and I would like to for a couple of minutes discuss, number one, the seriousness of the agricultural problem; but, secondly, the result of the advantages of 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 money, 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 see, 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 per 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.

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 money, 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 see, 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 small farmers. And I think 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 that plant while 65 percent of the businesses in our area face bankruptcy. They paid for the operation of that plant in 3 months for what they thought would take 5 years or more to pay off.

Now recently, five former employees of Duke Energy, five former employees of the South Bay Energy Plant, testified under oath, testified with 100 years of experience in that plant, Mr. Speaker, and what they said should be taken very seriously by anybody studying this crisis. They said that the generators were turned up and down not because of the need of the people of San Diego or of California but because of the price at a given moment that the market was bringing. In fact, a 250 megawatt generator was turned off at a time when we had blackouts in San Diego, at a time when people were sent home from their jobs and not getting paychecks, at a time when there were blackouts at our hospital due to a fire because the lights were off, at a time when elevators had people stuck in them. Yet the biggest generator in our county was turned off.

These employees further said that they were told to throw away spare parts so maintenance would take a lot longer, supply could be withheld and the prices increased. They talked about how the trading floor where the prices were set for electricity was in direct contact with the generating floor; and so the generators were ramped up and down, as I said, not by the need of California or of San Diego, but by the price that could be gotten. So Duke Energy has stolen $800 million from the citizens of San Diego and of California. They have charged up to $4,000 a megawatt hour for something that cost $30 only a year ago. That, Mr. Speaker, is not the free enterprise system at work; that is stealing from people who could not afford the cost.

Now, to add insult to injury, Mr. Speaker, that theft took place from a power plant which the citizens of San Diego own. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we own that plant through the San Diego Unified Port District, a public agency, and that public agency, at very, very good terms for the lessee, leased the plant to Duke Energy Corporation to operate, as the lease says, in the public interest. Well, that lease has not been operated in the public interest. That lease has allowed Duke Energy Corporation to steal hundreds of millions of dollars from the people of San Diego.

Mr. Speaker, since the public owns the South Bay Power Plant, I call upon the San Diego unified Port District to take back that plant and to operate the lease in the public interest.

IN MEMORY OF SANDY POLICE CHIEF SAM DAWSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I come before the House today to memorialize the death of Police Chief Sam Dawson of Sandy, Utah. Chief Dawson, who served faithfully for 7 years as the head of the police department of Utah's fourth largest city, passed away July 2, 2001, doing what he loved best, riding his Harley-Davidson motorcycle.

Chief Dawson lived up to the sign he had on his desk that said, 'Lead, follow, or get out of the way.' Chief Dawson was a leader for 30 years in Utah law enforcement. He started as a Salt Lake County sheriff's deputy in 1971. He became the chief police investigator for the Salt Lake County attorney's office after that and became the head of Sandy City's police department in 1994.
Chief Dawson was an outspoken leader in his field. In the year 2000 he spearheaded a project to produce and distribute a video called “Your Kid May Have a Secret,” which describes the growing problem of methamphetamine use in Utah communities. Keeping true to his style, Chief Dawson sent a copy to every county sheriff and every city police chief, asking them to freely distribute the video throughout the State.

Chief Dawson was also a leader among his peers. He led an effort to increase the size of the Sandy Police Department while at the same time increasing officer pay. He succeeded at both, increasing his department by 30 officers during his tenure and significantly increasing the wages of those who worked for him.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I end with the words of Lieutenant Kevin Thacker of the Sandy Police Department. He said, “Sam Dawson will be greatly missed by all who knew him. He will always be remembered for his leadership abilities and dedication to the community. His death leaves a void in the police department.”

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the Members of the House of Representatives to join me in heartfelt appreciation for the service this great man provided my community. I would also like to ask the House to join me in extending our deepest condolences to the wife of Chief Dawson, Bridgett Dawson, and her three children, Sam Jr., Chris, and Angela.

POSTAL BOARD OF GOVERNORS DECISION REGARDING 6-DAY MAIL DELIVERY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Davis) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, earlier today Mr. Robert Rider, chairman of the Postal Board of Governors, released a statement indicating that 6-day mail delivery would continue without any further study. The Postal Board of Governors had commissioned a study on April 3 to study cost savings associated with reducing delivery service to 5 days.

In response to the idea of cutting mail delivery to 5 days, I, along with the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHugh), the gentleman from California (Mr. Waxman), and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Burton), introduced H. Res. 154, a bill to preserve 6-day mail delivery.

☐ 1900

The bill we introduced enjoys wide bipartisan support and has more than 55 cosponsors. This bill is the companion to Senate Resolution 71 introduced by Senator Harkin. I applaud the Postal Board of Governors’ decision today to continue 6-day mail delivery.

This decision means that businesses, advertisers, and others who want to reach citizens on Saturday will be able to do so.

In addition, citizens who receive paychecks, Social Security, food coupons, and other important mail will not see an interruption in their basic service. Also, it means that postal workers and letter carriers will win because cutting mail delivery to 5 days could have led to mail piling up, delivery delays, and other problems.

I commend the leadership and efforts of Moe Biller, and the American Postal Workers Union; Vincent Sombrerro; George Gould and the Letter Carriers; Kevin Richardson and the Printers; Jerry Cerasale and the Direct Marketing Association; and all of those who worked to preserve 6-day mail delivery.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, the Postal Service is an important entity in all of our communities. As chair of the Postal Caucus, I look forward to the continued focus on the U.S. Postal Service and assuring its viability not only today but into the future.

Mr. Speaker, knowing that the agriculture appropriations bill is going to be on the floor tomorrow, let me just take a moment and remind us that the sugar subsidy program is keeping prices extraordinarily high and is driving candy makers and food processors out of my community and out of many other communities throughout the country because they end up paying an enormously high price for sugar, which is the main ingredient used in their product. As a matter of fact, Brach’s Candy Company, located in the heart of the community where I live, just announced that they are going to move their plant to Argentina. Fifteen hundred people will be out of work. So as we look at agriculture appropriations and rewrite our agricultural policy, let us be reminded that the sugar subsidies are bad for my community, bad for the City of Chicago, bad for the food processors and candy makers and bad for America.

PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES CAN SERVE IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OR ANY FIELD OF ENDORV WITH JUST MINOR CHANGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Langevin) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, I was up here speaking as the proud sponsor of a resolution honoring Erik Weihenmayer, a young man who inspires not only people with disabilities but from the moment I was elected in November of last year, the hard-working engineers, architects, design managers, and my fellow Members of Congress made it clear that they would do whatever was necessary to make my office, the committees on which I serve, and the House floor accessible. One of the products of this generous response to our needs, in fact, is the lectern and microphone that I am using right now. It took months to design and build this remarkable podium that can be easily raised and lowered and is truly a work of art.

I gratefully recognize all the time and resources that were dedicated to making this lectern, to installing additional voting machines on the floor, and placing ramps in my committee rooms and providing accessible office space. What everyone involved in this process may not realize, however, is that beyond enabling me to better serve my constituents, they have also opened doors for people with disabilities to serve in this Chamber in the future.

As I have said many times before, I may be the first quadriplegic elected to the United States Congress but most certainly I will not be the last. The invaluable message that has been delivered in making this Chamber accessible is that any one of the nearly 53 million people with disabilities in this country can become a Member of the United States Congress or can serve in any other field of endeavor with just minor changes.

Mr. Speaker, people with disabilities are an integral but underutilized part