the basis of the payments described in section 1211(a)(1)(E) shall have 5 reinsurance years after the date on which such payments become subject to section 1211 to develop and comply with an approved

conservation plan so as to maintain eligibility for such payments; and

''(II) in the case of a person that the Secretary determines would have been in violation of section 1211(a) if the person had continued participation in the programs requiring compliance at any time after the date of enactment of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.) and is currently in violation of section 1211(a), the person shall have 2 reinsurance years after the date on which the payments described in section 1211(a)(1)(E) become subject to section 1211 to develop and comply with an approved conservation plan, as determined by the Secretary, so as to maintain eligibility for such payments.

''(ii) CERTIFICATION.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with the first full reinsurance year immediately following the date of enactment of this subparagraph, all persons seeking eligibility for the payment of a portion of the premium paid by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for a policy or plan of insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) shall provide certification of compliance with section 1211(a), as determined by the Secretary.

''(II) TIMELY EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate the certification in a timely manner and—

''(aa) a person who has properly complied with certification shall be held harmless with regard to eligibility during the period of evaluation; and

''(bb) if the Secretary fails to evaluate the certification in a timely manner and the person is subsequently found to be in violation of section 1211(a), ineligibility shall not apply to the person for that violation.

''(III) EQUITABLE CONTRIBUTION.—

''(aa) IN GENERAL.—If a person fails to provide certification of compliance to the Secretary as required and is subsequently found in violation of section 1211(a), the Secretary shall determine the amount of an equitable contribution to conservation in accordance with section 1241(e) by the person for the violation.

''(bb) LIMITATION.—The contribution shall not exceed the total of the portion of the premium paid by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for a policy or plan of insurance for all years the person is determined to have been in violation subsequent to the date on which certification was first required under this clause.''.

(b) WETLAND CONSERVATION PROGRAM INELIGIBILITY.—Section 1221 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3821) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following:

''(4) CROP INSURANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this paragraph, a person subject to a final determination, including all administrative appeals, of a violation of subsection (c) shall have 1 reinsurance year to initiate a conservation plan to remedy the violation, as determined by the Secretary, before becoming ineligible under that subsection in the following reinsurance year to receive any payment of any portion of the premium paid by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for a policy or plan of insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

''(B) APPLICABILITY.—In the case of a person that is subject to this subsection or subsection (d) for the first time due to the amendment made by section 2801(b) of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, the person shall have 2 reinsurance years after the date of final determination, including all administrative appeals, to take such steps as the Secretary determines appropriate to remedy or mitigate the violation in accordance with subsection (c).

''(C) GOOD FAITH.—If the Secretary determines that a person subject to a final determination, including all administrative appeals, of a violation of subsection (c) acted in good faith and without intent to violate this section as described in section 1222(h), the Secretary shall give the person 1 reinsurance year to begin mitigation, restoration, or such other steps as are determined necessary by the Secretary.

''(D) TENANT RELIEF.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If a tenant is determined to be ineligible for payments and other benefits under this section, the Secretary may limit the ineligibility only to the farm that is the basis for the ineligibility determination if the tenant has established, to the satisfaction of the Secretary that—

''(I) the tenant has made a good faith effort to meet the requirements of this section, including enlisting the assistance of the Secretary to obtain a reasonable conservation plan for restoration or mitigation for the farm;

''(II) the landlord on the farm refuses to comply with the plan on the farm; and

''(III) the Secretary determines that the lack of compliance is not a part of a scheme or device to avoid the compliance.

''(ii) REPORT.—The Secretary shall provide an annual report to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning the ineligibility determinations limited during the previous 12-month period under this subparagraph.

''(E) CERTIFICATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with the first full reinsurance year immediately following the date of enactment of this paragraph, all persons seeking eligibility for the payment of a portion of the premium paid by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for a policy or plan of insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) shall provide certification of compliance with this section as determined by the Secretary.

''(ii) TIMELY EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate the certification in a timely manner and—

''(I) a person who has properly complied with certification shall be held harmless with regard to eligibility during the period of evaluation; and

''(II) if the Secretary fails to evaluate the certification in a timely manner and the person is subsequently found to be in violation of subsection (c), ineligibility shall not apply to the person for that violation.

''(iii) EQUITABLE CONTRIBUTION.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—If a person fails to provide certification of compliance to the Secretary as required and is subsequently found in violation of subsection (c), the Secretary shall determine the amount of an equitable contribution to conservation in accordance with section 1241(e) by the person for the violation.

''(II) LIMITATION.—The contribution shall not exceed the total of the portion of the premium paid by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for a policy or plan of insurance for all years the person is determined to have been in violation subsequent to the date on which certification was first required under this subparagraph.'';

(2) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) INELIGIBILITY FOR CROP INSURANCE PREMIUM ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If a person is determined to have committed a violation under subsection (a) or (d) during a crop year, the person shall be ineligible to receive any payment of any portion of the premium paid by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for a policy or plan of insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

''(2) APPLICABILITY.—Ineligibility under this subsection shall—

''(A) only apply to reinsurance years subsequent to the date of final determination of a violation, including all administrative appeals; and

''(B) not apply to—

''(i) the existing reinsurance year; or

''(ii) any reinsurance year prior to the date of final determination.

''(3) DATE OF CONVERSION.—Notwithstanding subsection (d), ineligibility for crop insurance premium assistance shall apply as follows:

''(A) In the case of wetland that the Secretary determines was converted after the date of enactment of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.) but on or before May 1, 2013, and continues to be in violation, the person shall have 2 reinsurance years after the date on which this subsection applies, to begin the mitigation process, as determined by the Secretary.

''(B) In the case of wetland that the Secretary determines was converted after May 1, 2013—

''(i) subject to clause (ii), the person shall be ineligible to receive crop insurance premium subsidies in subsequent reinsurance years unless section 1222(b) applies; and

''(ii) for any violation that the Secretary determines impacts less than 5 acres of the entire farm, the person may pay a contribution in accordance with section 1241(e) in an amount equal to 150 percent of the cost of mitigation, as determined by the Secretary, for wetland restoration in lieu of ineligibility to receive crop insurance premium assistance.

''(C) In the case of a wetland that the Secretary determines was converted prior to the date of enactment of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.), ineligibility under this subsection shall not apply.

''(D) In the case of an agricultural commodity for which an individual policy or plan of insurance is available for the first time to the person after the date of enactment of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013—

''(i) ineligibility shall apply only to conversions that take place after the date on which the policy or plan of insurance first becomes available to the person; and

''(ii) the person shall take such steps as the Secretary determines appropriate to mitigate any prior conversion in a timely manner but not to exceed 2 calendar years.

''(4) CERTIFICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In enforcing eligibility under this subsection, the Secretary shall use existing processes and procedures for certifying compliance.

''(B) RESPONSIBILITY.—The Secretary, acting through the agencies of the Department of Agriculture, shall be solely responsible for determining whether a producer is eligible to receive crop insurance premium subsidies in accordance with this subsection.

''(C) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that no agent, approved insurance provider, or employee or contractor of an agency or approved insurance provider, bears responsibility or liability for the eligibility of an insured producer under this subsection, other than in cases of misrepresentation, fraud, or a scheme or device to avoid compliance.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman

from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I've been pleased to work with Congressman THOMPSON in providing this commonsense amendment to enhance the conservation goals in our country.

Our farmers and ranchers are the first stewards of the land. This amendment would simply continue the practice of conservation planning on our most fragile lands to ensure that we meet important land and stewardship goals. The concept is widely upheld as an important conservation initiative by many in the agricultural and environmental communities.

The amendment does call upon farmers and ranchers to develop unique conservation plans when seeking to receive Federal crop insurance subsidies on highly erodible lands. I believe this to be a reasonable measure that is consistent with our current conservation policies.

It is also important to emphasize that this is not a new idea. In fact, this approach has a long track record of proven results. Conservation compliance was linked with crop insurance in the 1985 farm bill and has been tied to direct payments since 1996.

According to a report by the USDA's Economic Research Service:

> An estimated 295 million tons of erosion reduction per year could be directly attributed to implementation of conservation compliance policy.

In addition, conservation compliance has resulted in a significant reduction in the annual loss of wetlands. I believe this is a strategy that has worked.

Given some late-hour complications that have arisen, I'm going to ask that the amendment be withdrawn; but I hope that we can look forward to continuing dialogue with the chairman, particularly since this is in the underlying Senate bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

□ 1700

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The ACTING CHAIR. Is the gentlewoman a designee of the gentleman from Florida?

Ms. KAPTUR. Yes, I am the designee of the gentleman from Florida.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 263, line 3, strike ''; and'' and insert a semicolon.

Page 263, after line 3, insert after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

(4) in subsection (h)(2), by inserting '', including, to the extent practicable, practices that maximize benefits for honey bees'' after ''pollinators''; and

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

SEC. 12____. PROTECTION OF HONEY BEES AND OTHER POLLINATORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall carry out such activities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to protect and ensure the long-term viability of populations of honey bees, wild bees, and other beneficial insects of agricultural crops, horticultural plants, wild plants, and other plants, including—

(1) providing technical expertise relating to proposed agency actions that may threaten pollinator health or jeopardize the long-term viability of populations of pollinators;

(2) providing formal guidance on national policies relating to—

(A) permitting managed honey bees to forage on National Forest Service lands where compatible with other natural resource management priorities; and

(B) planting and maintaining managed honey bee and native pollinator forage on National Forest Service lands where compatible with other natural resource management priorities;

(3) making use of the best available peer-reviewed science regarding environmental and chemical stressors on pollinator health; and

(4) regularly monitoring and reporting on the health and population status of managed and native pollinators including bees, birds, bats, and other species.

(b) TASK FORCE ON BEE HEALTH AND COMMERCIAL BEEKEEPING.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a task force—

(A) to coordinate Federal efforts carried out on or after the date of enactment of this Act to address the serious worldwide decline in bee health, especially honey bees and declining native bees; and

(B) to assess Federal efforts to mitigate pollinator losses and threats to the United States commercial beekeeping industry.

(2) AGENCY CONSULTATION.—The task force established under this subsection shall seek ongoing consultation from any Federal agency carrying out activities important to bee health and commercial beekeeping, including officials from—

(A) the Department of Agriculture;

(B) the Department of the Interior;

(C) the Environmental Protection Agency;

(D) the Food and Drug Administration;

(E) the Department of Commerce; and

(F) U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(3) STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION.—The task force established under this subsection shall consult with beekeeper, conservation, scientist, and agricultural stakeholders.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the task force established under subsection (b) shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) summarizes Federal activities carried out pursuant to section 1672(h) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925(h)) or any other provision of law (including regulations) to address bee decline;

(2) summarizes international efforts to address the decline of managed honey bees and native pollinators; and

(3) provides recommendations to Congress regarding how to better coordinate Federal agency efforts to address the decline of managed honey bees and native pollinators.

(d) POLLINATOR RESEARCH LAB FEASIBILITY STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service, may conduct feasibility studies regarding—

(A) re-locating existing honey bee and native pollinator research from Federal laboratories to a cooperator-run facility in a location most geographically appropriate for pollinator research; and

(B) modernizing existing honey bee research laboratories identified by the Agricultural Research Service in the capital investment strategy document dated 2012.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the feasibility studies under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with—

(A) beekeeper, native bee, agricultural, research institution, and bee conservation stakeholders regarding new research laboratory needs under paragraph (1)(A); and

(B) commercial beekeepers regarding modernizing existing honey bee laboratories under paragraph (1)(B).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

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

First, I would like to offer my highest commendation to Congressman HASTINGS for his work on this vital issue.

Let me begin with the words of Congressman HASTINGS: ''No bees, no food.''

The amendment being offered today will help coordinate the Federal response to the sudden, massive, and frightening decline in our Nation's bee population. Specifically, the amendment would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to work with the Secretary of Interior and Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to ensure the long-term viability of our bee population.

The amendment would allow the establishment of a task force on bee health and commercial beekeeping to coordinate Federal efforts in addressing the significant bee population decline.

Preliminary results from a survey by the U.S. Department of Agriculture show that over nearly a third of managed honeybee colonies in our country were lost during the 2012–2013 winter. That is an increase of 42 percent in honeybee losses. On average, U.S. beekeepers lost nearly half of their colonies during this past winter. This was an increase nationally of over 78 percent from the previous winter. Traditionally, the average loss had only been about 10 to 15 percent, and there have been significant honeybee losses in 22 different States.

This amendment will help coordinate the Federal response to the sudden massive decline of our Nation's bee population. Since 2006, we have lost 10 million beehives, costing beekeepers more than $2 billion. No one knows what is causing these dramatic losses, which was formally referred to as ''colony collapse disorder.'' We don't know if it is a natural phenomenon, we don't

know if it is the result of changes in the environment, we don't know if it is due to interactions with genetically modified crops, we don't know if it is due to pesticides.

I can tell you one thing it is due to, because I've seen it myself in Ohio. It is due to mites that were shipped in to our nation from foreign countries in imported material. The critters got into these hives as they intermingled with our native hives. The mites came from foreign countries—from China, and from South Africa by way of Brazil—varroa mites among them—these mites are just crippling these colonies that have pollinated our orchards and our fields for generations.

We need to take this seriously because the massive decline in these populations threatens us all. Without sufficient bee pollination we will not be able to meet the demands of U.S. agricultural crops that require pollination to grow. It isn't by magic that all this happens. Not every plant is a self-pollinator.

That means if we do not have proper bee pollination, we will not be able to grow the food we need to feed our country. We are already importing too much food, food that could be grown here at home. China, but the way, is now shipping a product they call honey into our country. But it is not honey. It is corn syrup diluted with water. We need better honey labeling.

The decline in the bee population has been occurring over a period of time. But listen to these losses. In 1947, when America only had about 146 million people, we had 6 million bee colonies. In 1970, that number dropped to 4 million. And in 1990, the number fell to 3 million. Today, there are only 2.5 million bee colonies in our country. We have a population of 310 million, and it is projected by 2050 we will have a population of 500 million people. These numbers are not moving in the right direction.

Bee health is vitally important for our food system, as bee pollination helps produce about a third of what we eat—one-third. This adds $125 billion in global agricultural production value and 20 to $30 billion in United States agricultural production value.

Of the 100 crops that provide 90 percent of the world's food, over 70 percent are pollinated by bees. Are we listening? Of the 100 crops that provide 90 percent of the world's food, over 70 are pollinated by bees. That's 70%.

In North America, honeybees pollinate nearly 95 different kinds of fruits, including many specialty crops like almonds, avocados, cranberries, oranges, raspberries and apples, and so much more. The current Federal response to this problem is entirely inadequate. People are somnambulant. They think this is nonexistent because the bee is so small it can fly right by you and you don't even see it. In fact, most people don't know the difference between a honeybee and a bumblebee. Well, let me tell you, there is a big difference.

It is so bad that one professor was quoted as saying:

''We are one poor weather event or high winter bee loss away from a pollination disaster.''

Why have we let it get to this point where one bad storm could essentially wipe out our bee population? It is clear what we are doing is not working.

The amendment is supported by: American Honey Producers Association, American Beekeeping Federation, Pollinator Partnership, American Farm Bureau, Florida Farm Bureau, National Farmers Union, Blue Diamond Growers, Center for Food Safety, National Wildlife Federation.

In closing, I hope we can come together on a bipartisan basis to help stem the decline in our Nation's bee populations.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

I appreciate the gentlelady's very sincere interest, and of course our colleague Congressman HASTINGS' work and concern about pollinator health. He has been a champion on these issues for quite some time.

While we are all aware of the need for Federal cooperation in addressing the issues related to pollinators, I believe this amendment is costly and duplicative.

I am likewise concerned with the broad nature of the authority granted to the Secretary to implement new policies without the necessary statutory structure to direct the Secretary's agenda.

I am aware that several constituent groups have raised concerns since this language first surfaced last month as a proposed Boxer amendment to the Senate farm bill, but as yet, few, if any, have had a chance to clearly evaluate it, and none have had a chance to be heard in a hearing process to evaluate their concerns.

I, therefore, must respectfully oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues otherwise. I would like to work with the both the lady and the distinguished gentleman to see if we can come up with a mutually desirable outcome to address this. When I say ''I'm concerned about the authority given to the Secretary,'' in the language it says:

The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall carry out such activities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to protect and ensure long-term viability of populations.

''Determine.'' I just have concerns about the nature of this language. Therefore, I must respectfully oppose the amendment, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chair, my amendment today is simple: No bees, no food. The amendment improves federal coordination in addressing the documented decline of managed and native pollinators, as well as promotes the long-term viability of honey bees, wild bees, and other beneficial insects in agriculture.

Beekeepers and their honey bees are vitally important partners in American agriculture.

They provide essential pollination services to a diverse array of important agricultural commodities. Bee pollinated crops represent an estimated $20 billion in value annually.

Furthermore, one in three bites of food that we eat directly or indirectly comes from pollinators.

Unfortunately, our honey bees, native bees and other pollinating partners are showing signs of decline.

Colony collapse Disorder (CCD), multiple pests and diseases continue to plague beekeepers and their honey bees, as well as affect agriculture producers who depend on their pollination services.

This means that our food and job security, and healthy ecosystems are also at risk.

A recent study released by the National Academy of Sciences on the status of pollinators in North America, highlighted the lack of research and coordination in the federal government when it comes to pollinator health and protection.

In 2008, I offered an amendment to the Farm Bill aimed at protecting pollinators through additional research at the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA).

Those provisions went a long way in highlighting the seriousness of pollinator health decline and Colony Collapse Disorder.

I am pleased to see those provisions preserved and extended in this year's Farm Bill. While progress has been made, we still have a long way to go. My amendment will help address these issues.

Bee health is affected by the activities of a number of federal agencies who are dedicated to finding a solution.

But this is a complex problem and it requires a sophisticated and multi-agency response.

For example, USDA activities alone include the Agricultural Research Service (ARS), the National Institutes of Food and Agriculture (NIFA), the Farm Services Agency (FSA), the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), and the U.S. Forest Service.

Forage area for bees can be enhanced through federal programs on conservation and public lands that are managed by the U.S. Departments of Interior and Transportation.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is responsible for striking the delicate balance between pollinator health and the ability of our nation's growers to produce strong crop yields.

And, of course, agencies such as the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC), as well as the U.S. Customs and Border Protection Agency all have a role in ensuring a safe food supply and level playing field capable of supporting our nation's commercial beekeepers.

Specifically, my amendment: promotes cooperation between federal agencies to support the long-term viability and health of pollinator populations including to share guidance and technical expertise, establishes a task force on

bee health and commercial beekeeping to coordinate federal efforts; requires the production of a report on the United States' and international efforts to address the decline; requests regular monitoring and reporting on health and population status of pollinators (including bees, birds, bats, and other species); encourages agencies to utilize the best available peer-reviewed science on environmental and chemical stressors to pollinators, including giving consideration to international efforts addressing pollinator declines; as well as encourages the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct feasibility studies for the creation of a new bee lab at ARS, and the modernization of current facilities.

Mr. Chair, I thank you for the time and urge the Committee to make my amendment in order.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 275, line 1, strike ''paragraph (1), by'' and insert the following: ''paragraph (1)—''

Page 275, after line 3, insert the following new subparagraph:

(B) by striking ''agricultural commodities'' and inserting ''assistance, including agricultural commodities,''; and

Page 275, after line 8, insert the following new section:

SEC. 30__. PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE.

Section 202 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1722) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES**'' and inserting ''**ASSISTANCE**'';

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''agricultural commodities'' and inserting ''assistance, including agricultural commodities,'';

(3) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''agricultural commodities'' and inserting ''assistance, including agricultural commodities,''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title, not more than 45 percent shall be used for assistance other than agricultural commodities and associated costs under subsections (a) and (b).''.

Page 277, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 30__. MINIMUM LEVEL OF LOCAL SALES.

Section 203(b) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1723(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''shall'' and inserting ''may''; and

(2) by striking ''equal to not less than'' and inserting ''up to''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1710

Mr. ROYCE. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Before beginning, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) be permitted to control 5 minutes of the debate time allocated to me.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the very hard work of Chairman LUCAS, but there is one program in glaring need of reform. This bipartisan amendment will make our well-intentioned, but grossly outdated, international food aid programs more flexible, more efficient, and far more effective.

Under the current system, which was designed 60 years ago, all of our food aid must be purchased in the U.S., and at least 50 percent has to be shipped on U.S.-flagged vessels. Yet, today, 60 years later, food prices and U.S. agricultural exports have reached historic highs, and this makes this program of negligible value to the U.S. farm economy. Food aid purchases now account for less than half a percent of net farm income. Businesses at the ports are booming, and there are only a handful of U.S.-flagged ships.

When asked how the proposed reforms would impact American farmers, the Secretary of Agriculture stated:

Far from ending a partnership between our Nation's humanitarian and development mission and our world-class agricultural and food system, we are recommitting to the role that American agriculture plays in food security and tapping into the ingenuity of American farmers and the powers of science and innovation to avoid future shortages and global hunger.

Mr. Chairman, these subsidies can no longer be justified. They only add to the cost of the program, and they delay by months the time that it takes for food aid to reach desperate disaster victims. The Royce-Engel amendment would enact two commonsense reforms:

First, the amendment would allow up to 45 percent food aid to be purchased closer to the crisis. This change will yield an estimated $215 million in efficiency savings; it's going to reduce mandatory spending by $150 million over the bill's life; and it's going to allow us to reach 4 million more disaster victims.

Second, the amendment curtails a process called ''monetization,'' which the Government Accountability Office found is inefficient and disrupts local markets. In other words, it wastes money; it slows economic growth; and it harms those we are trying to help. In recent years, it has wasted $215 million.

There are real-life consequences to clinging to an inflexible, inefficient program that puts the interests of the few over those of the taxpayers, not to mention over those of the millions in desperate need of humanitarian aid globally. With this reform, by investing in local markets, we help nations become more food secure; we develop more U.S. trade partners; we break the cycle of aid dependency.

This amendment enjoys wide bipartisan support. Both administrations—this one and the last—have sought these changes. The amendment is supported by a long list of relief organizations. Mr. Chairman, the question is not: Why should we reform food aid? It is: Why have we waited so long?

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time.

I respectfully disagree with my good colleagues, both of whom are sincere in their efforts.

I believe this amendment is wrongheaded. If it had been enacted last year, it would have placed $928 million in cash assistance into largely unstable regions of the world and with no clear guidelines on how the money should be spent or tracked. We saw a rampant waste of cash in Iraq when we tried to use cash to further our means there. It's a whole lot harder to steal a sack of rice with ''USA'' written on the side of it than it is to steal a sack of currency. This program is meant to help folks in need of food. There is no better producer and no cheaper producer than the American farmer.

I respectfully disagree with my colleagues, and I would urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Royce-Engel amendment to H.R. 1947.

Let me say that I am pleased to stand with the chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee in a bipartisan amendment which is common sense.

Since 1954, the Food for Peace program has fed more than a billion people around the world and has saved countless lives. This program embodies the compassion and generosity of the American people, and it's something of which we can all be proud. However, the world has changed in the 59 years since Food for Peace was enacted, and our food aid should be reformed to reflect the new realities.

The biggest problem with our current food aid is that it takes too long to deliver. Food grown in the U.S., which makes up the vast majority of our assistance, takes an average of 130 days

to deliver. By purchasing food closer to the recipient countries, we can cut the delivery time in half and, in the process, get food to starving people before it's too late.

Food aid is also too expensive. Shipping and transportation costs account for half of the food aid budget. By purchasing food locally or providing vouchers, we can save hundreds of millions of dollars, which can be used to feed more needy people. By passing our amendment, we can reach 4 million more people without spending an extra dime.

Mr. Chairman, the easy thing to do is to do nothing on the issue of food aid reform, but the right thing to do is to enact sensible reforms that save taxpayer money and, most importantly, save lives.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan, commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the chairman.

I would just like to respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chair, this amendment would dismantle one of the most effective diplomatic tools available to the United States. Food for Peace promotes the good will of the American people by providing American-grown food supplies to the poorest and most vulnerable populations in the world. This program has been in place for nearly 60 years and is the cornerstone of the United States' diplomatic and humanitarian efforts.

If there are any inefficiencies, as the sponsors of this amendment suggest, then USDA and USAID must be held accountable for them because they coordinate the program's implementation. I reject the idea that direct cash assistance from the Local and Regional Purchase Program, or LRP, is a better way to go because it will simply provide food vouchers used to buy foreign-sourced food. This sounds less like reform and more like a proposal to provide food stamps to the world.

Instead of giving USAID free rein to spend cash however they see fit, Congress must recognize that Food for Peace allows our farmers to serve as ambassadors. As you can see on the sign beside me, the first thing starving people see when they receive a bag of rice—and it likely came from Arkansas—is the stamp of the American flag. We are concerned about what the contents of that bag are. That American flag means something, and we don't want to diminish the brand and the quality of the product contained in that bag.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. ROYCE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues from California and New York are sincere, and like, I think, all 435 of us, they possess a deep sense of humanity and the necessity for America to reach out in our best spirit to help those in need.

This is the reality: this is a picture that my wife took in Eritrea a few years back. That's the American Food for Peace program. It is not broken. The American Food for Peace program is really about humanitarian, economic, and national security. It is extremely important. My wife and I have spent many years and many days in the famine camps around the world.

This is the statement of America. It's not a check and it's not cash, and it's not a credit card or a debit card. It's the delivery of food. The Food for Peace program really does work. It's not broken. It is not broken at all. Prepositioning food overseas does work. When the great flood occurred in Pakistan just a couple of years ago, it was this program—the delivery of American food in sacks—that actually arrived before there was any local food that was purchased.

□ 1720

The Food for Peace program is not broken.

I agree about the need for flexibility and we actually have it. We have the International Disaster Assistance program which is in place and can be used, and it can be cash purchases.

You don't need to change the Food for Peace program to deal with it. You preposition food. You send American products, American food overseas. It is the very best way that we can help. And it turns out that in the Pakistan disaster, this program, the Food for Peace program, delivered food faster and better than the local programs because the local programs had totally broken down. And that will happen over and over.

We don't need to destroy something that's worked for 50 years.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

While I support efforts to make our foreign food aid programs as efficient and effective as possible, I cannot support the amendment by the gentlemen from California and New York, Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL. However well-intentioned the sponsors might be, the effect of this amendment would be to undermine the integrity of the U.S. merchant marine and U.S. flag fleet, which serve our Nation in times of war and peace.

The effect of this amendment would be to reduce the volume of U.S. Government-impelled cargoes shipped overseas under the Food for Peace program. No one disputes that fact. However, many of the militarily useful vessels that provide this needed sealift capacity for our military also participate in the food aid programs under cargo preference.

For example, all 19 vessels owned by Maersk Line, Limited and enrolled in the Maritime Security Program also carry foreign food aid. And for that matter, the U.S. mariners that serve on these vessels come from the same common pool that serves both needs. You cannot cut one without also harming the other. And once these jobs are gone, they're gone forever.

Plain and simple, this amendment will mean fewer voyages for U.S. carriers and fewer jobs for our U.S. merchant seafarers at a time when our military is reducing the sealift demand as it draws down from its deployment in Afghanistan.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chairman, as an American, I am proud that for six decades our great Nation has been a leader in the global effort to fight hunger and malnutrition. I have seen for myself what we have been able to do, helping Haiti, Pakistan, Sudan, Kyrgyzstan, Botswana, and so many more nations, yet we can do better. We can reach millions more. We can enable local and regional producers to do more, and we can alleviate hunger while at the same time promoting agriculture development that is so desperately needed in many low-income and high-risk developing nations.

I've seen how much more we can do if we enable in-country producers with local procurement and technical assistance. Millions more can be reached more efficiently and effectively and we can better empower nations and their people with the ability to self-sustain.

Food reform makes sense. If our goal is to help as many people as possible with funds that are dedicated to fighting hunger, why not reach millions more for what we are spending today? I want it to be the case that we have reached many. When I go on future trips, I want to know that there is progress for recipient nations on how many we have reached. But I also want the capacity of those to have increased to help themselves.

Support and vote for the Royce-Engel amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I deeply respect the authors of this amendment and respect their effort to try to balance competing concerns, but I respectfully believe that they've struck the wrong balance.

One concern that I have here is that money is fungible and food is not. The possibility of corruption occurring—not because of the good-faith NGOs, but because of some of the forces at work in the countries we're talking about—is a problem. At the same time,

I believe the effect of this amendment would be to undercut our merchant marine activities, our agricultural exporters, and ultimately undercut support within this country for a robust program of food aid to the rest of the world.

The present structure of the program is inclusive; it builds support. I respectfully think this amendment would detract from that support. For that reason, I would urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I've always been a strong supporter of America's global food aid programs, and I've made it a point to visit these programs in the field in Africa and Latin America.

After seeing firsthand these emergency response and development programs, one thing is clear to me: we need to do whatever works best for each situation. One size does not fit all.

We should provide U.S. commodities and pre-position them in the field, cash for local purchase, vouchers and fortified foods for children, and we need grants for projects that address chronic hunger. That's exactly what the Royce-Engel amendment does. It provides flexibility. It expands U.S. options in responding to crises. It reaches more people for the same amount of dollars, and it continues the engagement of U.S. producers and shippers in alleviating global hunger.

Our food aid programs are designed to end hunger. We can do better. It's not all one way or the other. We should do what works. This amendment provides the flexibility.

I urge my colleagues to support the Royce-Engel amendment on food aid reform.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the Royce-Engel amendment.

For nearly six decades, the Food for Peace program has used U.S. taxpayer funding to benefit those in need around the world, as well as U.S. agriculture and the United States Merchant Marines.

This amendment would gut the program by allowing 45 percent of its funding to be sent as cash payments to foreign nations. As a former chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, I can assure you this would be devastating to the U.S. Merchant Marine and to the domestic sealift capacity that moves 90 percent of the cargo supporting our military in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Let me paint a picture. In 2012, just over 9,000 ships visited U.S. ports. Approximately only 100 of those vessels sailed under the United States flag. I emphasize that these 100 vessels include militarily useful vessels that carry food aid. Policies such as the one embodied in this amendment would drive more vessels from the U.S. flag fleet, which exceeded 850 ships as recently as 1975.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. ENGEL. I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, the ranking member of the Africa Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Ms. BASS.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment modernizes and makes critical reforms to the U.S. Food for Peace program.

While this amendment will feed millions more people, it importantly ends policies that have depressed local markets and, in some instances, hurt, rather than helped, those in need.

In Africa, where we see food emergencies in the Sahel and the Horn of Africa, creating greater flexibility to purchase food commodities from local and regional farmers will strengthen local markets and ensure African nations are less reliant on U.S. foreign aid.

Too often, we Americans see Africa as a land of crisis. This amendment shifts this outlook and will show that Africans, themselves, can and will play a critical role in addressing hunger and malnutrition. This amendment saves money and assists countries to be self-sufficient.

Let's put an end to backward policies that are harmful to local markets and allow the continent of Africa and many other nations—Africa, with six of the fastest growing economies in the world—to help solve local food emergencies.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 2½ minutes remaining

Mr. LUCAS. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER).

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This amendment favors our foreign competitors over American-grown products, American-grown industries, and jobs filled by Americans.

Unlike foreign aid programs, the Food for Peace program is American-made through and through, and it's tied to approximately 44,000 American jobs in the agriculture, transportation, and maritime industries.

An American is employed at every step in this process of the Food for Peace program. Americans grow the crops. The commodities are processed and packaged in the United States. Those packages are carried by our railroads and barges to American seaports and finally delivered to the receiving nations by U.S.-flagged vessels.

□ 1730

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment and support American farmers, American workers, and American taxpayers.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of this amendment. Look, the way the program works now, it's the most expensive food in the world. This keeps the buying of American food, shipping it on American flagships. It preserves all of the American jobs. But it also frees up money to allow countries to learn how to fish, how to be able to go out and buy food and also develop the markets.

As a return Peace Corps volunteer, this is a really smart investment. And for those fiscal conservatives here, this is a much better amendment than keeping the status quo. I urge its support.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining 1¾ minutes to Mr. GREEN of Texas.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my good friends, Congressmen ROYCE and ENGEL. This amendment would cripple the Food for Peace Program, our Nation's premier foreign aid program, and endanger tens of thousands of jobs in agriculture and the maritime industry.

Since 1954, Food for Peace has enabled the United States to play a leading role in responding to international food assistance needs and ensuring global food security, reaching more than 3 billion people in 150 countries.

In 2012 alone, the Food for Peace Program shipped million of tons of American food aid abroad aboard dozens of U.S.-flagged and crewed ships.

Food for Peace also helps maintain our domestic merchant marine by ensuring a steady flow of American cargo shipped by Americans on U.S.-flagged ships. Unfortunately, many benefits from the Food for Peace Program are being threatened by this amendment, which would redirect 45 percent of the program's budget to send direct cash payments overseas with little accountability, scant transparency, and no benefit to U.S. farmers and merchant marines.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has expressed concern about accountability. With all due respect, allow me to dispel a myth. We are not talking about sending bags of cash to foreign governments so they can spend it on whatever they want. No matter the form, U.S. food assistance is now and will continue to be subject to multiple levels of scrutiny and monitoring and evaluation. The Food for Peace Program maintains strong accountability for funds. Food aid will continue to be branded with U.S. aid logos, prominently displayed on all program-related materials regardless of whether the food is purchased in the United States or in the affected region. That is the way this program works.

And according to the Secretary of Defense, the Defense Department supports the President's proposed reform,

supports this reform of the food aid program, and the Defense Department has assessed that it will not affect U.S. maritime readiness or national security obviously in any way since these are non-militarily useful ships under foreign ownership anyway, for the most part.

Mr. Chairman, this is about fixing a broken system. Our food aid takes too long to arrive and costs too much to get there. A former top aid official told our committee last week that in fast-onset famines such as Somalia and wars involving mass population displacements, such as Darfur: ''I watched people die waiting for food aid to arrive.'' He wants a change so that the aid can be purchased right there, and during that first month when they are waiting for the ship to arrive, to feed those people before they starve to death. That's what's driving this amendment.

In Syria, a shipment of U.S. food just arrived, yes it did, 2 years after the onset of this—2 years afterwards. It would have been helpful if we'd had a little ability in the program to handle this on the ground. U.S. interests are being undermined here by archaic food aid programs, and I urge adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 3102, relating to extension of funding for the market access program.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, the rationale behind this amendment is simple: hardworking taxpayers should not have to subsidize the world's most successful companies and trade groups for their business and advertising overseas, yet that's exactly what the Market Access Program does. Every year, the Federal Government takes millions from taxpayers and hands it to multi-million-dollar corporations. These funds end up financing lavish international travel and marketing expenses for corporations that could most certainly afford to do it themselves. In my view, this is corporate cronyism for the well-connected, and with a $17 trillion debt, almost, it's time to end this misuse of tax dollars.

Just a few of the more egregious examples of waste include a taxpayer-funded Japanese Tweet While You Eat campaign to promote U.S. beef; an animated series in Spain promoting walnuts that chronicles the adventures of a squirrel named Super Twiggy and his nemesis the Colesterator; educational wine tastings in London, Denmark, Dublin, and Mexico; American whiskey tastings in Hong Kong; an elaborate outdoor dinner party in New Delhi, India, so that food critics could discuss prunes.

The list goes on and on, and the trend is disturbing. Billion-dollar-industries are padding their bottom line with American tax dollars. They ought to do these things, but they ought to do them on their own dime, not on the backs of the American taxpayers.

Take, for example, Blue Diamond Almonds, which despite their billion-dollar year in 2012, still received $3.3 million from the Market Access Program.

Or the U.S. Meat Export Federation which received $19 million from MAP last year, even though the value of pork and beef exports was at the highest level in history.

Or Sunkist Growers, Inc., which recorded its third consecutive billion-dollar year, but still received $2.2 million from American taxpayers.

So we have billion-dollar enterprises and million-dollar recipients of aid from the American taxpayer.

The bottom line is Congress should not spend hard-earned tax dollars this way. Republicans don't believe in it; Democrats don't believe in it. So let's stop doing it. Don't get me wrong, these businesses ought to be doing this. They ought to be advertising their own products, but they shouldn't do it on the backs of the American taxpayers. For the sake of the taxpayers, who are earning the money that we're spending here, I urge passage of this amendment.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in strong support of the amendment.

This is one of the most indefensible programs in the entire Federal Government. As Mr. CHABOT said, it pays to market U.S. agricultural products in foreign countries, which invites the question of why should American taxpayers pay the advertising costs of some of the biggest corporations in the world?

Who are we talking about here—plucky little startup companies like Archer Daniels Midland, Dole, Del Monte, Sunkist. Companies that are big enough to export produce overseas are certainly big enough to advertise that produce without picking the pockets of every small shopkeeper and worker in America.

□ 1740

This amendment, thankfully, ends this program. It would save taxpayers about $2 billion over the next 10 years.

And as the gentleman said, these expenditures are completely out of the realm of reason:

Two million dollars to the California Prune Board for an evening dining experience for food critics in New Delhi to discuss prunes. Two million dollars, that must have been quite an evening;

$18.9 million going to the Cotton Council so it could advertise on India's reality TV show, ''Let's Design,'' now in its fifth season, by the way. This advertising isn't even being done in America. It is being done overseas, and it is being done to supplement the advertising budgets of giant corporations.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican majority was supposed to end this kind of nonsense, not perpetuate it. I support this amendment, and I believe that it is a test of the determination and sincerity of the House majority in meeting its mandate to stop wasting people's money.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I represent one of the most diverse agricultural areas of the country. Farmers in the 12th District of Georgia grow almost everything you can imagine, fruits and vegetables, including one of the largest blueberry crops in the Nation and the world-famous Vidalia onion, commodities like cotton and corn, pecans and peanuts, chickens and cows.

Georgia is also home to one of the largest container ports in the country. One of the real bright spots of the American economy is that, thanks in large part to the Market Access Program, farmers have been able to expand their exports to foreign markets and ship their crops through the Port of Savannah to thriving markets overseas. These are opportunities that these small businesses probably would not have if it were not for the MAP connections they had.

The people I represent, farmers and nonfarmers alike, understand that growing markets add tremendous value to what farmers grow. The Market Access Program expands our access into larger world markets, and access to these markets is what helps our farmers compete in the global economy. I think that's worth preserving, so I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), one of the subcommittee chairmen.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I most respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chair, the MAP program has been a critical tool for producers in my district to access foreign markets. The program forms a private-public partnership that shares the cost of overseas marketing and promotional activities.

The current agriculture export forecast for FY13 is estimated to be nearly $140 billion, which smashes our export records. For a country that operates under a net trade deficit, agriculture has been a bright spot and generates a surplus.

Independent studies show that the MAP program is directly responsible for $6.1 billion of these exports. This is a 35 to 1 return on investment.

How many other Federal programs have this type of economic benefit? Not many.

With our trade forecast expected to increase this year, this reinforces the need for valuable programs such as the Market Access Program. I urge my colleagues most respectfully to oppose the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), a State with the most amazingly diverse agriculture.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The Market Access Program provides matching grants. These are matching grants for technical assistance and other activities that help our family farmers expand their market access overseas.

Let's face it. We are in a global market, and our farmers are not always facing a level playing field. Since the creation of this extremely successful agricultural export program, it has increased America's export by over 500 percent. That is a success story by any measure.

The USDA's commissioned study conducted in 2010 found that, for every dollar that MAP spent, it generates, as was noted just a moment ago, $35 in additional exports. This creates an additional $6.1 billion in economic activity annually.

Billions and billions of dollars have been achieved as increased exports as a result of this program and thousands and thousands of jobs. That includes safeguards to the taxpayers.

The statements by the proponents of this measure, I believe, are overreaching because they ignore the fact that it is a matching grant. And the particular statements they make ignore the fact that these were personal expenditures by these organizations, not the money of the Market Access Program.

So I would urge you to defeat this amendment. The processors have matched over 100 percent of the funds that we have provided in this program. It's been a success by any measure, and I would urge the defeat of this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 3102, and insert the following new section:

SEC. 3102. FUNDING FOR MARKET ACCESS PROGRAM.

Section 211(c)(1)(A) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5641(c)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''and $200,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''$200,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013, $185,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, $180,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017, and $175,000,000 for fiscal year 2018''.

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

SEC. 4208. HUNGER-FREE COMMUNITIES.

Section 4405 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7517) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 4405. HUNGER-FREE COMMUNITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In this section:

''(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term 'eligible entity' means—

''(A) a nonprofit organization (including an emergency feeding organization);

''(B) an agricultural cooperative;

''(C) a producer network or association;

''(D) a community health organization;

''(E) a public benefit corporation;

''(F) an economic development corporation;

''(G) a farmers' market;

''(H) a community-supported agriculture program;

''(I) a buying club;

''(J) a retail food store participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program;

''(K) a State, local, or tribal agency; and

''(L) any other entity the Secretary designates.

''(2) EMERGENCY FEEDING ORGANIZATION.—The term 'emergency feeding organization' has the meaning given the term in section 201A of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7501).

''(3) SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—The term 'supplemental nutrition assistance program' means the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.).

''(b) HUNGER-FREE COMMUNITIES INCENTIVE GRANTS.—

''(1) AUTHORIZATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In each of the years specified in subsection (c), the Secretary shall make grants to eligible entities in accordance with paragraph (2).

''(B) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of carrying out an activity under this subsection shall not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of the activity.

''(C) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal share of the cost of an activity under this subsection may be provided—

''(I) in cash or in-kind contributions as determined by the Secretary, including facilities, equipment, or services; and

''(II) by a State or local government or a private source.

''(ii) LIMITATION.—In the case of a for-profit entity, the non-Federal share described in clause (i) shall not include services of an employee, including salaries paid or expenses covered by the employer.

''(2) CRITERIA.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, an eligible entity is a governmental agency or nonprofit organization that—

''(i) meets the application criteria set forth by the Secretary; and

''(ii) proposes a project that, at a minimum—

''(I) has the support of the State agency;

''(II) would increase the purchase of fruits and vegetables by low-income consumers participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program by providing incentives at the point of purchase;

''(III) agrees to participate in the evaluation described in paragraph (4);

''(IV) ensures that the same terms and conditions apply to purchases made by individuals with benefits issued under this Act and incentives provided for in this subsection as apply to purchases made by individuals who are not members of households receiving benefits, such as provided for in section 278.2(b) of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation); and

''(V) includes effective and efficient technologies for benefit redemption systems that may be replicated in other for States and communities.

''(B) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to projects that—

''(i) maximize the share of funds used for direct incentives to participants;

''(ii) use direct-to-consumer sales marketing;

''(iii) demonstrate a track record of designing and implementing successful nutrition incentive programs that connect low-income consumers and agricultural producers;

''(iv) provide locally or regionally produced fruits and vegetables;

''(v) are located in underserved communities; or

''(vi) address other criteria as established by the Secretary.

''(3) APPLICABILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The value of any benefit provided to a participant in any activity funded under this subsection shall not be considered income or resources for any purpose under any Federal, State, or local law.

''(B) PROHIBITION ON COLLECTION OF SALES TAXES.—Each State shall ensure that no State or local tax is collected on a purchase of food under this subsection.

''(C) NO LIMITATION ON BENEFITS.—A grant made available under this subsection shall not be used to carry out any project that limits the use of benefits under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) or any other Federal nutrition law.

''(D) HOUSEHOLD ALLOTMENT.—Assistance provided under this subsection to households receiving benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program shall not—

''(i) be considered part of the supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits of the household; or

''(ii) be used in the collection or disposition of claims under section 13 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2022).

''(4) EVALUATION.—

''(A) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall provide for an independent evaluation of projects selected under this subsection that measures the impact of each project on—

''(i) improving the nutrition and health status of participating households receiving incentives under this subsection; and

''(ii) increasing fruit and vegetable purchases in participating households.

''(B) REQUIREMENT.—The independent evaluation under subparagraph (A) shall use rigorous methodologies capable of producing scientifically valid information regarding the effectiveness of a project.

''(C) COSTS.—The Secretary may use funds not to exceed 10 percent of the funding provided to carry out this section to pay costs associated with administering, monitoring, and evaluating each project.

''(c) FUNDING.—

''(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsection (b) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

''(2) MANDATORY FUNDING.—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out subsection (b)—

''(A) $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

''(B) $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2017; and

''(C) $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the leadership of the Rules and Agriculture Committees for making this amendment in order.

Right here in the United States, the richest country in the world, one in four children is at risk of going hungry. Last year, 50.1 million Americans lived in food insecure households, including 16.7 million children. In my home State of Nevada, one in six households struggles with food security, and 170,000 schoolchildren in southern Nevada go to school hungry, leaving them unprepared to learn.

So you can see, hunger is not some crisis that is just happening in remote, faraway lands. It's happening right here, all across our own country, and we must address it.

That's why I've offered this important amendment that would restore funding to USDA's Hunger-Free Communities Grant program. This program has received wide bipartisan support and is included, or was included, without dissent in the Senate farm bill.

The amendment is a commonsense proposal to ensure that children and their families have access to the nutritious food they need to survive and to thrive. It continues a grant program that includes assistance with food distribution, community outreach, and initiatives that improve access to food.

The Hunger-Free Communities Grant program has helped facilitate public-private partnerships across the country, from New York City to Ajo, Arizona. The grants enable local communities to root out the causes of hunger and build strategies to eliminate food insecurity.

With the proposed cuts of $20.5 billion to the SNAP benefits, which I oppose, this amendment becomes even more important.

It's morally unacceptable to allow children to go hungry in the wealthiest country in the world, so I would encourage my colleagues to support this amendment to ensure that our communities have the resources they need to tackle hunger at the local level and create healthy, hunger-free communities.

Again, I thank Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON for their consideration of this amendment.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition and claim the time.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, we all have deep concerns about hunger in America and hunger around the world, and every effort to abate that is worthy; however, I must oppose this amendment.

One of our efforts at the committee, over the last several years, is to look for duplicative processes, duplicative programs to eliminate. Reducing this duplication in these agencies has been a major priority for the committee over the last 2½ years, and we've held audits for implementing agencies, field hearings across the countryside and hearings here in Washington to receive stakeholder input on the effectiveness and, more importantly, the inefficiencies of programs within our jurisdiction.

□ 1750

While I support providing access to healthy foods for low-income communities, I believe that our base bill makes significant strides in addressing these concerns, both the inefficiencies as well as the effectiveness of the programs.

What is even more concerning than authorizing this duplicative program is the offset that is used to pay for more government redundancy. Exports are vital to the U.S. agricultural economy. Nearly one-third of our agricultural sales come from exports. In the last 25 years, the Market Access Program has proven to be highly successful in helping to boost U.S. agricultural exports, expanding jobs and increasing rural income.

The amount of money sought is about $20 million a year over the 5-year program for a total of $100 million. We must look at programs that are effective on a big enough scale to have a really big impact; and this is a program that, while perhaps impactful on a few very small communities and small issues, it will not affect hunger widely across this country.

I respectfully ask for a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the ranking member of the committee, Mr. PETERSON.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, must reluctantly rise to oppose this amendment. The Hunger-Free Community Program is in the Senate bill, and I think there's wide support for this.

The problem is what's happening here with this amendment is we're taking mandatory money from the Market Access Program, which is an important program for a lot of different reasons that were discussed just in the last amendment, and we're taking money from that program, which is in title III, and moving it to this hunger-free community program which is in title IV. And I just don't think that we want to be taking mandatory money and moving it between titles.

So I think this is something we can consider when we get to conference. It's in the Senate bill. I encourage people to oppose this amendment at this time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I would just urge that my colleagues support this important amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

The amendment was rejected.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113–117 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. FOXX of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 14 by Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. ROYCE of California.

Amendment No. 16 by Mr. CHABOT of Ohio.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 234, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

AYES—188

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—234

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Cleaver
Duckworth
Gutiérrez
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pallone
Rogers (KY)

□ 1818

Mrs. BLACK and Messrs. MEEHAN and DUFFY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 256 on June 19, 2013, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 267, noes 156, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

AYES—267

Amash
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carter
Cartwright
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Delaney
DeLauro
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Esty
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lee (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shuster
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tierney
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—156

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bonner
Boustany
Braley (IA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clyburn
Collins (NY)
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DelBene
Denham
Deutch
Duckworth
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gerlach
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Joyce
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Latham
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Owens
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Ruiz
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Cleaver
Conyers
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pallone
Rogers (KY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1823

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

Messrs. CICILLINE, KEATING, LATTA, and BACHUS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 112, noes 309, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 258]

AYES—112

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Black
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Campbell
Cantor
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Cook
Cotton
Culberson
Daines
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Harris
Hensarling
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kingston
Kline
Lamborn
Latta
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mulvaney
Nunnelee
Palazzo
Paulsen
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Shuster
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Tiberi
Upton
Weber (TX)
Westmoreland
Woodall
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—309

Aderholt
Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibson
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—13

Cleaver
Conyers
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pallone
Rogers (KY)
Slaughter
Vela

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1828

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. VELA. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 258 on the Brown (GA) amendment H.R. 1947, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 242, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 259]

AYES—179

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Grayson
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harris
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Rooney
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—242

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Cleaver
Conyers
Gutiérrez
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pallone
Rogers (KY)
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1832

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 266, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]

AYES—157

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Himes
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—266

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry

Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Cleaver
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pallone
Rogers (KY)
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1836

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 273, noes 149, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 261]

AYES—273

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)

NOES—149

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Daines
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hunter
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
Kingston
Labrador
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rokita
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Cleaver
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pallone
Rogers (KY)
Slaughter
Smith (NE)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1840

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 203, noes 220, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 262]

AYES—203

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barr
Bass
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Cantor
Capps
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hall
Hanna
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Himes
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Jeffries
Jordan
Kennedy
Kind
Kingston
Kuster
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Nugent
O'Rourke
Olson
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tipton
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—220

Aderholt
Alexander
Andrews
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Capuano
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
DelBene
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hudson
Hunter
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
LaMalfa
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
McDermott
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
Nunnelee
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Posey
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walz
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Cleaver
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pallone
Rogers (KY)
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1845

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

Messrs. OLSON, GUTIERREZ, and LARSON of Connecticut changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 98, noes 322, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

AYES—98

Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Barton
Bentivolio
Black
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cohen
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Culberson
DeSantis
Doggett
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fleischmann
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gohmert
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Hall
Harris
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
O'Rourke
Olson
Paulsen
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Radel
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Van Hollen
Wagner
Walberg
Wenstrup
Wilson (SC)
Yoder
Young (IN)

NOES—322

Aderholt
Alexander
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick

Kuster
LaMalfa
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Bass
Cleaver
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pallone
Rogers (KY)
Rush
Slaughter
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1851

Messrs. WESTMORELAND, WOODALL, COLLINS of Georgia and GINGREY of Georgia changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 3203, relating to promotion of agricultural exports to emerging markets, strike subsection (b) and insert the following new subsection:

(b) TERMINATION OF PROGRAM TO DEVELOP AGRICULTURAL MARKETS IN EMERGING MARKETS.—Section 1542(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–624; 7 U.S.C. 5622 note) is amended by striking paragraph (1).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I propose would eliminate the funding for the Emerging Markets Program.

For those of you who are not familiar, the Emerging Markets Program assists United States private and public organizations with agriculture marketing in low- to middle-income countries in Africa, the Caribbean, Central and South America, Eurasia and the Middle East.

The Emerging Markets Program funding is $10 million per year in this food stamp and farm bill. Over the 5-year life of this legislation, funding is $50 million.

The Emerging Markets Program duplicates and overlaps the Federal Government's much larger Marketing Agricultural Program. By way of example, in 2010, at least 27 of the 82 projects funded by the Emerging Markets Program went to entities that also received funding from the Federal Government's Marketing Agricultural Program.

Emerging Markets Program expenditures are quite informative:

$30,000 was spent on ''Brazil Craft Beer School Seminars for the Brewers Association.''

$468,000 in hard-earned taxpayers' money was spent studying food consumption in China's second-tier cities, the new frontier for U.S. agricultural export opportunities.

$212,000 of taxpayers' hard-earned money was spent concerning, ''Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Sector Development for the United States Department of Agriculture/Foreign Services/Chengdu, China.''

$174,431 was spent on a ''Global Food Safety Forum China Exchange for the GIC Group.''

$35,000 was spent on ''China Beer Distributors Education Program for the Brewers Association.''

$142,356 was spent on a ''Central American Microbiological Standards Program for USDA Foreign Agricultural Service.'' And the list goes on and on and on.

Mr. Chairman, since, first, the Emerging Markets Program overlaps and duplicates America's Marketing Agricultural Program, and since, second, the private sector's ability to do this work without Federal Government intervention or assistance, and since, third, America's out-of-control deficit and debt situation slowly but surely increased America's risk of a debilitating insolvency and bankruptcy, and since, finally, America's financial condition forces us to borrow every penny of the $50 million being spent on the Emerging Markets Program, I urge this body to be financially responsible by adopting my amendment to eliminate funding for the Emerging Markets Program.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

The Emerging Markets Program, EMP, provides funding for technical assistance to aid public and private agricultural organizations in their efforts to improve market opportunities in low- and middle-income nations that offer viable markets for our U.S. commodities.

□ 1900

This program truly focuses on promoting U.S. products to build repeat customers in markets where incomes are growing to the point that they can import high-quality products. Program resources may only be used to broadly support export of U.S. commodities and products, and promoting a company's own branded product is strictly prohibited.

The Emerging Markets Program requires the participating entities to commit a portion of their own resources to seek export opportunities in emerging markets, and a priority is given to the applications which bring the greatest amount of cost-share funds to the project.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of studies about the amount of dollars that this generates in U.S. agricultural exports. It's one of those things that helps us move into markets that have the potential and the growing potential to buy our products. I believe it is a good use of resources, and it's subject, of course, to the oversight of the appropriators.

I would ask my colleagues to reject the amendment rather respectfully; and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma's response—and he's a good friend of mine—is reflective, unfortunately, of the financial irresponsibility that jeopardizes America's future solvency. Let's keep in mind that we're in a triage situation. We've had four consecutive trillion-dollar deficits. We are looking at blowing through the $17 billion total accumulated debt mark. If we cannot eliminate a program of this magnitude—only $10 million per year—

a program that is duplicative of other Federal Government programs, well, I would submit to this body that that suggests and reflects, in a very strong way, the financial irresponsibility that has put America into the position we are in where we are at risk long term of a debilitating financial insolvency and bankruptcy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title III, add the following new section:

SEC. 32__. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE CERTIFICATES OF ORIGIN.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall seek to ensure that Department of Agriculture certificates of origin are accepted by any country with respect to which the United States has entered into a free trade agreement providing for preferential duty treatment.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that addresses a problem relating to the American citrus industry and implementation of the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress approved the U.S.-South Korea Free Trade Agreement, and it was signed by the President in 2011. The agreement has increased opportunities for U.S. businesses, farmers, and workers through an important access to a vital foreign market.

Under this agreement, over 95 percent of bilateral trade in consumer and industrial products will become duty-free within 5 years of the date of the agreement. For American agricultural products, the U.S.-Korea agreement immediately phases out tariffs and quotas on a broad range of products.

The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates that annual U.S. agricultural exports to South Korea will increase by a minimum of $1.9 billion upon full implementation. In particular, the free trade agreement eliminated South Korea's 54 percent tariff on frozen concentrated orange juice, and it phases out the tariffs on fresh grapefruit and freshly squeezed orange juice over 5 years.

The negotiated removal of such tariffs will allow the American citrus industry to grow and expand. It will create jobs in America, including jobs related to citrus growers, maritime businesses and ports such as my home port, the Port of Tampa. This is great news for my home State of Florida and other States across the U.S. where they grow citrus. It's vital to our economy and local communities.

But we have hit a little bit of a stumbling block with South Korea during the implementation of the free trade agreement. South Korea is resisting the USDA's country-of-origin certification for U.S. citrus.

My amendment, the Castor amendment, seeks to correct this problem by directing the Secretary of Agriculture to ensure that the Department's certificates of origin are accepted by any country with respect to which the United States has entered into a free trade agreement providing for preferential duty treatment.

Fortunately, the Congressional Budget Office says there's no new cost for this amendment. I would like to thank my colleagues from Florida, Congressman WEBSTER and Congressman HASTINGS on the Rules Committee, for their support in getting this amendment made in order. I'd like to thank Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON for their fair consideration.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the Castor amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. I would just note to the gentlelady I think by the expression on my ranking member's face we both agree this is a good-faith effort to try to make something happen. Therefore we would accept the language.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee and the ranking member and thank them for including the Castor amendment in the farm bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. GRIMM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 318, at the end of line 3, add the following:

''At least 1 such pilot project shall be carried out in an urban area that is among the 10 largest urban areas in the United States (based on population) if the supplemental nutrition assistance program is separately administered in such area and if the administration of such program in such area complies with the other applicable requirements of such program.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would reduce fraud in the SNAP program.

The farm bill currently requires the USDA to create pilot programs around the Nation that leverage Federal-State partnerships to combat SNAP retailer fraud.

My amendment requires the USDA to include at least one of the top 10 largest urban areas as one of the pilot program locations. To be clear, the bill specifically states that any State or large urban area chosen for a pilot program would not be able to divert resources away from recipient anti-fraud efforts; thus, this program only supplements those recipient fraud efforts.

This is a critically important amendment because we must ensure that the pilot programs account for the unique structure of SNAP programs within large urban areas. For instance, in one Midwest State, 75 percent of SNAP benefits were redeemed in just eight large supermarkets or publicly owned convenience store chains.

But the urban environment is distinctly different. As an example, New York City has over 10,000 SNAP retailers—of which 80 percent are small, privately owned retailers. According to recent statistics, while 87 percent of SNAP transactions occur in large supermarkets, they account for only 5.4 percent of retailer trafficking.

□ 1910

Conversely, 9 percent of SNAP retailers are privately owned—small convenience stores in local neighborhoods—but they account for 80 percent of SNAP fraud.

Therefore, to be successful in combating retailer fraud, we must ensure that we're able to investigate fraudulent activities at these small, privately owned stores. To do this, we must ensure that a large urban area is included in at least one of these pilot programs, in one location. If we fail to include a large urban area in the pilot program, we will miss a large portion of retailers responsible for 80 percent of the retailer fraud.

This amendment will not take a pilot program away from any other State or determine which large urban area must receive a program. It only says that to

ensure we receive fully accurate information from the pilots, that we must include at least one large urban area.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIMM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. I would note to my good friend and colleague that I think he is involved here in a good government measure, and I would encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. GRIMM. I thank the chairman of the Ag committee, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member seek time in opposition? If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV (page 346, after line 17), insert the following new section:

SEC. 4033. TESTING APPLICANTS FOR UNLAWFUL USE OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.

Section 6 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015), as amended by section 4009. is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(s) TESTING APPLICANTS FOR UNLAWFUL USE OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.—

''(1) Nothing in this Act, or in any other Federal law, shall be considered to prevent a State, at the full cost to such State, from—

''(A) enacting legislation to provide for testing any individual who is a member of a household applying for supplemental nutrition assistance benefits, for the unlawful use of controlled substances as a condition for receiving such benefits; and

''(B) finding an individual ineligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program on the basis of the positive result of the testing conducted by the State under such legislation.

''(2) For purposes of this subsection, term 'controlled substance' has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act ((21 U.S.C. 802).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support our commonsense amendment to allow the States to conduct drug screening on applicants for welfare. If adopted, this amendment would join a list of good government reforms contained in the FARRM Bill that save taxpayer money and ensure integrity and accountability within our nutrition system.

From preventing lottery winners from receiving food stamps to closing loopholes and preventing illegal immigrants from receiving benefits, I commend the chairman and ranking member on the work done to reform the food stamps program in the FARRM Bill.

Mr. Chairman, our amendment simply allows the States to conduct drug testing to ensure addicts and criminals are not taking food out of the mouths of hungry children. This debate is not about hungry children. We all agree that we need to take care of the least among us, those who need this type of assistance. We all agree that we don't want children to go hungry. What this amendment is about is making sure that addicts and criminals are not taking what is not theirs, taking food from the mouths of these children, taking food from those who are in need.

So I ask my colleagues to just consider this as a simple measure, a commonsense measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I guess I would rebut several of the arguments the gentleman has made.

First of all, you know, common sense really ain't that common, and this amendment is an example of that. First of all, it uses very fallacious arguments that presume that most of the people who use food stamps also use drugs. I would just remind the body that 46 percent of the people who use food stamps are hungry children. And as the author of this amendment has suggested—quite incorrectly—this is not about hungry children, it is; because if that person in the household who is the applicant is denied food stamps, hungry children will be affected.

This is unconstitutional. This has been through court. It violates the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution against illegal searches and seizures. It costs a lot of public money just to humiliate people. They found in Florida, for example, that people who don't use public assistance programs are three times more likely to be drug users; and nationwide, they have found that recipients don't use drugs at any greater rate than the general population. This is a slippery slope in violating one of the basic tenets of our Constitution.

Mandatory drug testing laws are not based on individualized suspicion, and the Supreme Court has held that it doesn't pass the constitutional measure. It will cost $75 for one of these drug tests, and for what purpose? Just to criminalize and humiliate poor people.

So with that, I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. At this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today with my colleagues, Congressmen HUDSON and LAMALFA, in offering this amendment.

Under current law, States are not allowed to test SNAP recipients. This amendment would give States the authority to do the testing only if they want to, so it gives States States' rights.

Law-abiding citizens who are most in need are those who the program is meant to serve. We're cutting waste to protect this program so we make sure that the SNAP dollars are going to those who truly need it, not to those who are able to spend funds on illegal purchases.

With a $17 trillion national debt, we must give States all the tools they need in order to make sure SNAP funding goes to the people most in need.

I thank my colleagues, Congressman HUDSON and Congressman LAMALFA, for working with me on this and encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. I just would like to remind the body and the sponsors of this bill that SNAP already has an option to target and punish drug offenders. States right now, without this amendment, can require individuals who have been convicted of a drug felony to submit to a drug test before they can receive SNAP benefits—totally in line with our Constitution.

At this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a great member on the Ag Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlelady, and I rise along with her to oppose this amendment.

I just want to say, Really? This is what we're debating here right now? I mean, I'm curious why the amendment doesn't include drug testing for people who get benefits of crop insurance or who receive direct payments, agricultural benefits from the Federal Government. Why aren't we requiring that they be drug tested, too? Why don't we drug test all the Members of Congress here, force everybody to go urinate in a cup to see whether or not anybody is on drugs? Maybe that will explain why some of these amendments are coming up or why some of the votes are turning out the way they are.

Bottom line is this is about demeaning poor people, and we've been doing this time and time again on this House floor. Enough is enough. We don't need this amendment. This is a bad idea. Please vote it down.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HUDSON. At this point, I'd like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to join my colleagues, Representatives HUDSON and YOHO, to again offer a commonsense amendment that will further assist in diminishing the abuse in the SNAP program.

This is a no-nonsense amendment. If you have enough money to buy drugs, you do not need taxpayer money to buy food. This amendment protects the taxpayer from directly subsidizing the purchase of drugs. Without this amendment, drug users will continue to use their money to buy drugs and your money to buy food.

This amendment gives States the ability to implement a drug screening program in the way that works best for them, but it needs to be part of the SNAP benefit qualification application. There are already 29 States that have proposals to do this, and eight States have already passed this type of legislation for this type of screening.

Letting drug users abuse the SNAP program diverts funds from those who truly need it. That's what we're about here. Of course, this is what taxpayers, when you talk to regular folks, this is the kind of thing they complain about around the kitchen table, like, ''Why are my tax dollars going towards this?'' If I had a dime for every time I've heard this.

□ 1920

People want this sort of thing to happen for those that are abusing this program. Taxpayers deserve better; the folks that really need the benefits of food stamps deserve better.

I ask for an ''aye'' vote on this amendment.

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

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady.

I think that this is really the height of temerity here to make reference to people who are on a food stamp program and make a presumption that because they're on a food stamp program that they are using drugs and that they should be tested.

My gosh, I would just say that what about those people who are getting $4.7 million in direct payments from the Federal Government—as the gentleman from California does—and an additional $1.2 million from direct payments from the Federal Government? Maybe we ought to start drug testing all of the people who get some sort of a benefit from the Federal Government, and particularly those folks in this program, like the folks who are on crop insurance.

We can't find out the names of the 26 individuals on crop insurance that get at least $1 million—$1 million they get in a premium subsidy. And do you know what, my friends? There is no cap on the amount of money, there is no threshold on what they can receive, they have no eligibility criteria. They just get the money, and they don't have to even farm the land. Why don't we drug test those folks today and not demean people who have fallen on hard times?

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining.

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HUDSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, I ask my colleagues to consider this as a commonsense measure that does nothing to take food away from those who need it, but it makes sure the integrity of this program is upheld. We don't make any presumptions about folks on the program, but we think that States need this tool so that they can make sure that folks who are on the program are the folks that need to be on that program.

I thank the gentlelady, my colleague, from Connecticut for endorsing this farm bill this year because we do eliminate direct payments. As she alluded, I agree, that is a practice that we should end, and so I appreciate her endorsement of that piece of it.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I will conclude by just saying I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense measure that does nothing but allow the States to have the tool to use drug testing should they see fit when administering this program.

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

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 15 seconds.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is not commonsensical; this is unconstitutional. The majority wants to excuse itself from taking food away from 46 million people who are hungry, and it is a proxy for criminalizing the food stamp program in order to get away with it.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4033. REDUCTION IN BENEFITS PAID WITH UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 8(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2017(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(a) The'' and inserting the following:

''(a)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) For any fiscal year for which funds are not authorized under section 18(a)(1), the thrifty food plan shall be reduced by 10 percent only for the purpose of determining the value of allotments under paragraph (1) for such fiscal year.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

I offer this amendment because serious reforms to the SNAP program are difficult because the program continues on autopilot even after the FARRM Bill expires.

SNAP is defined as an appropriated entitlement, meaning that appropriations can continue to fund the program regardless of action taken by the Ag Committee.

This amendment is about the accountability of SNAP. While SNAP funding is provided in the annual appropriations act, the level of spending for appropriated entitlements is not controlled through the annual appropriations process. Instead, the level of spending for appropriated entitlements, like other entitlements, is based on the benefits and the eligibility criteria established in law.

The amount provided in the appropriations act is based on the projected level. In general, the maximum SNAP benefit is set at 100 percent of the USDA's Thrifty Food Plan. TFP is calculated each year by USDA as the lowest cost food plan and varies by household size. Benefits are further reduced by 30 percent of a qualifying family's annual income on the expectation that families contribute to their own food purchases.

This amendment will simply reduce by 10 percent the Thrifty Food Plan calculation in any year that SNAP is not authorized, otherwise bringing the Agriculture Committee back into the operations. In this way, all parties would have an incentive to come to the table and negotiate SNAP reforms while drafting the next FARRM Bill.

It is important to note that this amendment does not end SNAP; nor is it expected this amendment will actually ever go into force. It simply lowers the benefit if, and only if, Congress fails to reach an agreement on how to reauthorize the SNAP program. Further, it does not impact the baseline for this year's FARRM Bill and does not cost any money to implement.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

This is unprecedented. This far-reaching amendment would quite literally hold millions of our country's poorest children, working families, seniors, and the disabled hostage to this Congress' ability to compromise and pass a farm bill. That is almost laughable. This Congress hasn't been able to come to an agreement or a compromise on anything.

If the farm bill is not reauthorized by September 30, food stamps for all families of four would be cut about $64 a month. Right now, more than 47 million Americans, including more than 19 million children, rely on food stamps to put food on the table. They don't rely on the program because they want to; they rely on the food stamp program because they have no other choice. They either do not make enough money to afford food for their family because of the paltry minimum wage or they are temporarily unemployed because of the historic economic recession this country has experienced.

This is a misguided amendment. It would impose deep cuts for each and every one of the households. The nonpartisan Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimated that passing this amendment could result in a nearly 15 percent cut for households. That is $64 for a family of four when they only receive an average of less than $430 a month.

Already, 90 percent of SNAP benefits are redeemed by the third week of the month, around the same time that food banks see more and more men, women, and children enrolled in the program turning to the food bank because their benefits ran out.

All social safety net programs, including food stamps, have historically been protected from automatic across-the-board cuts. This was true when the law was enacted in 1985, 1987, 1990, 2010, and the Budget Control Act of 2011. SNAP was also protected in Simpson-Bowles, which recognizes the need not to reduce the deficit on the backs of the poor and the most vulnerable in this country.

Christian leaders continue to call on this body to form a circle of protection around programs that help the neediest Americans, including those on food stamps. That circle of protection should surround this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to heed that request and to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I don't have any other speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, can you tell me how much time remains.

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

□ 1930

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Let me get this straight. So, if Congress doesn't do its job, we don't get punished—poor people get punished. I think we have it backwards here. Why should we hold poor people hostage to the fact that somehow this Congress can't get its act together? For our lack of ability to get things done around here, we don't hold people accountable who receive other subsidies who are, quite frankly, well off.

This is yet another in a series of amendments to diminish the plight of poor people, to demonize programs like SNAP; and I really think it's unfortunate. I mean, we're going to punish poor people because we can't reauthorize the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. What a terrible idea. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will agree with us on this and reject this.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlelady from Connecticut has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I think it's really rather incredible that we, once again, in the prior amendment have singled out a group of people, many of whom today are people who were working but who lost their jobs through no fault of their own and who find themselves in a situation in which they have to access the food stamp program in order to feed their families.

On the other hand, those people whom I singled out earlier—the 26 individuals—will get at least $1 million in a premium subsidy for crop insurance, and they have no income threshold at all. These folks, if we can't get to a compromise, will continue to get what they're getting. They're eating well. I would bet they have more than three squares a day.

Let's think about who this amendment targets—76 percent of SNAP households, including child, senior or disabled individuals. The average household on SNAP has a gross monthly income of $744. The average SNAP allocation is already less than $1.50 per meal, and 55 percent of SNAP dollars go to households with incomes below half of the Federal poverty line. This targets the poorest. It asks them to pay a price for congressional farm bill politics.

Let's talk about the Members of Congress. If they can't get it to a compromise, let's make sure they don't get their salaries and that we do something to those who are responsible for not getting the job done. Don't take it out on the poorest people in this Nation. This is unprecedented. It is immoral. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Many of the arguments that have just been made speak to why we need to do this deal. We need that sense of urgency that is portrayed on the other side in order to get this FARRM Bill done.

Now, this amendment won't take effect until the next FARRM Bill; but right now, this FARRM Bill's only production agriculture and conservation programs are trying to drag this program across the finish line with 219 votes. The nutrition program and its supporters couldn't give a rat's rear end whether or not it gets passed because its program goes forward without any effect if we don't do anything. They're really at an advantage to production agriculture.

This is not about the SNAP program, and this is not about the benefits. This is simply saying, I don't necessarily think SNAP is perfect, and the only way to get out of SNAP reform is to bring the SNAP beneficiaries—who are in every single congressional district, as opposed to farmers who are not in every single congressional district—to the table, to have some skin in the game, to make sure that they are communicating to their Members of Congress that they want them to get something done.

Right now, they're just simply on the take side. They're not part of the process, and they don't have to be because of the way we've done these rules. Arguing against the rules of the House don't argue about the idea that we must do our jobs. As Congressmen, we do our jobs. I've got folks back home who motivate me to do it far more than anything else that's up here. This amendment is simply saying that SNAP has a role and that the SNAP beneficiaries have a role in communicating to their Members of Congress to get this work done on a timely basis.

I urge support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 4033. SNAP ENHANCEMENT.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 3(k) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(k)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and (9)'' the last place it appears and inserting ''(9)'', and

(2) by inserting ''; and (10) items of personal hygiene for household use'' before the period at the end.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the 1st day of the 1st month that begins not less than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to propose an amendment to the nutrition title of this bill. I will mention at the outset that my amendment has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office as budget neutral and not adding to direct spending.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It will expand the items available for purchase under the SNAP program to include items of personal hygiene.

Historically, the purpose of the SNAP program has been to provide financial assistance to poor individuals to purchase food. Nearly 50 million people in this country currently rely on SNAP benefits to provide food for themselves and their families. No one wants to depend on SNAP for one's next meal, but we have a responsibility to our neighbors to provide and care for them in their time of need; but for the poor, need does not just stop at food.

While SNAP currently provides financial assistance to purchase certain types of food, there is no mechanism to help needy people purchase personal hygiene items like toothbrushes and toothpaste and toilet paper and feminine items, among other items used for their personal care, items that they cannot afford. My amendment expands SNAP-eligible purchases to include personal hygiene items to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Ensuring that poor families have access to personal hygiene products is the right thing to do. Giving families the ability to purchase personal hygiene products will save us money in the long run. Poor personal hygiene can have far-reaching consequences on an individual's health and result in more trips to the emergency room, and it increases uncompensated care. Research indicates that a lack of proper dental hygiene can increase the risk of heart attack and stroke, can exacerbate diabetes and kidney disease and, for expectant mothers, can increase the risk of delivering a pre-term, low-birth-weight baby.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when we are coming out of this recession and when State governments across the country, like the one in my home State of North Carolina, are refusing to expand Medicaid, now is the time to give our most vulnerable citizens some flexibility to buy products that will improve their long-term health. It is especially critical as we stand here today to debate this $20.5 billion cut to the SNAP program.

So, Chairman LUCAS and all of those responsible for this bill, thank you for the work that you have done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program is just that—a nutrition assistance program—which is designed to provide nutrition assistance to eligible low-income individuals and their families. Personal hygiene items never have been eligible for purchase under a Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program transaction and should never be eligible under SNAP. We should be devoting our scarce resources to providing food to hungry Americans, not personal hygiene items.

I urge my colleagues to join me in the opposition of this amendment and to vote ''no.''

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

I think that the majority has really raised the point that, historically, we have not allowed purchases beyond food for the food stamp program, but it's not that poor people don't really need to be able to do that.

□ 1940

This amendment is very narrow, and I can recall from personal experience some of the things that many families run out of in a family that are directly related to their nutritional needs, like a baby bottle. You've never seen a family frantically trying to find the last baby bottle or nipple that the baby has bitten off and not be able to deliver the formula to the child because they don't have a baby bottle and it'll cost over $2 to be able to make that purchase.

Certainly, toilet paper is sort of inversely related to eating. The need for feminine hygiene products or deodorant is something that adds to the dignity of being alive. It's quite true that many Americans during our Great Recession only had food stamps to depend on, not even TANF benefits. So if you're looking for a job, you really do want to have deodorant and toothpaste.

I think that this is budget neutral, and it is a small concession to make given the draconian cuts we're making in the program already.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I reserve the balance of my time, as I'm prepared to close if the gentleman has no further speakers.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I'm going to ask my colleagues if they would look very closely at this amendment. It's not a radical amendment. It simply empowers those recipients of SNAP to buy very simple and basic items that are related to nutrition, such as toilet paper and toothpaste and toothbrushes and the like.

I ask my colleagues to please allow an up-or-down vote on this and to vote ''aye'' on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I respect the initiative here. I appreciate that. I think that we're kind of wandering into uncharted waters here because we're talking about a farm bill and nutrition title, and this is not, I don't believe, in our purview to authorize the use of nutrition funds to address personal hygiene items, and that's why I have reservations about this.

I appreciate the effort put forth here and totally recognize the value of personal hygiene. I'm a big believer in personal hygiene. I just don't think that it's appropriate for us to address personal hygiene items in the context of nutrition.

For that reason, I would respectfully request a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. MARINO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A, of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4033. GAO PILOT PROGRAM TO COLLECT AND PUBLISH SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE BENEFIT REDEMPTION DATA.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—After the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall carry out a pilot program as follows:

(1) The program shall collect the data that is currently required to be reported under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) and under the benefit redemption requirements applicable to households under such Act.

(2) The program shall be carried out in 9 States, selected by the Comptroller General in the discretion of the Comptroller General, based on a good variety of demographics, economics and geographics.

(3) The program shall conclude after the expiration of the 9-month period, and before

the expiration of the 1-year period, beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) RESULTS OF PROGRAM.—Promptly after the conclusion of the program, the Comptroller General shall—

(1) describe the extent to which data collected under subsection (a) can be analyzed under current reporting requirements to identify the aggregate number and aggregate cost of each specific food item purchased with supplemental nutrition assistance benefits;

(2) indicate which additional information should be collected in order to obtain the aggregate number of and cost of each specific food item purchased with supplemental nutrition assistance benefits;

(3) make recommendations necessary to improve the current benefit redemption data reporting requirements to enable the Secretary to publish on the Internet in a searchable, comparable database available to the public, the aggregate number and aggregate cost of each specific food item purchased with supplemental nutrition assistance benefits; and

(4) publish the data collected under subsection(a) on the Internet in a searchable, comparable database available to the public.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

My amendment is simple. This amendment finally brings some transparency and public accountability to the 80-plus billion dollar food stamp program. It directs the Government Accountability Office to establish a pilot program in nine States that will allow the GAO to collect and make public information showing how our food stamp dollars are being spent.

As a prosecutor, I presented all of the facts to the jury so that they were able to make an accurate decision based on the evidence. It is inconceivable to me that at a time when all Americans are demanding accountability and transparency in government, we are allowing 80-plus billion dollars a year to go out the door with virtually no idea on how it is being spent. To put that into context, $80 billion a year is more than double the amount of money the Department of Homeland Security received in the appropriation bill we approved on June 6 and roughly the same amount that was cut by sequester.

I have had several interesting arguments made to me against this bill, driven primarily by Big Business, who are more interested in protecting profits rather than taxpayers. Opponents have argued that this would be costly for retailers to implement.

First, the information required to be reported and made public is information that retailers are already required to keep under existing law. I also find it ironic that opponents are arguing that because there may be a compliance cost for a program that is voluntary for retailers, we should just forego any meaningful oversight over how these taxpayer dollars are being spent.

Some opponents claim that this is food surveillance. This amendment is not food surveillance; it is oversight and accountability. At a time of high debt and deficit, it is incumbent on Congress to scrutinize fully every Federal dollar spent.

I have also heard opponents argue that SNAP is efficient because USDA says that it only has a 3.8 percent error rate. This is a false, red herring argument that is meant to distract from what this amendment would do. The error rate referred to involves the percentage of benefits that either went to ineligible households or went to eligible households, but in excessive amounts. The error rate has nothing to do with how the taxpayer dollars are spent.

Having that information is critical, especially as we debate things like how much to scale back the SNAP program or whether it is inappropriate to allow the purchase of certain items with SNAP dollars. I have heard that there were no hearings about the SNAP program in conjunction with this FARRM Bill. I agree that there should have been hearings. Nevertheless, those hearings would be more productive if they had all the information as to how programs are operating.

My amendment would give us and the American people the ability to make informed policy decisions about the program. That is why my amendment is supported by a range of groups from the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine to Americans for Limited Government.

Mr. Chairman, I want to again emphasize that this amendment is about transparency. It is about oversight and accountability. We have to have the facts at our disposal to determine what, if anything, to do. It is about good government.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most terrible amendments that has ever been brought before this House of Representatives. It goes against the very grain of what America is about.

I don't care if you're rich. I don't care if you're poor. I don't care if you're in the service. I don't care if you have to have SNAP. You are an American. And Americans today if they're tired of one thing, they're tired of the government prying into their lives under surveillance that's happening right now on the 6 o'clock news, in our major papers. The one thing is the mistrust of a government-surveillance program. This has everything to do with surveillance. That's exactly what it is. It's a food surveillance program from my good friend, Mr. TOM MARINO.

What this will do—you tell me if it isn't—it will require retail food stores to monitor, to put in a surveillance system, to collect and report back to the Secretary of Agriculture detailed information that identifies what food items, what type, what size of purchase by those who are on SNAP.

This isn't about SNAP. You've gone into the grocery stores. Everybody goes into that grocery store as an American to purchase, to buy the food, the basic things that he needs to survive. You can't put surveillance on the SNAP person without putting surveillance on every American that goes into that store. How asinine such an amendment this is in this eagerness of this declaring of war on SNAP recipients.

□ 1950

We are declaring a war on the soul of America itself. And I don't care if you're liberal; I don't care if you're moderate or you are conservative. Every American ought to be concerned about this. You're not going to be able to put a surveillance program over what the SNAP folks get without putting a surveillance program over all Americans. Just think about how big our system is, and the statistics bear it out. Right now, there are 460,000 different items on the market shelves. There are 15,000 new ones going on every year. What's going to happen there?

And for the consumers, there's going to be a cost. Yes, there's going to be a cost. These retailers don't go and print money and make it. Do you know who is going to pay for the cost of this surveillance program that is unneeded? It's going to be the customers.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, and with all due respect to the gentleman, let us ease this war against the poorest who are among us. I remind everybody every day that the fastest growing group of recipients who are receiving benefits from food stamps are our veterans, the very ones who've gone and put their lives on the line, who come back maimed, that have to depend on food stamps, who went and fought overseas so we could be free from surveillance, and here's an amendment that wants to put surveillance on them.

Let's look at this and see it for what it is. It is an awful surveillance program. And I have respect for the gentleman, but this amendment is totally misguided and does great damage to the heart and the soul of this Nation, because you cannot discriminate going into those grocery stores against the poor recipient of SNAP without discriminating and taking away the freedoms of every single American.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MARINO. You know, keeping track of this, it's already done by a bar code, so there's no additional cost. And

there's no surveillance. There's no cameras. There's nothing checking on anybody. We're not asking who is buying. We're asking what is being purchased. With my colleagues, it's always a war. It's a war on women, and now it's a war on people using food stamps.

We should be doing this anyhow. It's a law that should be done by the stores. It is just not being enforced. Hardworking taxpayers deserve accountability. They deserve to know how their $80 billion is being spent and on what. I wonder what my friend across the aisle is concerned about, perhaps what the results will show. But we don't know at this point. The American people are entitled to know how their money is being spent.

As I said, there's no cost associated with this. They're doing it by bar code anyhow. Everything that goes through a store now is bar coded, so it's just reporting the information. If anything is misguided, what is misguided is $80 billion in 2012 and $82.5 billion projected in 2013 that's going to be spent and there is no accountability for it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4033. EXPUNGEMENT OF UNSUED SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS.

Section 11 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020), as amended by section 4015, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(w) EXPUNGEMENT OF UNUSED BENEFTIS.—The State agency shall expunge from the EBT account of a household benefits that are not used before the expiration of the 60-day period beginning on the date such benefits are posted to such account.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

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

I introduced this amendment to reform the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP program, and specifically the electronic benefit transfer account program within the SNAP or within the food stamp program.

The SNAP, or food stamp program, is in dire need of reform, and I think most people realize that and many have spoken out about that already. Under the current administration, the Obama administration, the number of people on food stamps has increased by 16.5 million persons. In 2011, the SNAP program handed out $84 billion in food stamps in 1 year alone. The SNAP program is now the second most expensive—after Medicaid—program, and it is the fastest growing of all the Federal Government's 80 welfare programs. This cost is unsustainable. Reforms can be made without impacting, in my belief, those who truly need assistance; and there are some who truly need assistance, and we ought to help them.

Under current law, unused benefits are rolled over each month and can pile up for an entire year. The current law is terribly flawed and encourages fraud and abuse. My amendment would increase the integrity of the program by ending the rollover and recouping leftover benefits. Instead of allowing benefits to remain unused in an account for an entire year, my amendment would return unused SNAP or unused food stamp money or benefits to the U.S. Treasury after 60 days, 2 months, which I believe is a reasonable period of time.

Those actually using the benefits or those truly in need would not be impacted. The intent of SNAP, or food stamps, is to assist those in need on an as-needed basis. If a recipient hasn't utilized all their benefits, those benefits could be used to help others who do need them or used to reduce our almost $17 trillion national debt.

Clearly, this is a program in need of reform. My amendment addresses the out-of-control growth we have witnessed with this program over the past 4 years, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHABOT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to say, on behalf of the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for bringing this good government amendment before us today. Current law states that a State agency must return unused benefits to the Treasury after a 12-month period of inactivity. The gentleman's amendment simply shortens that time period that a SNAP recipient has to claim their benefits to 60 days.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this commonsense amendment.

Mr. CHABOT. I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to claim the time in opposition? If not, the gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I would also note that almost 80 percent of the farm bill—we're spending about a trillion dollars overall—goes to the food stamp program. So we're talking about a very significant part of the overall farm bill.

The GAO notes in a report:

It's inconclusive regarding whether SNAP, or food stamps, alleviates hunger and malnutrition in low-income households.

Think about that. It's inconclusive whether it actually reduces hunger or malnutrition. And the people that it's supposed to be helping, which is low-income households, if that's the case, why are we spending all these dollars? This doesn't go to the entire food stamp program, obviously; it just goes to a certain item, and that is reducing from a year, allowing those dollars to pile up, to a reasonable time, which is 2 months.

I would also note that the GAO report goes on to say that the amount of SNAP money paid in error is substantial, totaling in the billions of dollars.

□ 2000

So it's clearly something that should be reformed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4033. TERMINATION OF EXISTING AGREEMENT.

Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the memorandum of understanding entered into on July 22, 2004, by the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Mexico and known as the ''Partnership for Nutrition Assistance Initiative'' is null and void.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today to speak in support of my amendment to officially end the agreement between the USDA and the Mexican Government known as the Partnership for Nutrition Assistance Initiative.

Now, this partnership began back in 2004, but it has greatly expanded under the Obama administration. It's an aggressive outreach program funded by

U.S. taxpayer dollars which promotes SNAP enrollment in targeted communities by partnering with Mexican Government officials to hold meetings, health fairs, and coordinate other outreach initiatives designed to bring working-class families into public assistance and dependence programs.

Not only is this an ill-conceived partnership with Mexico promoting a life of dependency rather than upward mobility, there is no reason to believe that the Obama administration isn't just using this partnership as a way to get illegal immigrants enrolled in the SNAP program.

This current partnership is among the most egregious examples of policies contributing to the 46 percent expansion in SNAP recipients under the Obama administration, and it must stop now.

My amendment today is an opportunity for Congress to be good stewards of our taxpayer dollars, our hardworking taxpayer dollars, and to get the U.S. Government out of the business of promoting dependence.

I urge my colleagues today to vote in support of my amendment to terminate this partnership with the Mexican Government. Let's stop this blatant misuse of the taxpayer dollars so that SNAP is there for those who have fallen on hard times and truly need temporary assistance, not for exploitation by foreign governments.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for yielding.

And on behalf of the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, I would like to thank her for bringing this amendment to void the partnership with the Mexican Government that promotes participation in the SNAP program.

We support this amendment, and urge our colleagues to vote ''yes.''

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

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member seek time in opposition? If not, the gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, this is so important that we are assured that our hardworking taxpayer dollars are used for those that are the most in need, as a safety net, and not to be given to foreign governments. And so I ask support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 4402(a) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3007(a)), as added by section 4201 of subtitle C of title IV—

(1) in paragraph (2) strike the close quotation and the period at the end, and

(2) add at the end the following:

''(3) REQUIREMENT.—Not less than 50 percent of the funds made available to carry out this section in any fiscal year shall be used to provide assistance to seniors.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the chairman, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I'm offering today would create a clear set-aside for senior citizens in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program.

Senior hunger is a serious and growing problem, sadly, in our country. Feeding America estimates nearly 5 million seniors—5 million; 1 in 12—in 2011 were food insecure, double the number in 2001. With prices up and with what's happening across this country, we know that that number is not the top, but probably the base, and it's probably more.

So, senior hunger is a growing problem, and we know the costs of food are up. In fact, 6 percent of households with an elderly person are definitely food insecure, and we know that women over the age of 85 have a poverty rate of 13.8 percent. That means elderly women have the second-highest poverty rate in the Nation.

This is a great country. No single senior citizen in our country should ever have to worry about food.

I remember one senior center that I went to for a small little lunch, and they put these tiny sandwiches on the plate, and they cut them in half. And I remember a senior woman, very frail, very elderly, she took half a sandwich and ate it, and then when she thought no one else was looking, she wrapped up the other half of the sandwich and put it in her purse.

Unless you really see it, you don't realize how painful it is for millions of seniors across our country. Senior hunger has a health impact because food insecurity among elders causes more headaches, more dehydration, more disability, more decreases in resistance to infection, more high blood pressure and extended hospital stays.

In fact, food-insecure elderly persons have been found to be over two times more likely to report poor or fair health. Ultimately, the health impact of hunger results in higher health care costs.

In an effort to help address this serious problem of senior hunger, Congress created the Senior Farmers' Market Nutrition Program. It is a very popular and very effective program. It is so small and meagerly funded it doesn't even function in every congressional district in this country.

But the program is a home run for seniors who need help, and it's a home run for local producers. The program brings together needy seniors, who purchase fresh and nutritious, locally-grown fruits, vegetables, honey and herbs at their local farmers markets, roadside stands and community-supported agriculture programs.

In effect, seniors help farmers and farmers help seniors. Farmers expand their customer base, and seniors buy fresh vegetables, fresh fruits, fresh honey, locally produced, which helps to combat many allergies which are growing across this country and, obviously, herbs.

The program helps local food production because farmers sell their agricultural products locally, at local places, with direct marketing.

There are similar programs for WIC participants but, unfortunately, the discretionary funding for the program has been declining. It is my hope that as we go to conference with the Senate we can look at the changes in the underlying bill and increase mandatory funding for a unified program.

From my perspective, a unified program holds the potential to serve the more needy seniors, which will help combat senior hunger. Given the damage sequestration is doing to Meals on Wheels and other senior assistance programs, I hope we can work on a bipartisan basis to support our seniors, the most vulnerable among us.

I urge adoption of the amendment, and reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Who claims time in opposition?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I have been given every indication that this amendment is going to be acceptable to both sides, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In subtitle C of title IV, strike section 4207.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 2010

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sure this is true for all of us in the body, both on the

right and the left. As we grind through the amendments and look at them, we, on occasion, come across an amendment that you can actually see where it was well meaning. It may have had a good heart behind it, but when you sort of dice it up, you start to actually understand both something from a personal basis almost borders on the humorous side but also structurally has some real problems.

I stand up today trying to remove some language, the Healthy Food Financing Initiative. Look, we will have some Members who will say it's only $125 million, but understand that $125 million may be used to buy a grocery store to subsidize certain healthy food products in areas where the program deems there is a shortage of such.

Where there is an amazing irony is, okay, we want healthy foods. There are some areas that the products that may be available in those areas we deem not to be particularly nutritious, but that may be because in our commodity subsidy system, what's in our grocery stores? The fact of the matter, processed foods, because we subsidize commodities. Then I go in and say, But my solution is I'm going to create another subsidy to take care of the problem on the other side. At some point, you've got to be willing to take a step back and see the irony of this.

But there are also other structural problems. We're basically taking taxpayer money, and through a sort of a network, you may find a private grocery store being financed by taxpayer money. You may be finding the system where certain foods and certain retailers are being financed by taxpayer money just because it's designated as an area where these products don't exist.

So with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FUDGE. I rise in opposition to the Schweikert amendment to strike the Healthy Food Financing Initiative.

Let me just say that not only is it well meaning, it works. And it's about time this Congress does something that is proven to work.

This amendment removes from the farm bill bipartisan language that I successfully championed during the House farm bill markup. The Healthy Food Financing Initiative outlines a comprehensive Federal response to addressing the limited and inequitable access to healthy foods in low-income communities in both rural and urban America.

It does this through the creation of a national fund manager housed within USDA that would improve access to healthy foods, create quality jobs, and revitalize low-income communities by providing loans and grants to eligible food retailers.

Nearly 30 million people live in low-income areas more than 1 mile from a supermarket, which means they lack adequate access to fresh, healthy, and affordable food. It comes as no surprise that these same people are less likely to have a healthy diet than those with better access. Barriers to healthy food have worsened the growing epidemic of obesity, diabetes, and other diet-related health problems in these communities.

The Healthy Food Financing Initiative would combat the lack of healthy food retail through a public-private initiative that would allow for the leveraging of millions of private capital at the national level—something that my colleagues talk about all of the time.

HFFI provides one-time loans and grant financing to attract grocery stores and other fresh fruit retail to renovate and expand existing stores so they can provide the healthy foods that communities want and need. This financing will help local businesses through loans and tailored financing packages that are not readily available.

Healthy food retail increases and stabilizes home values in nearby neighborhoods. It generates local tax revenues, provides workforce training and development, and promotes additional spending in the local economy generated by the store and the new jobs it creates. It actually has a multiplier effect.

To know that this works, we just need to look at Pennsylvania. A similar program that began there in 2004 resulted in 88 projects being built or renovated in underserved urban and rural communities across the State. Today, more than 5,000 jobs have been created—and I know we all want to create jobs—have been created or retained, and 400,000 people now have increased access to healthy food. Thirty million invested by the State has resulted in projects totalling more than $190 million.

The Pennsylvania program success rate has been better than the grocery industry overall. Federal, State, and many city governments are enacting legislation and policies to attract healthy food retail. There is tremendous momentum around the country right now to bring grocery stores to places that need them.

Also, a diverse group of nearly 100 stakeholders support this bill, including PolicyLink, The Reinvestment Fund, The Food Trust, and the National Grocers Association; and numerous agriculture, health, civil rights, and industry groups support this bill.

The Senate supports HFFI—not his bill. The Senate has recognized the case for HFFI and included this text in their bill.

Food access is a critical problem. The good news is that we know what to do and we can do it. I ask that you stand with me in defending this HFFI by opposing the Schweikert amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve to close.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio has the right to close as a member of the committee.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, to the gentlelady from Ohio, you hit a couple points that I absolutely agree on.

We have a horrible obesity epidemic. We have a crisis of nutrition of what people consume. If you really care about those things, then you would actually look at the farm bill overall and what we do in this country to distort what we consume. Walk down your grocery store aisles and you will see what we've done by more government policy.

But the fact of the matter is you, in many ways, make your own argument. If there is actually a program that you believe is working at all in Pennsylvania, then you've demonstrated the States are capable of doing this. But, once again, to take another $125 million of Federal money to create another program that ultimately actually does things like buys a grocery store, I mean actually competes with a private business, I see something that's almost absurd in that if that's the way that this amendment ultimately works.

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

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the gentleman.

First, let me just say that certainly we can agree to disagree. But let's be honest. We are not buying grocery stores. It is not accurate to say to the American people that is what we are doing, Mr. Chairman. So let me just make that clear.

Secondly, if we have something that works and we know that our people are in need, then I think that we should make it something that all of us can agree to do.

Now, every State is not in the same situation. Every State doesn't have the same kind of vision that maybe the State of Pennsylvania had, but there are a lot of things that the States can do that they don't do and that all States don't do. So we want to make sure that every American has the opportunity to have decent, healthy food.

So I think that this is, in fact, a good start. My bill was passed bipartisan. I think it's good. I think that for someone to just come up and take potshots at something that they don't even clearly understand is unfair to the American people, because if it was understood, they would know that we are not buying grocery stores.

Mr. BURGESS. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. FUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I would just say, Members, you know your districts. Some of you do have food deserts, whether you be in rural or urban areas.

This is important. We want people to spend those food stamp dollars wisely.

This gives them an opportunity to do so. This is not a Democrat or Republican issue. This is a commonsense, good health issue. We should defeat the Schweikert amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. May I request my remaining time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, it may be a little unprecedented, but I wanted to actually give my friend, Dr. BURGESS, even though he is on the other side, 30 seconds of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It seems a little strange for me to be lecturing you about a desert, but, Mr. Chairman, it is true. There are food deserts in both Republican and Democratic districts all over this country, people without access to fresh foods or healthy foods.

Look, I don't think it's right that people buy processed foods and soft drinks with food stamps, but if they've got no other choice, what are they going to do?

□ 2020

This initiative allows people to have the option to purchase healthy foods, get those micronutrients that they need to keep them healthy. Let's keep them out of the doctor's office. Let's keep them out of the hospital.

I thank the gentleman for the recognition. I urge defeat of the Schweikert amendment.

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I will try to be fast at this.

To the gentlewoman from Ohio, actually, I want to be careful in my language because I did say purchase grocery stores. It's basically finance their acquisitions through loans and other mechanics. It would be unfair to use the Solyndra type, but it is that mechanic of doing those loan mechanics and those things. And functionally, the taxpayers do have money out and risk in that fashion.

Look, for many of us here, we see an amendment like this, we see the well-meaning nature of it, but the underlying cause of much of this is the global policy we engage in—and we have for 60, 70 years.

We seem to be, if you look at all the amendments and really dig through this farm bill, I believe you will see layer after layer after layer where we're trying to fix sins that we created with our last attempt to fix a mistake.

I appreciate we have a crisis in parts of our country—whether it be access to healthy foods, whether it be obesity—but a $125 million program that creates special grants, special purchases, special loans, this isn't the way you get there to fix that.

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 31 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. TIERNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 375, line 5, insert ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''Section''.

Page 375, after line 6, insert the following:

(1) by inserting ''or commercial fishing'' after ''aquaculture'' the 1st place it appears;

(2) by striking ''or aquaculture'' each place it appears and inserting ''aquaculture, or commercial fishing'';

Page 375, line 7, strike ''(1)'' and insert ''(3)''.

Page 375, line 15, strike ''(2)'' and insert ''(4)''.

Page 375, line 19, strike ''(3)'' and insert ''(5)''.

Page 375, line 22, strike ''(4)'' and insert ''(6)''.

Page 376, line 1, strike ''(5)'' and insert ''(7)''.

Page 376, line 3, strike ''(6)'' and insert ''(8)''.

Page 376, after line 10, insert the following:

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 329 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1970) is amended by striking ''or aquaculture'' and inserting ''aquaculture, or commercial fishing''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, right now, fishermen in Gloucester, Massachusetts—which is in my district—and across the country are facing dire circumstances. There have been devastating cuts to the allowable catch of a number of crucial stocks; for instance, a 78 percent cut in Gulf of Maine cod, a 61 percent cut to Georges Bank cod. Consequently, some of these fishermen already have been forced to sell their boats and their permits, while others feel that they will soon be out of business.

Many of my Massachusetts colleagues and I have been doing everything we can to help these fishermen and their families. We've offered amendments to last year's disaster relief appropriations bill for those fishermen in Massachusetts and the several other States that were officially declared fisheries disasters by the Department of Commerce, but to no avail.

I filed legislation to redirect a portion of the tariffs that the United States collects on imported fish to provide urgently needed financial assistance for our fishermen, but that matter has yet to come up.

A number of us are working to responsibly reform the underlying Federal statute—the Magnuson-Stevens Act—that governs our Nation's fisheries so the law is more flexible and fairer toward our fishermen, but of course that is somewhere down the road.

I don't think we can stop there, and that's why I—along with Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. TIM BISHOP and Ms. SHEA-PORTER—am offering this amendment today to ensure our fishermen have access to the USDA's emergency disaster loan program.

We're essentially doing away with an inequity in the law that denies fishermen the ability to apply through the normal procedures for a loan under Federal emergency standards. A similar provision was included in the Senate-approved farm bill, and our work to provide financial relief to our fishermen and reform the law will certainly continue in the weeks and months ahead. But in the meantime, this is a small and important step that's intended to help those in our local community who are struggling.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I must oppose, with respect, the gentleman's amendment.

The addition of commercial fishing operations, which have traditionally not been recognized in FSA lending programs, unnecessarily extend the limits of an already oversubscribed lender. Commercial fishermen in need of disaster assistance are already able to apply for loans from both Farm Credit and the Small Business Administration.

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, we are basically trying to settle an inequity here where the loans that are available to the fishermen of course are at 3 percent or 4 percent, not the 2.25 percent. That would make a substantial difference to them if they were there. And we're not giving them any preference over anybody else, they would just get the equitable right to apply for and seek those loans.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TIERNEY. I just reiterate what I said earlier, Mr. Chairman. These people are in dire straits. There has been

nothing that we've been able to do. Even though they've been declared eligible for disaster relief, this Congress has yet to afford them any of that relief.

The fleets are shrinking. They are going out of business. They have all sorts of debt and problems with their gear and their property on that. They need the access to this low-interest loan at 2.25 percent. It gives them no more preference than anybody else on this, and it makes available to them a much needed supply. It is passed, it's in the Senate version. The Senate version score showed there was no increase in the scoring on that.

I would hope that my colleagues would have some compassion for the fishing industry as they do for others in this country that are in this type of situation.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his input on this.

I continue to oppose the amendment. I certainly sympathize with those affected by disaster. But given the current fiscal environment, it just defies common sense to implement new, duplicative lending programs.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. COSTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 379, line 23, insert ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''Section''.

Page 380, after line 2, insert the following:

(b) PILOT PROGRAM FOR TECHNCAL ASSISTANCE TO ADDRESS NITRATE CONTAMINATION OF RURAL DRINKING WATER.—Section 306(a)(2)(B) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(2)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(viii) PILOT PROGRAM FOR TECHNCAL ASSISTANCE TO ADDRESS NITRATE CONTAMINATION OF RURAL DRINKINGWATER.—Using amounts made available to carry out this subparagraph, the Secretary, acting through the Rural Utilities Service, shall conduct a pilot program under which the Secretary shall provide grants and technical assistance for disadvantaged communities in rural areas and in cities and towns with a population of less than 10,000 individuals where drinking water is impaired by nitrate contamination.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, it is oftentimes the poorest and some of the most underrepresented communities in the country that have the greatest impacts—for historical reasons, in part—on public health, communities across the country we all represent.

I represent a number of those communities in California in the San Joaquin Valley that are experiencing enormous challenges as it relates to their water quality and contamination that has existed because of decades-past experiences in many cases with nitrates, in which at the time it was not well understood, but today it is, that in fact it has tremendous impacts on our drinking water supply as it relates to our aquifers.

The amendment that is proposed is intended to address this problem by creating a pilot program for severely disadvantaged communities that would provide funds in this FARRM Bill for the Rural Utility Service that would address this nitrate contamination for rural drinking water communities, those communities that we all represent that have 10,000 population or less.

The San Joaquin Valley that Congressman VALADAO and I and others represent has almost 4 million people. It's almost 10 percent of California's population. Twenty percent of those folks live below the poverty line. They reflect a broad cross-range of folks—immigrants past, immigrants present—who have come here to live the American Dream and work so hard, so many in our agriculture economy.

While nitrates occur naturally at low levels, crop fertilizers and practices with both dairy and other animal husbandry practices create nitrates that in fact impact the elevation of the contamination within our drinking water sources within our aquifers.

□ 2030

In fact, California's Central Valley is especially vulnerable to that nitrate contamination since it accounts for more than half of the agriculture production in California and aquifers are the primary source of drinking water for 90 percent of the residents.

Unfortunately, in the past, have didn't have strong controls, and we didn't really understand the science. Today, we do.

It is often difficult to identify a single party that is responsible for the impacts; but what is most important is that we fix the problem, that we clean the water supply for those residents.

Today, we have, I think, a better balance between public health and the impact of agricultural practices.

This amendment, if adopted, would provide the opportunity to focus on assisting disadvantaged communities with improving their drinking water that has been contaminated by nitrates.

I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) and his amendment.

Ground water provides drinking water for more than one half of the Nation's population and is the only source of drinking water for many rural communities, like those in my Central Valley congressional district. Many do not have access to a clean, safe supply of water and are unable to access the funding or resources necessary to develop sustainable water supplies and improve their water infrastructure.

In the Central Valley, nitrate contamination is all too common. While contamination can occur for many reasons, oftentimes no one is directly responsible. Clean-up costs are then borne by the affected community.

Through my position on the House Appropriations Committee, I worked to ensure language was included in the House agricultural appropriations bill to require the Department of Agriculture to provide a report to the Appropriations Committee regarding their programs and outreach efforts to disadvantaged communities who are impacted by water supply issues.

Every family in America should have clean drinking water. Anything less is unacceptable.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTA. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate that.

On behalf of Chairman LUCAS, I certainly want to extend my appreciation for the gentleman's work on this issue. If the gentleman will be willing to withdraw his amendment, I have been assured by the chairman that he is more than willing to work with you on this important issue.

Mr. COSTA. Yes, Congressman CRAWFORD, I will be more than willing to yield to Chairman LUCAS and to Ranking Member PETERSON. We appreciate your willingness to work with us together on this effort to ensure that we can deliver resources that are important to our small communities throughout the country that are impacted in this way. I will withdraw the amendment and continue to work with you.

The ACTING CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 394, strike line 11 and all that follows through page 396, line 17.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise this evening to urge my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment to H.R. 1947, the FARRM Act of 2013. My amendment is very straightforward in that it would simply strike section 6105 from the underlying bill. This is the section of the FARRM Bill that reauthorizes the Rural Broadband Access Loan and Loan Guarantee Program at RUS, Rural Utilities Services, at USDA at a cost of $25 million each fiscal year over the next 5, subject to appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, this program was first authorized by the 2002 farm bill with the goal of deploying broadband to rural and unserved areas. Despite this goal, the rural broadband loan program has been riddled—riddled—with numerous problems.

In the 112th Congress, I was a member of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Communications and Technology. During a hearing held in the subcommittee in February of 2011, I first learned of problems within this program. USDA Inspector General Phyllis Fong testified on a variety of issues at RUS that prevented it from being effective. She testified that in the 2005 OIG audit of the program, of the 159 of the 240 communities associated with loans in 2004, 66 percent of the loans already had preexisting broadband service in contravention of the statutory intention of these funds.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the problems were only exacerbated in the 2009 OIG audit. Of the 14 recommendations made by OIG in 2005, RUS only took action on six of them. Between 2005 and 2009, RUS made loans to broadband providers serving 148 communities within 30 miles of urban areas with 200,000 or more residents. Furthermore, RUS approved 34 of 37 applications for providers with service lines already existing.

Mr. Chairman, although there were reforms made in the 2008 farm bill that were finally enacted earlier this year, I am still very skeptical of the need for this program when it has consistently demonstrated its inability to achieve its objective.

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

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

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to our chairman of the Agriculture Committee and to our staff, I deeply appreciate all the work on this farm bill. I am proud to have been associated with it.

I will say to the gentleman from Georgia, who just moments ago cited data from about a decade ago and then a report from 2009, I acknowledge the challenges with the program. However, as the gentleman mentioned, a couple of developments that have occurred are, first of all, implementation that has occurred just several months ago that addressed the points that were made in an IG report, and also the fact that in the underlying language—and I will thank the chairman—we incorporated other measures that deal with transparency and clarification that were talking about unserved areas.

So I would say to the gentleman, and I appreciate him very much, but I want to tell you that this program is really important to districts like mine. The FCC claims that there are up to 19 million Americans who do not have access to high-speed broadband. The place that I represent in upstate New York, we've got many communities that don't have access to high-speed broadband. A program such as this has been helpful and will be helpful going forward.

I want to remind everyone—it is worth pointing out—that this is a loan program that is paid back with interest. This expanding broadband helps us not only with job creation, but it helps us with health care delivery, it helps us with education, and overall quality of life. I know that even in your own State this has been a program that has done some good, certainly needed reform, and has happened, reform has come about.

What I would say to the gentleman is I appreciate his concern for the taxpayer, I share that concern, and believe that we have made significant progress with regard to transparency, efficacy in the program, and want to see us continue this program because we need to move forward and continue to—just as we did with electrification for this country—to see all communities have access to high-speed broadband.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I would like to yield myself such time as I may consume.

I remind my good friend from New York that Solyndra was a loan program, too, that was supposed to be paid back with interest. I offer this amendment because there is something better—there is something better.

□ 2040

I certainly understand and I appreciate the efforts taken by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee for creating further transparency with the RUS Rural Broadband Loan Program. However, despite these improvements, I am still incredibly skeptical of this program.

Mr. Chairman, since its inception, Congress has appropriated nearly $130 million in taxpayer dollars towards this program, and I feel that RUS has consistently missed the mark. On the other hand—and this is the alternative—in 2011, the FCC, the Federal Communications Commission, under existing statutory authority, fundamentally changed the nature of the Universal Service Fund and created the Connect America Fund with essentially the same goal as the Rural Broadband Loan Program. The Connect America Fund is a different entity, and the FCC announced last month that $485 million of that fund, which is rooted not in increased taxes but in user fees, will be dedicated to unserved areas for broadband deployment.

Mr. Chairman, I do believe that the FCC is in a better position than the USDA to implement telecommunications policy, and over the life of the Rural Broadband Loan Program, USDA has only confirmed my cynicism.

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

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. GIBSON. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have the privilege every evening to travel back to the northern neck of Virginia. It's just an hour and a half from D.C., and that area is not served by broadband. We all know how important it is to have that service. Folks there are stuck with 1990s' technology—dial-up. If you've ever had to deal with that, you know how frustrating that is. We know for rural areas that economic development, job creation and educational opportunities are all tied to broadband access. Granted, there may be challenges with the Rural Utilities Service program, but, nonetheless, those areas need that particular service. I want to make sure that they get that.

That's why I oppose this amendment, and I understand the gentleman's frustration with that. The RUS Broadband Loan Program does provide the needed leverage to fund construction. It also provides the ability to improve our systems in these areas and to acquire the facilities and equipment that are needed to provide broadband to these communities.

Folks, this is absolutely critical. This amendment, unfortunately, takes us away from that. I want to make sure that reforms are put in place so the system works, not taking away that opportunity for our rural areas.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Might I ask the gentleman to yield 15 seconds to me for closing?

Mr. GIBSON. I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia's time has expired.

The gentleman from New York is the only one who has time at this point.

Mr. GIBSON. How much time do I have, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GIBSON. In order to demonstrate the bipartisan nature of this amendment, I yield 30 seconds to my friend from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank my friend from New York.

I thought it so very unfair that the majority party would be fighting this out without somebody from the minority party jumping in in opposition to the proposal.

I am delighted that the FCC has provided $400-plus million for what is a very essential service. I am also very happy that the Department of Agriculture continues with the program in which they have a unique ability to reach out to these rural communities. The Department of Agriculture has the men, the women and the organizational structure to provide direct access and direct service. Perhaps—just perhaps—the Department of Agriculture program, together with the FCC program, might actually get the job done. It's very, very important.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I ask the gentleman again if he would yield 15 seconds.

Mr. GIBSON. I will yield in just a second. I will be happy to do it. Let me first yield 30 seconds to our acting chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman from New York.

I had the opportunity to discuss this with the gentleman from Georgia prior to debate.

As I understand it, if you are still of the mind and would like to consider withdrawing your amendment, I would gladly yield the balance of my time to allow you to do that.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York controls the time.

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I will go ahead and do that.

I believe that it is critically important to eliminate duplicative programs. It was just mentioned from the other side of the aisle that, with both programs, duplication is unnecessary with the changes in the Connect America Fund. I believe that the Rural Broadband Loan Program will only become more obsolete. Therefore, I believe that we must act now to eliminate the authorization of this program, and I do urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. GIBSON. I appreciate the debate here, but I will just end where I began.

I think that there have been significant improvements that have been made over time. I appreciate both the chairman and the ranking member for allowing us to improve this program.

This is a program that's going to particularly help small companies so that we can build out broadband. It will be good for job creation and good for rural America. It's going to be good for health care delivery, and it's going to be good for education. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 36 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 444, after line 18, insert the following:

SEC. 73___. AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION PARTNERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM FOR REGIONAL COLLABORATION AND INNOVATIVE VENTURE DEVELOPMENT TRAINING.

Subtitle A of title VI of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 is amended by adding after section 604 (7 U.S.C. 7642) the following:

"SEC. 605. AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION PARTNERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM FOR REGIONAL COLLABORATION AND INNOVATIVE VENTURE DEVELOPMENT TRAINING.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds made available under this section shall be used to provide regional collaborations, technology transfer and commercialization, and innovative venture development training under the Agricultural Technology Innovation Partnership program of the Office of Technology Transfer in the Agricultural Research Service.

''(b) FUNDING.—Of the funds made available to the Agricultural Research Service, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section $500,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

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

I rise today to discuss my amendment, which ensures adequate funding for a valuable program already authorized within this farm bill.

My amendment would simply provide the funding of the Agricultural Technology Innovation Partnership from the funds already available for that purpose. As a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, we often discuss the significant role technological advancements play in maintaining U.S. competitiveness among global industries and growing our economy. My amendment is simple. It adds absolutely no extra cost to this bill or to the taxpayer. It authorizes existing funds within the agricultural research program budget to support the ATIP program, which has already been established by the USDA.

For those of you unfamiliar with the program, the Agricultural Technology Innovation Partnership, ATIP, is a partnership set up to harness the research and development capabilities and innovations of USDA's research programs for technology-based economic development.

Adequate funding for the program will enable the integration of research from academic, government and industry institutes, and will help develop relationships with outside businesses and private investors. Establishing these relationships will allow the agriculture industry to assist in guiding USDA to conduct research most beneficial to the industry as well as providing the agriculture industry quick access to new and innovative findings within USDA's research as it becomes available.

The program allows the advancement of transferring groundbreaking ideas and results from research labs into the commercial sector, which will maintain the growth of the industry as well as our economy. It is important for the U.S. to remain competitive in today's global agriculture marketplace, and in order to do this, we must lead the way in research and innovation. I believe this amendment is a step to ensure that this tool is being fully utilized.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would statutorily authorize a pilot program at $500,000. It's my understanding that USDA is already doing this without statutory capability. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in this matter, but there is really no reason to legislate on an issue that the administration has the capability to do.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2050

I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. I'm not sure I'll need 2 minutes.

This is basically an earmark, and basically all kinds of people want to put in bills to allocate their money to ARS. We don't have enough research money for wheat and whatever else.

We can't be doing this because it's going against everything else that was agreed to. I thought you guys had decided we weren't going to have any earmarks, we weren't going to do these kinds of things. So I would hope that

we would not support this amendment, and I join the gentleman from Arkansas in opposing it.

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chairman, in drafting this amendment, I saw nowhere where it would actually be considered an earmark. I'm definitely opposed to earmarks in this Congress, and it doesn't specify an entity in a certain State or a certain location.

If you just want to tag something as an earmark just to kill an amendment, explain why this amendment may be bad, but don't just sit there and say this is an earmark just because everybody is going to run from it. I see no reason why it would be considered such.

But if the gentleman from Arkansas will work with me in addressing this to possibly pursue this in the final legislation, I would definitely consider withdrawing my amendment.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi, and I feel like the chairman would certainly be of the mind to work with the gentleman from Mississippi on this if he is inclined to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. PALAZZO. I am, Mr. Chairman.

So with that, I withdraw my amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 475, after line 15, add the following new section:

SEC. 7605. LEGITIMACY OF INDUSTRIAL HEMP RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988 (41 U.S.C. 8101 et seq.), the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1986 (20 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), or any other Federal law, an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)) may grow or cultivate industrial hemp if—

(1) the industrial hemp is grown or cultivated for purposes of agricultural research or other academic research; and

(2) the growing or cultivating of industrial hemp is allowed under the laws of the State in which such institution of higher education is located and such research occurs.

(b) INDUSTRIAL HEMP DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''industrial hemp'' means the plant *Cannabis sativa L.* and any part of such plant, whether growing or not, with a delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol concentration of not more than 0.3 percent on a dry weight basis.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

In 1794, George Washington, our founding father, wrote to his gardener that he should ''make the most of the hemp seed and sow it everywhere.''

He wasn't alone. Thomas Jefferson grew hemp. Betsy Ross even made the first American flag out of hemp fiber. In fact, here is a flag right here that's made entirely from hemp.

Today, U.S. retailers sell over $300 million worth of hemp-related goods. It's not just flags. Hemp is found in over 25,000 products from lotions to soaps, to protein bars, to auto parts, to fuel. Yet somehow it's caught up in a completely unrelated drug war that prevents American farmers from growing this crop and forces us to import it from other countries. Our institutions of higher education can't even grow or cultivate hemp for research purposes.

Mr. Chairman, my bipartisan amendment, which I'm offering with my good friends Mr. THOMAS MASSIE and EARL BLUMENAUER is simple. It would allow colleges and universities to grow and cultivate hemp for research purposes. Our amendment would only apply in States where hemp cultivation is already legal, such as my home State of Colorado.

I recently had an exchange with the premiere agriculture research university in my district, Colorado State University. This is an area that they want to get into it, but they feel that they're prohibited; and their attorneys are telling them that unless we can make this change, they can't actually do research on what has great potential to be an important crop for Colorado.

Mr. Chairman, let me be clear about something because there's been some misleading information that's been put out there by the Drug Enforcement Agency. Hemp is not marijuana. I'm very disappointed to hear that the DEA is circulating misleading talking points that claim that somehow hemp could be used as marijuana. At the concentration levels specified in our amendment, it is physically impossible to use hemp as a drug. Let me emphasize that. It is physically impossible to use hemp as a drug.

Voters in my home State of Colorado and across the country have made it clear that they believe industrial hemp is an agricultural commodity, not a drug. Our colleges and universities are the best in the world. This is a modest step to simply allow them to research the potential benefits, downsides, strains to grow of this important agricultural commodity. There's been technology in France that allows tracers to be put in to ensure that it doesn't get contaminated with anything that includes narcotics. There's lots of research that can be done, and this amendment is a very simple and pragmatic step to do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I seek time in opposition.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's interest in the issue, but it's clear that the Agriculture Committee is not the committee of jurisdiction to be addressing the provisions of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act.

While some may consider the growth of hemp to be an agricultural endeavor, I think that there are many who feel quite differently. I would therefore oppose this amendment and urge the gentleman to seek a hearing on the issue within the appropriate committee.

I point out also that one of the concerns that we have long had is that even though the gentleman says hemp is not marijuana, I don't know if one can tell the difference when it's planted row by row out in the field. I know that's been a problem within my State when the residue of the leftover hemp from World War II became companions with the marijuana that was raised for a different purpose.

Mr. PETERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PETERSON. On that last point, the University of North Dakota, one of their ag guys up there came up with a way to splice a fluorescent gene into hemp, and North Dakota is a State where it's legal. So now the hemp that grows is fluorescent. So you can clearly tell the difference between the hemp and the marijuana. So we have solved that problem through research.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time in amazement, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. This is, of course, germane. It was ruled in order by the Rules Committee. There's no issue with the committee of jurisdiction.

I yield 1 minute to the cosponsor of the amendment, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to talk about some of the legal products that you can buy in the United States that are made with hemp.

You can buy paper, clothes, rope, food, hundreds of products. Even car panels are made out of hemp. But the great tragedy is that we cannot grow hemp in Kentucky. We can't grow industrial hemp anywhere in the United States, and so we have to import it. Where do we import it from? It comes from China. It comes from Canada. It comes from Europe.

There are many uses for hemp. There are 30 countries on this globe that can grow hemp. In fact, I believe every industrialized country in the world grows hemp. Farmers in Kentucky grew hemp during World War II. Hemp was grown in large quantities in my State of Kentucky. Canvas and rope made from hemp helped with the war effort.

So this is not about drugs. This is not about a drugs bill. This is about jobs. And for Kentucky farmers, we need the opportunity. We need the opportunity

to compete globally in a global market, and we shouldn't be denied this outlet for another productive crop in Kentucky.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to remark to the gentleman from Colorado that it wasn't a surprise to me to see that Colorado is the State that has legalized marijuana and so we also see the advocacy for this coming from the safe place. Perhaps it's a coincidence, but I'll give you two things to respond to.

The other one is the reference to George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and Betsy Ross. That's quite curious. And I don't think we advocate all the things that they might have participated in. Two out of three of those would have fit within a category of an ownership that I don't really care to bring up today, even though today is Juneteenth.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. In addition, Colorado did legalize recreational use of marijuana. It also separately has legalized industrial hemp. There are more States that have legalized industrial hemp than have done anything with regard to recreational use of marijuana or even medicinal use of marijuana. All very different issues, and States are taking them up as we speak.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I recognize that the gentleman's amendment only applies to States that have already legalized it, and that's true.

Nonetheless, I urge opposition to this amendment, Mr. Chairman, under the basis that we haven't had a full hearing on this; we don't have a knowledge base behind it; we each have our own understanding of it. Mine is a debate that I have seen that's gone on for years, which is, when you plant hemp alongside marijuana, you can't tell the difference. So it opens up the door for the recreational agriculture of the marijuana drug, and for that reason alone I oppose it. So I'd urge the gentleman to seek a hearing in the appropriate committee, and I urge the defeat of this amendment.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2100

Mr. POLIS. How much time remains on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Iowa has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, we should explore the opportunity to produce industrial hemp here in the United States. This amendment would allow us to take a first step carefully and deliberately. It will allow research institutions in our States, including my home State of Kentucky, to grow industrial hemp for the purpose of agricultural research, helping provide the information we need to consider future expansion of production.

Our States deserve this opportunity to demonstrate the usefulness and viability of this crop for our farmers. Kentucky was once the Nation's leading producer of industrial hemp. I encourage and support the passage of this amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the leadership of my friend from Colorado and my friend from Kentucky in moving this forward. Nineteen States have passed pro-industrial hemp legislation; nine States removing barriers to its production altogether. As has been pointed out, these products are perfectly legal in the United States, some $300 million a year, but it just has to be grown someplace else.

It's outrageous that American farmers can't produce it, but what this amendment does is to simply permit the research opportunities for colleges and universities to grow and cultivate hemp for academic and agricultural research purposes.

If this amendment passes and we're able to do this research in agricultural colleges and universities, then we're not going to have stupid talking points coming from DEA, and we won't have misleading statements that are made. People will understand why other countries have been able to figure this out, and the United States will be able. Nobody, regardless of your position on this, should be opposed to allowing our research colleges and universities to be able to do a deep dive to be able to find out what's possible.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the arguments that come forward from the Members here. They do come from States that have voted and expressed their support for, let's say, for the husbandry of hemp. It has a long history and it has been a useful product, but we have outlawed it for clear reasons; and that is, as I said, you can plant it alongside the recreational use marijuana and you can't tell the difference. If we are going to legalize the farming and the experimental agriculture with industrial hemp on our college campuses, that really wouldn't be the first place I would choose.

Mr. PETERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PETERSON. I'd say to the gentleman, and we may have differing views on this, but again, the University of North Dakota has spliced a gene into hemp; and I will work with the gentleman to say, if we ever do anything with this, that we'll require that that be done. And if it's grown in the United States, it has to have the gene spliced into it so it is fluorescent so you'll clearly be able to tell the difference between hemp and marijuana. I don't really know anything about marijuana, but I've been told that if you put hemp in with marijuana, it ruins it. I don't know if that's true or not. But anyway, I think there's a way to solve this.

You know, 35 percent of our cars are made out of hemp. This is a big market. We should be doing this. So let's work together, and I would like to bring you this information from North Dakota. We can solve that problem and maybe move forward.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I might want to do a night field trip up there and see that fluorescent hemp field.

Mr. PETERSON. We'll take you up there in January when it's 40 below.

Mr. KING of Iowa. This is a new piece of information for me, glow-in-the-dark hemp. I know that they have spliced a gene from a jellyfish into a monkey and it glows also in the dark, so I'm confident that the gentleman's science is accurate. But whether we can keep those who raise recreational marijuana from splicing an identical gene into their's, we've got to deal with the GMO recreational marijuana problem that would be created by this, too.

In any case, I oppose the gentleman's amendment and I urge its defeat.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 8102, relating to the Forest Legacy Program, insert before the existing text "(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—" and add at the end the following:

(b) AUTHORIZING STATES TO ALLOW QUALIFIED ORGANIZATIONS TO ACQUIRE, HOLD, AND MANAGE CONSERVATION EASEMENTS.—Subsection (l) of section 7 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103c) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) STATE AUTHORIZATION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—At the request of a State acting through the State Lead Agency,

the Secretary shall authorize the State to allow qualified organizations, as defined in section 170(h)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and organized for one or more of the purposes described in section 170(h)(4)(A) of that Code, to acquire, hold, and manage conservation easements, using funds granted to the State under this subsection, for purposes of the Forest Legacy Program in the State.

''(B) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to acquire and manage conservation easements under this paragraph, a qualified organization described in subparagraph (A) must demonstrate to the Secretary the abilities necessary to acquire, monitor, and enforce interests in forestland consistent with the Forest Legacy Program and the assessment of need for the State.

''(C) REVERSION.—If the Secretary, or a State acting through the State Lead Agency, makes any of the determinations described in subparagraph (D) with respect to a conservation easement acquired by a qualified organization under the authority of subparagraph (A)—

''(i) all right, title, and interest of the qualified organization in and to the conservation easement shall terminate; and

''(ii) all right, title, and interest in and to the conservation easement shall revert to the State or other qualified designee as approved by the State.

''(D) DETERMINATIONS.—The determinations required for operation of the reversionary interest retained in subparagraph (C) are that—

''(i) the qualified organization is unable to carry out its responsibilities under the Forest Legacy Program in the State with respect to the conservation easement;

''(ii) the conservation easement has been modified in a way that is inconsistent with the purposes of the Forest Legacy Program or the assessment of need for the State; or

''(iii) the conservation easement has been conveyed to another person (other than a qualified organization approved by the State and the Secretary).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

To the disappointment, I suppose, of everybody that is here, this isn't nearly as much fun as the last amendment. This is a rather simple amendment. It deals with a 1990 law, the Forest Legacy Act. It simply allows the Forest Legacy Act to be much more efficient and effective. It would allow those States that would like to participate in the Forest Legacy Act to also allow within that State a qualified trust, a land trust, to hold the easement.

The benefit of this is that it reduces the burden on the State government. The State government doesn't have to manage that easement. It would be managed by a qualified land trust, and it also allows for greater leverage of the money that would be available from the forest legacy projects from both the State and the Federal Government. It's a win all the way around. This program has been very, very successful in protecting forest lands all around the Nation, and this amendment simply would provide another opportunity to do even more to protect our forests.

Now, these forests are not going to be held as national parks or wilderness. These are operating forests. These are forests that would be operating with good, modern forest practices, providing wood and fiber into the community and the jobs that go with it.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate and share the gentleman's desire to preserve forests in danger of conversion—that's very important to me. I chair the Agriculture Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry, but I don't believe that this is the best way to do it. I respectfully oppose the amendment.

The Forest Legacy Program has been successful, to date, due to its unique structure, partnering with States to preserve forested land threatened by development. Since its creation in the 1990 farm bill, the Forest Legacy Program has more than been successful in fulfilling that purpose. The program has protected more than 2.2 million acres in 43 States and has leveraged $739 million of non-Federal funding over the last 20 years.

By opening the program to nongovernmental programs, we're doing nothing to promote the program's purpose. Demand is quite high for the program. For the last 3 years, USDA has only been able to fund roughly a quarter of the funding requests under this program. Additionally, this change only has the effect of making the program more similar to other conservation programs.

In the 2008 farm bill, we created the Community Forest Program with the purpose of allowing groups such as land trusts and Indian tribes the authority to manage forest easements. This was done in part to allow nongovernment groups to participate in protecting local forests.

While I'm certain the gentleman from California has the best of intentions, I don't agree we have a problem with this program that justifies opening it for alteration; and, therefore, I will oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. May I inquire as to how much time I have available?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from the State of New York (Mr. GIBSON).

Mr. GIBSON. I thank my friend for yielding, and I am honored to join with him in support of this amendment. And I would say to my good friend from Pennsylvania, absolutely, and I believe I speak for my friend Mr. GARAMENDI as well, we think the program is working very well. We think it can work even better.

□ 2110

We've got land trusts in my area of upstate New York that are highly confident. In fact, you know, I'll tell you that they played a major role in preparing me for this farm bill. I'm thinking of Teri Platchek out in Washington County, and Peter Paden from Columbia County at the Columbia Land Conservancy, and Ned Sullivan and Andy Bickening with the Scenic Hudson, Becky Thornton, Duchess Land Conservancy.

These are folks that are passionate about finding that nexus between agriculture and tourism where conservation plays a key role; and, you know, their insight to me helped me influence this farm bill. They're ready to step up and be more involved. That's going to help.

As my friend from California said, it's going to help us use our money in even a more efficient manner and to reach out more in this program.

So I urge support of this amendment. This only allows States the authority. You know, it really empowers States to make this decision. I think it's a good choice, and let's do it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I just note that my good friend from New York—and I appreciate his passion on this—but the organizations you named already have opportunities under the Community Forest Program.

And we have two rather unique programs, one that already, well, as of the last farm bill that was done in 2008, provides the opportunity for nongovernmental groups to be able to participate.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Pennsylvania, I thought, was making a wonderful argument in support of this legislation, in that you talked about the success of the Forest Legacy Program, and it really has been eminently successful.

And you also talked about the demands on the program, and that's true. Many, many States want to implement this program.

But you didn't mention the fact that many States don't have the resources to manage additional properties, to manage additional trusts that they've taken. This would allow those States to make a decision. It's a State decision, it's not a Federal decision, it's not a decision by a private nonprofit qualified trust. This is a decision by the State to welcome into their program a private, nonprofit, qualified trust that does this kind of work that could then manage the trust without the State having to spend the money.

The State maintains oversight and, should something happen that the trust is unable to continue, it would

then revert to the State. But this is a way of really expanding what, apparently, the three of us want to have happen.

You mentioned another program that does exist. Wonderful. Those programs could work in unison with the Federal Government participating, the State government participating, and the private.

But the problem here is that, under the Forest Legacy Program, the private, nonprofit qualified trust can't participate in that program.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, let me restate again, I recognize there's two different programs. There is one program that was created in 2008 that nongovernmental programs can participate in.

There's not capacity within the Forest Legacy Program, Mr. Chairman, to add nongovernmental programs in. It is specifically designed for partnering with States to preserve forest lands that are threatened by development.

And just as a reminder, over the last 3 years, USDA's only been able to fund roughly a quarter of those funding requests at this point, and by extending this would not serve a purpose.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I wish we had time to sit down and talk about this. It's really a shame that we're here on the floor at this moment. Really, I think, both of us are in support of protecting our forests, of enhancing their ability to continue to produce jobs, the food, the fiber and the wood that we need in our economy and in our society.

We're not very far apart. If there's something here that needs to be worked out between these two programs, I'm sure we could do it. But this really gives us an opportunity to really do what I think all of us want, and that is to preserve our forests, keep them in operating production, and allow the nonprofits to participate together with the States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 8301 through 8303 (page 481, line 20, through page 485, line 23) and insert the following:

SEC. 8301. INSECT AND DISEASE INFESTATION.

Title VI of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 602. DESIGNATION OF TREATMENT AREAS.

''(a) DEFINITION OF DECLINING FOREST HEALTH.—In this section, the term 'declining forest health' means a forest that is experiencing—

''(1) substantially increased tree mortality due to insect or disease infestation; or

''(2) dieback due to infestation or defoliation by insects or disease.

''(b) DESIGNATION OF TREATMENT AREAS.—

''(1) INITIAL AREAS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act of 2013, the Secretary shall, if requested by the Governor of the State, designate as part of an insect and disease treatment program 1 or more subwatersheds (sixth-level hydrologic units, according to the System of Hydrologic Unit Codes of the United States Geological Survey) in at least 1 national forest in each State that is experiencing an insect or disease epidemic.

''(2) ADDITIONAL AREAS.—After the end of the 60-day period described in paragraph (1), the Secretary may designate additional subwatersheds under this section as needed to address insect or disease threats.

''(c) REQUIREMENTS.—To be designated a subwatershed under subsection (b), the subwatershed shall be—

''(1) experiencing declining forest health, based on annual forest health surveys conducted by the Secretary;

''(2) at risk of experiencing substantially increased tree mortality over the next 15 years due to insect or disease infestation, based on the most recent National Insect and Disease Risk Map published by the Forest Service; or

''(3) in an area in which the risk of hazard trees poses an imminent risk to public infrastructure, health, or safety.

''(d) TREATMENT OF AREAS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out priority projects on Federal land in the subwatersheds designated under subsection (b) to reduce the risk or extent of, or increase the resilience to, insect or disease infestation in the subwatersheds.

''(2) AUTHORITY.—Any project under paragraph (1) for which a public notice to initiate scoping is issued on or before September 30, 2018, may be carried out in accordance with subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 102, and sections 104, 105, and 106.

''(3) EFFECT.—Projects carried out under this subsection shall be considered authorized hazardous fuel reduction projects for purposes of the authorities described in paragraph (2).

''(4) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2018, the Secretary shall issue a report on actions taken to carry out this subsection, including—

''(A) an evaluation of the progress towards project goals; and

''(B) recommendations for modifications to the projects and management treatments.

''(e) TREE RETENTION.—The Secretary shall carry out projects under subsection (d) in a manner that maximizes the retention of old-growth and large trees, as appropriate for the forest type, to the extent that the trees promote stands that are resilient to insects and disease.''.

Page 485, line 24, strike ''**8304**'' and insert ''**8302**''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, in my district in Colorado, and in other States across the West and Northwest, our trees, in my district, primarily lodgepole pines, have been plagued by pine beetle. Dendroctonus ponderosae has infected our trees. They're killed by a related fungus.

We have entire mountainsides for miles and miles where trees are dead and are now beginning to rot. It's really transformed, sadly, the landscape of Colorado.

The reason for the rise of the beetle is that we haven't had cold enough winters over the last several years to kill off the larva in the winter. It requires a certain number of days below a certain temperature.

So, again, this is not about preventing the spread of pine beetles. We have some ability to do that in small areas on private land. They can wrap trees, but we don't have a cost-effective way to do that across large areas.

What we do need to do, though, is once the trees have been killed, they represent a tremendous risk for forest fires, particularly when they're near power lines and other sensitive areas.

So what my amendment does is it adds language that makes it easier to access Federal land. In the West, much of our land, as the Chair knows, is owned by the Federal Government, and there's been varying difficulties in getting on to the Federal land, being able to make sure that they do mitigation where necessary, take down pine beetle infested trees near power lines, near watersheds, near populated areas, a very important but more active part of forest management.

Frankly, we'd love to find economically viable uses for the pine beetle kill. I have a desk in my office that's made from pine beetle kill. We also use it for biomass and other purposes. But many of it is back-country areas, and they're on Federal land.

And so this amendment is simply an amendment that allows a lease on lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, an expedited way that we can engage in some of the necessary clearing and forest maintenance to prevent the pine beetle kill from causing ancillary damage.

There is similar language in the Senate bill. I'm hopeful that we can work with KRISTI NOEM from South Dakota and others to achieve this important goal, increasing access to Federal lands for purposes of mitigating pine beetle damage.

We plan to continue to work on this issue, one of the top priorities from my district.

At this time I withdraw my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 40 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. MARINO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 9006 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 9006. REPEAL OF BIODIESEL FUEL EDUCATION PROGRAM.

Section 9006 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8106) is repealed.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would provide for the elimination of the Biodiesel Fuel Education Program subsidy. This is one of a series of duplicative programs.

□ 2120

This program gives money to not-for-profit organizations that inform fleet operators and the public on the so-called benefits of using biodiesel fuels rather than fossil fuels.

Mr. Chairman, this program is yet another example of corporate welfare—taxpayer dollars not being used wisely. The American taxpayer should not be forced to foot the bill for a proposed program in an industry that would be nonexistent if it were not for government subsidies.

The Biodiesel Fuel Education Program incorrectly informs the public that biodiesel fuel is ''better'' than fossil fuels, oil, or natural gas. I am supportive of an all-of-the-above energy strategy, but Congress need not be in the business of picking winners and losers. These industries should stand on their own merit, and the consumer should decide what is the best product. We should not be wasting hard-earned taxpayer dollars on groups that have a bias against fossil fuels. We should use this money to develop our current natural resources and create jobs.

My district is in the heart of the Marcellus shale, and I have seen the jobs and opportunities created by domestic energy. The unemployment rate is below the national average. I cannot support any program that favors any one type of energy over another.

I am not debating the merits of biofuels, and I am not against or opposed to biofuels; but there are over 20 other energy programs in the FARRM Bill alone. By continuing to funnel money to these programs to not-for-profit organizations going toward salaries, we are preventing other new energy technologies from breaking ground.

We are $17 trillion in debt and borrowing more and more money every day. Let the taxpayers determine what they prefer, what source of energy to use, not the government using hard-working taxpayer dollars. This program is nothing but a colossal government subsidy that is not profitable at all.

Again, I am not against the biofuel itself. I am against using taxpayer moneys going to not-for-profit organizations to promote this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NOEM. Essentially what this amendment does, Mr. Chairman, is it eliminates an extremely effective program. Biodiesel is a clean-burning product that's produced by a mix of feedstocks, including soybean oil, wasted grease, and recycled animal fats. The byproducts of biodiesel is protein meal that is often made from soy and is used as livestock feed. It's a protein-rich livestock feed, as well.

The more animal fat as biodiesel feedstock demand increases, livestock value increases, and this program is a grant education that's used to educate engine manufacturers, fleet operators, and the public on the benefits of biodiesel. The program plays a vital role in making sure it helps expand marketplace acceptance and the use of biodiesel as a low-carbon, renewable diesel replacement fuel.

Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is it doesn't save any money; what it does is it eliminates a program that is out there telling the story of what an all-of-the-above energy supply means that prioritizes American energy. We absolutely need to make sure that we are prioritizing the types of energy that we can produce in this country right here from renewable sources as well as petroleum products.

I'm a farmer and a rancher. I utilize petroleum products every single day in our operation. But I also recognize the value in being able to have a program that promotes the use of renewable sources that we can regenerate and prioritize over other sources that come from other countries.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I will yield 1 minute to Mr. KING from Iowa if he would like to speak, as well.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from South Dakota for yielding to me, and I wanted to come to the floor in opposition, also, of this amendment.

I've seen what this research does, and I've watched as we've gone from no industry to an industry now that's utilizing the products that the gentlelady from South Dakota has said, from animal fats, for soy oil, and it has cheapened up our energy supply and has cleaned up our air, and it's made us a better country because of it. This research that gets done—we should remember that there isn't always a return on that research investment. That's why we do research. That's why we do research in our universities, for example. And so with that research we can find those things that make us more efficient.

I remember when the research labs said it was impossible to get the energy out of the feed grains that we now turn into energy. We've exceeded that because of research. And to utilize these animal fats has dramatically been changed a lot because of the research that takes place here with this fund.

So I think this is a piece that we need to preserve so that we can preserve the efficiency that's there and we can preserve the education.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chairman, that is one of the things that we don't talk about enough is the fact that this research brings us benefits and cost savings in many other industries that we see reflected every day such as lower costs in energy areas, also lower costs in livestock feeds.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to Mr. PETERSON from Minnesota if he would like to speak in opposition to the amendment, as well.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentlelady.

I, too, oppose this amendment. People need to realize that the diesel engine was invented by a German fellow named Diesel, and it ran on peanut oil. It didn't run on diesel fuel. And the internal combustion engine ran on ethanol. It didn't run on gasoline. They had to reengineer those motors to get them to run on gasoline and diesel fuel. It takes a different type of engine to run those kinds of fuels.

One of the things you do with this type of a program is you help those manufacturers develop engines that can utilize the fuel. The same thing with a car engine. Down in Brazil, they're burning 30 percent ethanol with cars that are made by General Motors that are engineered to run on that fuel, and they get better mileage with that 30 percent ethanol than they get with gasoline because they engineered the engines right.

That's what we're trying to do with this program is help the industry be able to utilize these fuels which are renewable and are made by Americans and are creating jobs. So this is a good program, and I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. MARINO. I reserve the balance of my time, and if my colleague is ready, to close then.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from South Dakota, a member of the committee, has the right to close.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Once again, I'm not against the use of biofuels. I'm against the use of taxpayer dollars going to not-for-profit organizations to promote the use of biofuels. There is not one vehicle that runs 100 percent on biofuel that I know of at this point. And it does save money. If this program is eliminated of hundreds of thousands of dollars and millions of dollars per year, then that money should go back into the taxpayers' pockets, or at least pay the debt down.

We should use taxpayer dollars to create jobs like building the Keystone XL pipeline and like developing natural gas exploration that we have an abundant supply of. So let's stop borrowing money to promote a product where we pick the winners and losers. As I said earlier, that's up to the consumer. They can choose what best product to use.

But I just oppose the fact that hardworking, middle class taxpayer dollars are going for propaganda and advertising.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's concerns and all that he has brought to this House today.

I will just reiterate that this is an extremely effective program. What it does is it lets the consumers know that they do have a choice. It lets them know about the benefits of the fuel, lets them know that it actually can have an impact on their efficiency levels that they are able to enjoy with their engines, that it gives them another market that they can go to to lower their energy costs. It lowers our livestock feed costs.

What this program essentially does is it goes out there and it tells the consumer that there are options that are renewable right here in the United States that we can grow, that we can produce, and that we can put out there in the marketplace that will actually be something that is sustainable without the volatility of relying on the Middle East for our energy needs.

I will reiterate that this program does not have a cost score as it relates to the underlying bill. Even though that was mentioned in some of the comments, there will be no money saved in the underlying bill if this amendment is adopted, and that is why I oppose it because of the effectiveness of the program and ask that we would oppose this amendment when it comes to a vote.

Mr. PETERSON. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. NOEM. Absolutely.

Mr. PETERSON. I just wanted to say that Willie Nelson's bus runs on B–100.

Mrs. NOEM. There we go.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 2130

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 42 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 509, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 512, line 22.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment addresses a very simple question: Why are we spending millions of dollars advertising and promoting farmers markets?

The Farmers Market and Local Food Promotion Program spends $40 million on such trivialities as redecorating farmers' market stalls and roadside stands to attract yuppie customers. In Colorado, funds from this program paid for a chef competition and bike tour. More than $120,000 in two grants under this program were spent for beer seminars in China.

This program duplicates four other Federal programs that also promote various aspects of farmers markets, and God knows how many State and local programs that also do the same thing. My amendment simply eliminates this program.

I would challenge the supporters of the program to answer three questions.

First: Why should a taxpayer in Latimer, Iowa, for example, pay for a farmer in Lancaster, California to advertise his produce?

Second: Why should a shopkeeper in Lancaster, who has to pay for his own advertising, also pay for the local farmers advertising as well?

And third, and most importantly: How can any Member look his or her constituents in the eye and tell them that a beer seminar in China is worth spending more of their earnings than they make in a year?

We keep hearing how draconian is the sequester. We keep hearing how it's cutting deeply into vital public services. I dare say at least a dozen speeches on this floor this week were dedicated to the painful cutbacks caused by the sequester. We tell schoolchildren they can't tour the White House because we don't have the money due to the sequester. We tell our constituents that they'll have to wait in insufferable lines just to see us in the House office buildings because we don't have the money due to the sequester. And yet we seem to have plenty of money to fund travesties like those that are crammed into this farm bill. Doesn't that bother anybody here?

I believe that rooting out wasteful programs like this one is the principle reason that voters entrusted Republicans with majority control of the House—the House that's supposed to hold the purse strings of this government. I ask my colleagues if we're being true to our campaign promises that we made to our constituents by continuing to fund such obscene wastes of their money as this one.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and want to speak in favor of the Farmers Market Promotion Program.

I have a very different perspective. While I appreciate my colleague's opposition or concerns raised about the sequester, I do not think those same concerns apply to what is a very good program.

You know, when I moved to Maine about 40 years ago and started a small farm, growing and selling healthy food, locally grown food, was a little bit out of the mainstream. We had gone in a different direction. But I can tell you today, wherever I go, whether I'm talking to a group of bankers or a group of school teachers or a group of school kids or their parents, people nod in very strong support when I say we need to have more locally grown, sustainable food.

People want to know where their food comes from. They want to see farmers in their communities. They want to help those farmers make ends meet. This amendment would take us backwards. It would further undo our weakened infrastructure of local food support.

The Farmers Market Promotion Program—which is reformed in this bill to be the Farmers Market and Local Food Promotion Program—helps communities support local food systems through direct marketing. There are not price guarantees, there isn't income support. This helps farmers understand the best practices for marketing their food. It helps them understand how to get the best price from the market for their product in this growing opportunity that truly supports rural communities.

It's not an either/or proposition. You don't have to have just locally grown food or nationally grown food. You can support re-growing our local food infrastructure, helping rural communities, and also support conventional agriculture. You can buy California lettuce

and also buy in-season tomatoes from the farmers who live down the road and support your community.

The truth is I come from a State like Maine, and Maine is like many other States around the country; we have very, very few farmers who will be able to take advantage of the biggest programs in this bill, the biggest programs that are worth billions of dollars—the Revenue Loss Program, the Price Loss Program, the Stacked Income Protection Plan. They don't apply to farmers in my State. They get very little support to help these growing opportunities in rural communities. That's okay with them. They're not asking for a price guarantee; they're asking for some parity, for USDA programs to once and finally apply to them. They're not asking to be at a tremendous disadvantage because they are diversified and sustainable farmers, people who live and work in rural communities, whose kids go to our schools, who serve on local boards, who are part of the rural fiber of our country. That's all this program is asking for, a little bit of parity, a little bit of assistance in this billion-dollar program for big corporate farms.

I cannot imagine how anyone could come to the floor and say, I don't want to help the fiber and fabric of rural States like mine, programs like Cultivating Community, which helped promote six local farm stands in low-income areas. This program helps people to support farm stands that accept SNAP benefits, that do a tremendous amount of things to get more people eating healthy, local food and promoting them. As I said, it's a critical part of our local infrastructure. I can't imagine why anyone would go against that.

I'll pause there and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I'm happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment as well.

While we all share the desire to get rid of the fraud, waste and abuse, I think we've reached a delicate balance in the committee with the language that we've done here.

This is a competitive grant process. It will improve direct producer-to-consumer market opportunities. I think it's very valuable for our small farmers and our small communities.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I would just like to say one more time that this is a vital program.

Let me again reinforce the good words of my colleague and thank him for speaking on the other side of the aisle in support of this program. This helps communities through direct marketing. This helps roadside stands, farmers markets, CSA, agritourism, other direct producer-to-consumer marketing opportunities.

It's a competitive grant. It's not a boondoggle. It's not direct payments to a farmer. And once again, I just want to say, I come from the State of Maine, which like many States is full of rural communities, rural communities who are seeing this renewed interest in buying food locally—a great way to expand this economy, to provide jobs, to get more money into our rural economies, to make sure people are eating healthier food, getting to know their farmers in their communities, making better, healthier decisions.

I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I begin by asking the supporters to answer three simple questions:

Why should a taxpayer in one community pay to advertise produce for a farmer in another community? I heard no answer.

□ 2140

I asked why should a shopkeeper in one community who has to pay for his own advertising also pay for the local farmer's advertising as well. I heard no answer.

And third, I asked how can any of us look our constituents in the eye and tell them that $120,000, more than most of our constituents make in a year, is a worthwhile expenditure to hold a beer seminar in China. Once again, I heard no answer.

I forgive my Democratic colleagues the error of their ways. They never promised to be careful with the people's money. The Republicans made that promise. And because of that promise, the Republicans were entrusted with the majority of this House. Allowing programs like this to continue on our watch dishonors those promises, and I appeal to my Republican colleagues not to repeat the conduct that turned the Nation's stomach the last time we held the majority.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. GIBSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 10010.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

This is a bipartisan amendment addressing some underlying language in the bill pertaining to olive oil advanced by my good friends from California and Georgia who are here today to defend and to advance their olive growers. They are very proud of them.

I just want to say how proud I am of their olive growers, as well, and also to address fraud. I want to also express my commitment to combating fraud as well.

Regrettably, this underlying language misses the mark. In fact, it is going to significantly drive up costs. It is going to cost hundreds, in fact thousands, of jobs across America, including hundreds of jobs in my home State.

I think it is important to focus in on what this underlying language does. We should face the facts that at least at the moment 98 percent of the olive oil that we consume in America is imported from overseas. In fact, we've got hundreds of jobs in New York State that deal with that. But 98 percent of the olive oil is imported. The underlying language will require 100 percent of that 98 percent to be chemical- and taste-tested at the port. Now you have about 5 to 8 percent that's spot checked. We're talking about going to 100 percent. I don't even think the United States Government has the capacity to do that. I certainly would fear if it ended up with the capacity to do that.

Look, the way that we should deal with fraud is strike this language. We should look to the FDA for standards. We did this in New York. We have standards in New York. The olive oil distributors are certainly complying with it. They were part of making it come about. But what we've done in this underlying bill, I want to make sure it is very clear that this is going to drive up costs for all of our consumers, millions of dollars according to the CBO, and we are going to end up crushing jobs.

With that, I want to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, after three debates in support of my colleague from New York, I find myself on the opposite side of this issue.

We are in the process of developing a very viable American olive oil industry, one that has great potential. At

the same time, that industry faces a question from the consumers about the quality of the oil that is available, both domestically produced, as well as internationally produced.

There have been numerous studies done that indicate that there is a lot of misrepresentation as to the quality and the nature of olive oil. This bill, the FARRM Bill, simply establishes the opportunity for the creation of a marketing order that would eventually provide a farmer-oriented regulation of the quality and the type of olive oil that's going to be on the market. That would apply both to imported, as well as domestically produced, olive oil.

The cost of this need not be as high as my colleague from New York suggests. It is probable, and most feasible, that the olive oil that's imported would be checked as to its quality and consistency at the point of export, certainly not at the retail and probably not at the point of import.

This can be done. This is done in many, many products that are produced in America, as well as imported—quality controls, consumer awareness.

This is a very important bill for the domestic nascent olive oil industry.

Mr. GIBSON. At this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise to demonstrate my strong support for this amendment, led by my colleague from New York, Mr. GIBSON, to strike the olive oil price increase.

This amendment is needed to stop the unnecessary increase in olive oil pricing. The unfair marketing order being considered would place heavy restrictions and burdens on the importation of olive oil.

The United States is the largest importer of oil, importing approximately 97 percent of the olive oil Americans consume. The marketing order would result in tens of millions of dollars of costs for inspections a year, in turn raising the price of olive oil and making it incredibly expensive.

The inspection would occur only when it is produced, not once the product enters the United States. This tax on American consumers will hinder trade and undermine our international trade relations. It is clearly a non-tariff trade barrier, which will further complicate U.S. trade and export relations with our Transatlantic partners.

Just this week, the President has launched the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership negotiations. This provision is against the spirit of the talks and trade with our largest trading partner. Current European Union free trade talks would be compromised, resulting in the loss of greater U.S. exports.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to strike the olive oil price increase.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition of this amendment. This current farm bill, the olive oil provision, will simply require that both domestic and imported olive oil will be subject to the same labeling requirements. Let me restate that: the same labeling requirements for domestic and imported olive oil. Americans deserve to know that the product that is advertised on the label is the product that they are buying when they are pulling it off the shelf.

As the gentleman from New York stated, it is spot-checked right now. Less than 5 percent of the 98 percent of the oil sold in this country is actually checked as to whether or not it is labeled accurately.

U.S. growers and ethical importers have a strong interest in developing this program of cost-effective solutions since you are saving high-quality standards for the consumer.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from New York for yielding and for his work on this amendment.

I rise in support of this bipartisan amendment to strike the new trade barrier on imported olive oil included in this farm bill.

This would place a new effective tax rate on olive oil imports, which hurts small businesses like restaurants, retailers, and especially consumers. It will seriously threaten good jobs in many communities, including my own.

Roughly 98 percent of the olive oil consumed in the United States is imported. Only 2 percent—2 percent—is produced here. This new barrier would benefit a very small segment of the olive oil producers in very few States at the expense of all 50 States.

CBO pegged the new olive oil regulation as a private sector mandate—an earmark effectively—potentially costing businesses and consumers tens of millions of dollars.

□ 2150

Now is not the time to implement trade barriers with our allies as we begin new trade negotiations with the European Union. This amendment protects small businesses, consumers, and robust trade. I urge the support of this amendment.

Mr. SCHRADER. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA I must rise in opposition to this amendment from my colleague from New York.

In my family, olive oil was something that was very heavily used, my being of Italian descent. We purchased it locally in northern California by vendors just right nearby, and we always got top quality oil. I think we need to have that same opportunity for everybody across the country, not just the opportunity to buy the oil, but to know that the advertising—the labeling of it—is correct. Unfortunately, much imported oil does not have to meet the same standards for labeling, either using European standards or ours, especially by the time it's shipped here.

So what we're looking for is not knocking out jobs or knocking out imported oil or any of that; it's just simply the truth in labeling that people would expect. When a label says ''extra virgin,'' then what should be in that container should be extra virgin. Unfortunately, much of it, by the time it gets here, is rancid. Maybe the label should say ''extra rancid.'' What we're after here is not to cause problems for our friends who would like to market it; it's more just the truth in advertising that's necessary. There shouldn't be anything to worry about if you're an importer if your oil is meeting that standard.

Reasonable standards can be worked out for what the testing is, so let's move forward with blocking this amendment for today and, instead, allowing for a good labeling standard to be put in place for American olive oil users whether the olive oil is domestic or imported. So I ask for people to deny this amendment today.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Oregon has 1 minute remaining and has the right to close.

Mr. GIBSON. I yield my last minute to my good friend from New York (Mr. GRIMM).

Mr. GRIMM. I thank my colleague from New York.

I respect my colleagues from California and from Georgia, but let's just stop the nonsense and call it what it is.

I have a district that consumes more Greek oil and Italian oil than you can ever imagine. It's not rancid, and they don't have any problems. The producers here are the ones with the problems. The people buying it, the distributors, all the different restaurants—their costs would go up exponentially. They know good oil, and they haven't had a problem. Of course, there is always going to be a problem in every industry, but this is nothing more than a multimillion-dollar earmark, so let's call it what it is; but I respect the fact that they're sticking up for their States.

Olives, just like oranges, are tested, but we don't test orange juice. Grapes are tested, but we don't test the wine. We do test olives, but we shouldn't be testing olive oil. It would be the only manufactured good tested as a commodity. That would be a mistake. Even the CBO says it would be tens of millions of dollars in costs. We can't afford

that for our jobs throughout the country. We can't afford that for our industry. This is a specialty earmark. I respect the intent, but it is bad policy, and I would ask everyone to oppose it.

Mr. SCHRADER. I yield the last 1 minute to the other gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. This is a marketing order. The underlying law establishes a marketing order. A marketing order allows the producers to come together and decide how they're going to market their products and do it in a way that sets up standards for their products. This is common across virtually every aspect of American agriculture. This is nothing new. When you have a marketing order that involves imported as well as domestically produced, those imports are also affected by the qualifications and the standards set on that marketing order. This is not new.

In fact, virtually everything you'll find in the produce, including many of the products that were described a moment ago, are controlled by a marketing order. We're not exactly sure, until the marketing order, what kind of regulations and quality standards will be put in place; but once they're in place, then whether it's an imported or a domestically produced oil, they'll have to abide by the same regulations.

With regard to the cost, this is not new either. This happens in virtually most of the kinds of commodities and products that are imported and produced domestically. We're not talking about something radical.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 541, strike line 21 and all that follows through page 542, line 8.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment—to prevent the Christmas tree tax from taking effect. This amendment prevents President Obama's proposed Christmas tree tax from being implemented.

The administration already tried to enforce this tax right before the Christmas season in 2011. In response to a resounding outcry from the American people, the tax was put on hold.

When I'm at home in Indiana, I hear from Hoosier families firsthand about their daily struggles due to the sluggish economy—moms and dads and single parents who are struggling to make ends meet to pay their monthly bills and to pay their mortgages and still have enough left in their budgets to put food on the tables and fill up the gas tanks.

Americans are seeking commonsense solutions from Washington to jump-start the economy, to provide more jobs, and to ensure that our children and grandchildren have the same opportunities that we enjoy in this great Nation. Now, as we focus on passing a comprehensive 5-year farm bill, some of my colleagues are looking to revive this unnecessary tax.

There is no justification to impose another tax on the American people. There is certainly no justification to impose a tax on a commodity that symbolizes an historic Christmas tradition to many American families. The administration has denied that this is a ''tax,'' but I think most Americans would agree that, when the Federal Government forces us to pay something, it's a tax—a tax imposed on every American family the next time one goes to pick out a Christmas tree.

Christmas tree growers opposed to this tax cannot opt out. This tax will be charged to the grower, passed on to the consumer, adding to the cost printed at the bottom of your receipt, and increasing the amount of your hard-earned dollars owed to the Federal Government. Supporters of this tax will call it ''nominal'' and will argue that it's only 15 to 20 cents, but with around 33 million fresh cut Christmas trees sold in the U.S. each year, this little tax adds up to millions of dollars in tax revenues.

Our families save up for months to provide gifts for their families, to donate to charities, or to purchase a flight home to spend the holidays with their loved ones. This is not the time to raise taxes on our hardworking families, especially during the Christmas season. The President and Congress should, instead, focus on reducing government spending and finding commonsense solutions to lower taxes to provide relief for Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment in order to make sure that our Christmas trees remain a symbol of Christmas and of the holiday spirit, not a symbol of more Big Government taxation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHRADER. I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHRADER. I appreciate the opportunity to set the record straight.

With all due respect, the good and gentlelady from Indiana is completely and totally misinformed as to what this Christmas tree checkoff bill does.

If we were to strip this out of the FARRM Bill, millions of Americans would lose jobs. This is about protecting American agriculture. I did not see the gentlelady or any of her friends on the other side of the aisle get up and talk about the beef checkoff program or the dairy checkoff program or the cotton checkoff program, all of which help to promote American industry and American jobs and American research.

□ 2200

With all due respect, the idea that this is a tax is absolutely ludicrous. This is a fee that the industry has come to us for, just like the cattlemen did, just like the cotton growers did, and just like the dairymen did, to help promote their industry.

Perhaps the gentlelady is unaware of the fact that the Christmas tree industry is under siege in this country. What's more American than Christmas? You know what's happening? The Chinese are exporting to our country, and we are importing fake Chinese trees. It's devastating the American industry right now. We can be in favor of Chinese jobs, or we can be in favor of American agriculture jobs and silviculture jobs.

This is pretty straightforward, folks. This is something that's not new. It's been done for years and years. With all due respect again, the gentlelady's talking points talk about this Christmas season—well, I don't think it's Christmas season. We are now into June. It's time to get updated and understand where this country is coming from.

American agriculture has worked hard trying to stay competitive. What are the States that are going to be affected if we don't do this? What are the States that are going to be affected? We've got North Carolina. We've got Tennessee. We've got Michigan. We've got Washington. We've got Oregon. I could go on. Pennsylvania. All 50 States produce Christmas trees.

This industry needs to survive. This is an American industry producing Christmas trees. I'm shocked actually, that there's anyone that is willing to take this off the agenda.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the remaining time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Indiana has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. WALORSKI. With all due respect to the gentleman and his point on all these ''checkoffs,'' this is a tax that the American people themselves resoundingly in 2011 have said, absolutely not. In fact, the American people put so much pressure on President

Obama, he actually backed off and rescinded this and moved it into a different time slot, which is what we're looking at today.

The people in my district are hardworking Americans. They're double-income households, single moms with kids under the age of 18 that are trying to raise up households, they're trying to pay for their bills, they're trying to pay their mortgage and they're trying to put gas in their car. And I think that we have a government and a Washington that is out of control when it comes to taxation. We don't need another tax coming out of Washington. We need help for American families.

With that, I would again urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHRADER. I would again like to continue to set the record straight.

The American people did not vote in any, way, shape or form on this promotion research program for American Christmas trees. If they had, I think they would vote in favor of American agricultural jobs in rural America.

I don't know if the gentlelady knows this, but the unemployment rate in rural America is easily still in the double digits. This is an industry that needs severe help and our time. If the American government can't come to their aid by letting them assess themselves a fee that is overwhelmingly supported by the industry to keep it alive, to keep it producing American jobs, I don't know what our government is all about at the end of the day.

This should be a straightforward ''no'' vote on this amendment.

As a matter of fact, this was so noncontroversial in the Agriculture Committee on which I serve, that it passed unanimous en bloc. This was not a controversial issue. So I guess I'd like to think we've moved forward out of the election season. It's now time to get real. It's now time to put some jobs on the table for Americans, particularly in rural America.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, again I would just like to add, as I close, that this is a time—and I agree with the gentleman in one sense. This is a time for us to be talking here about things like jobs and a struggling, sluggish economy. Because of that, the hardworking people in my district, the last thing they expect to see, the last thing they want to see—and Americans did resoundingly cry out in 2011 to not send another tax their way.

This is a tax. When the Federal Government says to Americans you must pay ''X,'' that's a tax. In my district, it's hardworking Hoosiers that have resoundingly said, No more taxes from this government. They are taxed enough, and they don't want to be taxed at the Christmas season.

I again urge my colleagues to stand in support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHRADER. I guess what I would like to close with here is that I can't say it often enough and more accurate enough, that this is nothing about taxation. This is about the promotion of an industry that we would like to support in America: Christmas. What's more American than Christmas? I can't believe the opposition is seeking to attack Christmas and Christmas tree producers.

It's tough out there. The recession isn't over. The recession isn't over in rural America right now. Over 70 percent of the folks in the Christmas tree industry easily favor this bill. I'd love to see my approval rating come even up to 15 percent or 20 percent. These guys are at 70 percent wanting to get something done.

I think we owe it to them to back them. The producers across this country need our help. We did it for beef. We did it for dairy. We've done it for cotton. We've done it for a number of other industries. I don't see why Christmas trees should be discriminated against and we should be encouraging Chinese jobs and Chinese fake trees in our Christmas tree pageants. I think that's terrible.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title X, insert the following new section:

SEC. 10018. FARMED SHELLFISH AS SPECIALTY CROPS.

Section 3(1) of the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note; Public Law 108–465) is amended by inserting ''farmed shellfish'' after ''fruits,''.

In the table of contents in section 1(b), insert after the item relating to section 10017 the following new item:

Sec. 10018. Farmed shellfish as specialty crops.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment, which I've introduced with my friend, Mr. WITTMAN from Virginia, is a budget neutral amendment. It does not change any authorized level of spending. It very simply adds shellfish farming to the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act programs, the block grants and the crop research initiative, which is again, I think, a reasonable addition given the history of the block grants and the research initiative program prior to 2004.

Again, I want to just emphasize at the outset what we're talking about here is shellfish farming. We are not talking about fishing. Shellfish farming is a cultivated process from seed which in many instances starts offshore and proceeds to harvest in beds just adjacent to a coast. It actually goes back into antiquity in terms of the process and the farming technique that surrounds shellfish farming.

Again, prior to 2004, the specialty crop programs were administered through the USDA to States, and States had discretion to determine specialty crop programs which they wanted to fund. In some instances, shellfish farming was included along with fruit and nuts and other forms of specialty crops.

In 2004, Congress changed the program and gave specific definitions which take away that discretion to States in terms of the block grants program. And the block grants in many instances provide marketing assistance.

Shellfish farming—oysters, clams, mussels—is a growing industry. In fact, for people who have become exposed to it, it is considered a very high quality industry in terms of U.S. shellfish that actually provides opportunities for export growth around the world. And what this amendment will do is to give that growing area of aquaculture an opportunity to expand and grow. It affects the Pacific coast, gulf coast and the eastern coast.

Again, this is a cost neutral amendment to extend very important marketing assistance and research assistance to a part of American agriculture, which clearly aquaculture is. Again, this is cultivated growing of food, unlike fishing. And I think for the hardworking men and women who get up every single day, just like dairy farmers or people who pick apples or other forms of specialty crops who pay taxes, they should be allowed to have access to this program, a competitive grant program, which they would have to demonstrate their eligibility for.

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

□ 2210

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

While I appreciate the interest of the gentlemen in advancing shellfish fishermen in their districts, I think the premise of their amendment is wrong. While other definitions of specialty crops may have included shellfish, the definition under the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act was designed specifically for fruit, vegetable, and horticulture producers. The programs under this act were new, so nothing that shellfish were previously eligible for had been taken away by them. Being animals, shellfish have simply not been included in the program specifically designed for plant products.

Now, while some minor aspects of a limited number of programs developed under the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act may be generic enough that the addition of animal species would not be overly problematic, this definition has been used multiple times since 2004 in a variety of plant protection laws; and as has been pointed out to the amendment sponsors, the simple modification of the definition they are seeking would create potentially massive confusion in a variety of critical programs.

Therefore, as fond as I am of both authors, and as appreciative as I am of the product that they are attempting to endeavor, I must respectfully request that we oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Again, first of all, I just want to salute the great work the chairman of the committee has done. It has been magnificent to see regular order in this Congress.

Secondly, I would just point out that the 2004 specialty crop law was amended in the last farm bill in 2008 to add horticulture. So again, what was done in 2004 is hardly a sacred text. We have the ability to, again with good reason and evidence, to amend this law. And again, I think given the history of it pre-2004, this is not an unreasonable change.

To help make that point, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), for such time as he may consume.

Mr. WITTMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just as he said, this is an effort just to modernize the list of eligible products under the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act. It is just about making sure that those folks in rural coastal areas have the same opportunities as those farmers on land. In those coastal areas, shellfish, molluscan shellfish, are extraordinarily important as a part of the economy.

Modern practices take the watermen from wild harvest now to farming shellfish products, just like on-land farmers do. What this does is it makes sure that those coastal economies have the same access to resources under this program as those farmers on land do. It really is just the situation of making sure that we have parity there.

This doesn't add a new checkoff program. It doesn't add new taxes. It purely puts in place access to those dollars competitively, just like those farmers that farm other crops on land.

Again, this is extraordinarily important to coastal communities in those areas where those watermen are now converting to being farmers on the water. So it really is, again, about making sure that we are fair in treating those farmers on the water the same as we do the farmers on the land.

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

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

There is a difference, I think, in the way that the act was created between animals and plants. I think this is an issue certainly that we need to address and look at, but in the context that it is put here, I don't think that this is an appropriate amendment. I would simply ask my colleagues in a very respectful fashion to decline this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. KIND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In title XI, insert after the title heading the following:

Subtitle A—In General

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

Subtitle B—Assisting Family Farmers Through Insurance Reform Measures

SEC. 11041. ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME AND PER PERSON LIMITATIONS ON SHARE OF INSURANCE PREMIUMS PAID BY CORPORATION.

Section 508(e)(1) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''For the purpose'' and inserting the following:

''(A) PAYMENT AUTHORITY.—For the purpose''; and

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

''(B) ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Corporation shall not pay a part of the premium for additional coverage for any person or legal entity that has an average adjusted gross income (as defined in section 1001D of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-3a)) in excess of $250,000.

''(C) PER PERSON LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the total amount of premium paid by the Corporation on behalf of a person or legal entity, directly or indirectly, with respect to all policies issued to the person or legal entity under this title for a crop year shall be limited to a maximum of $50,000. To the maximum extent practicable, the Corporation shall carry out this subparagraph in accordance with sections 1001 through 1001F of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308 et seq.).''.

SEC. 11042. CAP ON OVERALL RATE OF RETURN FOR CROP INSURANCE PROVIDERS.

Section 508(k)(3) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(3)) is amended—

(1) by designating paragraph (3) as subparagraph (A) (and adjusting the margin two ems to the right);

(2) by inserting before subparagraph (A) (as so designated) the following:

''(3) RISK.—''; and

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

''(B) CAP ON OVERALL RATE OF RETURN.—The target rate of return for all the companies combined for the 2013 and subsequent reinsurance years shall be 12 percent of retained premium.''.

SEC. 11043. CAP ON REIMBURSEMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATING EXPENSES OF CROP INSURANCE PROVIDERS.

Section 508(k)(4) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(G) ADDITIONAL CAP ON REIMBURSEMENTS.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) through (F), total reimbursements for administrative and operating costs for the 2013 insurance year for all types of policies and plans of insurance shall not exceed $900,000,000. For each subsequent insurance year, the dollar amount in effect pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be increased by the same inflation factor as established for the administrative and operating costs cap in the 2011 Standard Reinsurance Agreement.''.

SEC. 11044. BUDGET LIMITATIONS ON RENEGOTIATION OF STANDARD REINSURANCE AGREEMENT.

Section 508(k)(8) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)(8)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) REDUCTION IN CORPORATION OBLIGATIONS.—The Board shall ensure that any Standard Reinsurance Agreement negotiated under subparagraph (A)(ii), when compared to the immediately preceding Standard Reinsurance Agreement, shall reduce, to the maximum extent practicable, the obligations of the Corporation under subsections (e)(2) or (k)(4) or section 523.''.

SEC. 11045. CROP INSURANCE PREMIUM SUBSIDIES DISCLOSURE IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

Section 502(c)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1502(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (C) and (D) respectively; and

(2) by inserting before subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(A) DISCLOSURE IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1) or any other provision of law, except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall on an annual basis make available to the public—

''(i)(I) the name of each individual or entity who obtained a federally subsidized crop insurance, livestock, or forage policy or plan of insurance during the previous fiscal year;

''(II) the amount of premium subsidy received by the individual or entity from the Corporation; and

''(III) the amount of any Federal portion of indemnities paid in the event of a loss during

that fiscal year for each policy associated with that individual or entity; and

''(ii) for each private insurance provider, by name—

''(I) the underwriting gains earned through participation in the federally subsidized crop insurance program; and

''(II) the amount paid under this subtitle for—

''(aa) administrative and operating expenses;

''(bb) any Federal portion of indemnities and reinsurance; and

''(cc) any other purpose.

''(B) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not disclose information pertaining to individuals and entities covered by a catastrophic risk protection plan offered under section 508(b).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. Chairman, I offer this bipartisan amendment with my friend and colleague, Representative PETRI from Wisconsin, that would call for further reforms in tightening of the crop insurance program. By the steps we take with this reform amendment, we would save the American taxpayer over $11 billion over the next 10 years. It was based on bipartisan legislation that Representative PETRI and I offered earlier this year that was supported by Representatives MCGOVERN, SENSENBRENNER, DELAURO, RADEL, BLUMENAUER, CONYERS, COOPER, DEFAZIO, CONNOLLY, and WAXMAN, and supported by a variety of outside groups.

What we're trying to do is maintain an element of risk in farming, again, in a fiscally responsible manner, by tightening up crop insurance programs that we feel have become too excessive with the shifting of title I commodity money and direct payments into the crop insurance category. We'd save over $11 billion over the next 10 years by doing the following:

We'd call for a limit of Federal crop insurance subsidies to $50,000 per farmer per year. Currently, there are no limits, no cap on the amount of taxpayer subsidies going to farm entities. Last year alone, over 26 entities received over $1 million in taxpayer premium subsidies alone. We think that's wrong, and we're trying to correct it with this amendment.

We'd also extend the adjusted gross income limit of $250,000 per farm entity to apply to crop insurance programs. The concept there is simple. If you're a farm entity with a gross profit of over a quarter of a million dollars, you really ought not be receiving taxpayer subsidies. This is after you back out the operating expenses of doing business. We're talking a quarter of a million dollars worth of profit.

It would promote crop insurance company efficiency by ending the 100 percent government subsidy of the administrative and operating costs that the private insurance companies currently enjoy today. Last year we spent over $1.3 billion on these insurance companies just for their A&O expenses alone. We're asking them to live with the total spending of $900 million, which is consistent with what the Obama administration is offering in its budget.

This would also guarantee that the crop insurance companies do not pass along the riskiest policies back to the American taxpayer, which is currently the practice.

It would lower the profit guaranteed to these private insurance companies from 14 percent to 12 percent. We don't offer that type of guarantee for any other business anywhere else in the country, and yet now they're guaranteed a 14 percent profit. We're saying can you at least live with a 12 percent profit for the sake of some savings within this program.

And it would also promote transparency to help the taxpayer know where the money is going and who's benefiting from it. It opens the sunshine up so we have greater disclosure of these programs and, therefore, greater scrutiny.

So we think this is commonsense reform. We think this is something that maintains the risk management tool of crop insurance. We're not proposing eliminating it, but we're just trying to propose making it more market sensitive and maintaining that element of risk.

Finally, one of the reasons we feel that this is so important is because of current commodity prices. There is great pressure on farmers now to plant everywhere, in the most fallow, highly sensitive, highly erodible land because they know if they experience any loss, their loss is covered. Therefore, the risk is taken out of it. That is leading to bad stewardship practices throughout our country. With this reform, we're trying to introduce that element of some second guessing, some risk in the most fallow, unproductive land that's right now being brought back into production.

So I would encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the subcommittee chairman of primary jurisdiction, Mr. CONAWAY of Texas.

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

I rise in strong opposition to this attack on a very important piece of the safety net that production agriculture relies upon. There are two possible outcomes for this amendment, and both are bad.

The first is that we're going to put the government back in the business of delivering crop insurance. We tried that. It didn't work. Government employees don't act nearly as responsibly as the private sector does. That comes with a cost, but the farmers like it. They get response from these folks that is appropriate.

Secondly, we would go back to the possibility of days when we spent billions of dollars on unbudgeted, ad hoc disaster relief.

□ 2220

And that's the least efficient way that we ought to go about this. And that's what this amendment does. It is bad for taxpayers. In spite of my colleagues' comments, this amendment won't save money. It will end up costing us untold billions in this ad hoc disaster spending that's the norm in that regard.

I know that the Environmental Working Group and other radical environment groups want to run our farmers and ranchers out of business. I get that. This amendment would certainly help them accomplish their goal.

So if your aim today is to stick the American taxpayer with billions of dollars to pay for ad hoc disaster bills, this is your kind of amendment. If you want to give the extreme environmentalist group, the crowd that gave us Meatless Mondays, a win in their effort to ruin American farming and ranching families, this will get right at it.

So I have farmers and ranchers struggling with 3 years of successive and severe drought. This is a slap in the face to those farmers and ranchers in west Texas and across this country. This amendment is not good, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. Unless my good friend wants to include the National Taxpayer Union, Taxpayers for Common Sense, Citizens Against Government Waste, Americans for Tax Reform, Committee for Responsible Taxation, American Commitment for the Center for Individual Liberty, ''R'' Street Competitive Enterprise Institute in that category of radical environmental groups, they've all come out in support, endorsing this legislation.

But we're not taking the private insurance companies out. We're just asking them to carry some risk and to reduce their guaranteed profit margin from 14 to 12.

With that, I yield 1½ minutes to my good friend and colleague from Wisconsin, Representative PETRI.

Mr. PETRI. I thank my colleague for yielding.

As the House considers the FARRM Act of 2013, I believe it's important that we offer the proper support for farmers, while ensuring that these support programs are responsible for the American taxpayer.

As you may know, the Federal Crop Insurance Program is the most expensive government program supporting farm income and is the only farm income support program that is not subject to some form of payment limitation or means testing.

This amendment, which incorporates the language in the AFFIRM Act that Representative KIND and I introduced last month, works to reform the crop insurance program. Capping crop insurance subsidies at $50,000 per person per year does not prohibit farmers from purchasing crop insurance, nor does it eliminate all taxpayer support for the program.

In fact, most farmers would not be affected by this cap at all. According to the GAO, in 2011, only 4 percent of farmers would have been impacted by this $50,000 cap on subsidy for insurance.

For 2001 to 2012, the total cost of premium subsidies jumped fourfold, from $1.8 billion to $7.5 billion. The Congressional Budget Office projects even higher costs in the future, averaging $9.1 billion annually. The subsidy cap, combined with the $250,000 means testing requirement, will assist in preventing fraud, waste and abuse in the Federal Crop Insurance Program.

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

Mr. KIND. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PETRI. This amendment also reforms administrative and operating reimbursements that the government pays to private insurance companies by capping those payments at $900 million, which is a fairly moderate cap and below what's currently being spent. It also lowers the reimbursement to insurance companies to the President's target of 12 percent return from 14 percent return.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the chairman.

Farm policy is intended to provide support when needed, based on production. U.S. farms have been forced to become larger to increase efficiency and remain competitive in the global marketplace. Arbitrarily limiting policies ultimately limits the ability of farms to grow and gain efficiencies, thereby penalizing U.S. farmers and putting them at a distinct disadvantage to our global competitors.

Adjusted gross income is different than farm profit. There are a number of expenses that must be covered. In addition to personal expenses, farmers must service debt, given the cost of today's machinery and land can easily reach into the millions.

AGI rules penalize spouses who oftentimes take off-farm jobs to help make ends meet when farmers are struggling with their farm income. An unreasonable AGI means test creates uncertainty for growers and their lenders by creating a ping-pong effect of being eligible one year and ineligible the next, making it difficult or impossible for lenders to measure, with any certainty, the future cash flow of thousands of farm and ranch families in order to make both short and long-term lending decisions.

In short, an unreasonable AGI means test would make U.S. farm policy unpredictable, inequitable and punitive for thousands of American farm and ranch families.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 4 minutes.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, at this time I'd like to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a champion for family farmers and for the nutrition program in the farm bill.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in support of this amendment, strong support of this amendment, because it aims to reform a broken crop insurance program. This is a program where taxpayers foot an average of 60 percent of the premiums for beneficiaries, plus there's the reimbursement of the administrative and operating costs, 100 percent of those efforts.

These are for private companies that sell the plans, including multinational corporations, some of whom trace back to companies who are in tax havens. And essentially, what it does, it works to improve crop insurance, it limits taxpayer subsidized profits of companies that sell crop insurance.

It does not harm the ability of the companies to sell these policies in any way. It would ensure that taxpayers do not continue to subsidize these administrative and operating expenses.

It's a bipartisan amendment. It enjoys broad support from a number of groups across the political spectrum, as has been laid out. It caps the amount of crop insurance premium support individual producers receive.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. KIND. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. GAO said that the cap would affect just under 4 percent. Crop insurance is the only farm support program subsidized by taxpayers and not subject to a payment limitation. This would bring this in line with other farm programs, and it would shine a little long overdue sunlight on the crop insurance program.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. I rise in opposition to the amendment. The people I represent value American agriculture and understand that food doesn't grow on grocery store shelves. It takes the hard work and high risk of farmers to get that food to market. I believe all of those farmers are worth supporting.

This amendment will undermine the safety net for many of those farmers, large and small. Many people don't realize it, but farm operations are made up of as many different kinds of farms as people. Different farms have different sizes, different ownership structures, different crop mixes and different equipment, and that diversity makes our domestic farming portfolio strong.

It's often the big guys who act as the hub of a farm community and offer the smaller farmers in the area access to expensive equipment that they could never afford on their own. These are all family farms in the best sense of the word, and they depend on each other for their livelihood.

This amendment effectively ends the safety net for the large family farmer, without whom many of our small family farms couldn't produce. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. KIND. How much time remains, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 2¾ minutes. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 6½ minutes.

Mr. KIND. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your yielding also to me.

I rise in opposition to the Kind amendment, and do I so because I don't want to see agriculture distorted.

We've watched as equipment's gotten larger, farms have gotten larger. And when you start locking this thing down and tying it to an AGI, what you really have is a means test for the first time. It pits neighbors against neighbors.

Here's what I remember. Back in the eighties, when we had a farm crisis and we had a real disaster, I saw on the front page of the paper, $26 billion in farm subsidy disaster money to deal with drought and the climate that we had and the bad economic climate.

We haven't had those calls. 2011 we had a big flood. No calls for disaster money. 2012 we had a big drought. No calls for disaster money.

Crop insurance is working. Eighty-six percent of the crop is insured today. I recall it being 13 percent back then when I saw the $26 billion bill hit the headlines in the Des Moines Register.

So I urge opposition to the Kind amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, thank you for yielding.

You know, what this amendment's going to do is undermine the crop insurance system and take a whole bunch of people out of the crop insurance system that we need to make it actuarially sound.

Now, it was just said here that there's no other program that doesn't have a payment limit. Well, let me tell you something. Mr. KIND is cosponsor of the Goodlatte-Scott dairy provision, which has no payment limits.

□ 2230

The 6,000 cow dairies in Mr. KIND's district are going to get $600,000 of benefit from our subsidies in the dairy program, and there's no payment limitation. So, come on. If you really believe

in payment limits, why isn't it on the Goodlatte-Scott scheme?

So this amendment undermines everything that we've been trying to do in the Agriculture Committee. We had the biggest disaster last year, drought, that we've ever had. We had no significant call for an ad hoc disaster for the first time that I can remember since I've been here, and the reason is because crop insurance worked.

Agriculture is working. In my district, we have 3 percent unemployment because agriculture is working. The one part of the economy that's actually working, and all these people that want to create jobs and want to create government programs so we can create jobs, they want to take the one thing that's working in the country and screw it up. And I'm not going to be part of it.

So vote ''no'' on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 2¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to myself, Mr. Chairman, 2 minutes.

The ranking member makes very valid points. When you look at the way Federal crop insurance works, it shifts the risk from the Treasury to the private companies to the reinsurers to the farmers and ranchers. If you look at how these premiums and payments have gone over the last decade—not just the really tough weather last year—you'll find that, in reality, 70 percent of the policies over the last 10 years have not returned one single penny—70 percent.

And if you look at how the program has worked in the 7 years prior to the onset of the drought of 2011, basically the Federal Government actually made money on Federal crop insurance. Now, I can't help the anomaly that the superdrought was in the Midwest. But I can tell you that's a pretty good track record.

The ranking member is entirely right: it works. Let's not mess up something that works. With that, I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in response.

To my good friend in Minnesota, my average dairy herd size in western Wisconsin is 125 cows. I don't have the mega-dairy operations and that. So we'll have plenty of time to debate the federally run supply management program that he's been advocating for in the FARRM Bill, which I think will be a disaster and won't work.

But to my friend from Iowa, we're not talking about eliminating the crop insurance program. This risk-management tool will be in place. It won't touch 96 percent of the producers out there.

The last time I checked, we're running some record budget deficits, and there are areas in this farm program, especially in crop insurance, that we can go to for sensible, commonsense savings that's economically justifiable while maintaining risk within the program today.

It's a little ironic that we have such defenders of this crop insurance program when last year alone, the typical insurance company received $1.46 in taxpayer subsidies to every dollar that went into the pocket of our farmers. And five of the 10 biggest insurance companies offering these programs are foreign-owned entities. As the gentlelady from Connecticut just pointed out, many of them are using tax havens on the taxpayer dime. And how they can get up here and justify this program with a straight face is really beyond me.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my colleague, Chairman LUCAS. Thank you to Ranking Member PETERSON.

We agree: crop insurance is not broken. I stand here today to remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that recently Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack sat in our Agriculture Committee hearing and said that crop insurance is not broken. Crop insurance is one of the most successful programs we have in the Midwest as you heard in this debate. We see that we're not doing off-budget disaster assistance. We see that farmers are willing to give up direct payments to have better risk-management tools like crop insurance.

Let's also get to the point, too, that bankers, our creditors, will not give loans to our farmers and keep our family farms in business without a strong risk-management program like the effective crop insurance program that we have.

I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this amendment. We need to ensure that this risk-management tool, crop insurance, stays as viable and as effective as it is; and I stand here today and agree with Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack and agree that crop insurance is not broken. Please oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I'd like to yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you, Mr. KIND, for giving up some of your valuable time. I will try to be quick. First, I want to thank the chair and the ranking member. They've worked hard on the FARRM bill, and I appreciate many of the good pieces that are in this bill.

But there are a lot of unconscionable cuts that hit deeply into the working poor in this country, particularly the SNAP benefits cuts, which is a means-tested program.

I want to rise in support of this amendment because unlike the cuts on the SNAP benefits for low-income families, this amendment just asks the richest agricultural business in America to pay a little more and receive a little less, just this one portion of the amendment, the $250,000 cap for farmers who clear more than $250,000 a year. We have a lot of farmers in our State and a growing number of farmers in our State, but there are very few that clear more money than that.

This mostly affects corporate farms. Ninety-six percent of the farmers will never be affected by this amendment, but for a very few, this is a huge benefit.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I thank my colleague for his time.

Mr. KIND. I believe the chairman has the right to close.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma has the right to close and does still have time.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, let me close by saying that, listen, I understand there's a lot of hard work that goes into the committee in producing a farm bill. I get that. But there are areas of cost savings that we can justify to the American taxpayer without jeopardizing the risk-management tools.

Crop insurance is ripe for that type of reform. And, again, what we're offering and what we're setting out is very commonsense, economically justifiable, and would save the American taxpayer over $11 billion over the next 10 years.

If the average taxpayer knew just how this crop insurance program is set up today, they'd be aghast in horror. It's not right. We're trying to correct that right now while maintaining the safety net in a viable crop insurance program that can work.

I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield myself whatever time I may have yet.

I would just simply say to my colleagues, the system works. As my colleague also noted, it is critically important that farmers be able to secure their financing. And while ultimately like most provisions in the FARRM Bill that raise the food and fiber, the consumers at the end of the chain benefit from the highest quality, most affordable price of food and fiber in the history of the world.

Please protect this important resource to production agriculture. Please continue it to enable farmers to farm. Vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. CARNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 11012.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of a bipartisan, straightforward amendment that I introduced with my colleague, Congressman RADEL of Florida, that will help maximize the efficiency of taxpayer dollars used in the Federal crop insurance program.

Periodically, the USDA, through the Risk Management Agency, renegotiates its agreement with private crop insurers for the delivery and administration of Federal crop insurance. These negotiations, known as Standard Reinsurance Agreements, do not affect the premium subsidies paid to farmers and instead focus on the percent of gains or losses assumed by taxpayers and the level of crop insurance administrative and operating costs paid by the Federal Government.

□ 2240

The most recent negotiation was finalized in 2010 and yielded $6 billion in savings. Of these savings, $4 billion was used to reduce the Federal deficit, and the remaining $2 billion was put back into farm programs to supplement conservation efforts and improve certain products provided through the Federal crop insurance program.

Our amendment simply maintains current law by striking a provision in the bill requiring that any savings from future Standard Reinsurance Agreements be put back into the Federal crop insurance program. This amendment continues to respect the importance of a robust farm safety net while maintaining USDA's tools to improve Federal crop insurance, reduce the deficit, and strengthen conservation programs within the farm bill.

Our amendment is supported by taxpayer advocates as well as the environmental community who share the same goal of ensuring that the Federal crop insurance program works for farmers and for taxpayers.

I want to thank my colleague from Florida for working with me on this amendment, and I urge its support. Thank you for your consideration.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL).

Mr. RADEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment because I believe that American taxpayers should be considered when their money is basically being divvied up here in Washington. That's what we're deciding. This amendment—which I thank the gentleman from Delaware for offering with me—simply allows for savings to occur in a renegotiation of crop insurance agreements.

I love the fact that we're working on both sides of the aisle. This is as bipartisan as you can get, Mr. Chair. Oftentimes on our side, as fiscal conservatives, we are accused of ''cut, cut, cut.'' But what this is really about is save, save, save. The Members of this House should be encouraging this administration to save, save, save when we can.

This amendment allows for the USDA to attempt to find savings when negotiating. So let's not tie the hands of our negotiators, as this current bill does. Let's allow them to pursue savings on behalf of the hardworking American taxpayer working day in and day out right now.

All around the country people are struggling to get by. So instead of requiring the maximum amount of taxpayer dollars to be spent on this government program, all we're asking is let's just try and save some money with this, and that's what this amendment does.

So a vote for this amendment is a vote to keep the taxpayer—the hardworking American taxpayer—in mind, what is fair for them, when we set up this crop insurance policy. It's plain. It's simple.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Delaware has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to close by thanking the gentleman from Florida for his assistance on this amendment and just to ask my colleagues to think about what we've been trying to do since I came to this House in 2011, which is to get a budget balanced and to find savings wherever we can.

This is an opportunity to use savings from the renegotiations of these agreements for deficit reduction and other things that the USDA might deem appropriate. So I want to thank my colleague for that, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, first off, a couple of points.

One, the 40-some-odd hearings we had in the last couple of years, at every single one of them, whether it blocked crop insurance or not, the producers said: Don't screw up crop insurance. Crop insurance is the one risk management tool that we know works, it's the one our bankers understand the best, and don't screw that up.

A little history lesson. The 2008 farm bill cut $6 billion out of the crop insurance program and out of the hides of the folks that these folks have been talking about. A re-rating process that USDA went through and RMA went through cut an additional $3 billion. And then the Standard Reinsurance Agreement renegotiation—that Congress had nothing to do with—trimmed another $8 billion. So $17 billion has been reduced out of the crop insurance program since the last time we reauthorized this.

Nothing in the base bill stops the USDA from finding savings in the crop insurance program, nothing. They are still able to do that. What we would like to happen with those savings though is we would like for Congress to control those. We don't want the pet projects of the administration, the pet projects of the USDA to get funded.

Now, my colleagues threw the words ''deficit reduction'' around in good faith, but that's not what happens with this money. USDA and this administration finds other places to spend the money. We don't think that's the right idea.

So I understand the intent of this, but there's nothing in the base bill that restricts USDA from finding those savings if they can find them. We just want Congress to control how that money gets spent and not the pet projects that the administration does.

So I urge a ''no'' vote on this. I believe it was done in good faith, but it won't accomplish what they want. It simply further empowers this executive branch and the administration to do what they will with these savings.

So the savings are still going to be there, still you're going to be able to find them. So I would urge a ''no'' vote on this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. RADEL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 590, beginning on line 18, strike section 12101 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 12101. REPEAL OF THE NATIONAL SHEEP INDUSTRY IMPROVEMENT CENTER.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 375 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2008j) is repealed.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. RADEL. Mr. Chairman, I've only been here a few months. In my short time I've witnessed firsthand just how we spend your money here in Washington—your money, the hardworking, tax-paying American.

Even I was shocked though to learn about something that is hidden very, very deep in this year's farm bill. It's actually filed under miscellaneous. It is for sheep shearing. Sheep shearing. Sheep shearing. We have already spent $50 million—$50 million—on sheep shearing, an industry that basically goes back to the Old Testament. Moses was sheep shearing. So my amendment right here—one page, one sentence—will stop another $50 million from being wasted.

But let's take a look at what $50 million of your money has purchased you as a hardworking, tax-paying American. This program funded a trip to Australia for the Tri-Lambs. It's kind of a play off of ''Revenge of the Nerds,'' if anyone saw that movie in the eighties.

Look, as much as I love that flick, the purpose of this trip was to get people to eat lamb. And Mr. Chair, I'm sorry, but I think that we can find a better way to use our money here in the United States.

In another grant, two beginner sheep shearers were given—here we go—free combs, brushes, razors and scissors with our $50 million. What we're talking about here are startup costs. Think about that. If you are a business owner and you had $50 million, what you could do with that kind of money. It was startup money. And here again in Washington, where the people of the United States of America are so sick and tired of us picking and choosing who will succeed or who will lose, that's debatable right now when we look at this.

It's not fair. You're struggling to make ends meet. We have Democrats right now and Republicans who are debating our social safety net in this country right now about how hungry children are, and we're talking about $50 million to shave sheep. It would be laughable if it was not so sad. This could be your money that you could be saving up for your rent, for your mortgage, for your next vacation.

This is as bipartisan as you can get. We are looking for places to save and show how we here in Congress can be more efficient with your money, accountable and transparent with your money—you, who are working 40, 50, 60 hours a week.

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

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

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I started to go down one path, but the disdain with which my good colleague from Florida insulted the folks in this industry is unacceptable.

I rise in opposition. I wish he would get his facts correct. The total appropriation, actual money spent since '96 is $1 million. He has confused authorizations with appropriations. So if he will go and check his records, the $50 million he blasted out over and over and over was just simply incorrect. That is not the money that was spent.

Sheep shearing is an important issue with respect to growing the wool industry in this country. It is about jobs. Sheep shearing is hard work, and we're trying to figure out ways to make that happen.

This board is housed at the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agriculture Marketing Service. It's a board appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. It's composed of seven members—four active sheep growers, two finance and management members, and then two folks out of the USDA to make a total of nine.

□ 2250

The National Sheep Industry Improvement Center provides small grant projects to assist in the improvement of the sheep industry and the expansion of markets.

Throughout the farm bill, we have attempted over and over and over again to promote production agriculture and the jobs associated with it. While sheep shearing may not be particularly exotic and folks from Florida may think it is beneath them, the folks from west Texas take a whole different view of that.

The author of the amendment has disparaged these grants saying that they are for razors and combs for beginning shearers. That's how you do it, Mr. Chairman. The truth is that a shortage of properly trained wool harvesting professionals, this shortage is critical and one of the difficulties for producers who wish to participate in the production of wool.

A major barrier for beginning sheep shearing professionals is an initial cost of purchasing the equipment. These small grants assist to create these jobs in an industry that needs our help.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RADEL. Mr. Chairman, we are defending sheep shearing: ''$50 million in appropriations, $1 million under government accounting.''

When we look at the industry ''best practices''—again, those quotes dripping with practically sarcasm—they could have been written by Moses with how old this industry is. The proposal funds ''an informational video describing recommended goat handling practices.''

When we look at the positions in this, the nine, seven are from the industry itself, two are from the Federal Government. They're using this money on social media. Mr. Chairman, you know as well as I do, we're talking this is free—social media, the Internet. This doesn't cost money to ''create a buzz'' among consumers. This is their quotes about lamb.

I love lamb. Sure, I'll have dinner with lamb any night, but I don't think that the Federal Government needs to fund a PR campaign for one industry.

Again, this is why the American people are so frustrated with both Democrats and Republicans picking and choosing industries. Congress has wasted $50 million, yes, in appropriations since 1996 on this program. It is time that this House elected to save taxpayer dollars at a time where we have record deficits and runaway spending. Put our votes where the Americans, the hardworking, taxpaying American's money is.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Again, Mr. Chairman, it is $1 million since 1996, not $50 million. He's exaggerating again.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, rise in opposition to this amendment. I would reiterate what my good friend Mr. CONAWAY said, that we did not spend $50 million; we spent $1 million.

I was part of putting this in the 2008 farm bill. The reason is that we almost killed off the sheep and goat industry in this country. With what we did back in the nineties and so forth, there was hardly anybody left in the industry. We basically gave it away to New Zealand and Australia.

What we're trying to do, and what we tried to do in the 2008 bill for this little bit amount of money that we put in there was give this industry a chance to get back on its feet and start producing lamb products and goat products in this country instead of importing them from some other place. That's what this is all about.

You can make fun of it all you want, but at the end of the day, this is about American jobs and about keeping the production here in the United States.

Let's be clear about what this is. It is $1 million. I think it is money that's well spent. We can go into all of the reasons for the demise of the sheep industry. A lot of it had to do with what we did at the Federal level and the government level to screw this industry up, especially in Montana, Wyoming, and places like that, but we don't have

time to go into all of that. This is a modest effort to help that industry get back on its feet and make sure that those jobs are in the U.S.

Mr. RADEL. Mr. Chairman, only in Washington, D.C., can someone call $1 million a modest amount. There's one thing that I live by that I hope I can serve the American people with, and it is that the individual raindrop does not blame itself for the flood.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a time of record deficits, a debt that hangs over to the point that it is a national security problem for our country. I encourage my colleagues to vote for this amendment and slow the torrent of wasteful spending.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. I would reiterate my opposition. This is a good investment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 12312.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, if it weren't for the lateness of the hour, I would be tempted to ask if any of my colleagues have had constituents call or write their offices to ask whether Congress has lost its marbles. I won't do that.

But I would point out the fact that the underlying bill we are considering tonight contains a provision to create a checkoff program, like many others, but this is a checkoff program for natural stone on behalf of the marble and granite industry.

To those of my friends who are supporters of the checkoff program—and again, there are many checkoff programs—I would simply ask for you to take a close look at my amendment.

Proponents of this checkoff have argued that stone is a natural product, and yes, it is. But is it just like the other products covered in the checkoff program in the agriculture arena?

To anyone unfamiliar, here's a sampling of the some of the other checkoff programs currently run by the USDA: dairy, eggs, beef, blueberries, pork, sorghum, watermelons, et cetera.

The common denominator between the some 20 checkoff programs run by the USDA is that they are all agricultural commodities. They all grow. They all can be raised. The statutory authority for this program defines precisely what an acceptable agricultural commodity is, and rock, no matter how natural it is, is not one of them.

Mr. Chairman, farmers in my district do not grow rocks. In fact, they don't like it when frost heaves and pushes new rocks up in their fields, as in my farm field.

□ 2300

My amendment is more than fair, Mr. Chairman, and is necessary for maintaining the integrity of the farm bill and not for expanding—for which our chairman earlier this evening expressed concern—more farm bill programs in assorted prior amendments. There are no laws preventing this industry from imposing a voluntary tax on their membership. If they are really insistent on having a government-run checkoff, they could have pursued a program under a more appropriate agency like the Department of Commerce or the Department of the Interior.

I would hope my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, would agree that rocks have no place in a farm bill, and would join me in removing this provision from the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. The underlying language of the farm bill simply provides this industry the same opportunity that many other industries have been provided through the checkoff.

I share a similar concern with the gentleman who has the amendment. Commerce or the Interior might have been an appropriate place to put this, other than they simply don't have the infrastructure to handle such a program. The infrastructure is already there at the USDA. There are other examples of products outside of agriculture that have been handled there.

It simply gives the U.S. stone industry the opportunity to come together with a voluntary payment to support a marketing program to help their industry. Again, it is voluntary. A ''tax,'' by definition, is an involuntary payment to support the government. This is a voluntary payment to support an industry.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. I would suggest that it's not voluntary for all of those in an industry, and I am certain that not all of them in the industry are asking for this checkoff.

Again, I understand there may not be the best infrastructure like the agriculture at the USDA programs for a checkoff like this. But again, I would ask the sponsor of this proposal: When have we grown rocks? Do we seed rocks?

When we look at the agriculture commodity as a term described and defined, it says that the agriculture commodity means agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, and dairy products, livestock and the products of livestock, the products of poultry and bee raising, the products of forestry. I could go on, but it nowhere says ''rocks.'' To expand the program in a farm bill issue and in dealing with something we can't grow, I think, establishes the wrong precedent.

I ask for support for the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair rather than to other Members.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I've got great respect for the author of the amendment, and he knows that, but I do stand in opposition to the amendment.

The checkoff programs on a generic basis are very successful. The industry itself votes on them and comes together to decide how they're used in the promotion of the products.

I respectfully disagree with my good colleague, but I have to oppose this amendment. We handled this in committee, and it passed in committee. We gave it a good scrubbing there. So I would ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the respect, and I understand that. I appreciate the fact that the USDA has a good record of dealing with checkoffs. I'm not necessarily opposed to all checkoffs, but they ought to fit. Growing rocks—marble, granite—just does not fit in an agricultural program. I think that's apparent. So I ask my colleagues to support this amendment in order to keep the integrity of the farm bill in growing agriculture.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Again, Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to put it in the Departments of Commerce or the Interior, but the infrastructure is already there to put it in the USDA.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. I thank the chairman.

The chairman and I have had several small businesses in Alabama—marble businesses, granite businesses, stone businesses—that have contacted me and have told me that this discretionary permission to request a research order or a promotion is very important to them.

They've been struggling over the past several years since our what was almost a depression, and they're small businesses. I'm talking about businesses of 10 people, 30 people, 100 people. This is predominantly a small business venture, and we all have them in our communities.

I would urge a ''no'' vote, although I do respect the gentleman from Michigan and many of his endeavors.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, propane and oil heat function as checkoff programs under the Department of Commerce and under the Department of Energy. The statutory authority for the USDA checkoff also does not include rock. So I respectfully request that my colleagues in this body support this amendment, which keeps free those things that don't grow and are not part of agriculture out of a farm bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the industry has simply asked for chance to participate in a no-cost-to-the-taxpayer, voluntary program in which they can use that to help promote their product. I as a conservative think that this is good for some of our small business owners, and I respectfully ask that we oppose the amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LUCAS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 271, I offer the following amendments en bloc which I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 53, 59, 60, 62 through 97, and 103, printed in House Report No. 113–117, offered by Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma:

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MS. SINEMA OF ARIZONA

Page 629, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 12317. PRODUCE REPRESENTED AS GROWN IN THE UNITED STATES WHEN IT IS NOT IN FACT GROWN IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO CBP.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall make available to U.S. Customs and Border Protection technical assistance related to the identification of produce represented as grown in the United States when it is not in fact grown in the United States.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on produce represented as grown in the United States when it is not in fact grown in the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Page 200, line 2, strike ''5 percent'' and insert ''7.5 percent''.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF MISSISSIPPI

Page 238, after line 13, insert the following:

''(D) The healthy forests reserve program established under section 501 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6571).

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of subtitle G of title II, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2609. LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN CONSERVATION REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry a report containing the results of a review and analysis of each of the programs administered by the Secretary that pertain to the conservation of the lesser prairie-chicken, including the conservation reserve program, the environmental quality incentives program, the wildlife habitat incentive program, and the Lesser Prairie-Chicken Initiative.

(b) CONTENTS.—The Secretary shall include in the report required by this section, at a minimum—

(1) with respect to each program described in subsection (a) as it relates to the conservation of the lesser prairie-chicken, findings regarding—

(A) the cost of the program to the Federal Government, impacted State governments, and the private sector;

(B) the conservation effectiveness of the program; and

(C) the cost-effectiveness of the program; and

(2) a ranking of the programs described in subsection (a) based on their relative cost-effectiveness.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER OF NORTH DAKOTA

Page 265, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 2609. WETLANDS MITIGATION.

Section 1222 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3822) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(D), by striking ''unless more acreage is needed to provide equivalent functions and values that will be lost as a result of the wetland conversion to be mitigated''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(E)—

(i) by inserting ''not'' before ''greater than''; and

(ii) by striking ''if more acreage is needed to provide equivalent functions and values that will be lost as a result of the wetland conversion that is mitigated''; and

(2) by striking subsection (g).

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 290, after line 9, insert the following new subsection:

(c) U.S. ATLANTIC SPINY DOGFISH STUDY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct an economic study on the existing market in the United States for U.S. Atlantic Spiny Dogfish.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. REED OF NEW YORK

Strike section 4015 and insert the following:

SEC. 4015. DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDIZATION FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.

(a) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDIZATION.—Section 11 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(v) DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.—

''(1) Designation.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with an interagency work group established by the Office of Management and Budget, and considering State government perspectives, designate data exchange standards to govern, under this part—

''(A) necessary categories of information that State agencies operating such programs are required under applicable law to electronically exchange with another State agency; and

''(B) Federal reporting and data exchange required under applicable law.

''(2) Requirements.—The data exchange standards required by paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable—

''(A) incorporate a widely accepted, nonproprietary, searchable, computer-readable format, such as the eXtensible Markup Language;

''(B) contain interoperable standards developed and maintained by intergovernmental partnerships, such as the National Information Exchange Model;

''(C) incorporate interoperable standards developed and maintained by Federal entities with authority over contracting and financial assistance;

''(D) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

''(E) be implemented in a manner that is cost-effective and improves program efficiency and effectiveness; and

''(F) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary.

''(3) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a change to existing data exchange standards for Federal reporting found to be effective and efficient.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Secretary shall issue a proposed rule within 24 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. The rule shall identify federally-required data exchanges, include specification and timing of exchanges to be standardized, and address the factors used in determining whether and when to standardize data exchanges. It should also specify state implementation options and describe future milestones.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4033. SERVICE OF TRADITIONAL FOODS IN PUBLIC FACILITIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM.—The term ''food service program'' includes—

(A) food service at a residential child care facility with a license from an appropriate State agency;

(B) a child nutrition program (as defined in section 25(b) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769f (b));

(C) food service at a hospital or clinic or long term care facility; and

(D) a senior meal program.

(2) INDIAN; INDIAN TRIBE; INDIAN TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The terms ''Indian''; ''Indian tribe''; and ''Indian Tribal Organization'' have the meanings given those terms in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(3) TRADITIONAL FOOD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''traditional food'' means food that has traditionally been prepared and consumed by an Indian tribe.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''traditional food'' includes—

(i) wild game meat;

(ii) fish;

(iii) seafood;

(iv) marine mammals;

(iv) plants; and

(v) berries.

(b) PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall allow the donation to and serving of traditional food through a food service program at a public facility, nonprofit facility, including facilities operated by an Indian tribe or tribal organization that primarily serves Indians if the operator of the food service program—

(1) ensures that the food is received whole, gutted, gilled, as quarters, or as a roast, without further processing;

(2) makes a reasonable determination that—

(A) the animal was not diseased;

(B) the food was butchered, dressed, transported, and stored to prevent contamination, undesirable microbial growth, or deterioration; and

(C) the food will not cause a significant health hazard or potential for human illness;

(3) carries out any further preparation or processing of the food at a different time or in a different space from the preparation or processing of other food for the applicable program to prevent cross-contamination;

(4) cleans and sanitizes food-contact surfaces of equipment and utensils after processing the traditional food; and

(5) labels donated traditional food with the name of the food and stores the traditional food separately from other food for the applicable program, including through storage in a separate freezer or refrigerator or in a separate compartment or shelf in the freezer or refrigerator.

(c) LIABILITY.—Liability for damages from donated traditional food and products to the participating food service program shall not be subject to civil or criminal liability arising from the nature, age, packaging, or condition of donated food.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MRS. NEGRETE MCLEOD OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4033. FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR INDIAN TRIBES.

Section 4 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR INDIAN TRIBES.—

''(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of a tribal demonstration project for tribes to administer all Federal food assistance programs, services, functions, and activities (or portions thereof) of the agency.

''(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall consider—

''(A) the probable effects on specific programs and program beneficiaries of such a demonstration project;

''(B) statutory, regulatory, or other impediments to implementation of such a demonstration project;

''(C) strategies for implementing such a demonstration project;

''(D) probable costs or savings associated with such a demonstration project;

''(E) methods to assure quality and accountability in such a demonstration project; and

''(F) such other issues that may be determined by the Secretary or developed through consultation with pursuant to paragraph (4).

''(3) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the effective date of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. The report shall contain—

''(A) the results of the study under this subsection;

''(B) a list of programs, services, functions, and activities (or portions thereof) within each agency with respect to which it would be feasible to include in a tribal demonstration project;

''(C) a list of programs, services, functions, and activities (or portions thereof) included in the list provided pursuant to subparagraph (B) that could be included in a tribal demonstration project without amending a statute, or waiving regulations that the Secretary may not waiver; and

''(D) a list of legislative actions required in order to include those programs, services, function, and activities (or portions thereof) included in the list provided pursuant to subparagraph (B) but not included in the list provided pursuant to subparagraph (C), in a tribal demonstration project.

''(4) CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES.—The Secretary shall consult with Indian tribes to determine a protocol for consultation under paragraph (1) prior to consultation under such paragraph with the other entities described in such paragraph. The protocol shall require, at a minimum, that—

''(A) the government-to-government relationship with Indian tribes forms the basis for the consultation process;

''(B) the Indian tribes and the Secretary jointly conduct the consultations required by this subsection; and

''(C) the consultation process allows for separate and direct recommendations from the Indian tribes and other entities described in paragraph (1).

''(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection. Such sums shall remain available until expended.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MS. DUCKWORTH OF ILLINOIS

Page 366, after line 20, insert the following:

SEC. 4208. STUDY ON FUNDING FOR EMERGENCY FEEDING ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations for such purpose, the Secretary shall conduct a study of the impact on emergency feeding organizations of cuts made to the supplemental nutrition assistance program pursuant to this Act and the Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–296).

(b) MATTERS TO BE ASSESSED.—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall assess the following:

(1) In the month preceding the implementation of the cuts described in subsection (a)—

(A) a baseline of the number of clients served by emergency feeding organizations;

(B) a baseline of the frequency that clients visit an emergency feeding organization during the month; and

(C) a baseline of the amount of food distributed by emergency feeding organizations during the month.

(2) Two months and four months following the implementation of such cuts (or at such other times the Secretary determines appropriate to best measure the impact of such cuts)—

(A) the change in the number of clients seeking food assistance from emergency feeding organizations;

(B) the change in the frequency that clients seek food assistance from emergency feeding organizations;

(C) the adequacy of supply of donated food to emergency feeding organizations to meet demand for food assistance; and

(D) the total number of clients served and number of clients turned away or reductions in the amount of food distributed to clients by emergency feeding organizations because of the lack of resources to meet the need for food assistance.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2014, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing—

(1) the impact of cuts described in subsection (a) on demand at emergency feeding organizations; and

(2) the ability of emergency feeding organizations to meet changes in need resulting from such cuts.

(d) EMERGENCY FEEDING ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''emergency feeding organization'' has the meaning given the term in section 201A of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7501).

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 4208. PURCHASE OF HALAL AND KOSHER FOOD FOR EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 202 of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7502) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) KOSHER AND HALAL FOOD.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall finalize and implement a plan—

''(1) to increase the purchase of Kosher and Halal food from food manufacturers with a Kosher or Halal certification to carry out the program established under this Act if the Kosher and Halal food purchased is cost neutral as compared to food that is not from food manufacturers with a Kosher or Halal certification; and

''(2) to modify the labeling of the commodities list used to carry out the program in a manner that enables Kosher and Halal food bank operators to identify which commodities to obtain from local food banks.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

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

SEC. 4208. REVIEW OF SOLE-SOURCE CONTRACTS IN FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS.

The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of sole-source contracts in Federal nutrition programs, and the effect such contracts have on program participation, program goals, nonprogram consumers, retailers, and free market dynamics. Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report the findings of this review to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. GARDNER OF COLORDAO

Page 393, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. _____. RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.

Section 18(c) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 918(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Rural Electrification Administration'' each place it appears and inserting ''Rural Utilities Service''; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by insertiong ''COOPERATIVE'' before ''AGREEMENTS''; and

(B) by inserting after the 1st sentence the folllowing: ''A contract funded by a borrower that is to be paid for out of the general funds of the borrower is not a public contract within the meaning of title 41, United States Code''.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ OF CALIFORNIA

Page 401, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. _____. TELEMEDICINE AND DISTANCE LEARNING SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS.

Section 2333(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 950aaa-2(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (12); and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (13) as paragraph (14) and inserting after paragraph (12) the following:

''(13) whether the applicant for assistance is located in a designated health professional shortage area (within the meaning of section 332 of the Public Health Service Act)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. MICHAUD OF MAINE

Page 401, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REGIONAL ECONOMIC AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT.

Section 15751 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''Not more than'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not more than''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) LIMITED FUNDING.—In a case in which less than $10,000,000 is made available to a Commission for a fiscal year under this section, paragraph (1) shall not apply.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

At the end of subtitle A of title VII (page 430, after line 18), add the following:

SEC. 7129. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING EXPANSION OF THE LAND GRANT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE ENHANCED FUNDING AND ADDITIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) institutions of higher education designated under the Act of August 30, 1890 (commonly known, and referred to in this section, as the ''Second Morrill Act''; 7 U.S.C. 321 et seq.) have played an integral role in the education and advancement of agriculture and mechanic arts for over a century;

(2) in addition to those institutions, a number of colleges and universities have fulfilled similar and parallel missions in successfully training and graduating generations of students who have gone on to be leaders in their field;

(3) the colleges and universities, both with and without designation under the Second Morrill Act, fulfill a vital role to the future of industry, opportunities for increased job creation, and the strength of American agriculture;

(4) Congress must ensure that the United States' higher education framework and policies meet the needs of young Americans, and that students from across the country are able to choose from a variety of institutions and programs that will equip them with the skills and training necessary to achieve their individual goals; and

(5) as Congress and the agricultural community generally consider policies and approaches to improve research, extension, and education in the agricultural sciences, expansion of the land grant program under the Second Morrill Act to include enhanced funding and additional institutions should be considered.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MS. GABBARD OF HAWAII

Page 433, line 17, strike '''subsections (e) and (f)''' and insert '''subsections (e), (f), and (g)'''.

Page 433, line 20, strike '''subsections (e) and (f)''' and insert '''subsections (e), (f), and (g)'''.

Page 433, line 23, strike ''subsections (e), (f), and (g)'' and insert ''subsections (e), (f), and (h)''.

Page 434, line 10, strike ''and'' at the end.

Page 434, after line 10, insert the following new paragraph:

(6) by inserting after subsection (f) (as redesignated by paragraph (4)) the following new subsection:

''(g) COFFEE PLANT HEALTH INITIATIVE.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a coffee plant health initiative to address the critical needs of the coffee industry by—

''(A) developing and disseminating science-based tools and treatments to combat the coffee berry borer (*Hypothenemus hampei*); and

''(B) establishing an area-wide integrated pest management program in areas affected by or areas at risk of being affected by the coffee berry borer.

''(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The Secretary may carry out the coffee plant health initiative through—

''(A) Federal agencies, including the Agricultural Research Service and the National Institute of Food and Agriculture;

''(B) National Laboratories;

''(C) institutions of higher education;

''(D) research institutions or organizations;

''(E) private organizations or corporations;

''(F) State agricultural experiment stations;

''(G) individuals; or

''(H) groups consisting of 2 or more entities or individuals described in subparagraphs (A) through (G).

''(3) PROJECT GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall—

''(A) enter into cooperative agreements with eligible entities, as appropriate; and

''(B) award grants on a competitive basis.

''(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''; and

Page 434, line 11, strike ''(6) in subsection (g)'' and insert ''(7) in subsection (h)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. FALEOMAVAEGA OF AMERICAN SAMOA

Page 460, line 1, insert ''**AMERICAN SAMOAM FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA, AND**'' before ''**NORTHERN MARIANA**''.

Page 460, line 7, insert ''american samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia,'' before ''and the Commonwealth''.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Strike section 7514 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 7514. RESEARCH AND EDUCATION GRANTS FOR THE STUDY OF ANTIBIOTIC-RESISTANT BACTERIA.

Section 7521(c) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 3202(c)) is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR OF ARIZONA

Page 481, line 17, strike the closing quotation marks and the second period.

Page 481, after line 17, insert the following:

''(7) FIRE LIABILITY PROVISIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Chief and the Director shall issue for use in all contracts and agreements under this section fire liability provisions that are in substantially the same form as the fire liability provisions contained in—

''(A) integrated resource timber contracts, as described in the Forest Service contract numbered 2400–13, part H, section H.4; and

''(B) timber sale contracts conducted pursuant to section 14 of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 472a).''.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. COTTON OF ARKANSAS

Page 486, lines 15 and 19, insert '', management,'' after ''restoration''.

Page 486, line 22, strike ''trees'' and insert ''forests''.

Page 486, line 24, strike ''and'' and insert the following:vegetative treatments; or

Page 487, line 1, strike ''(C)'' and insert ''(D)''.

Page 487, lines 8, 13, and 24 insert '', management,'' after ''restoration''.

Page 488, line 4, insert '', management,'' after ''restoration''.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON OF COLORADO

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 8408. FOREST SERVICE LARGE AIRTANKER AND AERIAL ASSET FIREFIGHTING RECAPITALIZATION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, may establish a large airtanker and aerial asset lease program in accordance with this section.

(b) AIRCRAFT REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out the program described in subsection (a), the Secretary may enter into a multiyear lease contract for up to five aircraft that meet the criteria—

(1) described in the Forest Service document entitled ''Large Airtanker Modernization Strategy'' and dated February 10, 2012, for large airtankers; and

(2) determined by the Secretary, for other aerial assets.

(c) LEASE TERMS.—The term of any individual lease agreement into which the Secretary enters under this section shall be—

(1) up to five years, inclusive of any options to renew or extend the initial lease term; and

(2) in accordance with section 3903 of title 41, United States Code.

(d) PROHIBITION.—No lease entered into under this section shall provide for the purchase of the aircraft by, or the transfer of ownership to, the Forest Service.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH OF VIRGINIA

At the end of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 8408. LAND CONVEYANCE, JEFFERSON NATIONAL FOREST IN WISE COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—Upon payment by the Association of the consideration under subsection (b) and the costs under subsection (d), the Secretary shall, subject to

valid existing rights, convey to the Association all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of National Forest System land in the Jefferson National Forest in Wise County, Virginia, consisting of approximately 0.70 acres and containing the Mullins and Sturgill Cemetery and an easement to provide access to the parcel, as generally depicted on the map.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—As consideration for the land conveyed under subsection (a), the Association shall pay to the Secretary cash in an amount equal to the market value of the land, as determined by an appraisal approved by the Secretary and conducted in conformity with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716).

(2) DEPOSIT.—The consideration received by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States for the purposes of deficit reduction.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the land to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary.

(d) COSTS.—The Association shall pay to the Secretary at closing the reasonable costs of the survey, the appraisal, and any administrative and environmental analyses required by law.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ASSOCIATION.—The term ''Association'' means the Mullins and Sturgill Cemetery Association of Pound, Virginia.

(2) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map titled ''Mullins and Sturgill Cemetery'' dated March 1, 2013.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 8408. CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION FOR FOREST PROJECTS IN RESPOSE TO EMERGENCIES.

In the case of National Forest System land damaged by a natural disaster regarding which the President declares a disaster or emergency pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), any forest project carried out to clean up or restore the damaged National Forest System land during the two-year period beginning on the date of the declaration shall be categorically excluded from the requirements relating to environmental assessments or environmental impact statements under section 1508.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MR. LOEBSACK OF IOWA

Page 502, strike lines 20 through 24.

Page 503, line 1, redesignate paragraph (2) as subsection (a) and conform the margins accordingly.

Page 503, line 5, redesignate subparagraph (A) as paragraph (1) and conform the margins accordingly.

Page 503, beginning on line 5, strike ''paragraph (2) as paragraph (3)'' and insert ''paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively''.

Page 503, line 7, redesignate subparagraph (B) as paragraph (2) and conform the margins accordingly.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. GRIMM OF NEW YORK

At the end of title IX, add the following new section:

SEC. ___. ENERGY EFFICIENCY REPORT FOR USDA FACILITIES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on energy use and energy efficiency projects at Department of Agriculture facilities.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An analysis of energy use by Department of Agriculture facilities.

(2) A list of energy audits that have been conducted at such facilities.

(3) A list of energy efficiency projects that have been conducted at such facilities.

(4) A list of energy savings projects that could be achieved with enacting a consistent, timely, and proper mechanical insulation maintenance program and upgrading mechanical insulation at such facilities.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. CÁRDENAS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 527, strike lines 20 through 23 and insert the following:

SEC. 10006. FOOD SAFETY EDUCATION INITIATIVES.

Section 10105 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7655) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting '', including farm workers'' after ''industry'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(3) practices that prevent bacterial contamination of food, how to identify sources of food contamination, and other means of decreasing food contamination.''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2018''.

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

After section 10007, insert the following new section (and redesignate succeeding sections and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 10008. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE CONSULTATION REGARDING ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN LABOR LAW PROVISIONS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall consult with the Secretary of Labor regarding the restraining of shipments of agricultural commodities, or the confiscation of such commodities, by the Department of Labor for actual or suspected labor law violations in order to consider—

(1) the perishable nature of such commodities;

(2) the impact of such restraining or confiscation on the economic viability of farming operations; and

(3) the competitiveness of specialty crops through grants awarded to States under section 101 of the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note).

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR OF OHIO

Page 545, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 10018. ANNUAL REPORT ON INVASIVE SPECIES.

(a) INITIAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on invasive species.

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A list of each invasive species that is in the United States as of the date of the report.

(B) For each invasive species listed under subparagraph (A)—

(i) the country that the species originated;

(ii) the means in which the species entered the United States;

(iii) the year in which the species entered the United States;

(iv) the rate by which the entry of the species is increasing or decreasing;

(v) cost estimates, covering both the date of the report and future periods, of the cost of such species to the public and private sectors;

(vi) if cost estimates cannot be conducted under clause (iv), a detailed explanation of why;

(vii) environmental impact estimates, covering both the date of the report and future periods, of the environmental impact of the species;

(viii) if environmental impact estimates cannot be conducted under clause (iv), a detailed explanation of why;

(ix) recommendations as to what steps are needed to combat the species;

(x) a description of the ongoing research occurring to combat the species; and

(xi) a description of any legal recourse available to people affected by the species.

(C) Any other matter the Secretary determines appropriate.

(3) PERIOD COVERED.—The report under paragraph (1) shall cover the period beginning in 1980 and ending on the date on which the report is submitted.

(b) ANNUAL UPDATED REPORTS.—Not later than October 1 of each fiscal year beginning after the date on which the report under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) is submitted, the Secretary shall submit annually to Congress an updated report, including an update to each of the matters described in paragraph (2) of such subsection.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make each report under this section available to the public.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

In section 11001, insert ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''Section 502(c)'' and add at the end the following new subsection:

(b) DISCLOSURE OF CROP INSURANCE PREMIUM SUBSIDIES MADE ON BEHALF OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND CERTAIN OTHER INDIVIDUALS AND ENTITIES.—Section 502(c)(2) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1502(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (D) and (E) respectively; and

(2) by inserting before subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(A) DISCLOSURE IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1) or any other provision of law, except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall on an annual basis make available to the public—

''(i)(I) the name of each individual or entity specified in subparagraph (C) who obtained a federally subsidized crop insurance, livestock, or forage policy or plan of insurance during the previous fiscal year;

''(II) the amount of premium subsidy received by that individual or entity from the Corporation; and

''(III) the amount of any Federal portion of indemnities paid in the event of a loss during that fiscal year for each policy associated with that individual or entity; and

''(ii) for each private insurance provider, by name—

''(I) the underwriting gains earned through participation in the federally subsidized crop insurance program; and

''(II) the amount paid under this subtitle for—

''(aa) administrative and operating expenses;

''(bb) any Federal portion of indemnities and reinsurance; and

''(cc) any other purpose.

''(B) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not disclose information pertaining to individuals and entities covered by a catastrophic risk protection plan offered under section 508(b).

''(C) COVERED INDIVIDUALS AND ENTITIES.—Subparagraph (A) applies with respect to the following:

''(i) Members of Congress and their immediate families.

''(ii) Cabinet Secretaries and their immediate families.

''(iii) Entities of which any individual described in clause (i) or (ii), or combination of such individuals, is a majority shareholder.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. SCHOCK OF ILLINOIS

Page 578, line 20, insert ''pennycress,'' after ''alfalfa,''.

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MR. BARR OF KENTUCKY

Page 590, after line 15, insert the following:

SEC. 11025. ADVANCE PUBLIC NOTICE OF CROP INSURANCE POLICY AND PLAN CHANGES.

Section 505(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1505(e)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7); respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph (5):

''(5) ADVANCE NOTICE OF MODIFICATION BEFORE IMPLEMENTATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any modification to be made in the terms or conditions of any policy or plan of insurance offered under this subtitle shall not take effect for a crop year unless the Secretary publishes the modification in the Federal Register and on the website of the Corporation and provides for a subsequent period of public comment—

''(i) with respect to fall-planted crops, not later than 60 days before June 30 during the preceding crop year; and

''(ii) with respect to spring-planted crops, not later than 60 days before November 30 during the preceding crop year.

''(B) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the application of subparagraph (A) in an emergency situation declared by the Secretary upon notice to Congress of the nature of the emergency and the need for immediate implementation of the policy or plan modification referred to in such subparagraph.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. ___. ECONOMIC FRAUD IN WILD AND FARM-RAISED SEAFOOD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Office of the Chief Economist, shall submit to Congress a report on the economic implications for consumers, fishermen, and aquaculturists of fraud and mislabeling in wild and farmed seafood.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include, with respect to fraud and mislabeling in wild and farm-raised seafood, an analysis of the impact on consumers and producers in the Unites States of—

(1) sales of imported seafood that is misrepresented as domestic product;

(2) country of origin labeling that allows seafood harvested outside the United States to be labeled as a product of the United States;

(3) the lack of seafood product traceability through the supply chain; and

(4) the inadequate use of DNA testing and other technology to address seafood safety and fraud, including traceability.

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MS. FUDGE OF OHIO

Page 601, after line 18, insert the following new section:

SEC. 12204. RECEIPT FOR SERVICE OR DENIAL OF SERVICE FROM CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AGENCIES.

Section 2501A(e) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279–1(e)) is amended by striking ''and, at the time of the request, also requests a receipt''.

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ OF NEW YORK

Page 629, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. _____. URBAN AGRICULTURE COORDINATION.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall coordinate opportunities for urban agriculture, by—

(1) compiling a list of all programs administered by the Secretary or by the head of any other department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States to which urban farmers can apply for assistance or participation;

(2) examining and implementing opportunities to adjust the regulations governing the programs to enable urban farmers to participate in more of the programs;

(3) developing a process for streamlining the process by which urban farmers may apply for assistance from, or for participation in, the programs, including through the use of a single, harmonized application for multiple programs; and

(4) such other methods as the Secretary deems appropriate.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Page 629, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 12317. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INCREASED BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES FOR BLACK FARMERS, WOMEN, MINORITIES, AND SMALL BUSINESSES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should increase the number of contracts the Federal Government awards to Black farmers, businesses owned and controlled by women, businesses owned and controlled by minorities, and small business concerns.

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. ROSS OF FLORIDA

Page 629, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 12317. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING AGRICULTURE SECURITY PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) agricultural nutrients and other agricultural chemicals are essential to ensuring the most efficient production of food, fuel, and fiber;

(2) these products must be properly stored, handled, transported, and used to ensure that they are not misused or cause harm either accidentally or intentionally;

(3) the Department of Agriculture is the Federal agency with the staffing and technical expertise to understand the important role these products play in agriculture;

(4) other Federal departments and agencies have been given lead responsibility to develop and implement security programs affecting the availability, storage, transportation, and use of a variety of chemicals and products used in agriculture;

(5) it is critical that the Department of Agriculture participate fully in the development of any such security programs to ensure that they do not unnecessarily restrict the availability of the most efficient and beneficial products needed to sustain American agriculture;

(6) the Secretary of Agriculture should review staffing at the Department to ensure that the agency has senior employees within the Department at the Senior Executive Service level or higher, who have responsibility for coordinating with other Federal, State, and international agencies in the development of regulations, guidance, and procedures for the secure handling of agricultural chemicals; and

(7) that such employees shall—

(A) work with manufacturers, retailers, and the general farm community to review existing and proposed Federal, State, and international agricultural chemical security regulations;

(B) coordinate with manufacturers, retailers, transporters, and farmers to evaluate how existing and proposed security regulations, including systems to track the sale, transportation, delivery, and use of agricultural products, can be designed to minimize any adverse impact on agricultural productivity;

(C) evaluate how existing and proposed security regulations will affect the ability of agricultural producers to have timely access to nutrients, chemicals, and other products that are affordable and best suited to the producers' operations;

(D) develop recommendations on best practices, policies, and regulatory mechanisms relating to existing and proposed security programs to ensure that there is minimal adverse impact on agricultural productivity; and

(E) engage with Federal agencies with responsibility for establishing security programs to ensure that they have the information needed to develop procedures for effective security administration and enforcement that minimize any adverse impact on domestic or international agricultural productivity.

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY OF TEXAS

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

SEC. 12317. REPORT ON WATER SHARING.

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) efforts by Mexico to meet its treaty deliveries of water to the Rio Grande in accordance with the Treaty between the United States and Mexico Respecting Utilization of waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande (done at Washington, February 3, 1944); and

(2) the benefits to the United States of the Interim International Cooperative Measures in the Colorado River Basin through 2017 and Extension of Minute 318 Cooperative Measures to Address the Continued Effects of the April 2010 Earthquake in the Mexicali Valley, Baja, California (done at Coronado, California, November 20, 2012; commonly referred to as ''Minute No. 319'').

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. FLORES OF TEXAS

At the end of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. ___. REPORT ON NATIONAL OCEAN POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Executive Order 13547, issued on July 19, 2010, established the national policy for the Stewardship of the Ocean, Our Coasts, and the Great Lakes and requires—

(A) Federal implementation of ''ecosystem-based management'' to achieve a

''fundamental shift'' in how the United States manages ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources; and

(B) the establishment of nine new governmental ''Regional Planning Bodies'' and ''Coastal and Marine Spatial Plans'' in every region of the United States.

(2) Executive Order 13547 created a 54-member National Ocean Council led by the White House Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Science and Technology Policy that includes 54 principal and deputy-level representatives from Federal entities, including the Department of Agriculture.

(3) Executive Order 13547 requires National Ocean Council members, including the Department of Agriculture, to take action to implement the Policy and participate in coastal and marine spatial planning to the maximum extent possible.

(4) The Final Recommendations of the Interagency Ocean Policy Task Force that were adopted by Executive Order 13547 state that ''effective'' implementation of the National Ocean Policy will ''require clear and easily understood requirements and regulations, where appropriate, that include enforcement as a critical component''.

(5) Despite repeated Congressional requests, the National Ocean Council, which is charged with overseeing implementation of the policy, has still not provided a complete accounting of Federal activities under the policy and resources expended and allocated in furtherance of implementation of the policy.

(6) The continued economic and budgetary challenges of the United States underscore the necessity for sound, transparent, and practical Federal policies.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report detailing—

(1) all activities engaged in and resources expended in furtherance of Executive Order 13547 since July 19, 2010; and

(2) any budget requests for fiscal year 2014 for support of implementation of Executive Order 13547.

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MR. REED OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4033. ELIGIBILITY DISQUALIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN CONVICTED FELONS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 6 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015), as amended by section 4009, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(s) DISQUALIFICATION FOR CERTAIN CONVICTED FELONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual shall not be eligible for benefits under this Act if the individual is convicted of—

''(A) aggravated sexual abuse under section 2241 of title 18, United States Code;

''(B) murder under section 1111 of title 18, United States Code;

''(C) an offense under chapter 110 of title 18, United States Code;

''(D) a Federal or State offense involving sexual assault, as defined in 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a)); or

''(E) an offense under State law determined by the Attorney General to be substantially similar to an offense described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).

''(2) EFFECTS ON ASSISTANCE AND BENEFITS FOR OTHERS.—The amount of benefits otherwise required to be provided to an eligible household under this Act shall be determined by considering the individual to whom paragraph (1) applies not to be a member of such household, except that the income and resources of the individual shall be considered to be income and resources of the household.

''(3) ENFORCEMENT.—Each State shall require each individual applying for benefits under this Act, during the application process, to state, in writing, whether the individual, or any member of the household of the individual, has been convicted of a crime described in paragraph (1).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 5(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(a)), as amended by section 4009, is amended in the 2d sentence by striking ''and (r)'' and inserting '', (r), and (s)''.

(c) INAPPLICABILITY TO CONVICTIONS OCCURRING ON OR BEFORE ENACTMENT.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to a conviction if the conviction is for conduct occurring on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of an amendment, one to ensure certainty and advance notice of any changes to crop insurance eligibility for our family farmers.

On December 18, 2012, the RMA made a decision to alter the 2013 provisions of insurance for flue-cured and burley tobacco to impose a more stringent rotation schedule on tobacco farmers. Starting this year, farms have to rotate land every 2 years to qualify for crop insurance coverage. Farmers had already made their preparations for spring planting at the time of this untimely announcement, and there was no public involvement or formal rulemaking process. Many farmers had already purchased fertilizer, signed leases and made other business decisions under the impression that the land they were making preparations for would be covered under the previous requirements.

□ 2310

Had these farmers been made aware in advance of these changes that rendered many ineligible for crop insurance coverage, they would have had sufficient time to make alternative plans. This amendment would prevent this problem for any commodity moving forward.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Kentucky an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. It would not overturn any existing crop insurance requirements, but it would simply give our family farmers, including those in Kentucky, particularly Burley tobacco growers, the time they need to adjust to future changes in crop insurance requirements. It would require that any changes to current crop insurance policies be published and open for public comment at least 60 days before June 30, and at least 60 days before November 30 of the preceding year. These dates are the self-imposed deadlines the risk management agency sets each year to announce any changes to existing policies for the ensuing crop season.

I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield 2 minutes to the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, thank you for including this amendment in the en bloc section.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support an amendment that will require the Secretary of State to submit a report on water sharing with Mexico as defined by the 1944 Water Treaty. This amendment has bipartisan support, and I would like to thank my good colleague Mr. VELA from Texas for supporting this important legislation.

This amendment addresses Mexico's failure to uphold its water obligations to the United States by seeking to increase accountability in water management by requiring the State Department to provide regular reports to Congress outlining the management of the Rio Grande system. The Rio Grande plays an important role in meeting the water needs of businesses and families all across west and south Texas.

This is a result of the 1944 water treaty between the United States and Mexico which outlines the obligations of both parties in the lower Rio Grande. Both the U.S. and Mexico are obligated to jointly manage and derive benefit from the water resources located across the binational border.

Mexico is required to provide 350,000 acre-feet of water on average each year over a 5-year term. Currently, Mexico has failed to meet this obligation as they owe nearly half a million acre-feet to the United States.

It's not a secret that Texas has suffered a terrible drought and there is really no relief in sight. Mexico needs to begin fulfilling its obligations. Our farming and ranching communities depend on it.

Again, I appreciate the chairman for including it in the en bloc amendment and obviously support passage of the en bloc amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the chairman to know that I support his efforts to keep this process moving, but I'm hearing concerns apparently on our side about the reach of amendments Nos. 79 and 82 and some potential labor concerns. I'm not exactly sure what it is. Apparently, the Natural Resources Committee has got some forestry issues.

So I inquire if the gentleman is willing to work with us in this regard. I'm not sure exactly what the concerns are.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. I would say to the ranking member that of course I will work with and cooperate with the ranking member in the minority. We have accomplished so much together in that spirit, and I would be happy to continue to on those particular issues of concern.

Mr. PETERSON. I'm not even sure what the concern is, but we'll work it out.

We've notified Members that this is going on, but nobody has shown up, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. In closing, I just offer the observation that this en bloc amendment will move us substantially towards completion. I believe we'll continue to work longer this evening. But most assuredly I think now—and the ranking member would probably agree—that it's possible to meet our departure deadline tomorrow, thank goodness.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Slaughter/Polis amendment to H.R. 1947, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, which reauthorizes the study of antibiotic resistant bacteria through 2018.

Since 2008, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has funded important research on antibiotic resistant bacteria in agriculture and the development of strategies to mitigate them. For example, the Department has funded research into the development of vaccines and probiotics that reduce the need for antibiotics in agriculture, research tracking the transmission of dangerous and antibiotic-resistant bacteria in agriculture, and the development of strategies for mitigating antibiotic resistance in food-animal production systems.

This type of research is more important today than it has ever been before. Eighty percent of all antibiotics sold in the United States are used in agriculture. We are throwing away the greatest scientific advancement of the 20th century on healthy animals—and in the process creating a massive public health emergency. Science has clearly demonstrated that this type of overuse contributes to the rise of antibiotic resistant infections, which kill 70,000 Americans each year. We must fund research to identify ways antibiotic use on farms can be eliminated to ensure that our Nation's food supply is safe. The type of research authorized under this grants does just that.

When we go to the grocery store to pick up dinner, we should be able to buy our food without the worry that eating it will expose our family to potentially deadly bacteria that will no longer respond to our medical treatments. Unless we act now to develop better surveillance and strategies to reduce the use of antibiotics in agriculture, we will unwittingly be permitting animals to serve as incubators for resistant bacteria and do irreparable damage to our ability to fight disease and protect the health of our fellow Americans.

It is time for Congress to stand with scientists and do something to stop the spread of antibiotic resistant bacteria. Protecting the public's health is one of the greatest responsibilities of this body. I urge my colleagues to stand with me to support the Slaughter/Polis amendment reauthorizing research into antibiotic-resistant bacteria.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii, Ms. GABBARD. This amendment establishes a coffee plant health initiative to be led by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, with the goal of addressing the pressing needs of the coffee industry in the United States.

The U.S. coffee industry is principally based in my district, Puerto Rico, and in the State of Hawaii, given that both jurisdictions offer natural conditions ideally suited for cultivation of the coffee crop. The industry in both Puerto Rico and Hawaii is increasingly threatened by a nonnative insect commonly known as the coffee berry borer or the Broca del Café in Spanish. This agricultural pest arrived in Puerto Rico in 2007 and in Hawaii in 2010. The insect has emerged as the primary threat facing the coffee industry, adversely impacting both the yield and the market value of coffee crops.

The insect damages coffee plants by boring and depositing eggs into the berries. The larvae then hatch inside the berries and feed on the coffee beans, destroying them by creating holes. The Agricultural Research Service estimates that the coffee berry borer has caused over $500 million in losses worldwide. In Puerto Rico, production of coffee has recently fallen to an historic low, and the coffee berry borer is partially responsible. Annual coffee production in Puerto Rico is now valued at $21 million, less than half of what it was just five years ago and about a third of what it was at its peak in the mid–1990s. Most hard hit are the rural and mountainous municipalities where coffee has traditionally been a cash crop—Adjuntas, Lares, Utuado, Maricao, Jayuya, Yauco, Orocovis, Ciales, Las Marías, and San Sebastian.

Why should we care about this situation? Because without a coffee berry borer-free and controlled environment in which to plant coffee trees, our agricultural economies in Puerto Rico and Hawaii are in jeopardy. This means higher unemployment, reduced exports and increased reliance on imports. Simply put, we must protect the U.S. interests in this worldwide commodity. So research on the coffee berry borer should be made a high priority at the USDA.

This amendment is relevant not only to residents of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, but also to millions of coffee consumers around the country, who should be able to enjoy American-made coffee, such as Puerto Rico's 58 gourmet brands or the world famous coffee from the Big Island in Hawaii. Economically speaking, the United States benefits if we can increase the worldwide market share and quality of coffee that is produced in Puerto Rico and in Hawaii.

The latest statistics available reveal that my constituents consume about 30 million pounds of coffee each year. Local production in Puerto Rico, though, is roughly 10 million pounds, leaving 20 million to be imported—typically from countries in the Caribbean and Central America.

Since the berry borer emerged as a threat in Puerto Rico and Hawaii, the local governments in these two jurisdictions have worked diligently with farmers and the extension agents of our land grant universities to control the spread of the insect and to mitigate its impact. However, more must be done. Now that the insect is affecting more than just one jurisdiction, a Federal response is especially appropriate.

The amendment requires USDA to develop and provide science-based tools and treatments to combat the coffee berry borer and to establish area-wide integrated pest management programs in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and anywhere else in the U.S. that the coffee berry borer may affect. USDA would be authorized to collaborate with the land-grant universities of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, as well as with the state governments and outside organizations, to carry out scientific research and to develop and implement the integrated pest management programs.

For years, USDA has sponsored applied research targeted toward the Nation's most challenging agricultural pests and diseases. Targeted research has spanned the range of commodities and crops. The needs in tropical and subtropical agriculture are many, and the needs facing our coffee industry are pressing. Cutting edge research continues to be conducted at the U.S. Tropical Agriculture Research Station in Mayagüez, Puerto Rico, and at the U.S. Pacific Basin Agricultural Research Center in Hilo, Hawaii, by a cadre of dedicated scientists, technicians, and agronomists.

This amendment is designed to buttress their mission and to give them the authority in law they need to expand their work to help local producers. The amendment also improves the capacity of the land-grant universities to address the problems presented by the coffee berry borer.

Finally, I would note that the research conducted at the ARS research stations and by the land-grant universities in Puerto Rico and Hawaii has national application. The techniques and technology developed there have proven their utility for increasing food production and controlling agricultural pests in the U.S. mainland. The research that stands to be enhanced through this amendment has a high probability of application benefiting agricultural production beyond coffee and beyond Puerto Rico and Hawaii.

For these reasons, I urge adoption of the amendment and I thank my colleague, Ms. GABBARD, for her leadership in bringing it forward for consideration.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. BENISHEK.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 12317. SCIENTIFIC AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF THE FDA FOOD SAFETY MODERNIZATION ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') may not enforce

any regulations promulgated under the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act (Public Law 111–353) until the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register the following:

(1) An analysis of the scientific information used in the final rule to implement the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act with a particular focus on—

(A) agricultural businesses of a variety of sizes;

(B) regional differences of agriculture production, processing, marketing, and value added production;

(C) agricultural businesses that are diverse livestock and produce producers; and

(D) what, if any, negative impact on the agricultural businesses would be created, or exacerbated, by implementation of the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act.

(2) An analysis of the economic impact of the proposed final rule to implement the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act with a particular focus on—

(A) agricultural businesses of a variety of sizes; and

(B) small and mid-sized value added food processors.

(3) A plan to systematically evaluate the regulations by surveying farmers and processors and developing an ongoing process to evaluate and address business concerns.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report on the impact of implementation of the regulations promulgated under the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENISHEK. I would like to thank the chairman for the opportunity to speak on this amendment and to bring this issue to the floor.

As many of my constituents and colleagues know, I'm a doctor, not a farmer. So what they taught me in medical school is, when you don't understand something or you need a second opinion, you ask the experts.

Since becoming a Member of Congress in January 2011, I began talking to farmers in my district when I needed to learn more about agricultural issues. In fact, I realized how much farming and agribusiness contributed not only to my district, but to Michigan's economy. I asked to join the Agriculture Committee so I could better represent them in Congress.

Earlier this spring, I began to hear about a regulation that some of the farmers in my district were really concerned about. Now, if you don't have farmers in your district, let me tell you something; they will make sure that you know there's an issue.

Gradually, they began to talk to me more and more about a rule that had been proposed by the FDA that would make farming fruits and vegetables, better known as specialty crops, much more difficult in the near future. This rule, better known as Standards for the Growing, Harvesting, Packing, and Holding of Produce for Human Consumption, was imposed by the FDA as a result of the 2011 Food Safety Modernization Act.

Before I go any further, I want to make one thing crystal clear. I support access to clean, safe, and healthy food, but this proposed rulemaking will have widespread consequences for American family farmers. For example, farmers will have to comply with a new set of rules as determined by the FDA when cleaning and storing their equipment—meaning tractors, harvesters, knives, et cetera—so that domesticated animals may be prevented from contaminating them. In addition, the same rules suggest that farmers inspect each individual piece of fruit or vegetable for bird excreta and refuse to harvest it if they find any evidence.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know if you've ever seen a cherry harvester or picked an apple, but if you had to hand inspect each individual piece of fruit for bird feces and throw it out before sending it to a packer, well, let's just say that most of our growers would go to a pick-it-yourself system or simply stop growing.

Let's move on to some other aspects of this rule.

The FDA suggests continuous soil and water monitoring. While that might not sound like a bad idea, we've already heard that some growers will have to completely redesign their irrigation systems to meet the new set of standards.

I spent the last few years visiting with farmers in my district. I know that they want to provide clean, safe foods for the American public. All specialty crop growers I have met eat the foods that they grow. So my point is that if the FDA estimates that this rule will cost at a minimum $460 million to the industry, why not make sure we're doing this right?

My amendment simply asks that the Secretary of HHS delay implementation of any final regulations resulting from the Food Safety Modernization Act until a scientific and economic analysis of the rule can be completed. This analysis will focus on both the science behind and the economic impact of these regulations. In particular, the study will look at the regional differences in agriculture production to see how producers will be impacted by these rules. If we take the time to study the proposed rules, I think the FDA will be able to see that some changes may be in order.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

I think it's very interesting that the Food Safety Modernization Act was passed by the Energy and Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction, as well as the FDA; and, quite frankly, it does not have any jurisdiction under this piece of legislation, and I'm disappointed that it made it through the Rules Committee.

However, in January 2011, the President signed a transformative food safety law that Congress had passed in a bipartisan manner to improve the health of our constituents.

□ 2320

The legislation was supported by a broad coalition of consumer, public health, and industry groups, groups including the Grocery Manufacturers Association and the National Restaurant Association.

When we crafted the final food safety bill, we struck a compromise, a compromise on the scope of the bill so that the vast majority of truly small farms and processors are excluded, including those that sell most of their food directly to the public through farmers markets and farm stands; in addition to which regional considerations were also taken into consideration.

The integrity of that compromise has been maintained in the proposals released by the FDA to date. I can speak to this compromise and the agreement we reached at the time because, in fact, I helped to craft and negotiate the final language.

The law also requires that the FDA take regional differences into account when crafting its proposed rules. Let us be clear: that legislation was needed. Foodborne illness remains a threat to the public health. According to the Centers for Disease Control, each year 48 million Americans become sick from the very food they eat; 128,000 are hospitalized; and 3,000 die. These figures are far too high and simply unacceptable, so we acted. We passed the first major improvement to the FDA's food safety laws in more than 70 years.

Under the guise of seeking a report, this amendment seeks to further slow down the implementation of the law, a law with the potential to improve the very health of our constituents by reducing their risk of becoming sick from food. Yet nowhere in the text of this amendment or in the intent of these reports do I see a mention of the public health or consumer safety.

All of the FDA's proposals to implement this critical law already go through the official rulemaking process, meaning that the agency must consider the costs and the benefit of the rules, and that every one of us and our constituents can weigh in and submit comments on the rules already. The amendment before us now simply intends to slow down the process of implementing the law.

Rather than working to obstruct and delay implementation, we should be working to encourage strong implementation. Let's look at what has happened since the bill was signed into law. In that short period of time, there

have been almost 20 multi-State outbreaks positively linked to food products regulated by the FDA. One of those was an outbreak of listeria associated with cantaloupe, a product that had not previously been identified as associated with that dangerous pathogen. The same outbreak killed 33 Americans, the largest number of Americans lost to a single outbreak in a quarter of a century.

Right now there is a multi-State outbreak of hepatitis A that may have been caused by a contaminated product regulated by the FDA. More than 115 people in eight States have become ill, and more than 50 of them have required hospitalization.

It continues to be supported by the majority of Americans. A recent poll showed that more than 75 percent of Americans surveyed supported the food safety law, which is why so many respected organizations that work to improve the public health, including the Consumer Federation of America, Center for Science in the Public Interest, Pew Charitable Trusts, and Consumer Unions, oppose this amendment. I urge my colleagues to heed their advice and oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENISHEK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. BENISHEK, I appreciate you yielding to me.

The gentleman's amendment, by requiring FDA to conduct scientific and economic analysis prior to enforcing these regulations, is a step in the right direction. Simply put, it is a step in the right direction. I commend him and support his amendment.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments, and I am certainly willing to work with you in the future on this issue, but we are just concerned that we are not going to make food any safer, and it is not going to help the jobs and the cost of our food because some of the rules are very difficult to comply with at the local level. There is difficulty in keeping wildlife away from apple orchards, for example. It is very difficult and more costly than I think the gentlelady suspects. I encourage everyone to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. I would just say to my colleague that all of those arguments were debated and discussed during the time of the Food Safety Modernization Act. As I said, I worked very, very hard, along with members of the Energy and Commerce Committee, in which jurisdiction this actually resides. It does not reside in the jurisdiction of the farm bill.

The fact of the matter is that we've had industry support of the legislation. I have a white paper, a summary by the United Fresh Producers Association issued in January 2011, which talks about all of the flexibility that exists for small farmers.

The issue here is about public health and public safety. I recommended that we oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. BACHUS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12317. IMPROVED DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE CONSIDERATION OF ECONOMIC IMPACT OF REGULATIONS ON SMALL BUSINESS.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall complete procedures consistent with the requirements of subsection (b) of section 609 of title 5, United States Code, whenever the Department of Agriculture promulgates any rule which will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I bring a very simple but a very important amendment for consideration.

Several agencies of government have small business review panels. They are advisory in nature; and as our agencies go through the rulemaking process, they get input on how their regulations will affect small businesses. This amendment really takes advantage of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, which was signed into law by President Clinton in 1996, which allows the agencies to form these panels.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia, myself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. MATHESON, actually in the next week or two, will be introducing language to really improve these small business panels. The SBA Advocacy Office recently said that small businesses pay about 45 percent more in annual cost in complying with regulations. They spoke very favorably of these panels.

I have a letter I will include from the NFIB urging strong support for this amendment.

NATIONAL FEDERATION
OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2013.

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BACHUS: The National Federation of Independent Business is pleased to support your amendment to the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 (H.R. 1947). This amendment would expand critical small business regulatory impact analyses and outreach requirements to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA).

Farming remains an integral part of the American economy and is at its core one of the most basic entrepreneurial endeavors. The federal government needs to be sure to use care when regulating the farming industry to ensure its viability.

Our farming members continually tell us about the difficulty and expense of complying with ever-increasing federal regulation. In fact, in our most recent Small Business Problems and Priorities, unreasonable government regulations ranked third out of 75 issues important to small businesses in the agriculture industry.

This amendment would help address this problem by requiring the USDA to conduct important small business impact analyses and outreach to small farmers. Specifically, the amendment would require USDA to convene Small Business Advocacy Review panels for rules that the department determines would have a ''significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.'' These panels are critical tools that allow small businesses to provide feedback to the agency before rules are proposed, therefore allowing the opportunity for more compliance flexibility.

NFIB supports this commonsense amendment because it will help alleviate compliance burden on small farmers while at the same time ensuring USDA can meet its regulatory aims. We urge the House of Representatives to approve the amendment to help America's agricultural community.

Sincerely,

SUSAN ECKERLY,
Senior Vice President,
Public Policy.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHUS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding just to note that the ranking member and I have discussed your amendment, and we are supportive.

Mr. BACHUS. I do want to say, as the chairman knows, the Judiciary Committee, as well as the Small Business Committee, has been looking at the effect of regulations on small businesses, and we've heard several horror stories. I welcome and applaud the Agriculture Committee and its leadership for being in support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2330

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member claim time in opposition?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 54 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following new subtitle:

Subtitle D—Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery

SECTION 12401. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2013''.

SEC. 12402. CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSCUT BUDGET.

(a) CROSSCUT BUDGET.—The Director, in consultation with the Chesapeake Executive Council, the chief executive of each Chesapeake Bay State, and the Chesapeake Bay Commission, shall submit to Congress a financial report containing—

(1) an interagency crosscut budget that displays—

(A) the proposed funding for any Federal restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year, including any planned interagency or intra-agency transfer, for each of the Federal agencies that carry out restoration activities;

(B) to the extent that information is available, the estimated funding for any State restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year;

(C) all expenditures for Federal restoration activities from the preceding 2 fiscal years, the current fiscal year, and the succeeding fiscal year; and

(D) all expenditures, to the extent that information is available, for State restoration activities during the equivalent time period described in subparagraph (C);

(2) a detailed accounting of all funds received and obligated by all Federal agencies for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years, including the identification of funds which were transferred to a Chesapeake Bay State for restoration activities;

(3) to the extent that information is available, a detailed accounting from each State of all funds received and obligated from a Federal agency for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years; and

(4) a description of each of the proposed Federal and State restoration activities to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year (corresponding to those activities listed in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1)), including the—

(A) project description;

(B) current status of the project;

(C) Federal or State statutory or regulatory authority, programs, or responsible agencies;

(D) authorization level for appropriations;

(E) project timeline, including benchmarks;

(F) references to project documents;

(G) descriptions of risks and uncertainties of project implementation;

(H) adaptive management actions or framework;

(I) coordinating entities;

(J) funding history;

(K) cost sharing; and

(L) alignment with existing Chesapeake Bay Agreement and Chesapeake Executive Council goals and priorities.

(b) MINIMUM FUNDING LEVELS.—The Director shall only describe restoration activities in the report required under subsection (a) that—

(1) for Federal restoration activities, have funding amounts greater than or equal to $100,000; and

(2) for State restoration activities, have funding amounts greater than or equal to $50,000.

(c) DEADLINE.—The Director shall submit to Congress the report required by subsection (a) not later than 30 days after the submission by the President of the President's annual budget to Congress.

(d) REPORT.—Copies of the financial report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations, Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations, Environment and Public Works, and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply beginning with the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act for which the President submits a budget to Congress.

SEC. 12403. RESTORATION THROUGH ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with other Federal and State agencies, and with the participation of stakeholders, shall develop a plan to provide technical and financial assistance to Chesapeake Bay States to employ adaptive management in carrying out restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

(b) PLAN DEVELOPMENT.—The plan referred to in subsection (a) shall include—

(1) specific and measurable objectives to improve water quality, habitat, and fisheries identified by Chesapeake Bay States;

(2) a process for stakeholder participation;

(3) monitoring, modeling, experimentation, and other research and evaluation technical assistance requested by Chesapeake Bay States;

(4) identification of State restoration activities planned by Chesapeake Bay States to attain the State's objectives under paragraph (1);

(5) identification of Federal restoration activities that could help a Chesapeake Bay State to attain the State's objectives under paragraph (1);

(6) recommendations for a process for modification of State and Federal restoration activities that have not attained or will not attain the specific and measurable objectives set forth under paragraph (1); and

(7) recommendations for a process for integrating and prioritizing State and Federal restoration activities and programs to which adaptive management can be applied.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—In addition to carrying out Federal restoration activities under existing authorities and funding, the Administrator shall implement the plan developed under subsection (a) by providing technical and financial assistance to Chesapeake Bay States using resources available for such purposes that are identified by the Director under section 12402.

(d) UPDATES.—The Administrator shall update the plan developed under subsection (a) every 2 years.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the end of a fiscal year, the Administrator shall transmit to Congress an annual report on the implementation of the plan required under this section for such fiscal year.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall contain information about the application of adaptive management to restoration activities and programs, including level changes implemented through the process of adaptive management.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) shall apply to the first fiscal year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) INCLUSION OF PLAN IN ANNUAL ACTION PLAN AND ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT.—The Administrator shall ensure that the Annual Action Plan and Annual Progress Report required by section 205 of Executive Order 13508 includes the adaptive management plan outlined in subsection (a).

SEC. 12404. INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR FOR THE CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be an Independent Evaluator for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, who shall review and report on restoration activities and the use of adaptive management in restoration activities, including on such related topics as are suggested by the Chesapeake Executive Council.

(b) APPOINTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Independent Evaluator shall be appointed by the Administrator from among nominees submitted by the Chesapeake Executive Council.

(2) NOMINATIONS.—The Chesapeake Executive Council may submit to the Administrator 4 nominees for appointment to any vacancy in the office of the Independent Evaluator.

(c) REPORTS.—The Independent Evaluator shall submit a report to the Congress every 2 years in the findings and recommendations of reviews under this section.

(d) CHESAPEAKE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.—In this section, the term ''Chesapeake Executive Council'' has the meaning given that term by section 307 of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–567; 15 U.S.C. 1511d).

SEC. 12405. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle, the following definitions apply:

(1) ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT.—The term ''adaptive management'' means a type of natural resource management in which project and program decisions are made as part of an ongoing science-based process. Adaptive management involves testing, monitoring, and evaluating applied strategies and incorporating new knowledge into programs and restoration activities that are based on scientific findings and the needs of society. Results are used to modify management policy, strategies, practices, programs, and restoration activities.

(2) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(3) CHESAPEAKE BAY STATE.—The term ''Chesapeake Bay State'' or ''State'' means the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Delaware, and New York, the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia.

(4) CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED.—The term ''Chesapeake Bay watershed'' means the Chesapeake Bay and the geographic area, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, consisting of 36 tributary basins, within the Chesapeake Bay States, through which precipitation drains into the Chesapeake Bay.

(5) CHIEF EXECUTIVE.—The term ''chief executive'' means, in the case of a State or Commonwealth, the Governor of each such State or Commonwealth and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(6) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(7) STATE RESTORATION ACTIVITIES.—The term ''State restoration activities'' means any State programs or projects carried out under State authority that directly or indirectly protect, conserve, or restore living resources, habitat, water resources, or water quality in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including programs or projects that promote responsible land use, stewardship, and community engagement in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Restoration activities may be categorized as follows:

(A) Physical restoration.

(B) Planning.

(C) Feasibility studies.

(D) Scientific research.

(E) Monitoring.

(F) Education.

(G) Infrastructure development.

(8) FEDERAL RESTORATION ACTIVITIES.—The term ''Federal restoration activities'' means

any Federal programs or projects carried out under existing Federal authority that directly or indirectly protect, conserve, or restore living resources, habitat, water resources, or water quality in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including programs or projects that provide financial and technical assistance to promote responsible land use, stewardship, and community engagement in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Restoration activities may be categorized as follows:

(A) Physical restoration.
(B) Planning.
(C) Feasibility studies.
(D) Scientific research.
(E) Monitoring.
(F) Education.
(G) Infrastructure development.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, as the largest estuary in the United States, the Chesapeake Bay watershed is home to more than 16 million people. The watershed encompasses six States and the District of Columbia; well over 1,000 local governments; 150 major tributaries; 100,000 streams and rivers; and more than 11,600 miles of shoreline, plus thousands of plant and animal species.

In addition to generating billions of dollars in economic activity and recreational revenue, the bay provides tens of thousands of jobs in the commercial seafood and recreational fishing industries alone and is the site of multiple major ports and military bases.

The bay draws millions of tourists each year. Clean and healthy waters encourage boating, fishing, and swimming, activities that are of great intrinsic value to the surrounding States and to our Nation.

The bay watershed is also home to many farmers and agricultural lands. Virginia forestry and agriculture alone account for $79 billion in economic output and employs over 500,000 workers.

Farmers have a vested interest in a clean Chesapeake Bay. Their commitment to the land and waters is reflected by multi-generational stewardship of farms across the watershed.

My amendment includes similar legislation that passed in a bipartisan way in the House of Representatives in the 111th Congress by a vote of 418–1.

Better accounting and more flexible management are essential to restoring the Chesapeake Bay. Crosscut budgeting and adaptive management provide performance-based measures to ensure Federal dollars currently being spent on bay restoration activities produce results.

Both techniques will ensure that we're coordinating how restoration dollars are spent and making sure that everyone understands how individual projects fit into the bigger picture. That way, we're not duplicating efforts, spending money we don't need to or, worse, working at cross purposes. Crosscut budgeting, adaptive management, and an independent evaluator should be key components for the complex restoration activities for the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITTMAN. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Clearly the gentleman is working diligently to do good things; and, therefore, I would be supportive of his amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member claim time in opposition to the amendment?

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 56 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 12317. APPLICABILITY OF SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in implementing the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to any farm, shall—

(1) require certification of compliance with such rule by—

(A) a professional engineer for a farm with—

(i) an individual tank with an aboveground storage capacity greater than 10,000 gallons;

(ii) an aggregate aboveground storage capacity greater than or equal to 42,000 gallons; or

(iii) a history that includes a spill, as determined by the Administrator; or

(B) the owner or operator of the farm (via self-certification) for a farm with—

(i) an aggregate aboveground storage capacity greater than 10,000 gallons but less than 42,000 gallons; and

(ii) no history of spills, as determined by the Administrator; and

(2) exempt from all requirements of such rule any farm—

(A) with an aggregate aboveground storage capacity of less than or equal to 10,000 gallons; and

(B) no history of spills, as determined by the Administrator.

(b) CALCULATION OF AGGREGATE ABOVEGROUND STORAGE CAPACITY.—For the purposes of subsection (a), the aggregate aboveground storage capacity of a farm excludes—

(1) all containers on separate parcels that have a capacity that is less than 1,320 gallons; and

(2) all storage containers holding animal feed ingredients approved for use in livestock feed by the Food and Drug Administration.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) FARM.—The term ''farm'' has the meaning given such term in section 112.2 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) GALLON.—The term ''gallon'' refers to a United States liquid gallon.

(4) HISTORY OF SPILLS.—The term ''history of spills'' has the meaning used to describe the term ''reportable discharge history'' in section 112.7(k)(1) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

(5) SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.—The term ''Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule'' means the regulation promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency under part 112 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, first I want to thank the 71 Members from both parties who joined in cosponsoring the bill that is identical to this amendment, H.R. 311, the FUELS Act. That bill also passed the House unanimously last year.

The EPA-mandated spill prevention and containment countermeasure rules require that oil storage facilities with a capacity of over 1,320 gallons make costly infrastructure modification to reduce the possibility of oil spills.

This bill simply changes those standards, makes them considerably more workable. We have 71 cosponsors that agree with me.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member claim time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee for such time as he may consume.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the subcommittee chairman and, once again, outstanding working being done.

I would encourage all of our fellow Members of this great body to vote for your wonderful amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the chairman.

With that, I'd urge a ''yes'' vote and yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 57 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 123___. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCER INFORMATION DISCLOSURE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) AGENCY.—The term ''Agency'' means the Environmental Protection Agency.

(3) AGRICULTURAL OPERATION.—The term ''agricultural operation'' includes any operation where an agricultural commodity crop is raised, including livestock operations.

(4) LIVESTOCK OPERATION.—The term ''livestock operation'' includes any operation involved in the raising or finishing of livestock or poultry.

(b) DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Administrator, any officer or employee of the Agency, or any contractor of the Agency, shall not make public the information of any owner, operator, or employee of an agricultural operation provided to the Agency by a farmer, rancher, or livestock producer or a State agency that has been obtained in accordance with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or any other law, including—

(A) names;

(B) telephone numbers;

(C) email addresses;

(D) physical addresses;

(E) Global Positioning System coordinates; or

(F) other identifying location information.

(2) EFFECT.—Nothing in paragraph (1) affects—

(A) the disclosure of information described in paragraph (1) if—

(i) the information has been transformed into a statistical or aggregate form at the county level or higher without any information that identifies the agricultural operation or agricultural producer; or

(ii) the producer consents to the disclosure; or

(B) the authority of any State agency to collect information on livestock operations.

(3) CONDITION OF PERMIT OR OTHER PROGRAMS.—The approval of any permit, practice, or program administered by the Administrator shall not be conditioned on the consent of the agricultural producer or livestock producer under paragraph (2)(A)(ii).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

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

I want to thank my colleague from Nebraska for joining me in sponsoring this amendment.

Earlier this year, as most of us already know, the EPA violated the privacy rights of producers across the country by releasing the personal information of livestock and poultry producers to various environmental activist groups. This information included names, addresses, phone numbers, GPS coordinates of over 80,000 producers over 30 States, including my home State of Arkansas. It was obtained by the EPA through State environmental quality agencies and released to the environmental groups through FOIA requests.

We all know this story, and I'll be brief, and I will yield such time as my friend from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) will consume.

Mr. TERRY. Well, I thank you, my friend from Arkansas.

It's too bad that the E in EPA now means ''espionage'' because the EPA rents airplanes and videotapes from the air farmers and ranchers and feedlots in their daily activities without any reason to think that they're violating any rule or regulation.

So not only are they spying, but what is most concerning to those that have been videotaped by the EPA is that the EPA released the documents. We don't know how the environmental and animal rights groups found out that they were doing this because the farmers didn't know it was going on.

But through a FOIA request, the EPA turned over all of the documents about the farmers, ranchers and food lot owners, with their personal identifiable information, their names and their addresses. And this has to stop.

The people that have been victims of this videotaping and giving this information are really concerned; and so I thank the gentleman for his good amendment here, and allowing me to join, because this protects their privacy rights in the future.

It doesn't stop them from spying yet. That will be done in a different bill. But this at least protects their privacy, and I really appreciate it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska, and I appreciate his leadership on this as well.

The Crawford-Terry amendment would prevent the EPA from making public the private information of producers, including their names, telephone numbers, addresses, email and physical, GPS coordinates or other identifying location information.

This measure will protect the individual privacy rights of ag producers and allow farm families to live without the threats of harassment and targeting.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. COSTA. Not to oppose the measure, but actually to speak on behalf of the amendment. The issues that have been raised here by this amendment, I think, are valid. There are concerns that have been raised by cattlemen and cattlewomen across the country. I think that, obviously, we all feel that there ought to be a level playing field when it comes to the protection of the Freedom of Information Act.

But on the other hand, cattlemen and cattlewomen every day are working really hard to try to do their best to produce the safest and the highest quality beef that Americans do every day and is the best in the world.

□ 2340

So we think this amendment is a step in the right direction and would like to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman from California for his support.

I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee for such time as he may consume.

Mr. LUCAS. This is clearly a very important issue and the gentleman has made great headway on it. Thank you for those efforts. Of course I'm very supportive of what you're endeavoring to do.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the chairman. With that, I would urge a ''yes'' vote and yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 58 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12_____. SUNSETTING OF PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), each fiscal year the Secretary of Agriculture may not carry out any program—

(1) for which an authorization of appropriations is established or extended under this Act; and

(2) that is funded by discretionary appropriations (as defined in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c))).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect with respect to a program referred to in such subsection on the date on which the authorization of appropriations under this Act for such program expires.

(c) EXISTING OBLIGATIONS.—Subsection (a) does not affect the ability of the Secretary to carry out responsibilities with regard to loans, grants, or other obligations made or in existence before an applicable effective date under subsection (b).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, President Ronald Reagan once said:

No government ever voluntarily reduces itself in size. So government's programs, once launched, never disappear. Actually, a government bureau is the nearest thing to eternal life we'll ever see on this Earth.

Mr. Chairman, it's hard to argue with the Gipper.

This amendment to H.R. 1947, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management, FARRM, Act of 2013, will bring accountability to our work here in the House of Representatives. What it does is it sunsets discretionary programs in this bill upon the expiration of the 5-year authorization period.

Now, some people might think that is the normal thing to happen in the Federal Government: you authorize a program; once the authorization goes

away, the program either gets reauthorized or it goes away. But that isn't what happens, Mr. Chairman.

The purpose of this program is to force Congress to justify the continued existence of these programs through regular reauthorization efforts. Mr. Chairman, it forces us to do our jobs.

If these programs and subsidies are left unchallenged, they will continue to consume taxpayer dollars forever without being approved explicitly by the Members of Congress. As our national debt approaches $17 trillion, we can't afford to put all these programs on autopilot.

This commonsense amendment would require Congress to explicitly revive expired programs at the end of the authorization period and prevent the covert continuance of sometimes wasteful, ineffective, and duplicative programs. Ultimately, this amendment will prompt Congress—and the public—to reexamine thoughtfully these programs when the farm bill's authorization expires.

Finally, this amendment will send a strong message to stakeholders, lobbyists, and special interests that many of these Federal programs have an expiration date.

Let me hasten to add, this commonsense amendment would not eliminate or undermine the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, and would not apply to the FARRM Bill's mandatory spending provisions.

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment before us.

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, before I state my opposition, I'd like to first thank Chairman FRANK LUCAS for the hard work that he and his committee staff have done today and throughout this year and last year in trying to put together not one, but two farm bills for the consideration of the House and for America's heartland, and thank Ranking Member COLLIN PETERSON and his staff for the hard work that they have done as well.

These are never easy, but as both the chairman and the ranking member like to remind us, and I think it's an important underlying point, the farm bill that we reauthorize every 4 years is among the most bipartisan efforts that we ever do. And both the chair and the ranking member and their staff are to be commended.

As it relates to this measure before us, this amendment, we believe that it uses a meat cleaver approach to the legislation. Like sequester, it doesn't discriminate among programs. It's blind between those programs which deserve longer authorization periods and those that could use trimming, and clearly we understand the author's intent.

The whole purpose of the farm bill, though, is to review programs under our jurisdiction to determine whether or not they should continue, whether they should be changed, or whether they should be eliminated. And, once again, to commend the chair and the ranking member, we have done a very good job on that oversight on determining what areas ought to be trimmed, what programs ought to be consolidated, and which should be eliminated. Our bill already does that. Actually, as the chair has indicated and the ranking member, it terminates hundreds of programs and consolidates, and the committee did the work in a thoughtful and careful manner.

So we can't support the amendment that undoes the careful work that the committee has pursued. I urge my colleagues to reject this haphazard approach—or shotgun approach, we might say back home—and vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, let me add my thanks to the chairman also for his good work. I know that he has worked very, very hard on getting a bill here to us to vote on, and I commend him and the staff for doing that. I was negligent in not saying that in the beginning of my remarks. So I thank the gentleman from California for his remarks and for reminding me that I should have done that.

I want to say that this amendment does not limit in any way the ability of Congress to reauthorize an expired program. Congress is Congress and can pass any laws it wants, in accordance with the Constitution, of course. But this amendment would require Congress to explicitly revive expired programs at the end of the authorization period.

What we are trying to prevent is the covert continuance of programs that have not been authorized. We should hold ourselves to a high standard here, Mr. Chairman. We shouldn't be funding programs that aren't authorized. It's just saying we should abide by the laws we pass, and that's what this does. We need to ensure that Congress and the public will thoughtfully reexamine these programs and revive them where they need to be.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, let me state the persuasive powers of the gentlelady are to be much respected and appreciated, occasionally even feared. While perhaps not every syllable of her amendments in their present form do I necessarily agree with, I am supportive. I believe she is on the right vein, and we will work together to accomplish the ultimate goal.

That said, though, I must also express my appreciation to all my colleagues, to the professional staff of both the majority and the professional staff of the minority.

□ 2350

When we started this process earlier, I noted to all of you that I felt like if we would work this in regular order, if we would have discussion and amendment and great debate, we could achieve consensus.

Now, we have approximately five more amendments to go tomorrow. We will conclude this experience on time—hurray—and I believe in a fashion that is appropriate for this august body, which means I think we'll pass the bill, but we shall see tomorrow.

That said, thank you all. This is the way the process is supposed to work.

Mr. COSTA. I think we've conducted the people's work today and this evening.

I yield back the balance of my time and thank the chair and, again, all those involved in this process. Hopefully, tomorrow we can conclude our work.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 61 printed in part B of House Report 113–117.

Mr. LUCAS. 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. FOXX) having assumed the chair, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 20, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1907. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority--National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation

Research--Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers [CDFA Numbers: 84.133B-10.] received June 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1908. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting written notification of the determination that a public health emergency exists that has significant potential to affect national security or the health and security of United States citizens living abroad and that involves the Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1909. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2014, pursuant to Public Law 106-398, section 1308 (114 Stat. 1654A-341); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1910. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period February 1, 2013 through March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1911. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1912. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's semiannual report from the Treasury Inspector General for the period of October 1, 2012 — March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1913. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's semiannual report from the Office of the Inspector General during the 6-month period ending March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1914. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, transmitting the 2012 management report and statements on system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1915. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General of the Federal Labor Relations Board for the period beginning October 1, 2012 and ending March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1916. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's decision not to appeal the decision of the district court Dynalantic Corp. v. United States Department of Defense, Nos. 95-2301 (D.D.C. Aug. 15, 2012); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1917. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Safety precautions to protect the public from the effects of a potential catastrophic failure of the Marseilles Dam; Illinois River [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0334] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1918. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Low Country Splash, Wando River, Cooper River, and Charleston Harbor; Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0052] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1919. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Melrose Pyrotechnics Fireworks Display; Chicago Harbor, Chicago, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0328] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1920. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Wy-Hi Rowing Regatta, Trenton Channel; Detroit River, Wyandotte, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0287] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1921. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Figure Eight Causeway Channel; Figure Eight Island, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0258] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1922. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; High Water Conditions; Illinois River [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0323] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1923. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation, 50 Aniversario Balneario de Boqueron, Bahia de Boqueron; Boqueron, PR [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0297] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1924. A letter from the Deputy Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Community Residential Care (RIN: 2900-AO62) received May 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1925. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Mexican Land Trust (Rev. Rul. 2013-14) received June 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1926. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a ''Report to Congress on Defense Environmental Restoration Cost and Schedule Estimating''; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WALZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. HAHN, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. ESTY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 2428. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to assist States to rehabilitate or replace certain bridges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. ADERHOLT):

H.R. 2429. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 2430. A bill to adjust the boundaries of Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HALL (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 2431. A bill to reauthorize the National Integrated Drought Information System; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 2432. A bill to prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds made available to any Federal department or agency for any fiscal year to provide military assistance to any of the armed combatants in Syria absent express prior statutory authorization from Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 2433. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human stem cell research, including human embryonic stem cell research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. BASS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 2434. A bill to require the Director of National Intelligence to conduct a study on the use of contractors for intelligence activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 2435. A bill to provide for the repayment of amounts borrowed by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac from the Treasury of the United States, together with interest, over a 30-year period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. HAHN):

H.R. 2436. A bill to prepare a feasibility study and implement demonstration projects to restore the San Gabriel River Watershed in California; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 2437. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish a national program to create jobs and increase economic development by promoting cooperative development; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. ENYART):

H.R. 2438. A bill to require an adequate process in preplanned lethal operations that deliberately target citizens of the United States or citizens of strategic treaty allies of the United States, to limit the use of cluster munitions generally, including when likely to unintentionally harm such citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 2439. A bill to promote permanent families for children, privacy and safety for unwed mothers, responsible fatherhood, and security for adoptive parents by establishing a National Responsible Father Registry and encouraging States to enter into agreements to contribute the information contained in the State's Responsible Father Registry to the National Responsible Father Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. MORAN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BASS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 2440. A bill to require the Attorney General to disclose each decision, order, or opinion of a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court that includes significant legal interpretation of section 501 or 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 unless such disclosure is not in the national security interest of the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 2441. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to permit agencies to count certain contracts toward contracting goals; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 2442. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Duwamish Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 2443. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain educational institutions from the employer health insurance mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2444. A bill to implement common sense controls on the taxpayer-funded salaries of government contractors by limiting reimbursement for excessive compensation; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2445. A bill to repeal the corporate average fuel economy standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 2428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BRADY OF TEXAS:

H.R. 2429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. IV, Section 3, clause 2: ''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . . .''

Art. I, Section 8, clause 18: ''The Congress shall have Power. . .To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 2431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 2432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress's constitutional power over the nation's Armed Forces arguably provides ample authority to legislate with respect to how they may be employed. Under Article I, Section 8, Congress has the power ''To lay and collect Taxes . . . to . . . pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence,'' ''To raise and support Armies,'' ''To provide and Maintain a Navy,'' ''To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces,'' and ''To declare War, grant letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water,'' as well as ''To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions'' and ''To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States.'' Further, Congress is empowered ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers . . .'' as well as ''all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.''

Congress has virtually plenary constitutional power over appropriations, one that is not qualified with reference to its powers in Section 8. Article I, Section 9 provides that ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.''

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 2434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce clause of the Constitution and Amendment 4 of the Constitution under the Bill of Rights.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 2435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and

Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 2436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 2437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I Section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which states the United States Congress shall have power ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Because this bill regulates the use of military and paramilitary force by the United States, Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution which empowers Congress ''To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces'' and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which empowers Congress to ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 2439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article, I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 2440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce clause of the Constitution and Amendment 4 of the Constitution under the Bill of Rights.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 2441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

And,

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 2442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 2443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which empowers Congress, in part, to ''lay and collect Taxes'' and ''provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . .'' The bill will exempt certain educational institutions from taxes imposed by public Law 111–148, as amended. Congress has the power to repeal such taxes and provide for the general welfare of those who have been and will be harmed by their imposition.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 171: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 272: Mr. NUNES and Mr. MCCARTHY of California.

H.R. 401: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 509: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 510: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 511: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 523: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 526: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 543: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 574: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 578: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 601: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 633: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 685: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 698: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 736: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 744: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 755: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 792: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 850: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 855: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 891: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 904: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 949: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 980: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1001: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROONEY, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1020: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1024: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1129: Mr. BARR, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 1255: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 1317: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1339: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1354: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FARR, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1397: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1413: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 1431: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1461: Ms. FOXX, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HANNA and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 1473: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1494: Mr. KILMER and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1508: Mr. MORAN and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1698: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1701: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1717: Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 1732: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1761: Mr. KIND, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1771: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 1779: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1786: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1793: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1795: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. ENYART, Mr. TURNER and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1798: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1825: Mr. BENTIVOLIO and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1830: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1838: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1857: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1908: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1916: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1966: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WATT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. BASS, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1975: Mr. SARBANES and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 2000: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 2009: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 2016: Mr. POSEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 2019: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 2022: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 2023: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2026: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 2053: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 2060: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2064: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 2094: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 2162: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 2218: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 2237: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 2265: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. STEWART, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. COLE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 2267: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 2273: Mr. PETRI and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 2300: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 2308: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2328: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2346: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 2347: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 2385: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 2389: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 2403: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 2422: Mr. TAKANO.

H. Res. 30: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H. Res. 35: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Res. 187: Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 213: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Ms. MENG.

H. Res. 268: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.