



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 22, 2006

No. 64

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
May 22, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM PRICE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

### SUGAR

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Later this week, there will be consideration of an amendment from Mr. FLAKE of Arizona and me dealing with the notorious sugar subsidy program, proposing a tiny reduction in it. For anyone who wants a lesson in how your government works, a review of the politics surrounding the sugar quota system is a textbook example of how the political process can distort reality and why. A Dear Colleague letter is circulating touting the benefits of a “no

cost to the taxpayer sugar program.” This does not pass the straight face test anywhere in America but Washington, DC. The most junior intern working in any congressional office who is doing independent research can quickly verify that this is not a “no cost program.” There are huge costs to the taxpayer, the government and the environment.

Straight off the top, this “no cost program” requires American consumers to pay almost \$2 billion a year more for sugar and sugar-related products. Only in Washington, DC would \$2 billion be “no cost.” Then there is the loss to industries for whom paying two to three times the price of the world price of sugar makes a big difference. There used to be a thriving confectionery industry, manufacturing in Hershey, Pennsylvania; in New England, in Chicago. Many of these jobs have since disappeared, being driven across the border to Canada, Mexico or elsewhere where sugar prices are dramatically lower. Only the powerful sugar lobbyists and the people who listen to them would think that \$2 billion a year that will be required to store and purchase surplus sugar over the next 10 years would be no cost.

One of the most perverse effects of the sugar program has been to dramatically increase cane sugar production in the State of Florida. Over the last 50 years the amount of acreage surrounding the Everglades has increased 800 percent. All of this sugar production is in the Everglades. This expansion has devastating consequences. Pollution, polluted runoff, and changed water flow attributed to the sugar industry is a significant reason why we are paying seven to \$8 billion as a down payment to clean up the Everglades and redo the plumbing. The sugar lobbyists in Washington, DC would lead you to believe that this is no cost.

How can this be? How can people pretend to believe this claptrap? Well, an

important reason this travesty continues is to be found in campaign contribution reports. This industry is only 1 percent of American agriculture, yet it spends 17 percent of the campaign contributions for agriculture and countless millions more lobbying and producing bogus surveys currently circulating on Capitol Hill.

I suggest if Members want to do a favor for the environment, for the taxpayer, allow a junior intern to do your research to determine whether or not this has no cost. This research done by any college economics student, in any college political science class, or by the outstandingly bright young men and women who work for us as volunteers on Capitol Hill right now as interns can demonstrate to any Member's satisfaction that it is not worth the cost. It is time to approve the Blumenauer-Flake amendment.

### THE LEGACY AND LIFE OF CARMEN ANAYA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Carmen Anaya was a remarkable human being. Her life of 79 years both inspires and teaches us. Born in Monterrey, Mexico; a teacher, she moved to the United States as a young woman and married José Anaya.

For the next 20 years as their family grew, they worked as migrant farm workers all across America—harvesting cherries in Michigan, tomatoes in California, potatoes in Oregon, and sugar beets in the Dakotas. Eventually they opened a small general store in Las Milpas in the Texas Rio Grande Valley.

In Spanish, a “milpa” is a temporary field that is cultivated for a few seasons. But the colonia of Las Milpas was

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2965