

farmers. The House-passed bill institutes mandatory country-of-origin labeling for meat. And despite what is said by editorial boards in big cities, this Farm Bill contains significant reforms that just a few years ago many people thought would be impossible to pass. We have eliminated the three-entity rule. We have implemented direct attribution of payments for transparency. And thanks to a hard cap on eligibility, millionaires will no longer be receiving farm payments.

The Senate passed their Farm Bill in late December, and staffs have been working hard ever since the New Year to work out many of the policy issues we will face once an overall funding level is reached.

Mr. Speaker, we are taking gradual steps to reaching a bipartisan, bicameral bill that everyone can support, and I believe we have made enough progress to support a 1-month extension.

Many people would like to see different things with this Farm Bill, but the truth is, Mr. Speaker, that all of the advances we have made in fruit and vegetable production, nutrition, conservation, reforming farm programs, and encouraging farm-based renewable energy will go out the window if we do not get this bill done and signed into law. The forward progress we have made over the last few weeks lead me to believe that we can get this done. Our farmers and ranchers expect us to finish a new farm bill for a new age of agriculture.

In closing, I would like to thank my friend and Ranking Member Mr. BOB GOODLATTE of Virginia for his work over the last few months and for standing alongside me in working with the Senate and the Administration in order to get this Farm Bill to a conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2745, the short-term farm bill extension that will extend some provisions of the 2002 farm bill until April 18. The other body passed the same provision this morning, and this body must pass this bill so both bodies can continue to work on conference negotiations.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, I would like nothing more than to stand before you today and report that we are on the brink of an agreement on the farm bill. However, progress on a new farm bill agreement has been painfully slow, and this process has become a source of frustration for me and my colleagues, and the chairman I know as well, as well as millions of rural Americans awaiting a new farm bill.

If we do not seek prompt and substantive action on the farm bill, I believe we must pursue a different course of action, because our farmers and ranchers have already waited too long. Interminable delays in implementing a new farm bill may not have real ramifications in Washington, but in rural America the effects are real, and they are substantial.

I appreciate the efforts of our committee chairman to try to keep this process moving. I know at times he has shared my frustrations. We all recog-

nize the need for a new farm bill, and we continue to work toward completing a farm bill and getting it to the President for him to sign into law by April 18.

I urge my colleagues to support this farm bill extension to give us a little more time to try to overcome the budget obstacles that have been standing in the way of the farm bill finish line since last year.

We started this process together in a bipartisan fashion more than 2 years ago. We worked together in the committee to move a farm bill forward, but we have been hindered time and time again outside the committee by the fact that others in the Congress have failed to recognize the fact that this farm bill starts out \$58 billion below the last farm bill in terms of what it will cost to continue the farm legislation forward. That is a great thing. That is a tremendous savings for the American taxpayer. But when we are trying to write a modern, forward-looking farm bill that encompasses changes in conservation, in nutrition, in energy, in specialty crops, and we are trying to reform the commodity title of the farm bill, we needed to have some additional resources.

The chairman and I went to the Budget Committee last year in a bipartisan fashion and asked for some money above the baseline, not \$58 billion coming back to us, but \$5 billion, \$10 billion above that baseline, which still would have been a huge savings for the taxpayers and allowed us to write a farm bill inside the committee and bring it to the floor of the House without being dependent on another committee or another source. The same problem existed in the Senate.

The outcome has been that we have been spinning our wheels having to deal with other outside influences rather than getting the job done in the committee because of this funding not being available. We are going to have to look at some new alternatives if we don't get a breakthrough here in the next couple of days, because even this extension will expire very, very soon, and the time it takes to write a farm bill that encompasses a whole host of issues, from what goes on on the farm to all of our nutrition programs, to our environmental and conservation programs, to research programs for agriculture, to a whole host of other areas that are very, very important, not just to America's farmers and ranchers, not just to people living in rural America, but to every American consumer who depends upon our farm community to continue to provide the safest, most abundant, most affordable food supply in the world, and we will be working together.

I appreciate the chairman's working with me and with other Members on this side of the aisle to accomplish that goal. He has been tenacious in that effort. But we need to either move on, or we need to get the help that was promised a year ago to finally come to the committee so we can get the job done.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2745.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. 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 materials thereon on S. 2745.

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

There was no objection.

PENSION PROTECTION TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2008

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3361) to make technical corrections related to the Pension Protection Act of 2006, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3361

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES TO ACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act may be cited as the "Pension Protection Technical Corrections Act of 2008".

(b) REFERENCES TO ACTS.—For purposes of this Act—

(1) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—The term "1986 Code" means the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) AMENDMENT OF ERISA.—The term "ERISA" means the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

(3) 2006 ACT.—The term "2006 Act" means the Pension Protection Act of 2006.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE I.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTIONS 101 AND 111.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Clause (i) of section 302(c)(1)(A) of ERISA is amended by striking "the plan is" and inserting "the plan are".

(B) Section 302(c)(7) of ERISA is amended by inserting "which reduces the accrued benefit of any participant" after "subsection (d)(2)" in subparagraph (A).

(C) Section 302(d)(1) of ERISA is amended by striking "the valuation date,".

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—

(A) Clause (i) of section 412(c)(1)(A) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking "the plan is" and inserting "the plan are".

(B) Section 412(c)(7) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting "which reduces the accrued benefit of any participant" after "subsection (d)(2)" in subparagraph (A).

(C) Section 412(d)(1) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking "the valuation date,".