



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1996

No. 13

Senate

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Gracious Father, source of all that we have and are, we are here by Your planning and for Your purposes. You have made possible any success we have had. Any recognition we have received is a reflection of abilities You have given us. You have blessed us with loved ones, friends, and fellow workers who have made possible any accomplishments. All our opportunities are a result of Your careful arrangement of circumstances. Nothing happens without Your permission.

So we commit this day to be one of special gratitude for all Your blessings. May our gratitude spill over with words of affirmation and encouragement to others. Help us make this a just-because-day in which we do special acts of kindness just because of Your love for us and our delight in others. So if there are any good words we've been thinking about saying or any acts of caring we've put off doing, may we say and do them today, just because of You, Lord, and all You have done for us. In Jesus' name. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today, there will be a period of morning business until 1 p.m. with the time equally divided between the two parties. Following this morning business period, the Senate will begin consideration of S. 1541, the farm bill. Under the agree-

ment reached during yesterday's session, Senator DORGAN will offer an amendment on which a cloture motion will be filed today. Also under an agreement, a cloture motion will be filed on the underlying bill. Those cloture votes will occur tomorrow beginning at 1:30 p.m.

I now ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, Members have until close of business today in order to file first-degree amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Senators should also be aware that there will be a joint meeting of Congress on Thursday at 11:45 a.m. to hear the address by the President of France, President Chirac. Members should be in the Senate Chamber at 11:25 in order to proceed to the House of Representatives for the address.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GREGG. What is the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes.

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

THE SUGAR PROGRAM

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, tomorrow, or possibly Friday, we will be voting on cloture motions dealing with

the Farm Program and a variety of bills dealing with the Farm Program.

Within the context of the entire Farm Program, there are a lot of subprograms, and one that I wish to talk about is the Sugar Program. The Sugar Program in this country has proceeded since the early 1980's to be a program of inordinate subsidy for a few small farmers—for a few farmers; they are not small farmers—at the expense of the consumers of this country.

Last year, it was estimated that the Sugar Program cost the consumers of this country approximately \$1.4 billion. It has cost the consumers of this country approximately \$10 billion over the last decade. That is because we have in this country a system in the Sugar Program where we artificially inflate the cost of sugar to benefit a few growers of sugarcane and some sugar beets, but primarily in this instance it is benefiting sugarcane growers.

This makes no sense. This program is appropriately tied to sugar, I guess, because the last vestiges of Marxism in the world of any significance is the nation of Cuba, which always had a sugar-based economy.

Now, you might argue, well, China is still a Marxist nation. Actually, China has become quite capitalistic. Cuba is the only country, certainly in the Western Hemisphere, it is the only dictatorship in the Western Hemisphere, in the world that still practices theoretically pure Marxism, Marxism being a system where essentially the State sets the price and the production of all commodities within the community. And, of course, the Cuban economy is always based on sugar. So maybe that is why we as a nation have for some reason decided in our sugar industry we are going to emulate Cuba because that is essentially what we do. We have in the Farm Program which we have designed in this country essentially a system of top-down market controls,

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

S 569

production controls which create, at best, an economic structure which emulates what used to be the East European countries and at worst an economic structure which basically tracks the philosophy of social economics as designed by Karl Marx, because essentially what it does is say that the Government will set the price, the Government will set the production levels, not necessarily for the purposes of benefiting the consumer but for the purposes of benefiting the producer.

We set up a structure here where the fact that sugar on the open market can be bought for 10 cents a pound has no impact on the price of sugar in the United States. Can you imagine that? The United States, the center of capitalism in the world, a market that all of the rest of the world looked to when other nations were trying to design their economies, has put in place in our Sugar Program a structure which is essentially a carbon copy of what they did in Eastern Europe, what they now do in Cuba, or still do in Cuba, in what we basically call a Socialist form of economics.

Why do we do this? Why do we have a system which penalizes our consumers to the tune of \$1.4 billion, which does not allow any competition for the price of sugar in the marketplace, which arbitrarily sets the cost of sugar, and which rewards a few growers of sugarcane specifically? Seventeen growers get 42 percent of the benefit in the sugarcane industry—17 growers get 42 percent of the benefit. In fact, one grower gets a benefit that is estimated to be almost \$68 million a year. Why do we structure a system like this? Well, at the risk of using a pun, it is raw power, raw political power.

The fact that the sugarcane, sugar producers lobby is so strong in the Congress of the United States, it has been able to maintain this totally unjustifiable system. How ironic it is that when the Republican Party, after 40 years, finally gets control over the Congress of the United States, we continue to allow this sort of antimarket system to flourish, to grow, and to abuse the consumers of this country.

How ironic it is that this President—and I cannot fault him individually because the fault lies on both sides of the aisle on this one—but this President who has made such a large issue of protecting consumers in many other areas of his administration and has made this his cause celebre, allows a program which every year takes \$1.4 billion out of the pockets of consumers and artificially transfers it to a non-productive sector of our economy—I am not sure it is unproductive—but a sector of our economy that does not want to compete. Why should not we have a sugar program which is willing to compete?

There are some other side effects that also we ought to be concerned about besides the fact that we are basically taking the consumers of this country for a ride for the benefit of a

few individual growers. There are some other issues we ought to be concerned about.

There is the issue of environmental protection, the fact that as a result of having this artificially high-priced sugar, we have seen a huge amount of land in southern Florida converted to cane growing which land was the original watershed of the Everglades. It is not clear really what would be a better use of this land. I have to admit that the jury may still be out on that.

But before the facts are known, the Everglades are under a tremendous effect, and the fact, first, that the water is not flowing in its original form—and there is the belief that the sugarcane activity is part of it—and, second, sugarcane activity is expanded artificially as a result of this.

Another concern we should have is the effect it is having on our neighbors in the Caribbean. We just invaded Haiti because we felt that it was in economic and political chaos. One of the reasons that our neighbors in the Caribbean are in economic chaos is because we do not allow them to participate in competition with us. We have closed our markets to one of their primary goods—sugar. We live in fear, I guess, as a nation, that we cannot compete with Haiti.

My goodness, how absurd. Obviously, with the technologies we have and the ability we have of growing products in this country, we can compete with our Caribbean neighbors. We would find, I suspect, that if we were to open our markets that sugar beets in many parts of this country would remain very viable and very competitive, sugarcane in parts of this country would remain very viable and very competitive, and we would have also the added benefit of allowing some of our Caribbean neighbors to maybe increase their standard of living a little bit by being able to sell us a little bit of their primary product.

Maybe we would not have to go around invading them. We could save the dollars we spend on national defense in places like Haiti, and the dollars we spend on economic and political development in other regions of the Caribbean because we would have to help them out through what is known as the old-fashioned way, by letting them compete in the marketplace with us.

So tomorrow we take up these farm bills, and there will be an attempt to shut off debate. One of the outcomes of shutting off debate and passage of these farm bills, or at least down the line in the farm bill would be a 7-year extension of the outrage called the Sugar Program. That would be a rather bitter pill for the American consumers. That is not a sweet deal for American consumers. It may be a sweet deal to get a 7-year extension of this program for some of the growers, but it certainly would mean that under the present calculations that would be about another \$10 billion of tax, be-

cause that is essentially what it is to American consumers.

So I strongly oppose the attempt to do this. And along with the Senator from Nevada, who has joined me on this, Senator REID, we will do all we can, I believe, to try to avoid allowing the consumers of this country to be once again pilfered by this program. As a result, I will attempt to oppose cloture. I hope that others who are concerned about the consumers of this country, about the environment of this country, and about our neighbors in Central and Latin America, would also join me in opposing cloture.

Because it is not right. It is not right that a few folks because of their political influence and strength should be able to keep in place a program which should have died when the Berlin Wall fell. The fact is, it is very ironic and unfortunate that as a nation we continue to promote this concept that competition should not be allowed in the production of sugar.

It is antithetical to all the Republican Party stands for. It is time to put an end to it.

Madam President, I thank the Chair for the time to speak. I yield back such time as I may not have used, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I assume that we are in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are.

UNPRECEDENTED FLOOD OF SUBSIDIZED CANADIAN LUMBER

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, in morning business today, let me make several comments on an issue that is very important to this country. It is kind of a quiet issue that has not been prominent in the headlines of the Washington Post or the Washington Times; but certainly in my State and every timber-producing State of the Nation, it has made a good many headlines over the course of the last year or 16 months. And that is the unprecedented flood of subsidized Canadian lumber flowing into the continental United States and into the markets of the 48 lower States.

Normally, Canada is a supplier to our market, and we need their timber to round out the needs of the housing industry of our country and the home building industry. But to meet that need and still keep America's work force in the forest products industry employed, Canada's percentage participation in our market normally is somewhere in the high 20's or low 30's.

In January, this month that is now today concluding, they reached an all-