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
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
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
Sinema
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 (IN)

NOES—189

Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
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
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
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
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Cantor
Collins (GA)
Denham
Grijalva
LaMalfa
Lankford
Matheson
McGovern
McHenry
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Rangel
Ryan (OH)
Scott (VA)

□ 1348

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent Resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the United States Capitol in commemoration of the Shimon Peres Congressional Gold Medal ceremony.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4800, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 616 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4800.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1351

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 4800) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to begin consideration of H.R. 4800, making appropriations for FY 2015 for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies. The bill before us is unique in that the programs supported in this bill will impact every American every day of the year.

We support America's farmers and ranchers, who are very vital to our Nation's economy and our health and well-being. We support those at home in need with food and housing and provide rural businesses with low-interest loans and grants to help them sustain local economies. We help others around the world that face starvation and malnutrition. We support research and development in agriculture to improve productivity and stability. We support the oversight of commodity markets, providing confidence for businesses, traders, investors, and the public. We support a safe food supply and safe and effective drugs and devices. We are fortunate this Nation can and does support these vital programs.

The bill before us this afternoon reflects a delicate balance of needs and requirements. We have drafted what I consider a responsible bill for FY 2015 spending levels for the departments and agencies that are under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee. We have had to carefully prioritize the funding in this bill. We have had to make some hard choices about how to limit spending.

I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman ROGERS, for supporting us with a very fair allocation for this bill and for helping us move this bill forward.

I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), the subcommittee ranking member. He has been a valuable partner and colleague as we have moved forward with this legislation. I appreciate his commitment. I appreciate his understanding as we have moved forward on a wide variety of programs in this bill, and I sincerely thank him for his help. While I and the other subcommittee members have a wide array of agriculture in our districts, Mr. FARR represents an area sometimes referred to as the ''salad bowl of the world.''

I want to thank all of the members of the subcommittee for their help, and I also thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), who is the ranking member for the full committee.

I also thank the majority staff for their hard work: Tom O'Brien, Betsy Bina, Pam Miller, Andrew Cooper, and Karen Ratzow.

I also appreciate the professionalism and the cooperation of the minority staff. In particular, I want to thank Martha Foley and Hogan Medlin for their help during all of the long hours spent putting this bill and report together, as well as Rochelle Dornatt, Troy Phillips, and Caitie Whelan of Mr. FARR's staff.

When the subcommittee began the FY15 appropriations process, I asked my colleagues to keep in mind three guiding principles. They were: to ensure the proper use of funds through robust oversight, ensuring the appropriate level of regulation to protect producers and the public, and to ensure funding is targeted to vital programs.

These three principles guided us from the time the President's budget request was first submitted to the subcommittee until this bill was put before the House today. This basic framework helped us set principles and priorities during the 10 budget hearings and oversight hearings that we had throughout the spring, which covered all of USDA's mission area, as well as the Food and Drug Administration, and also included the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

They also formed a framework for us to consider the many requests we received from our colleagues on this bill. In particular, we received more than 3,900 requests from 326 Members to support, reduce, or amend funding levels in the numerous accounts of this bill. Of course we could not meet every request, but we tried to address these requests in a bipartisan manner and in a way that was under the House rules. As such, there are no earmarks included in this bill.

The total funding for this bill is $142.5 billion. This is $1.5 billion below the President's request and $3 billion below the FY14-enacted level. The bill includes $20.88 billion in discretionary budget authority, which is the same as the FY14-enacted level. Mandatory spending totals $122 billion, or $3 billion below the FY14 level. These mandatory funds support USDA's farm, conservation, crop insurance, and nutrition programs.

I would like to briefly mention a few highlights that are in this bill.

We provide $2.8 billion for agricultural research. We have received many, many letters requesting support for the land-grant colleges and universities. We were able to provide level funding for them. We also provided $325 million, as requested, for the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative, which is USDA's premier competitive research grants program.

We provide $870 million for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. This agency works to eradicate plant and animal diseases and keeps the bad bugs out of the country. I am pleased to say that we were able to increase funding to combat citrus greening disease and the viral epidemic affecting the hog producers. This funding will supplement the emergency funding that the administration announced last week for research and surveillance purposes.

The bill also includes more than $1 billion for the Food Safety and Inspection Service. This is approximately the same as the FY14 level, but $3.8 million above the request. It will maintain more than 8,000 inspectors at more than 6,400 meat, poultry, and egg product facilities across the Nation.

The bill provides $1.5 billion for the Farm Service Agency, and it does not allow the closure of any county offices. This proposal made no sense when the 2014 farm bill is still being implemented in county offices across the Nation. We also fully fund the various farm loan programs in this bill.

□ 1400

For the Natural Resources Conservation Service, we provide $869 million to help farmers, ranchers, and private forest land owners conserve and protect their land and increase funding to help rehabilitate small dams.

This bill is the only one of the 12 appropriations bills that truly focuses on rural America. It provides $2.6 billion for the rural development programs. That includes funding to support $881 million in business and industry loans, $1.3 billion in loans for rural water and waste programs, and $6.2 billion for rural electric and telephone infrastructure. We also provide more than $1 billion for the single-family direct loan program, $1.1 billion for rental assistance, and $30 million for the Mutual and Self-Help program.

This bill includes both discretionary and mandatory funding for USDA's food and nutrition programs.

In particular, it provides $6.6 billion for the Women, Infants, and Children program. This is $93 million below the FY14 enacted level, and it is actually $200 million below the budget request. But I want to be clear about the decreased funding because a declining caseload and large carryover balances from the previous year is why we are doing this. And let me stress that every person who is eligible for the program will be able to receive funding under this funding level in this bill.

The bill includes $20.5 billion in required mandatory funding for child nutrition programs and $82.3 billion for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, sometimes referred to as SNAP. This funding level helps support more than 47 million Americans each month.

To support those in time of need in places like Syria, South Sudan, and the Central African Republic, the bill provides $1.7 billion for overseas food aid. We were able to provide a $66 million increase for Food for Peace grants, and $13 million for the McGovern-Dole Education and Child Nutrition Program offset from savings that we found elsewhere in the bill.

The Food and Drug Administration receives $2.6 billion in discretionary funding in this bill. This is an increase of $23 million over the FY14 level. When the user fees are included, FDA will receive $4.5 billion in FY15.

Within the total, the committee provides a $25 million increase of the full amount requested for food safety activities in the President's budget, and drug safety activities are increased by $12 million.

Furthermore, the bill includes $218 million for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. This is an increase of $3 million above last year's level and is intended to address information technology needs.

Before I close, I do want to address one issue that has opened up a necessary dialogue in local cafeterias and schools across the Nation. It is the provision that would allow schools to seek a temporary—and let me stress that it is a temporary—waiver from the current school lunch standards if a school district has lost money over the last 6-month period as a result of trying to implement the new regulations.

I have had a constant stream of letters, I have talked to people, received emails, and I have had meetings over the past year with school nutritionists, with the teachers, and the school administrators. I have talked to parents, and I have talked to students, all concerned about the rising cost, the increased waste, and the declining participation in the school lunch program.

To tell the truth, the students have been concerned about the taste, they have been concerned about the variety and the quality of the meals. But, again, we have gone to the school nutritionists, to the teachers, and the administrators who have identified where the real problem is.

This is a real problem in many school districts across the country. Some school districts may not be experiencing this problem, but many, many are across the country. This bill acknowledges the concerns of schools and responds to their requests for a certain amount of flexibility. It only allows schools more time if they need it. In fact, it provides something very similar to the flexibility that USDA recently announced for the whole grain requirements.

The benefits to farmers, ranchers, consumers, businesses, and patients provided in this bill far outweigh any one or two objections a Member may have about this bill. The bill represents our best take on matching needs with limited resources. We have tried to work hard to produce the best bill we possibly can within the resources that we have had to work with in this appropriations process.

I thank the Members for their attention, and I would urge all the Members

to support this bipartisan legislation. I look forward to passing this bill on the floor as we move forward, and I reserve the balance of my time.

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4800)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary					
Office of the Secretary	5,051	5,086	5,051	---	-35
Office of Tribal Relations	498	502	498	---	-4
Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Coordination	1,496	1,507	1,507	+11	---
Office of Advocacy and Outreach	1,209	1,217	1,209	---	-8
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	804	809	804	---	-5
Departmental Administration	22,786	25,661	22,811	+25	-2,850
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	3,869	3,897	3,869	---	-28
Office of Communications	8,065	8,137	5,535	-2,530	-2,602
Total, Office of the Secretary	43,778	46,816	41,284	-2,494	-5,532
Executive Operations:					
Office of the Chief Economist	16,777	16,854	16,777	---	-77
National Appeals Division	12,841	13,430	13,317	+476	-113
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	9,064	10,292	9,392	+328	-900
Subtotal, Executive Operations	38,682	40,576	39,486	+804	-1,090
Office of the Chief Information Officer	44,031	45,199	45,025	+994	-174
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	6,213	6,080	6,028	-185	-52
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights	893	898	898	+5	---
Office of Civil Rights	21,400	24,236	24,070	+2,670	-166
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments	(233,000)	(64,825)	(54,825)	(-178,175)	(-10,000)
Payments to GSA	164,470	---	---	-164,470	---
Department of Homeland Security	13,800	---	---	-13,800	---
Building operations and maintenance	54,730	64,825	54,825	+95	-10,000
Hazardous materials management	3,592	3,600	3,600	+8	---
Office of Inspector General	89,902	97,240	97,020	+7,118	-220
Office of the General Counsel	41,202	47,567	44,383	+3,181	-3,184
Office of Ethics	3,440	3,867	3,440	---	-427
Total, Departmental Administration	526,133	380,904	360,059	-166,074	-20,845
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics	893	898	898	+5	---
Economic Research Service	78,058	83,446	85,784	+7,726	+2,338
National Agricultural Statistics Service	161,206	178,999	169,371	+8,165	-9,628
Census of Agriculture	(44,545)	(48,044)	(47,842)	(+3,297)	(-202)
Agricultural Research Service:					
Salaries and expenses	1,122,482	1,104,403	1,120,253	-2,229	+15,850
Buildings and facilities	---	---	155,000	+155,000	+155,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service	1,122,482	1,104,403	1,275,253	+152,771	+170,850

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4800)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
National Institute of Food and Agriculture:					
Research and education activities	772,559	837,747	774,465	+1,906	-63,282
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund	(11,880)	(11,880)	(11,880)	---	---
Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities Endowment Fund	---	(10,000)	---	---	(-10,000)
Extension activities	469,191	468,968	467,339	-1,852	-1,629
Integrated activities	35,317	28,821	32,000	-3,317	+3,179
Total, National Institute of Food and Agriculture	1,277,067	1,335,536	1,273,804	-3,263	-61,732
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs	893	898	898	+5	---
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses	821,721	834,341	867,505	+45,784	+33,164
Buildings and facilities	3,175	3,175	3,175	---	---
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	824,896	837,516	870,680	+45,784	+33,164
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services	79,914	82,963	81,192	+1,278	-1,771
Standardization activities (user fees) NA	(64,000)	(64,000)	(64,000)	---	---
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(60,435)	(60,709)	(60,709)	(+274)	---
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (Section 32):					
Permanent, Section 32	1,107,000	1,122,000	1,122,000	+15,000	---
Marketing agreements and orders (transfer from section 32)	(20,056)	(20,317)	(20,056)	---	(-261)
Payments to States and Possessions	1,363	1,235	1,235	-128	---
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service program	1,248,712	1,266,907	1,265,136	+16,424	-1,771
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:					
Salaries and expenses	40,261	44,017	43,722	+3,461	-295
Limitation on inspection and weighing services	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	---	---
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety	811	816	816	+5	---
Food Safety and Inspection Service	1,010,689	1,001,402	1,005,189	-5,500	+3,787
Lab accreditation fees	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	---	---
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing	6,231,666	6,175,033	6,290,901	+59,235	+115,868

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4800)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Farm Assistance Programs					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services	893	898	898	+5	---
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses	1,177,926	1,139,323	1,205,068	+27,142	+65,745
(Transfer from Food for Peace (P.L. 480))	(2,735)	(2,528)	(2,528)	(-207)	---
(Transfer from export loans)	(354)	(354)	(354)	---	---
(Transfer from ACIF)	(306,998)	(306,998)	(306,998)	---	---
Subtotal, transfers from program accounts	(310,087)	(309,880)	(309,880)	(-207)	---
Total, Salaries and expenses	(1,488,013)	(1,449,203)	(1,514,948)	(+26,935)	(+65,745)
State mediation grants	3,782	3,404	3,404	-378	---
Grassroots source water protection program	5,526	---	2,500	-3,026	+2,500
Dairy indemnity program	250	500	500	+250	---
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency	1,187,484	1,143,227	1,211,472	+23,988	+68,245
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund (ACIF) Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	(575,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(+925,000)	---
Guaranteed	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	---	---
Subtotal	(2,575,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(+925,000)	---
Farm operating loans:					
Direct	(1,195,620)	(1,252,004)	(1,252,004)	(+56,384)	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(1,500,000)	(1,393,443)	(1,393,443)	(-106,557)	---
Subtotal	(2,695,620)	(2,645,447)	(2,645,447)	(-50,173)	---
Emergency loans	(34,658)	(34,667)	(34,667)	(+9)	---
Indian tribe land acquisition loans	(2,000)	(2,000)	(2,000)	---	---
Conservation loans:					
Guaranteed	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	---	---
Indian Highly Fractionated Land Loans	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	---	---
Boll weevil eradication loans	(60,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)	---	---
Total, Loan authorizations	(5,527,278)	(6,402,114)	(6,402,114)	(+874,836)	---

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4800)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	4,428	---	---	-4,428	---
Farm operating loans:					
Direct	65,520	63,101	63,101	-2,419	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed	18,300	14,770	14,770	-3,530	---
Subtotal	83,820	77,871	77,871	-5,949	---
Emergency Loans	1,698	856	856	-842	---
Indian Highly Fractionated Land Loans	68	---	---	-68	---
Individual development account grants	---	2,500	---	---	-2,500
Total, Loan subsidies and grants	90,014	81,227	78,727	-11,287	-2,500
ACIF administrative expenses:					
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)	306,998	306,998	306,998	---	---
Administrative expenses	7,721	7,920	7,920	+199	---
Total, ACIF expenses	314,719	314,918	314,918	+199	---
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	404,733	396,145	393,645	-11,088	-2,500
(Loan authorization)	(5,527,278)	(6,402,114)	(6,402,114)	(+874,836)	---
Total, Farm Service Agency	1,592,217	1,539,372	1,605,117	+12,900	+65,745
Risk Management Agency:					
Administrative and operating expenses	71,496	76,779	77,094	+5,598	+315
Total, Farm Assistance Programs	1,664,606	1,617,049	1,683,109	+18,503	+66,060
Corporations					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund	9,502,944	8,666,022	8,666,022	-836,922	---
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses	12,538,880	9,067,281	9,067,281	-3,471,599	---
Hazardous waste management (limitation on expenses)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
Total, Corporations	22,041,824	17,733,303	17,733,303	-4,308,521	---
Total, Title I, Agricultural Programs	29,938,096	25,525,385	25,707,313	-4,230,783	+181,928
(By transfer)	(330,143)	(330,197)	(329,936)	(-207)	(-261)
(Loan authorization)	(5,527,278)	(6,402,114)	(6,402,114)	(+874,836)	---
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(115,435)	(115,709)	(115,709)	(+274)	---

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4800)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment	893	898	898	+5	---
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations	812,939	814,772	843,053	+30,114	+28,281
Farm Security and Rural Investment program (transfer authority)	---	(732,819)	---	---	(-732,819)
Total, Public Lands Conservation operations	812,939	1,547,591	843,053	+30,114	-704,538
Watershed rehabilitation program	12,000	---	25,000	+13,000	+25,000
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service	824,939	814,772	868,053	+43,114	+53,281
Total, Title II, Conservation Programs	825,832	815,670	868,951	+43,119	+53,281
TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development	893	898	898	+5	---
Rural Development:					
Rural development expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	203,424	225,101	224,201	+20,777	-900
(Transfer from RHIF)	(415,100)	(397,296)	(415,100)	---	(+17,804)
(Transfer from RDLFP)	(4,439)	(4,249)	(4,439)	---	(+190)
(Transfer from Healthy Foods, HNI)	---	(750)	---	---	(-750)
(Transfer from RETLP)	(34,478)	(33,000)	(34,478)	---	(+1,478)
(Transfer from RTB)	---	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts	(454,017)	(435,295)	(454,017)	---	(+18,722)
Total, Rural development expenses	(657,441)	(660,396)	(678,218)	(+20,777)	(+17,822)
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family direct (Sec. 502)	(900,000)	(360,000)	(1,042,276)	(+142,276)	(+682,276)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(24,000,000)	(24,000,000)	(24,000,000)	---	---
Subtotal, Single family	(24,900,000)	(24,360,000)	(25,042,276)	(+142,276)	(+682,276)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4800)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Housing repair (Sec. 504)	(26,280)	(26,279)	(26,372)	(+92)	(+93)
Rental housing (Sec. 515)	(28,432)	(28,432)	(28,398)	(-34)	(-34)
Multi-family housing guarantees (Sec. 538)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	---	---
Site development loans (Sec. 524)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
Single family housing credit sales	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	---	---
Self-help housing land develop. (Sec. 523)	(5,000)	---	(5,000)	---	(+5,000)
Farm Labor Housing (Sec.514)	(23,855)	(23,854)	(23,602)	(-253)	(-252)
Total, Loan authorizations	(25,148,567)	(24,603,565)	(25,290,648)	(+142,081)	(+687,083)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family direct (Sec. 502)	24,480	26,568	76,920	+52,440	+50,352
Housing repair (Sec. 504)	2,176	3,687	3,700	+1,524	+13
Rental housing (Sec. 515)	6,656	9,812	9,800	+3,144	-12
Farm labor housing (Sec.514)	5,656	7,681	7,600	+1,944	-81
Total, Loan subsidies	38,968	47,748	98,020	+59,052	+50,272
Farm labor housing grants	8,336	8,336	8,336	---	---
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	415,100	397,296	415,100	---	+17,804
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund program	462,404	453,380	521,456	+59,052	+68,076
(Loan authorization)	(25,148,567)	(24,603,565)	(25,290,648)	(+142,081)	(+687,083)
Rental assistance program:					
Rental assistance (Sec. 521)	1,110,000	1,088,500	1,088,500	-21,500	---
Multi-Family Housing Revitalization Program Account:					
Rural housing voucher program	12,575	8,000	8,000	-4,575	---
Multi-family housing revitalization program	20,000	20,000	20,000	---	---
Total, Multi-family housing revitalization	32,575	28,000	28,000	-4,575	---
Mutual and self-help housing grants	25,000	10,000	30,000	+5,000	+20,000
Rural housing assistance grants	32,239	25,000	27,000	-5,239	+2,000
Rural community facilities program account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Community facility:					
Direct	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	---	---
Guaranteed	(59,543)	---	(73,222)	(+13,679)	(+73,222)
Total, Loan authorizations	(2,259,543)	(2,200,000)	(2,273,222)	(+13,679)	(+73,222)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4800)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Community facility:					
Guaranteed	3,775	---	3,500	-275	+3,500
Grants	13,000	17,000	13,000	---	-4,000
Rural community development initiative	5,967	---	5,000	-967	+5,000
Economic impact initiative grants	5,778	---	5,000	-778	+5,000
Tribal college grants	4,000	4,000	4,000	---	---
Total, RCFP Loan subsidies and grants	32,520	21,000	30,500	-2,020	+9,500
Subtotal, grants and payments	89,759	56,000	87,500	-2,259	+31,500
Total, Rural Housing Service	1,694,738	1,625,880	1,725,456	+30,718	+99,576
(Loan authorization)	(27,408,110)	(26,803,565)	(27,563,870)	(+155,760)	(+760,305)
Rural Business--Cooperative Service:					
Rural Business Program Account:					
(Guaranteed business and industry loans)	(958,097)	(590,802)	(880,626)	(-77,471)	(+289,824)
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Guaranteed business and industry subsidy	66,971	30,190	45,000	-21,971	+14,810
Rural business development grants	26,568	---	20,000	-6,568	+20,000
Delta regional authority	3,000	---	---	-3,000	---
Total, RBP loan subsidies and grants	96,539	30,190	65,000	-31,539	+34,810
Rural Business and Cooperative Grants	---	57,500	---	---	-57,500
Intermediary Relending Program Fund Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(18,889)	(10,013)	(16,234)	(-2,655)	(+6,221)
Loan subsidy	4,082	3,084	5,000	+918	+1,916
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	4,439	4,249	4,439	---	+190
Total, IRP Fund	8,521	64,833	9,439	+918	-55,394
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(33,077)	(59,456)	(59,456)	(+26,379)	---
Limit cushion of credit interest spending	(172,000)	(155,000)	(155,000)	(-17,000)	---
(Rescission)	-172,000	-155,000	-155,000	+17,000	---

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4800)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rural Cooperative Development Grants:					
Cooperative development	5,800	---	5,800	---	+5,800
Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas	2,250	2,087	2,500	+250	+413
Grants to assist minority producers	3,000	3,000	3,000	---	---
Value-added agricultural product market development	15,000	11,000	10,750	-4,250	-250
Total, Rural Cooperative development grants	26,050	16,087	22,050	-4,000	+5,963
Rural Microenterprise Investment Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	---	(25,683)	---	---	(-25,683)
Loan subsidies and grants	---	3,290	---	---	-3,290
Total, Rural Microenterprise Investment	---	3,290	---	---	-3,290
Rural Energy for America Program					
(Loan authorization)	(12,760)	(47,259)	(33,081)	(+20,321)	(-14,178)
Loan subsidy	3,500	5,000	3,500	---	-1,500
Grants	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Total, Rural Energy for America Program	3,500	10,000	3,500	---	-6,500
Rural Business Investment Program Account					
(Loan authorization)	---	(39,254)	(39,254)	(+39,254)	---
Loan subsidy	---	4,000	4,000	+4,000	---
Grants	---	2,000	---	---	-2,000
Total, Rural Business Investment Program	---	6,000	4,000	+4,000	-2,000
Healthy Foods, Healthy Neighborhoods Initiative:					
Grants	---	12,250	---	---	-12,250
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	---	750	---	---	-750
Total, Healthy Foods, Healthy Neighborhoods	---	13,000	---	---	-13,000
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service	-37,390	-11,600	-51,011	-13,621	-39,411
(Loan authorization)	(1,022,823)	(772,467)	(1,028,651)	(+5,828)	(+256,184)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4800)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rural Utilities Service:					
Rural water and waste disposal program account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	---	---
Guaranteed	(50,000)	---	(84,746)	(+34,746)	(+84,746)
Direct loans authorized by P.L. 83-566	(40,000)	---	---	(-40,000)	---
Total, Loan authorization	1,290,000	1,200,000	1,284,746	-5,254	+84,746
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Direct subsidy	---	---	---	---	---
Direct loans authorized by PL 83-566	---	---	---	---	---
Guaranteed subsidy	355	---	500	+145	+500
Water and waste revolving fund	1,000	---	1,000	---	+1,000
Water well system grants	993	---	993	---	+993
Colonias and AK/HI grants	66,500	36,480	66,500	---	+30,020
Water and waste technical assistance	19,000	9,120	19,000	---	+9,880
Circuit rider program	15,000	7,600	15,000	---	+7,400
Solid waste management grants	4,000	4,000	4,000	---	---
High energy cost grants	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Water and waste disposal grants	345,523	246,800	359,900	+14,377	+113,100
Total, Loan subsidies and grants	462,371	304,000	466,893	+4,522	+162,893
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5%	---	---	---	---	---
Direct, FFB	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	---	---
Guaranteed underwriting	(500,000)	---	(500,000)	---	(+500,000)
Subtotal, Electric	(5,500,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,500,000)	---	(+500,000)
Telecommunications:					
Direct, Treasury rate	(690,000)	(345,000)	(690,000)	---	(+345,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(6,190,000)	(5,345,000)	(6,190,000)	---	(+845,000)
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	34,478	33,000	34,478	---	+1,478
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account	34,478	33,000	34,478	---	+1,478
(Loan authorization)	(6,190,000)	(5,345,000)	(6,190,000)	---	(+845,000)
Distance learning, telemedicine, and broadband program:					
Loan authorizations:					
Broadband telecommunications	(34,483)	(44,238)	(24,077)	(-10,406)	(-20,161)
Total, Loan authorizations	(34,483)	(44,238)	(24,077)	(-10,406)	(-20,161)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4800)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Distance learning and telemedicine:					
Grants	24,323	24,950	20,000	-4,323	-4,950
Broadband telecommunications:					
Direct	4,500	8,268	4,500	---	-3,768
Grants	10,372	20,372	10,372	---	-10,000
Total, Loan subsidies and grants	39,195	53,590	34,872	-4,323	-18,718
Total, Rural Utilities Service	536,044	390,590	536,243	+199	+145,653
(Loan authorization)	(7,514,483)	(6,589,238)	(7,498,823)	(-15,660)	(+909,585)
Total, Title III, Rural Development Programs	2,397,709	2,230,869	2,435,787	+38,078	+204,918
(By transfer)	(454,017)	(435,295)	(454,017)	---	(+18,722)
(Loan authorization)	(35,945,416)	(34,165,270)	(36,091,344)	(+145,928)	(+1,926,074)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services	811	816	816	+5	---
Food and Nutrition Service:					
Child nutrition programs	19,262,957	20,472,000	20,471,795	+1,208,838	-205
School breakfast program equipment grants	25,000	35,000	25,000	---	-10,000
Demonstration projects (Summer EBT)	---	30,000	27,000	+27,000	-3,000
Total, Child nutrition programs	19,287,957	20,537,000	20,523,795	+1,235,838	-13,205
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	6,715,841	6,823,000	6,623,000	-92,841	-200,000
Supplemental nutrition assistance program:					
(Food stamp program)	79,168,947	79,250,389	79,250,140	+81,193	-249
Reserve	3,000,000	5,000,000	3,000,000	---	-2,000,000
FDPIR nutrition education services	998	998	998	---	---
Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion	---	---	---	---	---
National food consumption survey	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Nutrition education	---	---	---	---	---
FY 2016 (first quarter)	---	21,064,097	---	---	-21,064,097
Total, Food stamp program	82,169,945	105,320,484	82,251,138	+81,193	-23,069,346
Fiscal year 2015	(82,169,945)	(84,256,387)	(82,251,138)	(+81,193)	(-2,005,249)
Commodity assistance program:					
Commodity supplemental food program	202,682	208,682	208,682	+6,000	---
Farmers market nutrition program	16,548	16,548	16,548	---	---
Emergency food assistance program	49,401	49,401	49,401	---	---
Pacific island and disaster assistance	1,070	1,070	1,070	---	---
Total, Commodity assistance program	269,701	275,701	275,701	+6,000	---
Nutrition programs administration	141,348	155,000	150,824	+9,476	-4,176
Total, Food and Nutrition Service	108,584,792	133,111,185	109,824,458	+1,239,666	-23,286,727
FY 2015	(108,584,792)	(112,047,088)	(109,824,458)	(+1,239,666)	(-2,222,630)
Total, Title IV, Domestic Food Programs	108,585,603	133,112,001	109,825,274	+1,239,671	-23,286,727
FY 2015	(108,584,792)	(112,047,088)	(109,824,458)	(+1,239,666)	(-2,222,630)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4800)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service					
Salaries and expenses	177,863	182,563	182,563	+4,700	---
(Transfer from export loans)	(6,394)	(6,394)	(6,394)	---	---
Total, Salaries and expenses	184,257	188,957	188,957	+4,700	---
Food for Peace Title I Direct Credit and Food for Progress Program Account, Administrative Expenses					
Farm Service Agency, Salaries and expenses (transfer to FSA)	2,735	2,528	2,528	-207	---
Unobligated balances (rescission)	---	-13,000	-13,000	-13,000	---
Food for Peace Title II Grants:					
Expenses	1,466,000	1,400,000	1,466,000	---	+66,000
Commodity Credit Corporation Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):					
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS)	6,394	6,394	6,394	---	---
Farm Service Agency S&E (transfer to FSA)	354	354	354	---	---
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account	6,748	6,748	6,748	---	---
McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition program grants	185,126	185,126	198,126	+13,000	+13,000
Total, Title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs	1,838,472	1,763,965	1,842,965	+4,493	+79,000
(By transfer)	(6,394)	(6,394)	(6,394)	---	---
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	2,551,905	2,575,383	2,574,080	+22,175	-1,303
Prescription drug user fees	(760,000)	(798,000)	(798,000)	(+38,000)	---
Medical device user fees	(114,833)	(128,282)	(128,282)	(+13,449)	---
Human generic drug user fees	(305,996)	(312,116)	(312,116)	(+6,120)	---
Biosimilar biological products user fees	(20,716)	(21,014)	(21,014)	(+298)	---
Animal drug user fees	(23,600)	(22,464)	(22,464)	(-1,136)	---
Animal generic drug user fees	(7,328)	(6,944)	(6,944)	(-384)	---
Tobacco product user fees	(534,000)	(566,000)	(566,000)	(+32,000)	---
Food and Feed Recall user fees	(12,925)	---	(1,434)	(-11,491)	(+1,434)
Food Reinspection fees	(15,367)	---	(6,414)	(-8,953)	(+6,414)
Voluntary qualified importer program fees	---	---	(5,300)	(+5,300)	(+5,300)
Subtotal (including user fees)	(4,346,670)	(4,430,203)	(4,442,048)	(+95,378)	(+11,845)
Mammography user fees	(19,318)	(19,705)	(19,705)	(+387)	---
Export and color certification user fees	(12,447)	(13,651)	(13,651)	(+1,204)	---
Food and Feed Recall user fees	---	(1,434)	---	---	(-1,434)
Food Reinspection fees	---	(6,414)	---	---	(-6,414)
Voluntary qualified importer program fees	---	(5,300)	---	---	(-5,300)
Pharmacy compounding fees (CBO estimate)	---	(1,000)	(1,000)	(+1,000)	---
Subtotal, FDA user fees	(1,826,530)	(1,902,324)	(1,902,324)	(+75,794)	---
Subtotal, FDA (with user fees)	(4,378,435)	(4,477,707)	(4,476,404)	(+97,969)	(-1,303)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4800)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
FDA New User Fees (Leg. proposals):					
Food Facility registration and inspection user fees	---	(60,120)	---	---	(-60,120)
Food import user fees	---	(169,021)	---	---	(-169,021)
International courier user fees	---	(5,807)	---	---	(-5,807)
Cosemetic user fees	---	(19,457)	---	---	(-19,457)
Food contact substance notification user fees	---	(5,098)	---	---	(-5,098)
Subtotal, FDA new user fees (Leg Proposals)	---	(259,503)	---	---	(-259,503)
Buildings and facilities	8,788	8,788	8,788	---	---
Total, FDA (w/user fees, including proposals)	(4,387,223)	(4,745,998)	(4,485,192)	(+97,969)	(-260,806)
Total, FDA (w/enacted user fees only)	(4,387,223)	(4,486,495)	(4,485,192)	(+97,969)	(-1,303)
Total, FDA (excluding user fees)	2,560,693	2,584,171	2,582,868	+22,175	-1,303
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	215,000	280,000	217,578	+2,578	-62,422
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(62,600)	(65,100)	(54,000)	(-8,600)	(-11,100)
Total, Title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration	2,775,693	2,864,171	2,800,446	+24,753	-63,725
TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Emergency livestock assistance program (rescission) (Sec. 709)	---	-125,000	-125,000	-125,000	---
Limit Dam Rehab (Sec.717(1))	-153,000	---	-50,000	+103,000	-50,000
(rescission)	---	-153,000	---	---	+153,000
Limit Environmental Quality Incentives (Sec.717(2))	-272,000	-250,000	-95,000	+177,000	+155,000
Limit Agricultural Easement Program (Sec.717(3))	---	---	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000
Limit Conservation Stewardship Program (Sec.717(4))	---	---	-31,000	-31,000	-31,000
Limit Biomass Crop Assistance Program (Sec.717(5))	---	---	-10,000	-10,000	-10,000
Limit Rural Energy for America Program (Sec.717(6))	---	---	-16,000	-16,000	-16,000
Limit Biorefinery Assistance (Sec.717(7))	---	---	-24,000	-24,000	-24,000
Limit fruit and vegetable program (Sec.718)	-119,000	-122,000	-122,000	-3,000	---
Section 32 (rescission) (Sec.718)	-189,000	-203,000	-121,000	+68,000	+82,000
Resource Conservation and Development (rescission)	-2,017	---	---	+2,017	---
Geographic Disadvantaged farmers	1,996	---	---	-1,996	---
Hardwood Trees (Reforestation Pilot Program)	600	---	---	-600	---
Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments (rescission)	-30,000	---	---	+30,000	---
Rural Housing Service (rescission)	-1,314	---	---	+1,314	---
Section 9005 Bioenergy program (rescission)	-8,000	---	---	+8,000	---
Water Bank program	4,000	---	---	-4,000	---
Section 9003 Biorefinery program (rescission)	-40,694	---	---	+40,694	---
Hunger Commission	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
FDA user fees	79,000	---	---	-79,000	---
Citrus greening (APHIS)	20,000	---	---	-20,000	---
Southwest Border Regional Commission	---	2,000	---	---	-2,000
Total, Title VII, General provisions	-708,429	-851,000	-624,000	+84,429	+227,000
Grand total	145,652,976	165,461,061	142,856,736	-2,796,240	-22,604,325
Appropriations fiscal year 2015	(146,096,001)	(145,045,964)	(143,270,736)	(-2,825,265)	(-1,775,228)
Rescissions	(-443,025)	(-649,000)	(-414,000)	(+29,025)	(+235,000)
Advance appropriations, FY 2016	---	(21,064,097)	---	---	(-21,064,097)
(By transfer)	(790,554)	(771,886)	(790,347)	(-207)	(+18,461)
(Loan authorization)	(41,472,694)	(40,567,384)	(42,493,458)	(+1,020,764)	(+1,926,074)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(178,035)	(180,809)	(169,709)	(-8,326)	(-11,100)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 4800)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Agricultural programs	29,938,096	25,525,385	25,707,313	-4,230,783	+181,928
Mandatory	(23,149,074)	(18,855,803)	(18,855,803)	(-4,293,271)	---
Discretionary	(6,789,022)	(6,669,582)	(6,851,510)	(+62,488)	(+181,928)
Title II - Conservation programs (discretionary)	825,832	815,670	868,951	+43,119	+53,281
Title III - Rural development (discretionary)	2,397,709	2,230,869	2,435,787	+38,078	+204,918
Title IV - Domestic food programs	108,585,603	133,112,001	109,825,274	+1,239,671	-23,286,727
Mandatory	(101,432,902)	(125,787,484)	(102,722,933)	(+1,290,031)	(-23,064,551)
Discretionary	(7,152,701)	(7,324,517)	(7,102,341)	(-50,360)	(-222,176)
Title V - Foreign assistance and related programs (discretionary)	1,838,472	1,763,965	1,842,965	+4,493	+79,000
Title VI - Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration (discretionary)	2,775,693	2,864,171	2,800,446	+24,753	-63,725
Title VII - General provisions (discretionary)	-708,429	-851,000	-624,000	+84,429	+227,000
Total	145,652,976	165,461,061	142,856,736	-2,796,240	-22,604,325

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise having cosponsored this bill as the ranking member on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee. I have to say that I think we have worked very well together. We have worked together as chair and ranking member over a period of time. It is an interesting perspective. I think we have crossed the cultural divide when a Californian can understand the language of an Alabaman, and we have become friends.

I have to say that probably 90 percent of this bill is something we all agree on. Ten percent is what we don't agree on, and it is a horrible 10 percent—a big 10 percent. The bill allocates $20.8 billion, which is the same as what we came up with last year in the conference level.

I appreciate the working relationship that Mr. ADERHOLT already outlined and the wonderful staff that both his office and I have, and my office and the committee has. We all work well together as a team. So we bring this bill to the floor today.

It is quite a privilege to be able to have this position, and I think that we all understand the privilege, because the USDA, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is our main focus, in addition to the Food and Drug Administration, and to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Department of Agriculture, many people don't understand, was created during the Civil War by Abraham Lincoln. It was a department that needed to be created as the United States was facing the Western expansion. Abraham Lincoln was very insightful in realizing that people who moved out into the boonies needed help. There is no infrastructure there. There is nothing there. It became kind of a home ec department. And to this day, the Department of Agriculture still has a division of rural water, a division of rural housing, farmworker housing, and of rural telecommunications.

It is obviously involved with all the science research in agriculture and a big research section. The USDA has a specialist in almost every county in the United States and almost every country in the world, as we have ag advisers in all of our Embassies.

It is an awesome responsibility to govern a very complex system of trade and balances, of phytosanitary inspections, of fighting diseases that get into this country. And it is a lot of fun, also, and I think that is why we get along well trying to put together a good bill.

Now, I voted against this bill in committee because of the concerns of several aspects. Among these concerns are two highly objectionable nutrition riders. I am really concerned that the bill would allow school food authorities to get waivers from complying with the improved lunch and breakfast nutrition standards in the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act, which we enacted in 2010. The bill would allow them to get waivers if they show they are operating at a net loss.

I believe that rather than going backwards and serving children in some schools less healthy meals, we should be encouraging the USDA to continue giving schools the technical assistance they need to meet the standards. We should also be encouraging USDA to continue providing flexibility, where warranted, in meeting nutritional standards. The approach in this bill, however, is unacceptable.

Second, despite the recommendations of the medical community indicating that consumption of starchy vegetables meets or exceeds recommended amounts, and the food in-take data showing that white potatoes are the most widely used vegetables and therefore by law or by statute have been excluded from the WIC program, where you get vouchers to buy fresh fruits and vegetables, this bill allows white potatoes to be purchased under that program. It is not necessary at all. The white potato lobby is a very effective lobby.

I am troubled by the inclusion of this bill requiring white potatoes be eligible for purchase in the WIC program. The WIC program, as I said, gives supplemental nutrition through specified foods, and white potatoes is not one of them. So there are some real concerns with this bill. This is the first time that Congress has dictated as to what has to be purchased with those vouchers, and we have never before mandated an inclusion of a specific food item in the WIC food package in the history of the program.

While the funding levels in this bill are, in general, acceptable, there are some exceptions. The most notable to that is the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. This is a Commission that reviews about $300 trillion in trade. That is almost $1 trillion a day. And what we do is provide funding to have the referees so that they know when the trading is being fair or not fair, and it is essentially a review process, but they need money to hire those referees, as we call them. The President asked for $62 million more than we are allowing him to have to fill the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. Those are big concerns.

On the positive side, the bill restores the Food for Peace funding to 2014 levels. It increases the McGovern-Dole program by $13 million over the 2014 levels. But I am also concerned that in these programs there is an exclusion of important reforms that would have furthered the impact of each dollar spent on food aid.

Given the high level of need, our food aid has to be as cost effective and as efficient as possible, so I am disappointed that food aid reforms enabling more people to be fed at lower cost were not included in the bill.

I would like to say that you are going to hear a lot of my colleagues raise issues on some of these issues because it is very important that we try to get it right and hopefully defeat some of the bad provisions that are in this bill.

Food is peace. America leads the world in food assistance. California is the number one agriculture State in the Union. I am proud to be the ranking member in bringing this bill to the floor for healthy debate.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this bill. This is the fifth of the twelve 2015 appropriations cycle bills. It provides $20.9 billion in discretionary funding for important agriculture, rural development, and FDA programs.

With this legislation, we ensure America's farmers and ranchers—who contribute billions to our economy, as well as create jobs and put food on our tables—have the resources they need to continue to remain successful.

We have provided responsible funding for programs that work to stop crop, plant, and animal disease that can cripple U.S. producers and entire industries. Funding is also directed to programs that help conserve and protect farmland, and improve water quality and food safety.

In addition, this bill also provides funding for infrastructure development, housing loans and rental assistance, and economic opportunities for America's rural communities. These vital loans and programs help foster an environment for economic growth and will help rural America thrive.

The committee also prioritized the safety of our Nation's food and drug supply, targeting increases to FDA food and drug safety activities.

The funding in this bill will maintain 8,000 inspection personnel for meat, poultry, and egg products and facilities across the Nation.

I am also pleased that we have included language that forces the FDA to develop more robust guidelines for abuse-deterrent opioid pill formulations. We withhold $20 million from the Commissioner's office until these long-overdue regulations are finalized, because the drugs on the market that are not abuse-deterrent result in opioid addictions, overdoses, and deaths. They need to be corrected.

□ 1415

Prescription drug abuse is a scourge on this Nation, and FDA can and should be doing more to battle this epidemic.

Beyond funding these critical USDA and FDA programs, the bill also includes funding for a variety of nutrition programs, making sure our most vulnerable, including our children and elderly, don't go hungry.

The discretionary funding level in this bill is about the same as last year,

which is a testament to the hard work of this subcommittee to find savings wherever possible to make that possible. Each and every program within this bill has been closely examined to help make the best decisions about where to direct tax dollars and where to trim funding.

The bill also makes strides to make these programs more efficient, more effective, and more useful for the American people and strengthens congressional oversight, particularly where it comes to mandatory spending on important nutrition programs.

For example, within SNAP, formerly called food stamps, we have required the enforcement of a ban on certain outreach with foreign governments and implemented protocols to help weed out waste, fraud, and abuse.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is a commonsense bill that makes every step to adequately fund important agricultural programs, to support our most vulnerable citizens, and to act with fiscal restraint.

I want to thank Chairman ADERHOLT, Ranking Member FARR, the subcommittee members, and their staffs for all they did to achieve this very good bill. It was not easy because the allocation they had was not perfect, but they made do with it, and they made do well. I want to thank them for their hard work and congratulate them on a good bill. I urge unanimous support for the bill.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the efforts of the chairman and the ranking member in putting together this bill. While many of the funding decisions are appropriate, I do oppose this bill because I have deep objections to controversial riders.

First, this bill would begin to back away from much-needed efforts to make school meals healthier. According to the CDC, as of 2012, more than one-third of children and adolescents were obese.

Obese children are more likely to become obese adults, and thus are at a much greater risk of developing heart diseases, type 2 diabetes, stroke, and forms of cancer. Schools should support and teach healthy eating habits.

Instead of providing waivers, this bill should help the districts meet this higher standard by providing the technical assistance and training to become compliant.

Additionally, bill language would make white potatoes eligible for purchase by WIC participants, which is inconsistent with the purpose of the WIC program to include only foods based on documented nutritional deficiencies.

White potatoes are excluded today based on the best available science, and science, not special interests, should continue to be the guide for WIC's policies.

The majority should have fully embraced the work and purpose of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and fully funded the administration's request. I am also concerned that the bill provides only half of the requested funds to expand and improve oversight of drug compounding to ensure products are safe and effective.

I thank the chairman for working with me to ensure that the summer feeding pilot program remains open to children in rural and urban areas and adding report language related to sunscreen ingredients, sprays, and high SPF products.

I very much support the additional $13 million in funding for the McGovern-Dole food aid program and the restoration of funding for the Food for Peace program.

However, the bill should have also included the administration's proposal to allow up to 25 percent of title II resources to be made available in cash for emergencies to better respond to multiple, high-level crises around the world. This change alone would have allowed U.S. aid to reach an estimated 2 million more people in chronically food-insecure communities.

The bill provides sufficient funds for nutritional assistance programs, such as WIC and SNAP, and provides needed discretionary funds for food safety programs within FDA and the Food Safety and Inspection Service.

It is my sincere hope that we can improve these shortcomings before a bill is signed into law.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in an important colloquy with Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman ADERHOLT of Alabama and the ranking member of the Livestock Subcommittee on the House Ag Committee, Mr. COSTA of California, regarding the issue of mandatory country of origin labeling, or COOL, for beef, pork, and poultry.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, I strongly support discontinuing the overreaching country of origin labeling regulations that not only burden our Nation's livestock industry, but threaten massive retaliatory tariffs from Canada and Mexico on a vast range of U.S. industry and products.

I appreciate your work in the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee to include a directive in the bill's report language requiring USDA to discontinue enforcement of COOL, should the WTO compliance panel rule against the United States when they make their decision in a few weeks.

However, I believe the final appropriations bill should include the strongest language possible to prevent any further harm to the livestock industry and all industries threatened on the retaliatory trade list.

COOL represents yet another failed policy of the Federal Government, imposing costly and burdensome mandates on private sector industry. While the primary goal of COOL is to give American-grown meat a competitive advantage, the result has been exactly the opposite.

As a direct result of this policy, we are not only seeing sharp increases in the cost of marketing and selling beef and pork, but trade retaliation from our closest trading partners will cost us billions of dollars in trade, which will kill U.S. jobs, harm our competitiveness, and have a long-term negative impact on American industry.

As you prepare for conference, I hope we can work together to make sure the final bill provides the most appropriate response to this problem.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, we are again, I think, missing an opportunity with regard to the country of origin labeling, otherwise referred to as COOL.

COOL has proven, as Mr. CRAWFORD has stated, to be a failed experiment. We are seeing an increased cost to ranchers and processors in order to comply with these regulations that are ultimately passed on to the consumers and to make it more difficult to provide the separate lines of animal source from different countries to fulfill the intent of the law.

This program has added nothing but cost to the cattle industry in America, and it is time where we make an attempt to deal with these added costs.

To be totally honest, we don't even know what the actual costs to the industry are. Its producers and processors have had difficulty putting together a formal economic impact, so an analysis has never yet been done.

Finally—and probably more important—it is threatening to the trade relationship with our two biggest markets in the export of U.S. beef, pork, and chicken, which is Canada and Mexico.

Should, as we all assume, the WTO rule against the United States, we will face harsh retaliatory efforts against the products produced here and we are trying to encourage, not only in my home State of California, but in America.

No one wants to see retaliatory efforts made by Canada or Mexico. I know, in talking with producers and people in the industry in Canada and Mexico, they don't want to pursue retaliatory efforts.

We have the data and the studies and the WTO experience to show that it is time that we fix COOL. We want to see this problem resolved, and we want to work together to do it. Hopefully, we will use this legislation to do just that.

Mr. Chairman, we hope you will work with us to provide relief in the event the World Trade Organization does rule against the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I assure the gentleman from California that I will be committed to working with both he and Mr. CRAWFORD as we continue on this issue. I agree with my

colleagues that the final WTO ruling on the pending COOL case could bring irreparable harm to various U.S. industries.

As has been noted, report language has been included expressing the committee's concern that U.S. exports to Mexico and Canada will suffer an economic impact of approximately $2 billion in retaliatory tariffs. The report directs USDA not to implement or enforce the COOL final rule for meat labeling, should the WTO issue a final ruling against the United States.

Again, I can assure both of my colleagues here this afternoon that it is my intention to protect our domestic industries from retaliation. We will closely monitor the progress of the WTO in this matter and will respond as necessary, so that our U.S. economy does not suffer.

I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to discuss this important issue with both of you, and I look forward to working with both of you as we move forward.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), the second generation of congresspersons from the Roybal family.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to provisions in this bill that undermine nutrition standards for school meals and the WIC program. Nutrition programs that support balanced diets are vital tools in protecting against childhood hunger and reducing childhood obesity.

While I appreciate Chairman ADERHOLT's efforts to fully fund childhood nutrition programs, I strongly oppose this bill because it weakens, unnecessarily, Federal child nutrition standards; rather than allowing USDA to work with schools to help them meet healthier nutrition criteria, this bill undermines the national school meal program by allowing a blanket waiver to any school that says it can't meet the new standards.

In addition, the bill adds white potatoes to the WIC food package, ignoring research findings that white potatoes are already consumed above recommended levels and should not compete with other fruits and vegetables for limited WIC vouchers.

Mr. Chairman, we have an obesity crisis in our country, and our Nation's children and families are best served when Federal nutrition standards are guided by science. Now is not the time to lower the benchmarks that protect our children's health now and in the future.

I urge my colleagues to support amendments that remove these damaging riders to the bill.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your and the committee's hard work on crafting the agriculture appropriations bill on the floor today. It is a bill that supports American farmers, protects the safety of our food, keeps rural America vibrant, and ensures that our taxpayer dollars are being used efficiently and effectively.

I also want to thank you and the committee's continued support for an issue that is very important to my constituents of the Second District of Ohio, the Asian long-horned beetle. This pest, also known as ALB, is one of the most destructive, invasive species that has entered the United States.

These beetles have been discovered in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Illinois, and they were first seen in my district in 2012. Mr. Chairman, ALB is devastating our trees. These insects burrow themselves into the heartwood of our trees, where they lay larvae and feast off the wood.

As a result, trees in my community are dying or becoming so structurally weak that they are unsafe to even be near them. This doesn't just affect one type of tree, unfortunately, but over a dozen different species.

Eradicating this infestation is extremely important to me and my constituents. Unfortunately, the infestation has already come at a very high cost. To date, roughly 43,000 trees have been removed in Clermont County of Ohio, due to the Asian long-horned beetle, including over 30,000 trees that have not even yet been infested.

This is 43,000 less trees that can no longer provide shade on a sunny day or protect against erosion; not to mention, this infestation and tree removal is directly impacting the property values of homeowners.

Currently, cutting down and removing trees is the most common method used to eradicate these beetles. My constituents are having their trees removed from their own private properties, turning front yards into lumber yards.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that you insert language into the conference report that would encourage the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture to support alternative methods to tree removal to combat the Asian long-horned beetle.

Thank you, and I appreciate your past and continued efforts to eradicate this destructive pest.

□ 1430

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this agriculture funding bill. Budgeting is about choices, and this bill makes the wrong choices for the American people.

Time and again in this legislation the House majority has chosen to put profits and politics before nutrition and food safety. It puts partisan ideology before impartial science, and the interests of big corporate industries over the needs of families and children.

Examples: for decades our Federal nutrition policies have been based on the principle of sound scientific research and evidence-based decision-making. Until now, Congress has never prescribed the details of Federal nutrition programs. This bill circumvents the Institute of Medicine process for determining the appropriate foods to offer in the Supplemental Women, Infants, and Children program, or the WIC package.

To benefit industry, the House majority adds white potatoes to WIC, despite the advice and findings of nutritionists that white potatoes are not lacking in a mother's and children's diets. In fact, they are the most consumed vegetable in America. This is the same type of thinking from Congress that got pizza called a vegetable.

Further, this bill would waive requirements for schools to meet the nutrition standards that we passed as part of the 2010 Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act. These standards, developed by experts, improve school meals, remove unhealthy junk foods in our Nation's schools. The standards have already been achieved at over 90 percent of America's schools and are working to help kids choose healthier food options. House Republicans are trying to appease special interests by weakening child nutrition programs in this bill.

The bill also undermines menu labeling and creates carve-outs for industries at the expense of health. It assumes a passage of an accelerated and unsafe poultry inspection system that increases the chance of contaminated chicken on our kitchen tables just so companies can make more profit.

At a time when foodborne illness outbreaks are a continual challenge, it cuts the Food Safety and Inspection Service, a linchpin of our food safety efforts, by $6 million, putting families at risk, and no permanent inspectors will be able to be hired.

This bill dangerously underfunds the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. It allows risky financial transactions to continue, putting the profits of Wall Street ahead of consumers.

These are all unprecedented attempts to use the appropriations process to do the bidding of industry and special interests at the expense of the public interest.

Our job—our job—is to craft a budget that does right by the American people, that helps kids get the nutrition that they need to grow, that fights hunger in all of our communities, and that ensures that our food supply is safe. This budget fails in all of these regards, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. HOLT.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the nutrition standards for school meals and in strong opposition to the waivers to those standards in this legislation that would result in schools providing nutritionally deficient meals.

Federal child nutrition programs help alleviate hunger and poor nutrition, and were it not for these programs, many students would not receive enough to eat. In New Jersey alone, my home State, the number of children who were eligible for free and reduced school meals increased by 22 percent in the past 5 years to a total that now exceeds half a million children.

According to a study from Harvard released earlier this year, because of the nutrition standards, children are eating more fruits and vegetables. These standards are working, and they are helping children receive better nutrition.

We knew a decade ago that almost half of school lunches were based on prepackaged foods high in calories and fat and salt. Many schools did not offer fruits and vegetables as part of their meals. Congress acted and raised the standards. Healthy children are the source of our country's well-being. The effects of these new standards last long after the children leave school.

At a time when one in three American children is overweight or obese, school nutrition standards can reduce the long-term health costs. And at a time when medical costs are growing ever higher, we should be thinking of ways to reduce health care costs, especially by encouraging more healthful living. We should support Mr. FARR's amendment when he brings it up that would retain, in this bill, the good nutritional standards.

Almost all schools are meeting the new standards now. The USDA has provided flexibility to schools to allow schools to successfully implement the standards, and that is reflected in the high adoption rate among schools across the Nation.

Through the Farm to School Program that I helped write in the Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act, Hopewell Elementary School, for example, in my district is providing more local produce on their menu. This is helping the kids learn about healthy eating, learn where our food comes from—not a package or a box, but from the ground and from farmers. We should give them the best nutrition.

Congress should continue to ensure that schools have the resources to meet the standards, not to lower the standards or exempt schools from them.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in opposition to the language in this bill that rolls back standards that ensure our children are being fed nutritious foods at school.

As a former State health secretary, I want to refocus this debate where I think it belongs, and that is on health. What we are really talking about here is the health of our children. More than one-third of children and adolescents are overweight or obese, and more than 2 million adolescents are prediabetic.

Mr. Chair, children who learn to eat nutritious food are more likely to continue those healthy habits as adults. The best place to teach children about healthy eating is where they spend most of their time—in school.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues concerned about the cost of nutritious food to think about the cost of obesity and malnutrition and to think about our children's future. My colleagues say that it is too hard, that children really don't like healthy foods. I agree that making change isn't easy, but we are going to have to invest some time and energy into teaching our children to make healthy choices. That is a change worth making.

I thank the gentleman from California, who has been a real leader on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support his efforts to fix the bill.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank my colleague from Alabama for his leadership on this issue.

This is an issue where I think we all agree. We want children in this country to eat healthier. We all want to fight childhood obesity. But I come up to this podium in opposition to this amendment because I am a parent. I have three kids in public schools. I coach youth football. I coach Little League. I talk to children. I have talked to superintendents and principals in central Illinois about this problem. And it is not just a problem that Washington can solve, but it is a problem that Washington created that we need to fix.

There is a lot of plate waste. You look at a recent Los Angeles Times article, upwards of $20 million per year the Los Angeles, California, school district is losing to plate waste. 1.2 million less children in this country are participating in the school lunch program, the school nutrition program.

In my district, schools like Monticello, Illinois, have pulled out of the school nutrition program because they were losing upwards of $100,000 a year to comply with regulations that were thought of in a concrete building in Washington, D.C., rather than rural America.

Now, what have we done?

We have asked Secretary Vilsack to offer some flexibility to schools like Monticello so that more kids will participate and that school district doesn't have to choose between following the rules and regulations set forth in Washington, D.C., and choosing to hire two teachers.

We have asked the White House and the USDA to voluntarily comply with the same rules and regulations that every school nutrition program, every school cafeteria in this country has to comply with. No answer.

We have offered for Secretary Vilsack to come visit the school districts that have talked to me about this being a burden and a problem financially for them. Still no answer.

Giving schools flexibility does not mean that I want kids to eat unhealthy. It means parents and local schools districts know better how to feed our children rather than bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

I am going to continue to advocate for more flexibility for these regulations so that we don't lose more than the 1.2 million children that should be participating in the school lunch program.

What I want to know is why this administration and why the USDA fails to recognize that there is a problem in rural America and a problem in our urban schools when it comes to money that could be better spent educating our children in this great country.

Support this legislation. Do not support this amendment.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) has 12½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HOLT) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the author of the Child Nutrition Act. He probably knows more about child nutrition than anybody in Congress.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chair, these are not regulations that were written in Washington, D.C. These are regulations that were written in cooperation with school food service personnel, superintendents and teachers and school districts all over the country.

After many years of deliberation, we have continued to improve this program. Plate waste is less now than it was before. What we have discovered is, if children can select what they wanted to eat from a healthy menu, where we didn't have to worry that they were just selecting high-sugar content and high-salt content, they were eating what they liked, what they became familiar with, plate waste went down.

The purpose of this program is not to increase the profits of food processors or the agribusiness industry in this country. The purpose of this program is to improve the nutrition of children in our schools. Why? Because we understand that nutrition is directly connected to how well those children do in the classroom, not because I say so, not because the Secretary of Education says so or the Secretary of Agriculture, but because classroom teachers will tell you that if children don't have nutrition in the morning, if there is not food in their homes and they come to

school, they start to act out in class because they start to drift. And the fact is the school breakfast program has made a remarkable difference. The school lunch program has made a remarkable difference in children not acting out in class and children being able to concentrate and to perform better, to get better grades, to graduate from high school. It is directly connected.

Now what we see is that industry thinks that this is simply some kind of marketing system for their products. It is like white potatoes aren't available to poor people, white potatoes aren't available to people on food stamps, white potatoes aren't available in America. Yes, they are. But in the WIC program, it is directly related to the health of that mother, the fetus, the newborn infant, and the young child. We have to think about what a healthy meal means to the healthy development of that child. A surplus of white potatoes in that diet is not necessarily what you want to have happen.

In that schoolroom, what we want is good nutrition. We are not going to let that be dictated by the industry. The idea that somehow school districts can't comply, well, 90 percent have complied, and 90 percent have complied within the additional amount of money that the Federal Government made available so they could comply.

□ 1445

The Secretary has been reaching out to those districts in trouble, and I suggest those districts reach out to other districts in their area that are complying and finding this to be helpful. This isn't some big burden by the Federal Government. This is working in 90 percent of the districts.

Our own School Nutrition Association of California is against this waiver. We have very creative people. In our committee, we brought those people in and we talked about plate waste, we talked about flexibility, and that was incorporated in this legislation when it became the law of the land.

So on the whim and the misinformation that somehow it is not working, somehow it is impossible to do, I will stand with 90 percent of the districts and school food service people who are implementing it. I will stand with the health officials. I will stand with the teachers that understand what a difference it means to have healthy and nutritious food available to these children during the school day.

We have got to support the Farr amendment. We have got to take care of our children. We have got to give them an opportunity to learn in our schools, and good nutrition provides that opportunity. Bad nutrition interrupts that opportunity.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. And the time is expired for this kind of legislation.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I know this has been a controversial issue in this bill. I sincerely think that everybody in this House is well-intentioned about kids' meals, so I in no way want to say the other side is trying to hurt the schoolchildren. To indicate that the Republicans are trying to hurt the school kids is a complete misreading on what the Republicans are trying to do and what we are trying to do in this bill.

There are so many good intentions about this. I think what has happened is, a lot of the regulations as they have come down to a lot of these school districts, every school district is different, and it is hard to have a cookie cutter mentality in every school district in the Nation. That is really what makes this Nation. We are many States but we are one Nation, and they are not all the same.

What this legislation would do with just some commonsense standards—and I by no means say that my colleagues have bad intentions. I would never say that to my colleague from California, and I hope he would not say that about me on this issue. We are talking about providing lunches and flexibility to students and to the school nutritionists to meet their needs. We are not asking that this roll back the nutrition standards, we are not asking that it gut the underlying law. But some of the comments made, those would be the comments that you would think that we are trying to gut the entire law.

Mr. DAVIS made some very important comments when he spoke. All of us want kids to eat healthy meals, and we want to see child obesity decline. But simply providing school lunches that the kids won't eat and stopping there is not what this is about.

Student participation in the program continues to decline. A lot of the students are now bringing their lunches while the kids that are on these meal programs, they have no choice to eat this food while the other kids are bringing much more unhealthy food to the cafeteria, and watching them eat this other kind of food. It is just really disconcerting to see this. But we all have the same goal. Like I said, it is very disconcerting to hear that some of us would want our kids to be obese or to be unhealthy, and that is furthest from the truth.

I just want to say that because I think it is very important as we move forward with this debate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I would like to announce that the Tom Colicchio group—he is one of those celebrity chefs and his group is called the Food Policy Action Network—they have told us that they are going to score the vote on this bill because of this provision that we are talking about right now and the amendment that I am going to offer to strike the provision.

The reason I want to strike the provision in the bill is because it just gives it a blank waiver. It says, schools, you don't have to comply. That is too broad. We could have worked out some compromise language and more flexible language. But just to give them blank waiver, I think, is just an opt-out and doesn't necessarily get them back in, doesn't have any guidelines for how you can improve and get back on track. That's why I think it is a pretty extreme provision in the bill and ought to be knocked out.

Another reason is that we are paying for it. The taxpayers of this country put up the money and we are allocating it to this program, and I don't think the taxpayers want their money to go to food that isn't nutritious, that doesn't help kids to be healthier. I am not insinuating that the other side wants that, but I am saying that with that money, as in everything we do in the whole rest of this bill, it comes with conditionality.

Congress is a heavy parent. We don't just give money out. We also give instructions on what to spend it for and not to spend it for. When we are giving money to schools for school nutrition—for school lunch, school breakfast, school snack programs—we put some conditionality in it, and the conditionality is, let's buy healthy food with it, fruits and vegetables, and serve them to the kids.

I know there are places that say that is not what the kids eat at home or what they like, and so they are throwing it away. That is called ''plate waste.'' But frankly, there is plate waste in our cafeteria here in Congress. There is plate waste everywhere. There is too much plate waste in America. When so much of the world can't get access to food we are throwing away about 50 percent of what we prepare every day, which is just appalling.

How do you change that? One is you get kids to like what they are eating. We have to encourage our kids to eat vegetables. As was said earlier, you have to encourage your kids to take a bath, you have to encourage your kids to turn off the television set, you have to encourage your kids to do the math homework that they don't want to do. We give instruction.

I think what is missing in this whole debate is the instructional opportunity. Frankly, America has got to face the fact that we have not really put much attention into raising a culture of people that have values in food health, in body health, and the fast food industry has been very good at getting a lot of sugar, a lot of salt, a lot of things out there that taste really great, and people want to eat that all the time, but your body is not made to handle all that.

I think it is an opportunity for us to use the school nutrition program as a learning method. I point out that when I grew up there weren't any fast foods. McDonald's was the first fast food industry to come to our area. It came to the biggest city in my county in 1964. I had already graduated from college. So

all my youth experience was eating at home, eating in the school, and there were never any fast foods. It was all fresh prepared every day. I didn't have the ability to get all that. If anything, it was in a can, and a whole new industry was developing to have fresh frozen.

So we have an opportunity to help our national security problem with food nutrition because the military officers tell us that 75 percent of the youth today cannot qualify to get in the military—75 percent. That is just appalling. That is why they have indicated that we need to have a school nutrition program.

We also see it in health care costs, the biggest cost in America. Why we did this whole health care reform was to bring down cost. Underlying all of that was, hey, we are going to raise healthier people in this country so we can avoid—the ounce of prevention—avoid those expensive costs when people get diabetes, obesity, and other things that are preventable. So what better way to teach the cost of prevention than through nutritional health and exercise.

Lastly, why it is important that we wipe out this provision in the bill is because we are paying. The money is all there. So the schools that would be able to get the flexibility that you talk about, the waiver, they get to keep all the money but they don't have any of the responsibility to deliver the product, to deliver the nutritional foods. I think that is where we are wrong. We can't just give them money and then no responsibility to be wisely spent on the purposes for which it was intended.

So that amendment is going to come up later, and I hope that I can get support from this amendment across the aisle.

Mr. COHEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining so I can see how much time I can yield?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FARR. All right. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee for a colloquy.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. MILLER was talking about white potatoes. How does this bill affect white potatoes? I saw this movie called ''Fed Up,'' and white potatoes in general are the evil that cause people to get obese and gain weight. How are white potatoes in this bill?

Mr. FARR. Thank you for asking. The other provision is not in this school nutrition program, but in the WIC—the Women, Infants, and Children—program where we give vouchers to mothers of newborns or pregnant women in expectation that they are having children. To give them access to healthy fruits and vegetables we give them vouchers.

In that recommended formula, what the voucher should be spent on is, they are not allowed to spend them on white potatoes. Why? Because Americans eat about 90 pounds of white potatoes or potatoes per year. Think of it. They have hash browns for breakfast, french fries for lunch, and baked potatoes for night. That is a lot of potatoes in one day. Certainly, a newborn and about-to-be-born are not necessarily needing potatoes.

Nonetheless, the potato industry is very powerful here and they were able to get a provision in demanding that the vouchers also include the ability to buy white potatoes. That is what stirred up this whole comment, because Congress has never dictated as to what you have to buy with it or to get into buying things that haven't been recommended as nutritional.

Mr. COHEN. That is what I was astonished about, Mr. FARR, when I watched this movie. It was Katie Couric, and I forget all the other people involved in producing it. But it was about how Congress had basically acquiesced to special interests to change the dietary guidelines, to the detriment of children, women, and infants. Carbohydrates and the production of insulin causing the digestive system and body to produce fat is the main cause of obesity. It is not exercise. It is not pushing yourself away from the table so much, but they discovered it is carbs and white potatoes. So we are now putting white potatoes back because of the potato industry? This is the Idaho provision?

Mr. FARR. It is often said as a food analogy that if you like sausages or laws you should never watch either of them being made. Perhaps what you are watching is that white potato mandate is getting stuck into this bill.

Mr. COHEN. Sausages and white potatoes. Thank you, sir.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, we worked hard to try to put together a pretty good bill, except for these two provisions that we were just talking about and the underfunding of the Federal Commodities Futures Trading Commission, and we will be having amendments on those issues.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. May I inquire as to how many speakers the minority has.

Mr. FARR. We don't have any further speakers.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Alabama has 1 minute remaining and the right to close.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is an issue that, unfortunately, I think is misunderstood.

In school districts like Monticello, Illinois, that had to make the tough decision to pull out of the program, they don't get the Federal dollars anymore. They don't get the reimbursement. But they had to make the cost-benefit decision of whether or not to still feed those who qualify for free and reduced lunch out of their own pocket so they wouldn't lose the $100,000 a year. When the Los Angeles school district is losing upwards of $20 million a year, it is a big deal because school districts are having to choose between teachers and complying with Federal rules and regulations.

I believe that the decision on how to feed children is best left to parents and our local school districts. Do you know what? The kids that are hurt the worst by this, that is why we are asking for this waiver. We are asking for the USDA to approve a waiver. That is it; nothing more, nothing less.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I just wanted to clarify. I think the school district in Illinois you are talking about, they got out of the system because a hard boiled egg was not appropriate, or anything more than 12 ounces of skim milk was deemed inappropriate. That is what we are talking about, the regulations that are so out of whack.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. And the kids that are hurt the worst are the poorest kids who don't have the ability to go out to the convenience store when they are hungry afterwards, like many of the children of ours, and feed themselves. That is the only meal they may get that day, and we can't have Washington determining what that meal is.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, let me explain that not a drop of this money, a cent of it, can be spent on a teacher's salary. This is not, ''We are going to spend it on food or a teacher's salary.'' This is only for food, and the Federal Government takes sole responsibility for that. If States want to add something they can. But it is a Federal program, one of the only solid Federal programs in K–12 education.

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Congressman FARR's amendment that would remove the waiver that would exempt schools from providing even half a cup of fruits and vegetables to their students for lunch. More than 200 education and nutrition organizations oppose the weakening of nutrition standards. While it may be difficult to get kids to eat healthier, it is possible, as 90 percent of schools are already meeting the standards.

Rodney Taylor, the food service director at Riverside Unified School District, which is in my district, sent me a letter about the importance of nutrition standards, saying:

> Children in our district and many others are enjoying meals that meet updated school lunch requirements from the USDA, proving that it is possible to have healthy children and healthy budgets. Letting schools opt out

of these standards will not help them move forward and will be detrimental to the children they serve.

□ 1500

I thank Congressman FARR for introducing this amendment, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it, so we can move forward in the fight against childhood obesity.

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of Section 738, a section allowing for the inclusion of white potatoes in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC), in the fiscal year 2015 Agriculture Appropriations Act. I commend Chairman ADERHOLT as well as Chairman ROGERS for their work crafting this legislation in a bipartisan manner.

Washington State is blessed with an incredibly diverse agriculture industry, providing our nation and the rest of the world with top-quality products including asparagus, apples, cherries, peas, lentils, wheat—and of course—potatoes. In fact, Washington State is second in the nation when it comes to potato production, contributing 23 percent of the nation's potato crop. Additionally, potatoes are the fourth largest agricultural commodity in Washington, providing jobs for hundreds of people in Eastern Washington and all across the state. To that end, I was pleased to join my colleagues this past January in passing the bipartisan Omnibus spending bill which directed the U.S. Department of Agriculture to include in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for WIC a range of fruits and vegetables including nutritious white potatoes.

Science has proven that fresh white potatoes are more nutrient dense than many of the vegetables already included in the WIC program and possess a significant amount of vitamin C and potassium. Despite the latest research and the clear intention of Congress, the Administrative has repeatedly fought to exclude white potatoes from the WIC program. Relying on decades-old consumption data cited in a 2005 Institute of Medicine report, the Department of Agriculture has arbitrarily limited this healthy option from the diets of millions of Americans. In fact, the most current science available, the 2010 Dietary Guidelines for Americans, recommends greater consumption of starchy vegetables.

Mr. Chair, I believe the exclusion of potatoes in the WIC program is both scientifically unfounded and unfair to those Americans seeking a greater variety of healthy food options. I appreciate the work done in this bill to correct this arbitrary restriction and I urge my colleagues to support Section 738 of this bill.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment. No pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, or their respective designees, may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate. The chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose. Amendments so printed shall be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows.

H.R. 4800

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary, $41,284,000, of which not to exceed $5,051,000 shall be available for the immediate Office of the Secretary; not to exceed $498,000 shall be available for the Office of Tribal Relations; not to exceed $1,507,000 shall be available for the Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Coordination; not to exceed $1,209,000 shall be available for the Office of Advocacy and Outreach; not to exceed $26,115,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration, of which $22,811,000 shall be available for Departmental Administration to provide for necessary expenses for management support services to offices of the Department and for general administration, security, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department; not to exceed $3,869,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations to carry out the programs funded by this Act, including programs involving intergovernmental affairs and liaison within the executive branch; and not to exceed $5,535,000 shall be available for the Office of Communications: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to transfer funds appropriated for any office of the Office of the Secretary to any other office of the Office of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no appropriation for any office shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $11,000 of the amount made available under this paragraph for the immediate Office of the Secretary shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the amount made available under this heading for Departmental Administration shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations in this Act for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings as required by 5 U.S.C. 551—558: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations may be transferred to agencies of the Department of Agriculture funded by this Act to maintain personnel at the agency level: *Provided further*, That no funds made available under this heading for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations may be obligated after 30 days from the date of enactment of this Act, unless the Secretary has notified the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress on the allocation of these funds by USDA agency.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the first dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 2, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 2, line 22, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 43, line 18, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $8,150,000)''.

Page 44, line 2, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $8,150,000)''.

Page 48, line 4, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Ms. LEE of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 616, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, first, let me thank our chair and our ranking member for working with me on this amendment. I appreciate the bipartisan cooperation. Also, I want to thank our staff for helping us with this.

This amendment would provide a badly needed increase to the school breakfast grant program of approximately $8.1 million. The offset for this amendment is the Secretary's administrative account and the administrative and expenses account.

These competitive grants allow States, schools, and local educational agencies to purchase important equipment for their school breakfast program. The school breakfast program is a critical tool in the fight to keep our students fed with a nutritious meal at the start of the day.

Oftentimes, this is the meal that children rely on to help them get through the day, especially toward the end of the day, when they are about ready to go home and they have not been fully fed at the beginning of the day.

The bottom line is breakfast is very, very important to the growth, health, welfare, and development of our children.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. LEE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, the bill provides $25 million for USDA to

make the school meal equipment grants. I understand the intent of this amendment would be to increase the funding to match the President's request for a total of $35 million. Since there is an acceptable offset, we would be willing to accept this amount.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is especially critical for low-income children, many of whom who have not had a nutritious meal since the previous day of school, so I really appreciate your support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 2, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 2, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 6, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Mr. THOMPSON of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 616, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment authored by myself and Mr. HUFFMAN from California.

Our amendment would help support the USDA Office of the Inspector General by providing them with additional resources to protect our Nation's food supply.

In February of this year, Rancho Feeding, a slaughterhouse bordering my district, recalled 8.7 million pounds of beef that it produced in the year 2013. That is no small recall. Unfortunately, the USDA was slow to share information about the nature of the recall and what would happen to the beef already processed by the Rancho facility.

From the beginning of this recall, public safety has been our number one concern. We can't let food get out that puts the health and safety of the American people at risk. That is why it is important that the Office of the Inspector General have the support it needs from Congress to do its job and ensure our food is safe. This amendment provides them with that additional support.

Jobs, businesses, and livelihoods are on the line. The longer this investigation drags on, the more uncertainty businesses face. Following the results of the investigation, USDA must put in place practices and procedures that prevent this type of recall from occurring in the future.

I want to thank my colleague and friend, Mr. HUFFMAN, for working closely with me on this issue. He and I both represent ranchers affected by this recall. He has shared my frustration during the past few months.

If you support protecting our food supply and ensuring the integrity of USDA programs, then I urge you to support this amendment.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Thank you, Mr. THOMPSON.

The Federal Government has a responsibility to ensure our food safety and to make sure that the meat we barbecue this summer doesn't come with harmful diseases.

It is the responsibility of the inspectors and the oversight agencies to stop unsafe practices from occurring in the first place and to proactively address problems before they require massive recalls.

Unfortunately, it doesn't always happen that way. The facility in my district that is now experiencing a sweeping recall of 8.7 million pounds of meat does not represent a simple breakdown in the inspection process.

The Office of the Inspector General has launched a criminal investigation into improper activities that include deceptive practices by the owners of the slaughterhouse. We know, from a CNN investigation, that misconduct may even include some of the very USDA inspectors that were charged with protecting the public.

This incident clearly demands a serious investigation. The public has a right to know what happened, how the process broke down, and who will be held responsible for it. Unfortunately, to date, we have received virtually no information about this from USDA.

This sweeping recall, coupled with a complete lack of information, not only shakes public confidence, it affects, in a very serious way, many of the ranchers in my district whose livelihoods have been harmed. They deserve answers from the USDA, too.

I have many constituents who are facing serious financial losses, and they can't get any information about what happened. Many ranchers in the North Bay had tens of thousands of pounds of their premium beef recalled, and the USDA won't tell them what happened, whether their beef was actually contaminated, or even when this case will be closed.

We have gotten far more information, frankly, from CNN than we have gotten from USDA. This is completely unacceptable.

Our amendment transfers $1 million from the USDA's administrative account to the inspector general's office, so that we can have the resources needed to swiftly complete this investigation, close the case, and make sure we get answers, so that we can prevent this from happening again.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ADERHOLT. I was simply asking the gentleman to yield to say we would accept your language.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Reclaiming my time, thank you very much.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the chairman and ranking member for cooperating with us and working with us on this very important matter, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,869,000)''.

Page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,869,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 616, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because I believe that government must respect the people that it serves and always remember that government is a servant of the people.

Several years ago, the Department of Agriculture closed an inspection station that was incredibly important to the city of Presidio in Presidio County, Texas.

When I took office some 18 months ago and made inquiries, USDA never returned phone calls, never made any effort to work with us to determine why it is that that inspection station was closed.

They refused to work with the city or the county or the local business community, and so businesses across the area were harmed in a way that they will never get their money back as a result of all of the lost business. Presidio was the leading cattle importation port in the country at the time.

This amendment would zero fund their Office of Congressional Relations in an attempt to get the attention of the Department of Agriculture and indicate to them that their behavior is totally, thoroughly, and completely unacceptable.

People in Presidio, as well as people elsewhere across the Nation, deserve respect. Those men and women who run businesses and depend on the cattle

industry in that part of the State deserve to have their questions answered.

For the Department to drag its feet for more than 2 years before giving a simple answer as to why that action was taken by the Department is totally, thoroughly and completely inexcusable.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, this amendment would zero fund their Office of Congressional Relations in an attempt to get their attention.

Having offered the amendment, Mr. Chairman, and made my point, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY HINOJOSA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

Page 2, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

Page 2, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

Page 13, line 8, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Page 13, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Mr. HINOJOSA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 616, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman MIKE THOMPSON from California for joining me on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment to H.R. 4800 is simple. It would increase funding for the specialty crop pests program at the Department of Agriculture by $2.5 million in order to provide more funding to strongly combat the invasive pests that threaten our agriculture industry.

□ 1515

From the Mediterranean fruit fly, which attacks fruits and nuts throughout California, to the imported fire ant that destroys corn and soybean and okra in Louisiana, the need for this program is higher than it has ever been.

Nowhere is this more important than in my own congressional district in south Texas, which is being ravaged by citrus greening. Citrus greening is one of the most destructive plant diseases in the world. Once a citrus tree is infected, it produces bitter, unusable fruit and kills the tree, itself, within a few years. There is no cure, and it has proven to be difficult to eradicate. As a result, over half of the trees in every citrus orchard in Florida have contracted this disease. Right now, both Cameron and Hidalgo Counties, in my district, are under a full emergency quarantine. This is a growing epidemic that threatens to eradicate an entire agricultural industry if we do not do everything we can to stop it.

While I am pleased that the recently passed farm bill included $125 million in funding over a 5-year period to study ways to wipe it out, that funding is focused on long-term solutions through competitive grants. The funding for the invasive pest control, which the amendment would increase, is specifically meant to help deal with the immediate impacts on the ground today, programs such as coordinated area-wide suppression programs, pest surveys, protecting disease-free nursery stock, and public outreach and education programs.

While I am happy that the committee provided a modest increase to this funding in the underlying bill, I believe this additional funding is greatly needed to increase our on-the-ground presence to stop the outbreak in Texas from its alarming spread, which threatens the entire State. For these reasons, I would urge the support of my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, the House bill does provide significant funding for this project and report language regarding the citrus growing disease. Mr. ROONEY, Mr. VALADAO, along with Mr. MCCARTHY and Mr. FARR, have raised this issue. We understand how devastating this disease has been, especially to the Florida growers and, certainly, to California as well.

The bill, itself, provides $44.5 million for the programs that protect the citrus industry, so I believe we have addressed the urgency of the need in this bill. I do accept the gentleman's amendment, understanding this is a very important issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HINOJOSA. I thank the gentleman for accepting my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, in my area just a year ago, we went to see and meet with all of the producers, and they were showing us the comparison of where we are in Texas as compared to the damage that was done in Florida and in California. Within less than 6 months, we were put under quarantine in my area, and we are one of the three largest citrus growing regions in the whole country—in California, in Florida, and in deep south Texas—where we grow the Ruby Reds and the Navel oranges and all of that.

We are really needing it not over a 5-year period—we need to attack it now. We have the research going on with the Texas A&M University Research Center in Weslaco, and this money will help us to be able to stop the damage that has already been done.

I thank you for accepting my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ECONOMIST

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Economist, $16,777,000, of which $4,000,000 shall be for grants or cooperative agreements for policy research under 7 U.S.C. 3155.

NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

For necessary expenses of the National Appeals Division, $13,317,000.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, $9,392,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, $45,025,000, of which not less than $22,000,000 is for cybersecurity requirements of the Department.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, $6,028,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $220,000)''.

Page 6, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $220,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 616, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer the simplest of amendments.

This amendment transfers $220,000 from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's wasteful and ineffective Office of the chief financial officer to the Department's Office of Inspector General, bringing their appropriations in line with the President's request. It seems only fitting that the inspector general's office receive additional resources, particularly at the expense of the office it will most likely first investigate.

In April of this year, the inspector general reported that the Department's chief financial officer failed to comply with the Improper Payments Information Act for the third year in a row. The CFO would have saved more than $415 million by simply following Federal law and ensuring certain programs met their spending reduction goals. Instead, the CFO continued to turn a

blind eye, and the inspector general reported that, last year alone, the USDA made $6.2 billion in improper payments. Let me repeat that: $6.2 billion in improper payments were made by the USDA last year alone. I would like to provide a few examples of this wasteful spending.

In fiscal year 2013, the USDA paid more than $50 million to special interest groups to promote Christmas. The USDA's chief financial officer authorized a loan to a well-established brewing company for over $450,000. The USDA spent $20 million on IT software that did not work. On the chief financial officer's watch, $403,627 was wasted last year on a study to see if we could turn cow manure into electricity. Over 100 people received loan guarantees of $500,000 or more to buy a home in Hawaii. This ''Hawaiian beachfront property'' loan program lost nearly $500 million last year according to the Office of Inspector General.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ADERHOLT. We will accept your amendment.

Mr. GOSAR. We will accept the gentleman's proposal.

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. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, $898,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000)''.

Page 7, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000)''.

Page 12, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000)''.

Page 18, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000)''.

Page 20, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000)''.

Page 25, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000)''.

Page 26, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000)''.

Page 43, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000)''.

Page 82, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $40,000)''.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 616, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply gathers the arbitrary budget increases of $5,000 added to seven under secretaries' offices and one assistant secretary's office, totaling $40,000, and it applies that amount to the spending reduction account.

What would a $5,000 increase to the budget of the office of an under secretary even pay for? Would it pay for one taxpayer-funded trip? for pencils? for paper clips? maybe pay raises to the Federal bureaucrats to implement the nearly $1 trillion new farm bill?

According to the Web site wallstcheatsheet.com, a person can start a business for $5,000 or less in overhead; but, Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government is not a business, and it does not run like one, unfortunately, as $5,000 is a drop in the bucket compared to the accounts we are considering today.

This increase is a symbol of this government's out-of-control spending. Both political parties are guilty. If Congress can't cut $40,000, then we are facing the root of our spending problem—thousands of dollars can quickly add up to millions, which would soon become billions, and all the while, Congress keeps approving more and more even when there is no good reason for the increase.

The American people have demanded that we cut the outrageous spending that is going on here in Washington by Republicans and Democrats alike. We must look to every corner of the budget to do so. We must become better stewards of taxpayers' dollars, and this amendment is one small step in that right direction.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's concern for the Federal deficit and the debt problem that we are facing in this Nation. It is something that is very serious, and I appreciate his hard work on this issue. I know that he is very concerned, as we all are, about it.

I am going to have to reluctantly oppose the amendment. We have carefully reviewed the President's budget request, and we believe that we have appropriately and adequately funded the various mission areas within the Department of Agriculture, and because of that, as I say, I will oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, 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. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Civil Rights, $24,070,000.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92–313, including authorities pursuant to the 1984 delegation of authority from the Administrator of General Services to the Department of Agriculture under 40 U.S.C. 121, for programs and activities of the Department which are included in this Act, and for alterations and other actions needed for the Department and its agencies to consolidate unneeded space into configurations suitable for release to the Administrator of General Services, and for the operation, maintenance, improvement, and repair of Agriculture buildings and facilities, and for related costs, $54,825,000, to remain available until expended, for building operations and maintenance expenses: *Provided*, That the Secretary may use unobligated prior year balances of an agency or office that are no longer available for new obligation to cover shortfalls incurred in prior year rental payments for such agency or office.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Department of Agriculture, to comply with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), $3,600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations and funds available herein to the Department for Hazardous Materials Management may be transferred to any agency of the Department for its use in meeting all requirements pursuant to the above Acts on Federal and non-Federal lands.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, including employment pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, $97,020,000, including such sums as may be necessary for contracting and other arrangements with public agencies and private persons pursuant to section 6(a)(9) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, and including not to exceed $125,000 for certain confidential operational expenses, including the payment of informants, to be expended under the direction of the Inspector General pursuant to Public Law 95–452 and section 1337 of Public Law 97–98.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the General Counsel, $44,383,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,181,000)''.

Page 82, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,181,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 616, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer another amendment to the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015.

This amendment pertains to the Department of Agriculture's Office of General Counsel.

By way of background, this office was appropriated $41,202,000 in fiscal year 2014. The President's budget for FY15 requested a steep increase of $6,365,000. The President attempts to justify this 15.4 percent increase by saying that these moneys will go towards: ''31 full-time equivalents to handle an increased workload, to support current staff, rent, and enhance OGC's information technology reporting capabilities and litigation management tools.'' In other words, most of that money will be used to hire both government attorneys and to give raises to government attorneys already on staff.

You see, because I am from the Western States, I take issue with that.

I represent a rural district in western Arizona, and I serve on the House Natural Resources Committee, which oversees much of the executive branch's activities with regard to resources and lands. I am quite familiar with the effects government attorneys often have on States, their resources, and their lands, and my colleagues and I are generally disgusted with the overreaching policies the Obama administration has imposed on Western States. Therefore, I oppose any plans by the Department to hire more government attorneys, many of whom will be used to implement and defend the administration's overreaching landgrabs, watergrabs, and climate change policies.

I appreciate that this committee decided not to fulfill the President's request in full, but it did propose appropriating roughly half of his request. I simply cannot, in good conscience, allow more attorneys to be hired at the USDA—attorneys who will infringe upon many States' 10th Amendment rights.

My amendment proposes to cut most of the increase the Appropriations Committee has offered in this bill, but it leaves a portion of the increase for the sole purpose of improving the informational technology of the Office of the General Counsel.

□ 1530

I understand the Federal Government generally has major issues with information technology. Our departments and agencies are often using archaic IT systems and many should be updated for efficiency and security purposes.

IT issues are often highlighted at my other committee assignment on the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. This a bipartisan issue and has been addressed regularly by Chairman ISSA, Ranking Member CUMMINGS, and the rest of my colleagues.

To close, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. It would help to reserve States' rights, curb executive branch overreach, cut spending, and improve information technology systems all at once.

As always, I appreciate the work of the committee, particularly the work of the chair and the ranking member.

I urge passage of my commonsense amendment.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, again, I appreciate the gentleman's concern for the Federal debt, the deficit problem that we are facing in this Nation. Again, it is a very serious issue, and we need to address it in many ways.

However, I would have to oppose this amendment, reluctantly. We have carefully reviewed the President's budget, the request that he has made, and we have tried to appropriately and adequately fund the mission areas within the Department of Agriculture.

For that reason, again, we would have to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate the government's overreach, particularly in Western States. With due respect, this budget does not look at the appropriate utilization of funds for attorneys. And when you look at the overreach of this administration with climate change, with water, and with resources, it is about time that we made conscious use of attorneys' fees.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF ETHICS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Ethics, $3,440,000.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics, $898,000.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Economic Research Service, $85,784,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 43, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 44, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 616, the gentleman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the Kelly-Cohen-Titus amendment to increase funding to the Summer Electronic Benefit Transfer program.

For many young people, the end of school is an exciting day, and they get out for the summer. But for the millions of children and families who rely on school lunch for meals, the summer months are a time of stress, anxiety, and hunger when those meals disappear.

The Summer Food Service Program, created by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, provides free, nutritious meals and snacks to help children get the nutrition they need to learn, play, and grow throughout the summer months when they are out of school.

Last Monday, I joined the Summer Food Kickoff at Emerald Square in Memphis in support of this program. I had the opportunity to speak with kids, watch them in delight as they ate their lunch and listened to them read books provided by Dolly Parton's Imagination Library.

This amendment would increase the Summer Electronic Benefit Transfer for Children program by $3 million. The project allows USDA to study alternative approaches to providing food assistance to low-income children in urban and rural districts through the summer months.

Additional funding to this program for children would not only reduce childhood hunger when school is out and encourage healthier eating but allow us to learn more about food insecurity among children and the best approaches to reducing it long-term.

The wealthiest Nation of the world should not send its children to bed hungry, so making sure they have the food they need must be a top priority.

This program helps fill the gap when students are not in school, providing meals for many children that would otherwise go hungry in Memphis, Chicago, Las Vegas, and throughout the Nation.

By increasing funding to this program, we can be sure we are feeding our kids a healthy meal each day. I urge passage of the amendment to restore funding to the Summer Food Service Program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with the gentleman from

Tennessee and the gentlewoman from Nevada to offer a commonsense amendment to the Agriculture Appropriations Act that would ensure that this summer, when students walk away from their classroom, they don't walk into homes and communities that allow them to go hungry.

Most of us can remember the excitement of the last day of school. But too many of us forget the fact that, for millions of children in rural, suburban, and urban communities, the summer months, when you no longer have lunchtime in the cafeteria, are often the hungriest time of the year.

Our amendment is a fiscally responsible effort to be there for our kids while providing funds for the Summer Electronic Benefit Transfer for Children program, which will help the USDA offer responsible solutions that respond to the food security needs of children across our Nation.

When children wake up in Illinois and feel the same exact hunger as kids in Memphis, Las Vegas, and the Speaker's district, we are doing something wrong. I urge my colleagues to work in a bipartisan manner and put kids first and pass this amendment.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join with my colleagues, Representatives KELLY and COHEN, to introduce this amendment to increase the summer food program for children by $3 million.

Across the country, one of every five children is at risk of going hungry. In Nevada, more than 233,000 children qualify for free or reduced lunch. That means that 54 percent of Nevada's students come from low-income households that struggle with hunger.

While these children can eat free and reduced-price lunch during the school year, the vast majority are left without adequate nutrition during the summer.

The Summer EBT program is a pilot program that helps fill this gap by providing eligible families with additional SNAP benefits during the summer months. It works.

In 2012, it served almost 67,000 children who might have otherwise gone hungry. The participation in this program is dramatically higher than in other programs, serving up to 75 percent of eligible children.

That is why I believe that we should meet the President's budget request and increase funding to feed as many hungry children as possible. A vacation from school shouldn't mean a hungry child.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $7,726,000)''.

Page 82, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $7,726,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 616, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that would reduce the funding for the USDA's Economic Research Service by $7,726,000 and increase the spending reduction account by that same amount.

This amendment would maintain, I repeat, maintain current funding levels, while helping to end the duplicative research the USDA is currently conducting.

The Economic Research Service makes social science inquiries into the nutritional choices of citizens, as well as farmers' decisions to participate in risk management programs. According to the USDA, this program is ''the primary source of statistical indicators of the farm sector,'' and it is the only USDA research agency based entirely in D.C., according to the Congressional Research Service.

However, there is a second agency within the USDA, the National Agricultural Statistics Agency, which serves essentially the same purpose. This agency is funded at $169,371,000 in this bill.

But wait, Mr. Chairman. The underlying bill also provides $1.2 billion in mandatory spending for research, education, and economics studies, the same function as the Economic Research Service and the National Agricultural Statistics Agency.

Mr. Chairman, we are in an economic and fiscal emergency. The Federal Government spends too much money. It is irresponsible to keep spending money beyond our means. Not only do we need to reduce our deficit, but we need to begin to make an impact on eliminating the huge debt that has been accumulating over the last several years.

I applaud the Appropriations Committee for bringing to the floor five appropriations bills in roughly the same number of weeks. In fact, we haven't seen this particular bill here in the House since 2011.

I offered a similar amendment to this one during the consideration of that bill, to cut $7 million from the Economic Research Service.

So I ask my colleagues, let's try again. Let's cut the duplicative spending that is in this bill for that agency. Let's make meaningful cuts to show the American people that we are serious about controlling spending and serious about the future of our country. I urge support of my amendment.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman's desire to cut, squeeze, and trim and be a deficit hawk, but I think you are really cutting the wrong area.

There are a lot of statistical departments in the Department of Agriculture because it is involved with a lot of different issues, sort of the whole rural economics of America, all the trade issues.

You have got two departments. You have got one that does the big data and one that does the small data.

You are a doctor of medicine, and it would be like comparing an MRI to a thermometer. They both are diagnostic tools but they don't do the same things. And neither does ERS or NAS.

You stated they seem like they duplicate. No, they are both involved in economic research, and I don't know how to explain it all, but it is the underlying data that drives everything, drives all the markets, drives decision-making. The growers are private sector capitalists, if you will, having to borrow from a banking system. They all have to have good data in order to make decisions.

□ 1545

I think, if you squeeze and trim these economic data collectors, you are really hurting the underlying economy of agriculture in the United States, so I would oppose your amendment.

We need crop data. We need market data. We need nutritional data. We need rural economy data, and these are the agencies, particularly the ERS that you are cutting, that collects that, so I oppose the amendment.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank my friend for yielding.

In this bill, we are appropriating $1.2 billion of mandatory spending to gather data for research education and economic studies.

Is there any reason why, within that $1.2 billion of getting data, that they cannot do the same function as we are with the Economic Research Service?

Mr. FARR. Well, I am not sure that I understand the gentleman's question, but there are different kinds of data, and there are different places that you collect that data, as there is in everything we do in government and the private sector.

I think what you are doing, I mean, you are taking a program—if you just kind of open the book and look at government and find all these areas where you think there is duplication, I think that the next step is to go and find out exactly where there is waste.

Everybody is against—and we do trim waste because we are always looking for money, but this is not the place. There is no trim there. It doesn't get you anything. In fact, it hurts the

users of that data, not being able to have it.

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. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the National Agricultural Statistics Service, $169,371,000, of which up to $47,842,000 shall be available until expended for the Census of Agriculture: *Provided*, That amounts made available for the Census of Agriculture may be used to conduct Current Industrial Report surveys subject to 7 U.S.C. 2204g(d) and (f).

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Agricultural Research Service and for acquisition of lands by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100, and for land exchanges where the lands exchanged shall be of equal value or shall be equalized by a payment of money to the grantor which shall not exceed 25 percent of the total value of the land or interests transferred out of Federal ownership, $1,120,253,000: *Provided*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed one for replacement only: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one building shall not exceed $375,000, except for headhouses or greenhouses which shall each be limited to $1,200,000, and except for 10 buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed $750,000 each, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building or $375,000, whichever is greater: *Provided further*, That the limitations on alterations contained in this Act shall not apply to modernization or replacement of existing facilities at Beltsville, Maryland: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for granting easements at the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a): *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for granting easements at any Agricultural Research Service location for the construction of a research facility by a non-Federal entity for use by, and acceptable to, the Agricultural Research Service and a condition of the easements shall be that upon completion the facility shall be accepted by the Secretary, subject to the availability of funds herein, if the Secretary finds that acceptance of the facility is in the interest of the United States: *Provided further*, That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing or operating any research facility or research project of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For the acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities as necessary to carry out the agricultural research programs of the Department of Agriculture, where not otherwise provided, $155,000,000 to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

For payments to agricultural experiment stations, for cooperative forestry and other research, for facilities, and for other expenses, $774,465,000, which shall be for the purposes, and in the amounts, specified in the table titled ''National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Research and Education Activities'' in the report accompanying this Act: *Provided*, That funds for research grants for 1994 institutions, education grants for 1890 institutions, the agriculture and food research initiative, veterinary medicine loan repayment, multicultural scholars, graduate fellowship and institution challenge grants, and grants management systems shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That each institution eligible to receive funds under the Evans–Allen program receives no less than $1,000,000: *Provided further*, That funds for education grants for Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-serving institutions be made available to individual eligible institutions or consortia of eligible institutions with funds awarded equally to each of the States of Alaska and Hawaii: *Provided further*, That funds for education grants for 1890 institutions shall be made available to institutions eligible to receive funds under 7 U.S.C. 3221 and 3222: *Provided further*, That not more than 5 percent of the amounts made available by this or any other Act to carry out the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative under 7 U.S.C. 450i(b) may be retained by the Secretary of Agriculture to pay administrative costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out that authority.

NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

For the Native American Institutions Endowment Fund authorized by Public Law 103–382 (7 U.S.C. 301 note), $11,880,000, to remain available until expended.

EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

For payments to States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, the Northern Marianas, and American Samoa, $467,339,000, which shall be for the purposes, and in the amounts, specified in the table titled ''National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Extension Activities'' in the report accompanying this Act: *Provided*, That funds for facility improvements at 1890 institutions shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That institutions eligible to receive funds under 7 U.S.C. 3221 for cooperative extension receive no less than $1,000,000: *Provided further*, That funds for cooperative extension under sections 3(b) and (c) of the Smith–Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(b) and (c)) and section 208(c) of Public Law 93–471 shall be available for retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents.

INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

For the integrated research, education, and extension grants programs, including necessary administrative expenses, $32,000,000, which shall be for the purposes, and in the amounts, specified in the table titled ''National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Integrated Activities'' in the report accompanying this Act: *Provided*, That funds for the Food and Agriculture Defense Initiative shall remain available until September 30, 2016.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, $898,000.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, including up to $30,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4085), $867,505,000, of which $470,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available for the control of outbreaks of insects, plant diseases, animal diseases and for control of pest animals and birds (contingency fund) to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions; of which $11,520,000, to remain available until expended, shall be used for the cotton pests program for cost share purposes or for debt retirement for active eradication zones; of which $35,339,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for Animal Health Technical Services; of which $697,000 shall be for activities under the authority of the Horse Protection Act of 1970, as amended (15 U.S.C. 1831); of which $52,340,000, to remain available until expended, shall be used to support avian health; of which $4,251,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for information technology infrastructure; of which $156,500,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for specialty crop pests; of which, $8,826,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for field crop and rangeland ecosystem pests; of which $47,417,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for tree and wood pests; of which $4,222,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the National Veterinary Stockpile; of which up to $1,500,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the scrapie program for indemnities; of which $1,500,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the wildlife damage management program for aviation safety: *Provided*, That of amounts available under this heading for wildlife services methods development, $1,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That of amounts available under this heading for the screwworm program, $4,990,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for the current fiscal year that does not require minimum matching by the States of at least 40 percent: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed four, of which two shall be for replacement only: *Provided further*, That in addition, in emergencies which threaten any segment of the agricultural production industry of this country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the agencies or corporations of the Department such sums as may be deemed necessary, to be available only in such emergencies for the arrest and eradication of contagious or infectious disease or pests of animals, poultry, or plants, and for expenses in accordance with sections 10411 and 10417 of the Animal Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 8310 and 8316) and sections 431 and 442 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7751 and 7772), and any unexpended balances of funds transferred for such emergency purposes in the preceding fiscal year

shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the repair and alteration of leased buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 616, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, for decades, there has been a growing debate among marine biologists and other professionals over maintaining marine mammals in captivity, but it was last year's release of the documentary ''Blackfish'' that spurred a broader public discussion over whether the conditions in which marine mammals, particularly orcas, are held for public display are humane and whether these animals should even be held in captivity.

I have serious concerns about the psychological and physical harm to orcas and other large marine mammals in captivity. Isolating these animals—which can travel hundreds of miles in a day in the wild and which live in large, complex social groupings—in a small enclosure is troubling.

There is substantial evidence that orcas in captivity live much shorter lives than those in the wild and display high levels of stress and aberrant and sometimes dangerous behavior.

Two weeks ago, Representative HUFFMAN and I, along with 38 of our colleagues, sent a letter to the Department of Agriculture, urging them to move forward with a rulemaking regarding conditions of captivity for marine mammals under the Animal Welfare Act.

Twenty years ago, the Department recognized the need to revise regulations. Ten years ago, the Department proposed such a rulemaking and received many public comments. Since then, progress has stalled, despite the public outcry about this issue.

Our amendment would serve to kickstart that effort by providing $1 million for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service to study the effect of captivity on large marine mammals, so that USDA can follow through with proposing a rule that is long overdue.

Among the issues that would benefit from an unbiased examination by APHIS are the effects of captivity on the longevity of marine mammals, whether they suffer from physical and mental maladies at a higher rate than animals in the wild and whether they display unnatural and unhealthy behaviors indicating high levels of stress.

The finding of this study will inform the USDA's consideration of reopening a rulemaking process, which could result in scientifically-based regulations that ensure humane conditions for these awe-inspiring animals.

The amendment does not change existing rules and regulations. Instead, we are calling on the USDA to gather all scientific evidence and propose a rule that has been 20 years in the making. I urge adoption of the amendment.

At this point, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), who is a leader on this issue.

Mr. HUFFMAN. I thank my colleague from southern California for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, like many people, I did a lot of reflecting after I saw the documentary ''Blackfish.'' Specifically, I looked into whether our Federal authorities were using the most updated science-based information in their regulation of marine mammal captivity.

I was disappointed to find that our government has done virtually nothing to update these regulations in the last two decades.

APHIS, the agency charged with this responsibility, has not updated the Animal Welfare Act regulations since 1995, and these rules should have been updated 10 years ago, when APHIS opened up a rulemaking process. Unfortunately, they dropped the ball, so it is time to try again.

As Congressman SCHIFF mentioned, we recently led a sign-on letter with three dozen of our colleagues to Agriculture Secretary Vilsack, demanding action on that issue.

In that letter, we urged him to complete the updating of these regulations for captive marine mammals, including publishing the proposed rule and allowing a public comment period, so that we can incorporate the latest science.

We have had no response to that letter, so today, we are offering an amendment to provide APHIS with the funding needed to start that process again and ensure that our regulations for captive orcas and other marine mammals are based on modern science.

This amendment reminds APHIS that inaction is unacceptable. The agency must use the funds provided to ensure that we have on the books the best possible standards for captive marine mammals based on solid modern science and informed by all of the information that we have gleaned in the past two decades.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In fiscal year 2015, the agency is authorized to collect fees to cover the total costs of providing technical assistance, goods, or services requested by States, other political subdivisions, domestic and international organizations, foreign governments, or individuals, provided that such fees are structured such that any entity's liability for such fees is reasonably based on the technical assistance, goods, or services provided to the entity by the agency, and such fees shall be reimbursed to this account, to remain available until expended, without further appropriation, for providing such assistance, goods, or services.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, preventive maintenance, environmental support, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2250, and acquisition of land as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 428a, $3,175,000, to remain available until expended.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

MARKETING SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Agricultural Marketing Service, $81,192,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

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 16, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $15,500,000)''.

Page 48, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 616, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the chairman and the ranking member for the work that they have done to bring this bill to the floor, but this bill can be improved.

There is growing bipartisan support for improving our international food assistance to ensure that more people are helped for less money. Unfortunately, this bill fails to advance international food aid reform, and it actually reverses progress achieved in the 2014 farm bill, legislation enacted by this body just a few months ago.

It fails to provide flexibility, so that up to 25 percent of the Food for Peace title II budget would be exempt from U.S. purchase requirements. If enacted, this proposal would have generated over $100 million in efficiency savings and enabled the United States to reach an additional 2 million people in dire need of food aid. An effective international food aid program helps those in need, and it strengthens our international security.

Finally, the bill fails to fund a congressionally authorized, broadly supported Local and Regional Procurement program. Following upon a successful pilot, the 2014 farm bill authorized $80 million per year for the Local and Regional Procurement program.

That means we can buy food closer to the area in crisis, reducing transit time by more than 10 weeks, reducing the cost per food aid recipient by 20 to 30 percent. This was considered an important reform that won, again, broad bipartisan support.

This amendment contains a modest shift in funding that will have a major impact, $10 million, while reducing funds for the administration of marketing and promotion programs that benefit major corporations. We can save lives. It is an easy choice.

Mr. Chairman, our food aid takes too long to arrive and costs too much to get there. A former top aid official told our committee that:

> In fast onset famines, such as Somalia in 1991–1992, and wars involving mass population displacement, such as in Darfur in 2003 and 2004, I watched people die waiting for food arrive.

Obviously, he strongly backs this reform.

Lastly, I recently traveled to the Philippines and witnessed firsthand the impact that LRP can have. Devastated by a powerful typhoon and left with virtually nothing, the people of Tacloban did not have the luxury of time to wait for U.S. food aid to arrive from warehouses in Sri Lanka.

In fact, it took more than 3 weeks for those shipments to arrive, but with local and regional procurement, we were able to start helping people right away, and we saved lives.

I would say, in Syria, where the delivery of U.S. food is nearly impossible, the combination of vouchers with local and regional purchase is the only viable option.

It is time to make a change. This requires $10 million. Vote ''yes,'' please, on the Royce amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from California (Mr. ROYCE) has been working at this issue for a very long time, and he has considerable knowledge and certainly a compassion and a deep understanding of these issues. There is far more to this than was explained in your presentation.

There is an ongoing debate about how the United States ought to be assisting in the disasters and famines around the world. That debate came to a head last year in which it was decided that we ought to continue with the longstanding appeal for a Food for Peace program, with some modifications.

My concern here with this particular amendment is that it may open the door for a continuation of that debate and ultimately lead to the demise of the P.L. 480 program, which has extraordinary political support as a result of the combination of American farmers, the merchant marine industry, as well as many NGOs around the Nation.

I recognize that, in many places, it is necessary to have local purchases of food, and the chairman actually cited a couple of those examples. It turned out that the local purchase of food was accomplished through an existing program that USAID presently has, and that program is the international disaster assistance program, where money is available for the local purchase of food.

The bottom line is that this $10 million really doesn't add anything that isn't already available in the current appropriation—in the current bill, so I would say let's not go down this road right now. Let's not open up this door to what may very well be a very extensive debate that we have already had, so I would softly oppose the amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. FINCHER. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. This amendment would essentially duplicate an existing program already in place at the U.S. Agency for International Development under the international development assistance account.

□ 1600

USAID already allows for local and regional purchases so there is no need for the same program at the USDA.

More importantly, this amendment would use taxpayer dollars to purchase commodities from foreign countries rather than right here at home. Unlike other foreign aid programs, the Food for Peace program is American-made through and through. It was designed to take American commodities on American ships overseas to feed those in need.

The Food for Peace program supports American agriculture, exports, and jobs while increasing goodwill overseas and helping those in need. The USDA estimates that for every $1 billion in U.S. agricultural exports, 8,400 American jobs are created. We need to be focused on creating jobs here at home and growing our economy so the United States is able to be abundantly generous to countries that can't grow enough food to feed their growing populations.

This amendment gives away American tax dollars to our foreign competitors and puts American jobs at risk. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and support American farmers, workers, and taxpayers.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Mr. ROYCE's amendment. I want to work with him on an offset that I think might be a little more desirable.

But the notion here somehow that we are going to undercut the reforms that were achieved in the farm bill that require food, on average, to take 74 days longer, when you use U.S.-sourced commodities, when it is going to be, on average, 25 percent more expensive, and to talk about our ''foreign competitors,'' when we are talking about being able to purchase locally from people who are on the edge of impoverishment, rather than flooding American commodities that are more expensive late in the game and undercutting local production, I think is a sad step forward.

I appreciate the gentleman's leadership and strongly urge support of this as we work for a better offset.

Mr. ROYCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROYCE. In closing, I would just say that I am open to working with the chairman and ranking member to find an appropriate offset in conference. However, it is essential to adopt this amendment now so that this matter can be set, we can put a marker down, and get this in place. I thank the gentleman for the support for the amendment.

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 ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ADERHOLT. 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.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO) having assumed the chair, Mr. JOLLY, 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. 4800) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.