

similar to the unsuccessful attempts in the past.

The amendment will keep the current program, which has devastated domestic sugar. Today, there are only two commercial sugar plantations left in Hawaii, the result of the 1996 Act which has crippled the industry and left thousands of Americans unemployed, many of them in Hawaii. What this nation needs now is more American jobs, not fewer.

In addition it would cut the existing supports by \$.03 a pound. A rough calculation indicates such a move would transfer \$500.0 million from the domestic sugar producers to the food processors.

While sugar prices have plummeted, food prices have risen. The wholesale price of sugar has dropped 29 percent since the 1996 law while sweetened product prices have risen 4 percent-14 percent. It is not difficult to determine that consumers will not see one dime of that \$500.0 million. It will go straight into the pockets of the food manufacturers and processors who have soaked up all the additional revenue resulting from staggeringly low sugar prices since the 1996 Act.

Not only will the food processors unfairly benefit, but more foreign-produced sugar will pour into the country. My colleagues, in numerous cases, that imported sugar will certainly be produced by child labor and with no environmental protections.

How on earth are we helping either our own country or the rest of the world by adopting this amendment?

We've heard reports of candy manufacturers moving to Mexico. That is their prerogative, as much as I disagree with their abandoning America. The distortion that has been perpetuated, however, is that it is because of domestic sugar prices. Nothing could be further from the truth. Domestic sugar prices in Mexico have been consistently higher in Mexico than in the U.S. The reason they and other manufacturers have moved to Mexico is that labor costs are far lower and environmental protections are unenforced and ignored.

The Mexican government, and other foreign producers, then dump production in excess of their domestic consumption, regardless of their domestic price, on the world market for whatever price they can get. That is called the "world price" of sugar. In reality, it is the dump price, and that is the price at which the supporters of the amendment want to purchase sugar.

My colleagues, this amendment is strictly about money. It is about whether money will be paid to American workers for an American product produced with environmental protections and labor standards or whether it goes directly to the food processors and manufacturers to increase their profits regardless of the consequences domestically or internationally.

The House Agriculture Committee has developed a fair, rational and effective way to keep this industry producing an American product by American workers. I urge you in the strongest possible terms to reject this cynical, ill-conceived attack on American sugar producers and on hard-working people.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2646, the Farm Security Act of 2001, which authorizes domestic and international

agricultural programs that support American farmers and promotes American agricultural products throughout the world. It is important for Congress to support America's family farmers, agricultural industries, commodity packers and shippers, and the millions of Americans who benefit from the multibillion dollar agriculture industry that is the bread basket for the world.

I wish to commend Chairman COMBEST for his leadership in crafting the Farm Security Act and for ensuring that the many complex facets of American agriculture policy are adequately addressed.

I am especially pleased that the bi-partisan Farm Security Act does more than ever to promote international relief efforts through the Food for Progress and Food for Peace programs and also makes necessary reforms for these vitally important feeding programs. Indeed, these programs provide much needed food for the world's poor and starving, and are also coupled with sustainable development programs that teach the poor how to farm and increase food production.

Title III of H.R. 2646, also authorizes the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education Initiative that provides school lunches for needy boys and girls that attend school throughout the developing world. This is a noble endeavor that I enthusiastically endorse.

I am pleased that many farmers, producers, packers and shippers as well not-for-profits, including Catholic Relief Services, support H.R. 2646.

I am, however, mindful of the concerns voiced by the President regarding the cost of some of the domestic agricultural programs authorized by H.R. 2646, and share his view that improvements, including the cost of some programs, require additional review. Therefore, it is my goal to have the President's concerns addressed at a House-Senate Conference that reconciles differences between H.R. 2646 and the companion measure of this bill that will be considered by the Senate. I also believe that a shorter authorization period is in the national interest and hope that it will be agreed to during the House-Senate Conference on the bill.

Mr. Chairman, while I agree with the President that H.R. 2646 is not a perfect bill and will require modifications in order for the President to sign a final measure and have it enacted into law, I believe that H.R. 2646 serves as a good legislative vehicle to negotiate a bi-partisan agreement in Congress that will address many of the President's understandable objections. Therefore, with these caveats, I intend to support H.R. 2646.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to section 762(c) of this legislation.

Methyl bromide is a powerful ozone depleting substance. Releasing methyl bromide into the environment degrades the Earth's protective stratospheric ozone layer, increasing the risks of skin cancer and cataracts. As a result, the United States has joined with the international community to phase-out methyl bromide by 2005 with only limited exceptions.

Unfortunately, section 762(c) of the "Farm Security Act" could be interpreted to grant the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to allow continued use of methyl bromide even if the use is not in conformity with our international commitments under the Montreal Protocol.

The provisions may well circumvent or override regulations issued under the Clean Air Act and the Montreal Protocol.

This language could shift EPA's traditional authority to implement the Protocol to the Department of Agriculture, notwithstanding the fact that Congress affirmed EPA's primacy on this issue as recently as 1998.

Additionally, the provision waive compliance with the Administrative Procedures Act, the Department of Agriculture's policy on public participation, and the Paperwork Reduction Act. These provisions could significantly undermine our efforts to protect the stratospheric ozone layer as well as the nation's credibility in international meetings.

These provisions are strongly opposed by the environmental community, including the following groups: American Rivers, Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, League of Conservation Voters, National Audubon Society, National Environmental Trust, National Parks Conservation Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, Physicians for Social Responsibility, 20/20 Vision.

Mr. Chairman, we should strike these potentially destructive provisions. I urge all members to support removing these provisions as this bill proceeds through the legislative process.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011, had come to no resolution thereon.

FOOD INSPECTION SYSTEM

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, we took up the agricultural bill yesterday. We are going to do that again today. I think one area that we might want to reconsider looking at once this gets to conference or maybe even amendments today is an issue that relates to terrorism, and that is, our potential worst problem that we have in this country is the food inspection system.

Tommy Thompson reports that they have 750 agents looking at 130 points of entry, 55,000 places around America. Agriculture has thousands of inspectors compared to their 750. I think it is reasonable that we consider and talk about the possibility that those inspections in agriculture that are just looking for what is allowed into this country or maybe some insects need to team up and have a greater ability to

add to the energy of HEW in terms of the food health inspection.

To assure credibility and integrity, I would ask that the two statements opposing and supporting my amendment yesterday also be entered into the RECORD at this point.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 3, 2001.

“There’s a lot of medium-sized farmers that need help, and one of the things that we’re going to make sure of as we restructure the farm program next year is that the money goes to the people it’s meant to help.”—President George W. Bush, August, 2001

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Few people are aware that many of our farm commodity programs, for all of their good intentions, are set up to disburse payments with little regard to farm size or financial need. Often in our rush to provide support for struggling farmers we overlook just where that support is going:

This amendment only limits price supports, not AMTA, conservation, or any other type of farm payment.

The largest 18 percent of farms receive 74 percent of federal farm program payments.

In 1999, 47 percent of farm payments went to large commercial farms, which had an average household income of \$135,000.

The bulk of benefits over \$150 thousand paid out on the 2000 harvest went to cotton and rice farmers—in fact, two large rice cooperatives in Arkansas collected nearly \$150 million between them.

Unlimited government price supports for program commodities disproportionately skews federal farm aid to the largest of producers while encouraging overproduction and allowing the largest producers to become even larger. Let’s do more to be fair to small and moderate size family farm operations by establishing meaningful, effective payment limitations.

CBO Has Scored This Amendment as Saving
\$1.31 Billion!

Support the Smith-ArmeY-Blumenauer-McInnis-Shays amendment on federal price support limitations

Sincerely,

NICK SMITH,
Member of Congress.

Representative Smith states that his amendment will only affect the very largest of recipients.

Mr. Smith is wrong.

He claims that it would take 1,950 acres of cotton or 17,000 acres of rice to reach the payment limit he references. In reality, it would take 432 acres of cotton or 700 acres of rice.

What the Smith amendment will do: Compromises the integrity of the agricultural marketing system; punishes medium-size farmers, the very ones he claims to be helping; adversely affects producers who use marketing certificates; and drastically reduces the effectiveness of the marketing loan

Oppose the Nick Smith Amendment

I would like to add that less than 1 percent of imported food is inspected and that there were over 76 thousand reported food poisoning last year.

It is generally agreed that the 21st century brings with it a new era in the biological sciences with advances in molecular biology and biotechnology that promise longer, healthier lives and the effective control, perhaps elimination of a host of acute and chron-

ic diseases. The prospects are bright but there is a dark side—the possibility that infectious agents might be developed and produced as offensive weapons; that new or emergent infections, like HIV/AIDS or old diseases or other pathogens need to be guarded against at our borders.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Mr. GIBBONS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 4:00 p.m. and October 5 on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STENHOLM) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALCOMA, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COMBEST) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BRADY of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, October 5.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on October 3, 2001 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 1583. To designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 121 West Spring Street in New Albany, Indiana, as the “Lee H. Hamilton Federal Building and United States Courthouse”.

H.R. 1860. To reauthorize the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o’clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 5, 2001, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

4093. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Method for Determining Market Capitalization and Dollar Value of Average Daily Trading Volume; Application of the Definition of Narrow-Based Security Index; Joint Final Rule [Release No. 34-44724; File No. ST-11-01] (RIN: 3235-A113) received September 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4094. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Designated Contract Markets in Security Futures Products: Notice-Designation Requirements, Continuing Obligations, Applications for Exemptive Orders, and Exempt Provisions (RIN: 3038-AB82) received September 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4095. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—A New Regulatory Framework for Clearing Organizations (RIN: 3038-AB66) received September 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4096. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bispyribac-Sodium; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-301175; FRL-6803-2] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received September 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4097. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bentazon; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-301172; FRL-6803-2] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received September 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4098. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Mefenoxam; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-301170; FRL-6801-4] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received September 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4099. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Fluoroxypyr 1-Methylheptyl Ester; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-301164; FRL-6798-5] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received September 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4100. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Zeta-cypermethrin and its Inactive R-isomers; Pesticide Tolerances [OPP-301171; FRL-6801-1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received September 13, 2001, pursuant to 5