

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## BRIGADIER GENERAL STEPHEN G. WOOD, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, AIR FORCE LEGISLATIVE LIAISON

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to an exceptional officer in the United States Air Force, an individual that a great many of us have come to know personally over the past few years—Brigadier General Stephen G. Wood. General Wood, who currently serves as Deputy Director of the Air Force Office of Legislative Liaison, was recently nominated for promotion to Major General and selected for assignment as Commander of the Air Warfare Center, Air Combat Command, at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada. During his time in Washington, and especially with regard to his work here on Capitol Hill, General Wood personified the Air Force core values of integrity, selfless service and excellence in the many missions the Air Force performs in support of our national security. Many Members and staff have enjoyed the opportunity to meet with him on a variety of Air Force issues and came to deeply appreciate his character and many talents. Today it is my privilege to recognize some of General Wood's many accomplishments, and to commend the superb service he provided the Air Force, the Congress and our Nation.

General Wood entered the Air Force through the Reserve Officer Training Corps program at the University of Washington, Seattle. He served in various operational and staff assignments including duty as an F-4D pilot, AT-38 instructor pilot, F-16 weapons instructor and squadron operations officer. A command pilot, the general has more than 3,300 flying hours in the F-4, T-33, AT-38 and F-16, including 49 combat missions during Operation Desert Storm.

Throughout his distinguished career, General Wood's exceptional leadership skills were always evident to both superiors and subordinates as he repeatedly proved himself in numerous select command positions. He served as F-16 Operations Officer and Commander of the 10th Tactical Fighter Squadron at Hahn Air Base, Germany; and as Squadron Commander of the 389th Fighter Squadron at Mountain Home Air Force Base in Idaho. He was subsequently selected as Chief of Joint Training Teams at Headquarters, U.S. Atlantic Command, in Norfolk, Virginia. Following this assignment, General Wood was chosen as Commander of the 8th Operations Group in Kunsan Air Base, South Korea; and later as Commander of the 35th Fighter Wing at Misawa Air Base, Japan.

General Wood is best known to us, however, because of his two Air Force assignments involving liaison to the Congress. Many here will remember that from June 1997 until November 1998, General Wood was assigned as Chief, House Liaison Office, of the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force. He excelled in this position, bringing qualities of integrity and professionalism that greatly enhanced relations between the Air Force and the Congress. He was selected in May 2000 to return as Deputy Director of Air Force Legislative Liaison for the Secretary of the Air Force.

In his many years of working with the Congress, General Wood has provided a clear and credible voice for the Air Force while representing its many programs on the Hill, consistently providing accurate, concise and timely information. His integrity, professionalism and expertise enabled him to develop and maintain an exceptional rapport between the Air Force and the Congress. The key to his success, I believe, was his deep understanding of Congressional processes and priorities and his unflinching advocacy of programs essential to the Air Force and to our nation.

I am very pleased that General Wood has been nominated for his second star and I am sure that the Senate will soon concur in that promotion. I offer my sincere congratulations to General Wood for his nomination and for his new assignment as Commander of the Air Warfare Center. On behalf of the Congress and our great Nation, I thank General Wood and his entire family for the commitment and sacrifices that they have made throughout his military career. I know I speak for all of my colleagues in expressing my heartfelt appreciation to General Wood for a job well done. He is a credit to both the Air Force and the United States. We wish our friend the best of luck in his new command.

## HONORING DOLORES HUERTA

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, few people have done as much for America's workers as Dolores Huerta. She is a preeminent labor and civil rights leader who has worked tirelessly and skillfully to enhance and improve the working conditions for farm workers and their families for more than 40 years. She is the heart and soul—and the muscle—of the farm worker labor movement. And I join those in lauding her for all she has accomplished. No injustice and no wrong is too big or too small for Dolores's attention. And we are all so proud of all she does so well.

Born in Dawson, NM, on April 10, 1930, Dolores Huerta was raised, in Stockton, CA, in the San Joaquin Valley. Growing up, she saw first-hand the poverty that local farm workers endured. She also saw the generosity that her mother showed in providing free food and housing to local farm workers.

Dolores earned a teaching degree from Stockton College, but she left the profession because she could not stand to see her students the children of farm workers come to school hungry and without shoes. Convinced that she could be more helpful to their children by organizing farm workers, she founded the Stockton Chapter of the Community Service Organization in 1955, a Latino association to educate and assist these families.

In 1962, Dolores Huerta joined Cesar Chavez in founding the National Farm Workers Association which eventually became the famous United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.

As a co-founder of UFWOC, Ms. Huerta's efforts have led to wide-ranging reforms for farm workers and their families. For example, Ms. Huerta negotiated a contract which established the first health and benefit plan for farm workers. In addition, her consumer boycotts resulted in the enactment of the Agricultural Labor Relations Act, the first United States law that granted workers to collectively bargain for better working conditions. Ms. Huerta also fought hard against toxic pesticides which were destructive to farm workers and the environment, and negotiated agreements to ensure that dangerous pesticides were not used in the fields.

Ms. Huerta has already been recognized by many for the groundbreaking work that she has done. She has received several honorary doctorate degrees and was honored as one the "100 Most Important Women of the 20th Century." In addition, Ms. Huerta was recently named one of six Women Sustaining the American Spirit. We here in the Senate thank Ms. Huerta for her passion and commitment to children, women and farm worker families. All workers deserve fair treatment and safe working conditions. The American people are better off today because of all she has done, and it is a privilege to be able to offer her this tribute from the United States Senate.

## THE FARM BILL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the recent enactment of H.R. 2646, the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, and to explain why I made the very difficult decision to vote against it. First, I wish to express my sincere thanks to the members of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees and the conferees for their very hard work in producing this farm bill. I have no doubt that their aim was the good of America's farmers and of rural America.

There are a number of important provisions in the farm bill that will have a positive impact on our family farms. I am pleased that significantly more funds will go to conservation programs and to help livestock producers and feedlot operators to better protect the environment. I am especially proud of language included in the farm bill that

will restore a modest and carefully constructed wool program for our sheep industry. The new wool payment is crafted to provide some assistance during difficult times but not so much that the wool market will become distorted. I think the wool payment program is a good model for providing farmers with a good safety net.

I wish I could say that the other crop support programs in H.R. 2646 were also well-crafted, but I cannot.

I was a strong supporter of the previous farm bill, or the Fair Act. The Fair Act attempted to free our farmers from the heavy hand of government and restore to our farmers the benefits of the free market.

While I supported the Fair Act, I also recognized that the safety net for our farmers still needed some strengthening. A farm safety net should help farmers succeed in the free market. The alternative is to protect our farmers from the free market, and we have learned from failed farm programs of the past that there is not a good way to do that.

It is unfortunate that our new farm bill appears to be heading back down those same paths. Its greatest weakness is that in an attempt to provide some protection for farmers it goes well beyond the mark. We needed a fresh approach to supporting our farmers, but this latest farm bill is an unpleasant trip down memory lane. It risks turning our farmers into welfare recipients, and it puts the bureaucrat back in the business of running our nation's farms.

In H.R. 2646, the programs for row crops are intended to kick in when there is an oversupply and prices are low. Basic economic principles would indicate, and history has proven, that these counter cyclical programs themselves can create an incentive for overproduction which, in turn, keeps prices low. Unless they are crafted very carefully, counter cyclical programs lead to a spiral of dependency. As long as the government money keeps flowing to the farmers, the overproduction does not bankrupt them. But it does put our farmers on the federal dole, and I don't believe that's where the farmers of Utah want to be.

One of the greatest benefits our government can provide to our farmers is a world system of free and fair trade. Our Nation's farm products are the best, and consumers around the world are clamoring for them. Through tremendous effort and lengthy negotiations, this and past administrations have been prying open foreign markets to U.S. agricultural products. I believe that too many of the programs in H.R. 2646 go beyond support for farmers and instead attempt to protect them from competition. The governments of our largest foreign markets for agriculture products are keenly aware of this, and with some justification they are alarmed by our recent shift toward protectionism. I fear the effects of this shift will hurt farmers. Doors to for-

eign markets that have been opened to our farmers may now close, the possibility for new markets may be quashed, and a greater number of future agricultural trade issues will be decided by the World Trade Organization, not by our trade negotiators.

Another important consideration for me in deciding to oppose H.R. 2646, was the alarming escalation of the cost of the bill. My understanding was that it would take about \$100 billion to keep the current programs running for our farmers. On top of that, we budgeted an additional \$73.5 billion to help meet the needs of our farmers. That is a big increase, but I think our farmers deserve the additional help. I would feel better about spending this extra money, though, if I believed that it would benefit our agricultural industry rather than work against it. I would also feel better about the extra spending if the original \$173.5 billion had not mysteriously risen to a budget busting \$190 billion.

I know the farmers of Utah. They are prudent businessmen who simply want a fair shake. They do not want to go on the government dole, they do not want to close foreign markets, and they do not want to add to our budget deficit. Unfortunately for the farmers of Utah, the farm bill that has recently been signed into law does all of the above. And yet, all this money and all these programs do strangely little for the small farmer of Utah. A full two-thirds of all these programs will go to only 10 percent of our nation's largest farms. This is a particularly grotesque and embarrassing aspect of H.R. 2646. If these largest farms are so efficient, why do they need this level of welfare? Where are the economies of scale that should make the largest farms the strongest?

I voted on the floor of the Senate, along with 65 of my colleagues, to address this issue by providing certain limitations on the size of payments the largest farms could receive under this farm bill. Although two-thirds of the Senate agreed on these payment limitations, the final conference report came back to us stripped of this important provision.

I wish we had a farm bill to which I could have given my blessing, but frankly, H.R. 2646 did not deserve my blessing. I am pleased that Utah's woolgrowers will receive some much needed relief, that our livestock producers in general will receive important funding for conservation measures, and that our crop growers will gain some certainty from the enactment of a farm bill, but I fear there may be a heavy price to pay in the long run for our agricultural industry—a price that could have been avoided with a little more prudence and restraint on the part of the legislators and the farm organizations who helped to develop this farm bill.

I hope that Utah's farmers can understand why I needed to vote against this farm bill. I cherish the farmers of

Utah. I consider them the finest citizens our nation has. There is no group that works harder, that is more patriotic, or that is more morally strong than the farmers of Utah. I have often stated that they are the backbone of our society, and I have always believed it to be true. I will continue to do all I can to support our farmers in the way that I believe they want to be supported, and I think my record reflects that this is what I have attempted to do over the years. I believe that the farmers I represent understand this.

#### TUNA IMPORTS FROM THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise today to express my concerns about a provision in the Andean Trade Preferences Act, ATPA, that will have serious adverse, unintended consequences on United States initiatives in the Philippines and our relationship with the Philippine government.

Both the House and Senate versions of the ATPA would allow canned tuna from the Andean region to enter the United States duty-free, while maintaining the current tariff rates for all other countries. There are slight differences between the two versions: The House version allows all canned tuna imports from the Andean region to enter duty-free; the Senate version extends duty-free treatment to Andean tuna imports up to a cap equal to 20 percent of the preceding calendar year's domestic production excluding production in American Samoa. For the Philippines, however, the House and Senate versions have the same effect. Philippine tuna is sold generically; purchasers of this tuna are the most price-sensitive, and they would gravitate to the cheaper, duty-free product.

Loss of these sales would mean, effectively, the collapse of the tuna market. The major suppliers to the U.S. canned tuna market are just six countries: Thailand, 60 percent; the Philippines, 18 percent; Indonesia, 12 percent; Papua NG, 4 percent; Ecuador and Malaysia, 2 percent each. Of the six, Ecuador is the only one of the six that would benefit from the proposed trade preference, to the sharp detriment of the Philippines. The Philippine government estimates that the implementation of the ATPA preference would affect 24,000 workers directly, and another 150,000 indirectly.

Moreover, it is the economy of Mindanao, where the entire tuna-canning industry is located, that would be especially hard hit. It is on this southernmost island that the poverty level is acute and terrorist activity is concentrated; a number of civilians have been kidnapped or murdered there by Abu Sayef, an extremist Islamic group, and two Americans are currently being held there.

The ramifications of this legislation will almost certainly undercut the Philippine government's efforts in Mindanao. It will undercut U.S. efforts