

also to remind future Congresses that freedom is not free, that a price is very high when the President calls on our Armed Forces to deliver, and when they do, we honor them and will always remember their memory.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I just want to again thank Mr. KIRK and Mr. NEUGEBAUER for their very, very hard work and important work on this legislation and colleagues on both sides of the aisle who came together in a bipartisan spirit to pass this.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 634.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOOD, CONSERVATION, AND ENERGY ACT OF 2008—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-125)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 6124, the "Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008."

The bill that I vetoed on May 21, 2008, H.R. 2419, which became Public Law 110-234, did not include the title III provisions that are in this bill. In passing H.R. 6124, the Congress had an opportunity to improve on H.R. 2419 by modifying certain objectionable, onerous, and fiscally imprudent provisions. Unfortunately, the Congress chose to send me the same unacceptable farm bill provisions in H.R. 6124, merely adding title III. I am returning this bill for the same reasons as stated in my veto message of May 21, 2008, on H.R. 2419.

For a year and a half, I have consistently asked that the Congress pass a good farm bill that I can sign. Regrettably, the Congress has failed to do so. At a time of high food prices and record farm income, this bill lacks access program reform and fiscal discipline. It continues subsidies for the wealthy and increases farm bill spending by more than \$20 billion, while using budget gimmicks to hide much of the increase. It is inconsistent with our objectives in international trade negotiations, which include securing greater market access for American farmers and ranchers. It would needlessly expand the size and scope of government. Americans sent us to Washington to achieve results and be good stewards of their hard-earned taxpayer dollars. This bill violates that fundamental commitment.

In January 2007, my Administration put forward a fiscally responsible farm bill proposal that would improve the safety net for farmers and move current programs toward more market-oriented policies. The bill before me today fails to achieve these important goals.

At a time when net farm income is projected to increase by more than \$28 billion in 1 year, the American taxpayer should not be forced to subsidize that group of farmers who have adjusted gross incomes of up to \$1.5 million. When commodity prices are at record highs, it is irresponsible to increase government subsidy rates for 15 crops, subsidize additional crops, and provide payments that further distort markets. Instead of better targeting farm programs, this bill eliminates the existing payment limit on marketing loan subsidies.

Now is also not the time to create a new uncapped revenue guarantee that could cost billions of dollars more than advertised. This is on top of a farm bill that is anticipated to cost more than \$600 billion over 10 years. In addition, this bill would force many businesses to prepay their taxes in order to finance the additional spending.

This legislation is also filled with earmarks and other ill-considered provisions. Most notably, H.R. 6124 provides: \$175 million to address water issues for desert lakes; \$250 million for a 400,000-acre land purchase from a private owner; funding and authority for the noncompetitive sale of National Forest land to a ski resort; and \$382 million earmarked for a specific watershed. These earmarks, and the expansion of Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage requirements, have no place in the farm bill. Rural and urban Americans alike are frustrated with excessive government spending and the funneling of taxpayer funds for pet projects. This bill will only add to that frustration.

The bill also contains a wide range of other objectionable provisions, including one that restricts our ability to redirect food aid dollars for emergency use at a time of great need globally. The bill does not include the requested authority to buy food in the developing world to save lives. Additionally, provisions in the bill raise serious constitutional concerns. For all the reasons outlined above, I must veto H.R. 6124.

I veto this bill fully aware that it is rare for a stand-alone farm bill not to receive the President's signature, but my action today is not without precedent. In 1956, President Eisenhower stood firmly on principle, citing high crop subsidies and too much government control of farm programs among the reasons for his veto. President Eisenhower wrote in his veto message, "Bad as some provisions of this bill are, I would have signed it if in total it could be interpreted as sound and good for farmers and the nation." For similar reasons, I am vetoing the bill before me today.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 18, 2008.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the veto message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

I'm not going to take a lot of time because I think people have heard enough about this issue, and we apologize. I guess we have to be in this position, but what we're doing here today is overriding the veto hopefully for the final time on the farm bill because of the enrolling error that was made on the initial override or veto that happened a few weeks ago.

At the time, we made a decision to move ahead. Even though the wrong bill was vetoed, we moved ahead to override that veto, which we prevailed on the floor here by a substantial margin. I think in retrospect that was a good idea because 14 titles of the farm bill have been law since then.

We had a meeting this morning with the Secretary to talk about implementation. So the work has been going on within the department to get ready for implementation. We have gained a couple or 3 weeks in that process. Just a couple of days ago, the administration Secretary put out the loan rates and target prices for this crop year. So that process is moving along.

What this bill does, the 14 titles are now law. The trade title was left out. What this bill does is reenact the entire 15 titles as they were passed by the original conference report and does it all as one complete whole. And in the bill, what it does, it vitiates the 14 titles that have been law for the last 3 weeks I guess, or so.

It cleans up the technical problem that we had created by the enrolling office and puts into law what was intended by the conference committee.

This is a good bill. It has wide support in the Congress, as we have seen by the number of votes that we've had here on the floor. It is not perfect, but it does address all of the issues that have been brought to the Agriculture Committee by the various different groups that have been interested in this piece of legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to override the veto.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the farm bill veto. Currently, 14 of the farm bill's 15 titles have been enacted into law, and the passage of the veto override will ensure that the whole bill, including the trade title, becomes law.

□ 1530

The content of the bill before us today is the exact same as it was when

317 of my colleagues joined me in May in support of the reform-minded farm bill the House and Senate Conference Committee produced. The only things that have changed are the bill number and the title, all else remains the same.

This farm bill has enjoyed significant bipartisan support in both Chambers. This bill was a collaborative effort crafted by Members on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol and is historic in the amount and degree of reform that it contains.

We brought this bill a long way with a long list of reforms that lower cost to the taxpayer and increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the programs, yet retains the fundamental purpose for having farm programs to begin with, guaranteeing a stable, reliable, and affordable food supply for the American consumer.

Unlike the last farm bill, which was signed into law by the President of the United States, this farm bill is less expensive and contains many of the reforms that the President requested. So I urge my colleagues to support the farm bill override and ensure that the very same farm bill that has garnered significant bipartisan support in this Congress already can finally become law in its entirety.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I would just take one additional small amount of time to thank my colleague and friend, Mr. GOODLATTE, for the work that he did with me on this bill. As he said, this has been a bipartisan effort; had it not been, we wouldn't be here today. So I very much want to thank him and the other Members on his side of the aisle as well as the Members on our side of the aisle for all their hard work through this process.

And also, I want to mention our staff, both my staff and the minority staff. The amount of time that they put into this bill has been extraordinary, the patience that they showed, having to sit in meetings and not make much progress for a lot of time is what you really want to see in public service. Our staff went above and beyond the call of duty.

So, again, I thank all of my colleagues and urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself a moment to say to the chairman of the committee that I also appreciate the very hard work that he put into this very bipartisan effort. And I want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle.

I do believe that this farm bill contains far more reform than any previous farm bill. And I think the track record in the future in preserving good farm policy to assure the American people, our taxpayers, our consumers of the opportunity to have a safe and

abundant and affordable food supply is very, very important. And so I thank the chairman for his hard work for all this time. The two-and-a-half-year process it has taken has finally come to a conclusion. I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. One minute is hardly time to speak against this bill.

Let me just read a statement that was made by the majority leader a couple of days ago. He commented on the budget that was being passed at the time. He said, "There is only one person in the United States of America that can stop spending in its tracks, the only person." He was referring to the President of the United States and putting a lot of blame, if you will, on the President for not stopping spending that I had argued was going on.

Here we have the President standing up and saying, this bill is bloated; this bill is far too big; it spends far too much. Yet the same people who were blaming the President for not standing up to spending are voting now to override the President when he says enough is enough. This is wrong. We ought to stand up—as Republicans at least, if not the Democrats as well—to stand up and say enough is enough. This bill spends too much, far, far too much.

This bill lacks real reform, overspends, hides its real costs with gimmicks, jeopardizes trade negotiations, increases size and scope of government, and is disservice to taxpayers.

It contains more than \$5 billion a year in handouts to millionaire farmers and landowners.

It includes the Average Crop Revenue Election program in the conference report, a program that appears to serve the purpose of ensuring commodity farmers get federal handouts even though crop prices are soaring. The details of the potential liability to taxpayers only came out after passage.

Under the supposed salary cap, married farmers could still be making up to \$2.5 billion and receive direct payments.

It weakened the payment limit for farm subsidies—lifting the limit on marketing loan benefits and increasing the limit on direct payment benefits.

The gaming of the price support program allows farmers to lock in their loan rate when prices are lowest and sell when prices are highest.

The bill adds target prices for additional crops and increases loan rates and target prices for others.

The brand new and permanent disaster title costs \$3.8 billion.

Unfortunately, it includes the extension of marginally reduced ethanol production tax credits and the import tariff—thus continuing the failed federal ethanol program that is re-

sponsible at least in part for high food prices plaguing consumers.

The bill includes hundreds of millions of dollars in loan guarantees for the construction of advanced biofuels plants and a Biomass Crop Assistance Program to provide incentives to cellulosic ethanol crops.

This bill forces USDA to sell excess sugar into ethanol production, even though sugar users would continue paying artificially inflated prices (\$4 billion or more). (USDA has estimated that ethanol from sugar is twice as expensive to produce [as opposed to corn-based ethanol].)

The bill included disclosed earmarks, plus an undisclosed and airdropped earmark that provides \$170 million for commercial and recreational "members of the fishing communities" affected by missing salmon, and the "forestry conservation tax credit bond" to benefit the Plum Creek timber company.

This bill represents the worst of legislative process: pandering to special interests, dark of night negotiations, airdropped earmarks worth millions of taxpayer dollars, opposition shut out of the floor process, and a \$300 billion boondoggle bill.

The cost of the bill is not fully offset: OMB says as much as \$20 billion in budget gimmicks and "illusionary" spending stops where funding for programs abruptly ends.

Conferees waived PAYGO, and went "baseline shopping" (did not use the most current baseline). I have said from the beginning: no way to do a Farm Bill without waiving the PAYGO rules. I was proven right.

The President has rightly vetoed this bill not once but twice. We need House Members to stand up for taxpayers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate having expired, without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, the vote must be by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 317, nays 109, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 417]

YEAS—317

Abercrombie	Boswell	Clarke
Ackerman	Boucher	Clay
Aderholt	Boustany	Cleaver
Akin	Boyd (FL)	Clyburn
Alexander	Boyda (KS)	Coble
Allen	Brady (PA)	Cohen
Altmire	Brady (TX)	Cole (OK)
Andrews	Braley (IA)	Conaway
Arcuri	Brown (SC)	Conyers
Baca	Brown, Corrine	Costa
Bachus	Brown-Waite,	Costello
Baird	Ginny	Courtney
Baldwin	Buchanan	Cramer
Barrow	Butterfield	Crowley
Bartlett (MD)	Buyer	Cuellar
Becerra	Camp (MI)	Cummings
Berkley	Capito	Davis (AL)
Berry	Capps	Davis (CA)
Bilirakis	Cardoza	Davis (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Carnahan	Davis (KY)
Bishop (NY)	Carney	Davis, David
Blackburn	Carson	Davis, Lincoln
Blunt	Carter	DeFazio
Bonner	Castor	DeGette
Bono Mack	Cazayoux	Delahunt
Boozman	Chandler	DeLauro
Boren	Childers	Diaz-Balart, L.

Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
Kingston
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kucinich

NAYS—109

Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berman
Biggart
Bilbray
Blumenauer
Boehner
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor

Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds

Fossella
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Goode
Granger
Heller
Hensarling
Hobson
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan

Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (OH)
Wittman (VA)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

Keller
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCrery
McDermott
McHenry
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Bishop (UT)
Gilchrest
Harman

Hulshof
Meeks (NY)
Peterson (PA)

Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaah
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Wamp
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. LAMPSON
The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. LAMPSON:
In title XI, add at the end the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1109. EXCEPTION TO ALTERNATIVE FUEL PROCUREMENT REQUIREMENT.

Section 526(a) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17142(a)) does not prohibit NASA from entering into a contract to purchase a generally available fuel that is not an alternative or synthetic fuel or predominantly produced from a non-conventional petroleum source, if—

(1) the contract does not specifically require the contractor to provide an alternative or synthetic fuel or fuel from a non-conventional petroleum source;

(2) the purpose of the contract is not to obtain an alternative or synthetic fuel or fuel from a nonconventional petroleum source; and

(3) the contract does not provide incentives for a refinery upgrade or expansion to allow a refinery to use or increase its use of fuel from a nonconventional petroleum source.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 429, noes 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

AYES—429

Abercrombie	Brady (PA)	Cooper
Ackerman	Brady (TX)	Costa
Aderholt	Braley (IA)	Costello
Akin	Broun (GA)	Courtney
Alexander	Brown (SC)	Cramer
Allen	Brown, Corrine	Crenshaw
Altmire	Brown-Waite,	Crowley
Andrews	Ginny	Cubin
Arcuri	Buchanan	Cuellar
Baca	Burgess	Culberson
Bachmann	Burton (IN)	Cummings
Bachus	Butterfield	Davis (AL)
Baird	Buyer	Davis (CA)
Baldwin	Calvert	Davis (IL)
Barrett (SC)	Camp (MI)	Davis (KY)
Barrow	Campbell (CA)	Davis, David
Bartlett (MD)	Cannon	Davis, Lincoln
Barton (TX)	Cantor	Davis, Tom
Bean	Capito	Deal (GA)
Becerra	Capps	DeFazio
Berkley	Capuano	DeGette
Berman	Cardoza	DeLaHunt
Berry	Carnahan	DeLauro
Biggart	Carney	Dent
Bilbray	Carson	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bilirakis	Carter	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bishop (GA)	Castle	Dicks
Bishop (NY)	Castor	Dingell
Bishop (UT)	Caza,youx	Doggett
Blackburn	Chabot	Donnelly
Blunt	Chandler	Doolittle
Boehner	Childers	Doyle
Bonner	Christensen	Drake
Bono Mack	Clarke	Dreier
Boozman	Clay	Duncan
Bordallo	Cleaver	Edwards
Boren	Clyburn	Ehlers
Boswell	Coble	Ellison
Boucher	Cohen	Ellsworth
Boustany	Cole (OK)	Emanuel
Boyd (FL)	Conaway	Emerson
Boyda (KS)	Conyers	Engel

□ 1557

Mr. REICHERT changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. NEUGEBAUER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1257 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 6063.

□ 1558

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6063) to authorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes, with Ms. CLARKE (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 12, 2008, amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 110-707 offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 110-707 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. LAMPSON of Texas.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. HODES of New Hampshire.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second electronic vote in this series.