

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	Trafficant
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
McColum	Rush	Whitfield
McCrery	Ryan (WI)	Wilson
McDermott	Ryan (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