

Norwood	Roukema	Tancredo
Nussle	Royal-Allard	Tanner
Oberstar	Royce	Tauscher
Obey	Rush	Tauzin
Olver	Ryan (WI)	Taylor (MS)
Ortiz	Ryun (KS)	Terry
Osborne	Sabo	Thomas
Ose	Sanchez	Thompson (CA)
Otter	Sanders	Thompson (MS)
Owens	Sandlin	Thornberry
Oxley	Sawyer	Thune
Pallone	Saxton	Thurman
Pascarel	Schakowsky	Tiahrt
Pastor	Schiff	Tiberi
Payne	Schrock	Tierney
Pelosi	Scott	Toomey
Pence	Sensenbrenner	Traficant
Peterson (MN)	Serrano	Turner
Peterson (PA)	Sessions	Udall (CO)
Petri	Shadegg	Udall (NM)
Phelps	Shaw	Upton
Pitts	Shays	Velazquez
Platts	Sherman	Visclosky
Pombo	Sherwood	Vitter
Pomeroy	Shimkus	Walden
Portman	Shows	Walsh
Price (NC)	Shuster	Wamp
Pryce (OH)	Simmons	Waters
Putnam	Simpson	Watkins (OK)
Quinn	Skeen	Watson (CA)
Radanovich	Skelton	Watt (NC)
Rahall	Slaughter	Watts (OK)
Ramstad	Smith (MI)	Waxman
Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Weiner
Regula	Smith (TX)	Weldon (FL)
Rehberg	Smith (WA)	Weldon (PA)
Reyes	Snyder	Weller
Reynolds	Solis	Wexler
Riley	Souder	Whitfield
Rivers	Spratt	Wicker
Rodriguez	Stark	Wilson
Roemer	Stearns	Wolf
Rogers (KY)	Stenholm	Woolsey
Rogers (MI)	Strickland	Wu
Rohrabacher	Stump	Wynn
Ros-Lehtinen	Stupak	Young (AK)
Ross	Sununu	Young (FL)
Rothman	Sweeney	

## NAYS—1

Paul

## NOT VOTING—12

Doggett	Jones (NC)	Pickering
Engel	Jones (OH)	Schaffer
Granger	Kaptur	Taylor (NC)
Houghton	Lipinski	Towns

□ 1846

So the motion to instruct conferees was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOBSON, WALSH, MILLER of Florida, and ADERHOLT, Ms. GRANGER, Messrs. GOODE, SKEEN, VITTER, YOUNG of Florida, OLVER, EDWARDS, FARR of California, BOYD, DICKS and OBEY.

There was no objection.

□ 1845

## ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 249) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 249

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Judiciary: Mr. Bryant to rank after Mr. Goodlatte; and Mr. Pence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). 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.

## SUPPORT A REASONABLE LIMIT ON FARM PRICE SUPPORT PAYMENTS

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 will be taking up the agricultural bill for agricultural programs for the next 10 years.

Farmers are in a predicament right now in terms of low commodity prices. In fact, some of those commodity prices are the lowest they have been in 20 years. So we are seeing a lot of farmers go out of business, go into bankruptcy, especially because the land value for recreational use, for use by people that want a country estate, is bidding up those land values far more than can be accommodated by current commodity prices for those farm products those farmers are producing.

The question this Nation is facing is do we want to maintain a strong agricultural industry in the United States so that we do not have to be dependent on importing our foodstuffs, our feed, our food, like, for example, we have in energy. We have increased our dependence on petroleum energy to the extent that if OPEC and those countries that send petroleum energy to this country decided to cut off that available supply, we would at least temporarily see our economy collapse, because right now, we are importing almost 58 percent of our total energy supplies. I think it is important that we do not let that happen to agriculture.

Tomorrow, I have an amendment on the agricultural bill that I think will reduce some of the criticism that some Members in this Chamber have of the agricultural farm programs and the payments, Federal payments, the subsidy payments that are made to agriculture. That amendment puts a real limit on how much any one farmer can receive from Federal Government programs in terms of price-support subsidy.

Right now, the limit for price supports is said to be \$150,000 per year per farmer. Actually, it is a hoodwinking to suggest that there is a limit, a real limit of \$150,000, because what we have in farm programs, and it is somewhat complex, but in price supports, there

are four ways that a farmer can achieve the benefits of the price-support program: one is loan deficiency payments; the second is marketing loans; the third is derived from a non-recourse where the farmer can take out a loan on the commodity and give the Government title to that commodity and receive the same benefits as if they were getting an LDP or a marketing loan. So what they do is an end run, if you will, around the \$150,000 limitation, and that \$150,000 limitation is reasonable in terms of the acreage that any normal family farm in this country produces.

Let me give my colleagues an example. The average farm in this country is approximately 500 acres in size; but \$150,000, based on the last 2 years, one would need to have 6,000 acres of corn, 6,200 acres of soybeans, and 17,000 acres of cotton and, likewise, 1,300 acres of rice to accommodate that limitation of \$150,000. Yet, our technical language of this farm bill that we will be taking up tomorrow says any farmer that is big enough, and there are 30,000-, 40,000-, 80,000-acre farms; in fact, in Florida, there is one landowner that owns 130,000 acres, receiving over \$1 million in government benefits.

My amendment that I hope this body will consider tomorrow sets a real limit by saying it is not only loan deficiency payments and marketing loans, but it includes limitations on the benefits from certificates and forfeitures from that nonrecourse loan. It is reasonable. It saves, according to the CBO, \$520 million over the life of this farm program. That money would be better spent with the kind of farmers that need the help most, and that is the average family farm in this country.

## SUPPORT A REASONABLE LIMIT ON FARM PRICE SUPPORT PAYMENTS

(The Associated Press reported recently that over 154 individuals received more than \$1 million in farm aid last year! Limit massive government payments to the largest recipients—Vote for the Smith/Clayton/Holden/Armey/Shays/McInnis payment limitation amendment to the Farm Bill!)

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Over the years, Congress has established caps on the amount of money a producer can receive from federal farm program price supports. Unfortunately, these payment "limits" on loan deficiency payments, LDPs, have easily been avoided by the unlimited use of commodity certificates, which give the farmer the same dollar benefit as an LDP. In fact, a CRS report on commodity certificates stated that, "while purported to discourage commodity forfeitures, certificates effectively serve to circumvent the payment limitation." (CRS Report 98-744 ENR)

My amendment would establish a REAL PAYMENT CAP by including commodity certificates among the methods of price support that are limited. The Congressional Budget Office has scored this amendment as saving \$528 million over the life of the Farm Bill.

The limitation in this amendment will only affect the very largest of recipients. For instance, the average acreage it would have taken to reach this limit in the last two crop years was over 6,000 acres of corn and soybeans, 1,950 acres of cotton, and 13,000 acres

of wheat and 17,000 acres of rice! Note: The average U.S. farm size is 450 acres.

The Bush Administration recently released a report, *Food and Agricultural Policy: Taking Stock for the New Century*, that clearly refers to the flaws with current farm price supports, stating, "Past attempts at tailoring or directing benefits to particular groups have not proved very successful . . . payment limits to individual farmers have not proved effective." This is because of the loophole allowing farmers to keep the equivalent loan benefit and forfeit the crop.

Difficult future budget decisions, coupled with the increased press scrutiny of farm price support programs, may threaten to reduce the continued strong public support for American agriculture. Setting a real limit on farm payments will help to maintain this support, and save taxpayers \$528 million dollars!

Please consider cosponsoring and speaking in favor of this amendment on behalf of the American family farmer.

Sincerely,

NICK SMITH,  
Member of Congress.

---

**SUPPORT MILLER-MILLER  
AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2646**

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, like my colleague from Michigan, I also rise to talk about the farm bill that we will be debating on tomorrow. Of course, in that bill is the sugar subsidy program. There is going to be an amendment, the Miller-Miller amendment, and I rise in strong support of it. The sugar program hurts working people in my congressional district and the Miller-Miller amendment would help to redress the harm that they have suffered.

The candy industry is important to the Chicago area. There are 31,000 confectionery employees in Illinois, with 15,000 of those in Cook County. Unfortunately, employment in the confectionery industry in Chicago has fallen 11 percent since 1991. The sugar program has contributed to this decline.

Along with other members of the Illinois delegation, I have repeatedly spoken on this floor about the injury caused to my constituents by the sugar program. We have not been alone. Mayor Daley and the Chicago City Council strongly oppose the sugar program. They are joined in this opposition by city business leaders and the Chicago Federation of Labor.

For companies that make nonchocolate candy, sugar is a large portion of their total costs. The U.S. sugar program supports prices in our domestic market so that candymakers in Chicago are forced to pay more than twice as much for sugar as their competitors abroad. For example, on September 25, the price of raw sugar in the United States was 20.65 cents per pound. On the same date, the world price of raw sugar was 6.84 cents per pound.

Candy manufacturers and workers must compete with the candy that is made offshore, using world-priced

sugar. Imports of hard candy have been rising, from less than 12 percent of the U.S. market in 1997 to 19 percent in 1999. These imports make it difficult for our companies and workers to compete, because a major part of their ingredient cost, sugar, is so much cheaper than in our domestic market. It is the classic unlevel playing field that we hear our colleagues from agriculture districts talk about so frequently. But in this case, it is the workers in Chicago and other places throughout the country who are on the wrong end of the field.

The sugar programs helped cause the candy industry's problems through price supports and import quotas. The Miller-Miller amendment reforms the price support system; it does not abolish the sugar program. The amendment does not say that there should be no assistance to sugar growers and producers; it reduces price supports modestly and increases the penalties that sugar processing companies must pay when they fail to repay their government loan.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the sugar program, and I strongly believe in supporting farmers, but I believe that we have to support the needy and not the greedy. So I would urge my colleagues to vote for the Miller-Miller amendment and give the workers throughout America, and especially those in the confectionery industry, an opportunity to work and not see their jobs moved to other countries and other places.

---

□ 1900

**CLAYTON AMENDMENT TO FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001 WILL HELP FARMERS, THEIR FAMILIES, AND COMMUNITIES**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow we will have the Farm Security Act of 2001. It is our farm bill. It is our farm bill for the next 10 years.

I want to tell the Members, food security is very important to this country. Indeed, we should protect the opportunities for our producers to produce, but also to make a decent living, so there is a vested interest in seeing that the farm bill is indeed enacted appropriately.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about the opportunity of making that farm bill even more responsive to a larger number of citizens who live in rural America. We have a title called Rural Development. It is a title that the committee itself had the foresight to include.

It provides clean water and infrastructure for wastewater facilities. It provides economic development, and strategic planning so that small communities can come together and plan for their future. It also provides for ad-

ditional resources in something we call value-added, where producers can add more profitability and add more processes right there at the local level, making more money for the raw commodities they produce.

In order to provide more money for a larger number of people, we have to have something called shared sacrifice, meaning our farmers, who indeed need resources, must begin to see this as in their value, as well.

So the amendment that I will propose does require a reduction of farm subsidies. It represents an addition of 2 percent overall to a reduction, which will give to these rural development activities \$1.065 billion over the next 10 years.

As I said, they will go for three important areas.

First, \$45 million a year will go for clean water and wastewater facilities, which rural communities desperately need. There is a report out now by the EPA which says that communities of 3,000 or a little better for the next 15 years would need \$37 million just to speak to the deficiencies as they are now, not even to anticipate the things they may need to plan for, or plan for contingencies, given the new scare regarding water resources.

In addition, as we look at the resources coming to rural communities, we know rural communities do not have the advantage of planning and coordinating or the staff capacity of writing grants so they can benefit. Most of the resources that come to rural communities come in the form of loans or guaranteed loans, so we do not have the community development funds as urban communities have. So the strategic planning part of it will allow a community to have that opportunity.

Finally, as I stated, the value-added portion will simply add funds to our farmers' capacity to have long-term profitability of their raw products.

Now, there will be those who say we should not take one dollar from the farmers whatsoever, but I would submit that I think farmers do care about clean water, I think farmers do care about economic development, I think farmers do care about value-added. These dollars are included for all rural communities. They are included for farmers, for their families, their neighbors, and their communities.

So when we ask for the shared sacrifice, it is not as if we were saying that this will not benefit farmers. We are just recognizing that the crisis in rural communities includes the farmers, but it does not stop at the field. It includes the communities that are losing, because there is high-tech industry leaving the area. It includes the despair that out of 250 poorest counties, 244 of them are in rural communities.

It does not ignore the fact that our census data show most of the young people are leaving rural communities. We are creating an almost irreversible gulf there. It means that if we are not careful, we are going to have this as a