EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

His volunteer involvement in the Cincinnati community is legendary. He is particularly well known for his advocacy on behalf of children and his passion for education. His public service has taken him from president of the Wyoming, Ohio School Board in 1986 to more recent positions as Co-Chair of the Ohio Education Improvement Council and membership on the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future. Bob has capably led numerous local organizations, including the Greater Cincinnati March of Dimes, the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, the National Advertising Council Board, and Beech Acres For the Love of Kids Parenting Conference.

All of us in Cincinnati congratulate Bob on his outstanding career with Procter & Gamble, thank him for his many years of dedicated community service, and wish him well in the new challenges to come.
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Wednesday, June 27, 2001

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to John and Mary Kolimas who recently celebrated their fiftieth wedding anniversary on June 16, 2001.

John and Mary represent the epitome of married life and family values. They have raised six wonderful children—Mamie, Chris, Bob, Barb, Rich, and Paul. I can attest first-hand to their ability as parents; their son Paul is a former employee of mine and a man I have great respect for. John and Mary have also been blessed with nine beautiful grandchildren: Nicole, Jordan, Kelly, Amie, Cathy, Samantha, Alexandra, Jesenia, and Michael. They also have one deceased grandchild, Elizabeth.

Friends of the couple fondly recall their meeting at a dance in 1948 at St. Stanislaus Bishop and Martyr Catholic Church. They were married at that same church three years later in 1951 by Mary’s brother, Father Edwin Karlowicz. Their outstanding devotion to the Catholic Church has continued throughout their marriage.

Both John and Mary attended St. Stanislaus Bishop and Martyr Catholic Grammar School. John graduated from Foreman High School, where he was class president. He served in the Navy for two years, and then attended Loyola University in Chicago under the GI Bill. Mary graduated from Holy Academy High School.

The couple was surrounded by seventy-five relatives and friends for mass and a joyous reception at the Rosewood West Restaurant on Saturday, June 16. Mary’s brother, Father Edwin Karlowicz, presided over the mass along with Father John Sayaya. In attendance for the celebration were Mary’s four sisters: Therese, Kay, Janet, and Jean; and John’s sisters: Helen, Bernice, and Emily. The group enjoyed a video presentation of pictures and music from the couple’s fifty years together.

I have the highest level of respect for devoted couples like John and Mary. Their ability to love and raise children serves as a model for all of us to follow. I encourage my colleagues to join me in congratulating the fiftieth wedding anniversary of John and Mary and the strong family values they represent.
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Mr. BERERuter. Mr. Speaker, as the House prepares to consider the next Farm Bill, this Member commends to his colleagues the following analysis by Roy Frederick, a highly respected government economist.

Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act in 1996 broke the mold. Under current law, farmers are not required to take land out of production as a precondition to receiving supports from the federal government.

Critics say that the lack of a supply-adjustment mechanism in the 1996 act is a serious flaw. Prices for all the major crops grown in Nebraska have been lackluster since mid-1998. Why not spur prices higher by restricting bushels offered to the marketplace? It seems like a logical question that deserves an answer.

Supporters of the current system respond that commodities are overproduced and marketed around the world. Any attempt to reduce U.S. production might be met by increased production elsewhere. Some livestock feeders also wouldn’t be happy with the prospect of higher feed costs. Then there’s the matter of how agribusinesses feel about it. Many survive on the basis of volume; the more acres in production, the better it is for farm-related businesses.

Recently, formal studies by agricultural economists at the University of Maryland and Iowa State University examined the land-idling question in greater depth.

In the first study, the focus was on inefficiencies caused by taking land out of production. That is, not only may land be taken out of its highest and best use, but other inputs, such as machinery and equipment, may be underused as well. The estimated cost to produce and consumers of a modest land-idling scheme is $2 billion to $4 billion a year, the study found.

The Iowa State study assumed that commodities are overproduced and marketed around the world. Any attempt to reduce U.S. production might be met by increased production elsewhere. Some livestock feeders also wouldn’t be happy with the prospect of higher feed costs. Then there’s the matter of how agribusinesses feel about it. Many survive on the basis of volume; the more acres in production, the better it is for farm-related businesses.

Recently, formal studies by agricultural economists at the University of Maryland and Iowa State University examined the land-idling question in greater depth.

In the first study, the focus was on inefficiencies caused by taking land out of production. That is, not only may land be taken out of its highest and best use, but other inputs, such as machinery and equipment, may be underused as well. The estimated cost to produce and consumers of a modest land-idling scheme is $2 billion to $4 billion a year, the study found.

The Iowa State study assumed that commodities are overproduced and marketed around the world. Any attempt to reduce U.S. production might be met by increased production elsewhere. Some livestock feeders also wouldn’t be happy with the prospect of higher feed costs. Then there’s the matter of how agribusinesses feel about it. Many survive on the basis of volume; the more acres in production, the better it is for farm-related businesses.