

Hoekstra	McNulty	Schaffer
Holden	Meehan	Schakowsky
Holt	Meek (FL)	Schiff
Honda	Meeks (NY)	Schrock
Hooley	Menendez	Scott
Horn	Mica	Sensenbrenner
Hostettler	Miller (FL)	Serrano
Houghton	Miller, Gary	Sessions
Hoyer	Mink	Shadegg
Hunter	Mollohan	Shaw
Hutchinson	Moore	Shays
Hyde	Moran (KS)	Sherman
Inslee	Moran (VA)	Sherwood
Isakson	Morella	Shows
Israel	Murtha	Shuster
Issa	Myrick	Simmons
Istook	Nadler	Simpson
Jackson (IL)	Napolitano	Skeen
Jefferson	Neal	Skelton
Jenkins	Nethercutt	Slaughter
John	Ney	Smith (MI)
Johnson (CT)	Northup	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (IL)	Norwood	Smith (TX)
Johnson, E. B.	Nussle	Smith (WA)
Johnson, Sam	Oberstar	Snyder
Jones (NC)	Obey	Solis
Jones (OH)	Olver	Souder
Kanjorski	Ortiz	Spence
Kaptur	Osborne	Spratt
Keller	Ose	Stark
Kelly	Otter	Stearns
Kennedy (RI)	Owens	Stenholm
Kerns	Oxley	Strickland
Kildee	Pallone	Stump
Kilpatrick	Pascarell	Stupak
Kind (WI)	Pastor	Sununu
King (NY)	Payne	Sweeney
Kingston	Pelosi	Tancredo
Kirk	Pence	Tanner
Klecza	Peterson (MN)	Tauscher
Knollenberg	Peterson (PA)	Tauzin
Kolbe	Petri	Taylor (NC)
Kucinich	Phelps	Terry
LaFalce	Pickering	Thomas
LaHood	Pitts	Thompson (CA)
Lampson	Platts	Thompson (MS)
Langevin	Pombo	Thornberry
Largent	Pomeroy	Thune
Larsen (WA)	Portman	Thurman
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Tiahrt
Latham	Pryce (OH)	Tiberi
LaTourette	Putnam	Tierney
Leach	Quinn	Towns
Lee	Radanovich	Traficant
Levin	Rahall	Turner
Lewis (GA)	Ramstad	Udall (CO)
Lewis (KY)	Rangel	Udall (NM)
Linder	Regula	Upton
Lipinski	Rehberg	Velazquez
LoBiondo	Reyes	Visclosky
Lofgren	Reynolds	Vitter
Lowey	Rivers	Walden
Lucas (KY)	Rodriguez	Walsh
Luther	Roemer	Wamp
Maloney (CT)	Rogers (KY)	Watkins (OK)
Maloney (NY)	Rogers (MI)	Watson (CA)
Manzullo	Rohrabacher	Watt (NC)
Markey	Ros-Lehtinen	Waxman
Mascara	Ross	Weiner
Matheson	Rothman	Weldon (FL)
Matsui	Roukema	Weldon (PA)
McCarthy (MO)	Roybal-Allard	Weller
McCarthy (NY)	Royce	Wexler
McCollum	Rush	Whitfield
McCrery	Ryan (WI)	Wilson
McDermott	Ryun (KS)	Wolf
McGovern	Sabo	Woolsey
McHugh	Sanchez	Wu
McInnis	Sanders	Wynn
McIntyre	Sandlin	Young (FL)
McKeon	Sawyer	
McKinney	Saxton	

NOT VOTING—24

Cannon	Kennedy (MN)	Scarborough
Capuano	Lantos	Shimkus
Carson (IN)	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (MS)
Coyne	Lucas (OK)	Toomey
Engel	Millender	Waters
Gutierrez	McDonald	Watts (OK)
Hulshof	Miller, George	Wicker
Jackson-Lee	Paul	Young (AK)
(TX)	Riley	

□ 1843

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and

the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1845

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are going to be taking up the agricultural appropriation bill; and I would like to for a couple of minutes discuss, number one, the seriousness of the agricultural problem; but, secondly, an amendment that I have tomorrow that deals with how we distribute some of this Federal money to farmers.

There are a lot of us that would hope that these extra funds go to help support the traditional family farmers in this country. However, our farm programs since we started them back in 1934 have tended to favor the large farmer. And so what has happened over the years is the small farmer has been forced out because of the advantages of Federal farm policy to the middle-sized and larger farmer; and the middle-sized farmer, figuring that they might survive, have bought out the small farmer and become bigger.

Specifically, we have legislation that says the price support for farmers in this country through the Federal Government should be limited to \$75,000. If a farmer wants to include their spouse or usually their wife for a separate producer payment, then they have to jump through all kinds of hoops to borrow money in the spouse's name and then document that it was invested in the farm operation, then the farm operation can pay it back. It is a disadvantage.

My amendment tomorrow does essentially three things: it says automatically the wife is included as a producer without jumping through these bureaucratic hoops, eligible for an additional \$75,000 payment limitation. The average size of a farm in this country now, Mr. Speaker, is about 448 acres. But some farms, some huge, giant corporation-type farms are up to 80,000 acres and 100,000 acres; and there is no payment limitation on those farms. So as you can guess, millions of dollars go out to those huge farming operations.

My amendment tomorrow says, let us stick to our guns of the historic \$75,000 limitation but automatically include

spouses. That would move it up to \$150,000. And let us make sure that there is no loophole such as forfeiting a nonrecourse loan or such as certificates that can be issued by the Federal Government in lieu of forfeiture of that particular loan, because those certificates, the alternative of those forfeitures of that loan, has resulted in approximately \$400 million extra payment going to those giant farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I request that my colleagues look at this amendment, that they consider the policy of how we want to spend this extra money, that they face the decision of what should farm programs try to do in this country; and I would suggest humbly that part of what we should be trying to do is help the small family farmer. The large farmer already has a competitive advantage, simply because of the size of their operation. We expand that advantage as we pay them on the bushels produced on each acre or the tons produced. Whether it is rice or corn or soybeans or cotton, we help that large farmer.

I feel it is important that we look at this policy, and I would request that my colleagues look at my amendment that will reaffirm the historical provision of limiting those payments to \$75,000 rather than the \$150,000 per producer that was passed out on a suspension vote late in June when the House went through that particular legislation without the opportunity for any amendments.

ELECTRICITY CRISIS IN CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, the electricity crisis continues 1 year later in San Diego, in California and the West. Scores of businesses in my hometown of San Diego have gone out of business. People on fixed incomes are suffering because they have to make choices between buying food and prescription drugs and air conditioning. This should not be happening in America.

Now, we have called for price controls, we have called for a refund of the overcharges, and people from my State on the other side of the aisle have said, Let the free market work. Price controls don't work. I say to my colleagues, there is no free market. The system is completely out of whack. There is an energy cartel which dominates our lives in California.

I want to give you a specific example, Mr. Speaker, of how the market in California is being manipulated by this energy cartel and what we in San Diego hope to do about it.

There is a 700 megawatt power plant in my district. We call it the South Bay Power Plant. It is operated by the Duke Energy Corporation. It looks like in the last year, Mr. Speaker, Duke Energy has made close to \$800 million off

that plant while 65 percent of the businesses in our area face bankruptcy. They paid for the operation of that plant in 3 months for what they thought would take 5 years or more to pay off.

Now recently, five former employees of Duke Energy, five former employees of the South Bay Energy Plant, testified under oath, testified with 100 years of experience in that plant, Mr. Speaker, and what they said should be taken very seriously by anybody studying this crisis. They said that the generators were turned up and down not because of the need of the people of San Diego or of California but because of the price at a given moment that the market was bringing. In fact, a 250 megawatt generator was turned off at a time when we had blackouts in San Diego, at a time when people were sent home from their jobs and not getting paychecks, at a time when there were near-fatalities at a traffic intersection because the lights were off, at a time when elevators had people stuck in them. Yet the biggest generator in our county was turned off.

These employees further said that they were told to throw away spare parts so maintenance would take a lot longer, supply could be withheld and the prices increased. They talked about how the trading floor where the prices were set for electricity was in direct contact with the generating floor; and so the generators were ramped up and down, as I said, not by the need of California or of San Diego, but by the price that could be gotten. So Duke Energy has stolen \$800 million from the citizens of San Diego and of California. They have charged up to \$4,000 a megawatt hour for something that cost \$30 only a year ago. That, Mr. Speaker, is not the free enterprise system at work; that is stealing from people who could not afford the cost.

Now, to add insult to injury, Mr. Speaker, that theft took place from a power plant which the citizens of San Diego own. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we own that plant through the San Diego Unified Port District, a public agency; and that public agency, at very, very good terms for the lessee, leased the plant to this Duke Energy Corporation to operate, as the lease says, in the public interest. Well, that lease has not been operated in the public interest. That lease has allowed Duke Energy Corporation to steal hundreds of millions of dollars from the people of San Diego.

Mr. Speaker, since the public owns the South Bay Power Plant, I call upon the San Diego Unified Port District to take back that plant and to operate the lease in the public interest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN MEMORY OF SANDY POLICE CHIEF SAM DAWSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I come before the House today to memorialize the death of Police Chief Sam Dawson of Sandy, Utah. Chief Dawson, who served faithfully for 7 years as the head of the police department of Utah's fourth largest city, passed away July 2, 2001, doing what he loved best, riding his Harley-Davidson motorcycle.

Chief Dawson lived up to the sign he had on his desk that said, "Lead, follow, or get out of the way." Chief Dawson was a leader for 30 years in Utah law enforcement. He started as a Salt Lake County sheriff's deputy in 1971. He became the chief police investigator for the Salt Lake county attorney's office after that and became the head of Sandy City's police department in 1994.

Chief Dawson was an outspoken leader in his field. In the year 2000 he spearheaded a project to produce and distribute a video called "Your Kid May Have a Secret," which describes the growing problem of methamphetamine use in Utah communities. Keeping true to his style, Chief Dawson sent a copy to every county sheriff and every city police chief, asking them to freely distribute the video throughout the State.

Chief Dawson was also a leader among his peers. He led an effort to increase the size of the Sandy Police Department while at the same time increasing officer pay. He succeeded at both, increasing his department by 30 officers during his tenure and significantly increasing the wages of those who worked for him.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I end with the words of Lieutenant Kevin Thacker of the Sandy Police Department. He said, "Sam Dawson will be greatly missed by all who knew him. He will always be remembered for his leadership abilities and dedication to the community. His death leaves a void in the police department."

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the Members of the House of Representatives to join me in heartfelt appreciation for the service this great man provided my community. I would also like to ask the House to join me in extending our deepest condolences to the wife of Chief Dawson, Bridgett Dawson, and her three children, Sam Jr., Chris, and Angela.

POSTAL BOARD OF GOVERNORS DECISION REGARDING 6-DAY MAIL DELIVERY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, earlier today Mr. Robert Rider, chairman of the Postal Board of Governors,

released a statement indicating that 6-day mail delivery would continue without any further study. The Postal Board of Governors had commissioned a study on April 3 to study cost savings associated with reducing delivery service to 5 days.

In response to the idea of cutting mail delivery to 5 days, I, along with the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH), the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), introduced H. Res. 154, a bill to preserve 6-day mail delivery.

□ 1900

The bill we introduced enjoys wide bipartisan support and has more than 55 cosponsors. This bill is the companion to Senate Resolution 71 introduced by Senator HARKIN. I applaud the Postal Board of Governors' decision today to continue 6-day mail delivery. This decision means that businesses, advertisers, and others who want to reach citizens on Saturday will be able to do so.

In addition, citizens who receive paychecks, Social Security, food coupons, and other important mail will not see an interruption in their basic service. Also, it means that postal workers and letter carriers will win because cutting mail delivery to 5 days could have led to mail piling up, delivery delays, and other problems.

I commend the leadership and efforts of Moe Biller, and the American Postal Workers Union; Vincent Sombrotto; George Gould and the Letter Carriers; Kevin Richardson and the Printers; Jerry Cerasale and the Direct Marketing Association; and all of those who worked to preserve 6-day mail delivery.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, the Postal Service is an important entity in all of our communities. As chair of the Postal Caucus, I look forward to the continued focus on the U.S. Postal Service and assuring its viability not only today but into the future.

Mr. Speaker, knowing that the agriculture appropriations bill is going to be on the floor tomorrow, let me just take a moment and remind us that the sugar subsidy program is keeping prices extraordinarily high and is driving candy makers and food processors out of my community and out of many other communities throughout the country because they end up paying an enormously high price for sugar, which is the main ingredient used in their product. As a matter of fact, Brach's Candy Company, located in the heart of the community where I live, just announced that they are going to move their plant to Argentina. Fifteen hundred jobs, 1,500 people, will be out of work. So as we look at agriculture appropriations and rewrite our agricultural policy, let us be reminded that the sugar subsidies are bad for my community, bad for the City of Chicago, bad for the food processors and candy makers and bad for America.