consideration the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes:

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today against this amendment which will prohibit the FDA from testing, developing, or approving any drug that could cause an abortion.

I often come to the House floor to note that this would be the 147th vote on choice since the beginning of the 104th Congress. But this vote is about so much more than abortion. It is truly a chilling attack on biomedical research.

We are legislators, we are not scientists. Political mandates have no place in interfering with the FDA's sound and rigorous scientific drug approval process.

Approval of this amendment would be the beginning of a slippery slope where some Members of Congress hold the health of all Americans hostage. Allowing Congress to dictate which drugs the FDA can and cannot test could halt the process of testing drugs that have nothing to do with abortion.

The target of this amendment, mifepristone or RU–486, has potential uses for the treatment of breast cancer, endometriosis, and even glaucoma. In fact, this kind of drug—an antiprogestin—was originally being developed for its cancer treatment potential.

I tell you, if RU–486 was only a cancer treatment, this researcher would have won a Nobel prize, and I bet the drug would already have been approved. Instead, because of its pregnancy disruption use, the drug has been held hostage by the right wing.

If this amendment passes, it would prevent further testing of drugs such as mifepristone that have the potential to treat millions of Americans for other medical conditions.

Delaying this drug is not an option. Think of what this will do to women with fibroid tumors. Think of what this will do to seniors with glaucoma. Think of what this will do to people with brain tumors.

And even worse, there is a very dangerous precedent being set today. Even those who disagree about whether RU–486 should or should not be approved, should be highly concerned by the precedent being set by this outrageous amendment.

Congress established the Food and Drug Administration to be an independent agency to test and approve drugs and devices. We should allow them to do their work without interference from the Congress. Science, not abortion politics, should dictate the type of drugs the FDA tests.

I strongly urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. DAN MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes:

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I was prepared to offer four amendments to this agriculture appropriations bill to highlight the absurdity of the US sugar program.

On Thursday, this Congress debated an amendment that would have limited the fleecing of taxpayers by the sugar program to $54 million. However, a point of order technically prevented a vote on that matter.

I did not proceed with the other three amendments in the interest of comity to move the legislative business of the House. However, I also did not offer because it became apparent that the defenders of the sugar program do not want to clear debate on the merits of the US sugar policy, they want to muddy the waters about what this sugar program is doing to consumers.

For example, as you look at the arguments of the defenders of the sugar program, they say that the price of sugar has gone down but the costs of soda has not. That is like saying the cost of sugar has gone down but the costs of cars have not. Sodas made in the United States do not use Sugar! Read, the label, they use high fructose corn sweeteners. They have not used sugar in the US for a while because the sugar prices are so high. They do use sugar in sodas in countries like Mexico. I am both deeply disappointed and slightly amused that the defenders of the sugar program continue to use ''soda'' in their arguments.

Another area of their attack is that this General Accounting Office study which revealed a consumer cost of $1.9 billion is flawed. They say the USDA even thinks their analysis is flawed. Well let's look at the real facts. The GAO said they were going to do this study. They solicited input from the USDA for help in developing a model. USDA refused. The GAO got independent economic experts to come up with a sound consensus model to gauge the costs. They asked USDA for comment about it, USDA refused. Instead, what USDA has done, is engage in 20/20 hindsight without helping the process. I am very frustrated by the blatant politics by the USDA and would hope they would be more helpful to future efforts. The GAO is a non-partisan fact finding agency. They carefully researched this program for months, they offered a chance to comment to interested parties including USDA and the sugar growers, they brought in outside academic experts and economists to review GAO's model. The fact remains that the GAO sent the economic model to USDA for review and USDA provided no substantive comments.

What my opponents would have everyone believe is that the carefully researched and inclusive report on sugar by the non-partisan, unbiased GAO is somehow flawed. But they would have you believe that the USDA, whose mismanagement of the program has already cost taxpayers $54 million this year and may costs up to $500 million by year's end, and the American Sugar Alliance whose members enjoy federal benefits of over $1 billion per year are the ones with the correct, unbiased opinion on the costs and impacts of the sugar program.

Furthermore, GAO has already responded to the criticisms they did receive in the appendix of this same report, and I would submit that portion of the report containing GAO's response for the record.

The negative environmental impacts of the federal sugar program are real, even though my colleagues on the other side of the debate choose to conveniently ignore this fact. Nowhere have these impacts been felt with such devastating effect as in my home state of Florida where federally subsidized sugar production has played a huge role in the destruction of the Everglades. I would like to submit for the record this letter from ''The Everglades Trust'' an environmental group concerned about the status and future of this American treasure. The Everglades Trust and other environmental groups recognize the sugar program's terrible environmental legacy and support efforts to reform the program.

Finally, I am amazed that the defenders of the sugar program fail to state why we can have a free market for corn, for cars, for toothpicks, for televisions, etc. but we can't have a free market for sugar. Their ''sky is falling'' logic only shows how desperate the big sugar growers are to preserve a program that costs consumers $1.9 billion a year, costs the taxpayers millions in direct spending, destroys the Everglades, sends US jobs overseas, and seriously undermines our free trade efforts.

I remain confident that this body will wake up and end the stupid sugar program, and submit the following into the RECORD.

THE EVERGLADES TRUST,
Islamorada, FL, June 28, 2000.

Hon. DAN MILLER,
102 Cannon Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: When the FY 2001 Agriculture Appropriations legislation is considered by the House, we understand you will offer one or more amendments which involve the federal sugar program. We would strongly support an amendment to stop sugar purchases to boost market prices. By encouraging massive increases in sugar production in the Everglades Agricultural Area, the sugar program has caused immense damage to the Everglades. Boosting the already excessive market price for sugar will serve to make sugar's assault on the Everglades even worse. It is obvious, as the GAO has documented, that the sugar program forces consumers to pay far too much for sugar. To prop up sugar prices by huge purchases of sugar by the government is an outrageous use of Taxpayers' money and a continuation of the assault on America's Everglades.

Should you choose to offer an amendment to phase out or reform the existing sugar price support program, we would strongly endorse your effort. We believe the sugar program must be changed from the harmful price fixing scheme it is today. Congressman Miller, the sugar program has become a ''welfare'' program, and it is time to put a stop to it. We commend your courageous efforts to end a program which has cost the consumer and Taxpayers billions of wasted dollars and caused massive damage to the nation's Everglades.

Sincerely,

MARY BARLEY,
President, The Everglades Trust.

GAO COMMENTS

The following are GAO's comments on the American Sugar Alliance's (ASA) written response to our draft report dated May 5, 2000. Based on USDA and industry comments, we revised our model's final estimates to more fully account for certain transportation costs. As a result, cost and benefit estimates

referenced in ASA's comments do not reflect those contained in the final report.

1. We disagree that the methodology used in our 1993 report on the sugar program was flawed. Nonetheless, we developed a more comprehensive economic model for our current analysis, and while we acknowledge that no economic model completely depicts reality, we are convinced that our current model is methodologically sound and that the estimates yielded by our model are reasonable. In developing the model, we took a number of actions to ensure that it was methodologically sound. First, we contracted with a well-known expert in modeling the international trade of agricultural commodities and with a prominent agricultural economist to work with us in developing the model. In December 1999, we sent our proposed model to four outside academicians specializing in agricultural economics and international trade economics and revised the model in response to their comments. We also sent our proposed model to USDA for review at that time. However, USDA did not provide any comments. Furthermore, we asked two of the agricultural economists to review our final model and results before we sent our draft report to USDA, ASA, and the U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association for comment.

2. We disagree with ASA's assertion that our findings are based on comparisons with a meaningless world price. In estimating the costs and benefits of the sugar program, our model compared baseline domestic and world sugar prices with an estimate of the domestic and world prices that would have been observed if the sugar program had been eliminated, other things being equal. Regarding the extent to which cost reductions would be passed through to consumers in the absence of the sugar program, the report presents two estimates showing how the benefits might be distributed based on two different sets of pass-through assumptions. We did not predict the extent to which cost reductions would be passed through to final consumers. See comments 4 and 5.

COMMENDING STUDENTS OF THE WENONAH SCHOOL

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2000

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to praise 15 tremendous students in Mrs. Tracy Clemente's class at the Wenonah School. Mrs. Clemente's class has done a magnificent job of excelling in their school work. This is a splendid group of children and I wish the best of luck and continued success to Phillip Anzaldo, Ashley Archambo, Kevin Barnes, Daniel Barton, Nicholle, Cesarano, Ashley Cuthbert, Davied D'Alesandro, Christopher Goldhill, Chloe Grigri, Shane McHenry, Stephen McNally, Drew Peters, Edgar Seibert, Rachel Sole, and Matthew Thompson.

HONORING THE 1999 GOVERNOR'S EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION PROGRAM AWARD WINNERS

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2000

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the governor of Guam, Carl T.C. Gutierrez, acknowledges the hard work of government of Guam employees. The governor's employee recognition program, better known as the Excel Program, is the highest and most competitive employee awards bestowed by the governor—showcasing outstanding employees and programs within the government of Guam.

Local governmental agencies and departments participate in this program wherein awardees are chosen within each department's nominees for a number of occupational groups. These groups range from clerical to labor and trades to professional and technical positions. The various awards reflect individual and group performance, valor, sports, community service, cost savings, and integrity.

My sincerest congratulations go to the awardees. I urge them to keep up the good work. I am pleased to submit for the RECORD the names of this year's outstanding employees.

OUTSTANDING EMPLOYEES AND PROGRAMS IN 1999

GOVERNOR'S EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION PROGRAM

The Winners for Outstanding Performance in 1999

A. Inspiration and Encouragement

Small Dept/Agency—Cynthia R. Gogo, Administrative Assistant, Department of Military Affairs.

Medium Dept/Agency—Mary P. Weakley, Social Service Supervisor, Department of Mental Health & Substance Abuse.

Large Dept/Agency—Beatrice Aquino, Accounting Technician II, Guam Memorial Hospital Authority.

B. Silent Ones

Small Dept/Agency—David J. Rojas, Compliance Officer, Guam Economic Development Authority.

Medium Dept/Agency—Pedro Lipata, Clerk, Department of Labor.

Large Dept/Agency—Evelyn G. Sepulia, Special Diet Assistant, Guam Memorial Hospital Authority.

C. Community Service

Alejandro T. B. Lizama, Historic Preservation Specialist II, Department of Parks & Recreation.

D. Female Athlete of the Year

Catherine Taitague, Youth Service Worker I, Department of Youth Affairs.

E. Male Athlete of the Year

Clifford M. Raphael, Utility Worker, Guam Power Authority.

F. Sports Team of the Year

Guam Customs Baseball Team, Customs and Quarantine Agency.

G. Lifesaving

Patrick B. Tydingco, Airport Police Supervisor, Guam International Airport Authority.

H. Integrity

Zennia Pecina, Assistant Administrator of Nursing Services, Guam Memorial Hospital Authority.

I. Cost Savings/Innovative Idea

Small Dept/Agency—Joe Leon Guerrero, Special Projects Coordinator, Department of Military Affairs.

Medium Dept/Agency—Jumpstart Program, Department of Youth Affairs.

J. Recognition of Former Outstanding Employees

Jose L. Gumataotao, Program Coordinator III, Department of Youth Affairs.

K. Project/Program of the Year

Small Dept/Agency—Defense and State Memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA)/CERCLA Program, Guam Environmental Protection Agency.

Medium Dept/Agency—Contraband Enforcement Team, Customs and Quarantine Agency.

Large Dept/Agency—Guam Highway Patrol, Guam Police Department.

L. Unit of the Year

Small Dept/Agency—Accounting Division, Guam Economic Development Agency.

Medium Dept/Agency—Community Social Development Unit, Department of Youth Affairs.

Large Dept/Agency—Building Construction and Facility Maintenance Division, Department of Public Works.

M. Department of the Year

Small Dept/Agency—Bureau of Planning, Guam Environmental Protection Agency.

Medium Dept/Agency—Department of Youth Affairs.

Large Dept/Agency—Guam Police Department.

N. Employee of the Year

Typing and Secretarial—Doreen S. Fernandez, Word Processing Secretary II, University of Guam.

Keypunch and Computer Operations—Norbert J. Palomo, Computer Operations Specialist, Guam Power Authority.

Office Management and Miscellaneous Administrative—Louisa F. Marquez, Administrative Assistant, Department of Public Works.

Personnel Administration, Equal Employment and Public Information—Vivian D. Iglesias, Personnel Specialist I, Guam Power Authority.

Computer Programming and Analysis—Joycelyn Aguon, Computer Systems Analyst I, Guam Housing & Urban Renewal Authority.

Employment Service and Related—Greg S. Massey, Employment Development Worker II, Department of Labor.

Youth Service & Related—Jose Quinata, Youth Service Worker I, Department of Youth Affairs.

Public Safety—Joseph S. Carbullido, Police Officer III, Guam Police Department.

Security and Correction—Joseph A. Torres, Guard, Department of Public Works.

Technical and Professional Engineering—Bruce Meno, Engineering Aide II, Guam Housing and Urban Renewal Authority.

Planning—Charles H. Ada II, Planner I, Department of Military Affairs.

Wildlife, Biology, Agriculture Science and Related—Anna Maria Leon Guerrero, Biologist I, Guam Environmental Protection Agency.

Nursing and Dental Hygiene—Rizalina Fernandez, Staff Nurse I, Guam Memorial Hospital Authority.

General Domestic and Food Service—Fred Balecha, Cook I, Guam Memorial Hospital Authority.

Custodial—Luisa Bainco, Building Custodian, University of Guam.

Labor, Grounds and Maintenance—Norbert J. Iriarte, Auto Service Worker I, Department of Public Works.

Equipment Operation and Related—Wayne D. San Nicolas, Cargo Checker, Port Authority of Guam.

Mechanical and Metal Trades—John R. Manibusan, Heavy Equipment Operator Leader I, Guam Power Authority.

Building Trades—Paul T. Cruz, Stage/Maintenance Technician, Guam Council on the Arts and Humanities Agency.

Power System Electrical—Anthony P. Cruz, Electric Power System Dispatcher II, Guam Power Authority.

Electronics and Related Technical—Vicente A. Aguero, Computer Technician Leader, Guam Power Authority.