Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—12

Doggett
Engel
Granger
Houghton
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Lipinski
Pickering
Schaffer
Taylor (NC)
Towns

□ 1846

So the motion to instruct conferees was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOBSON, WALSH, MILLER of Florida, and ADERHOLT, Ms. GRANGER, Messrs. GOODE, SKEEN, VITTER, YOUNG of Florida, OLVER, EDWARDS, FARR of California, BOYD, DICKS and OBEY.

There was no objection.

□ 1845

## ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 249) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 249

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be and are hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Judiciary: Mr. Bryant to rank after Mr. Goodlatte; and Mr. Pence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). 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.

## SUPPORT A REASONABLE LIMIT ON FARM PRICE SUPPORT PAYMENTS

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will be taking up the agricultural bill for agricultural programs for the next 10 years.

Farmers are in a predicament right now in terms of low commodity prices. In fact, some of those commodity prices are the lowest they have been in 20 years. So we are seeing a lot of farmers go out of business, go into bankruptcy, especially because the land value for recreational use, for use by people that want a country estate, is bidding up those land values far more than can be accommodated by current commodity prices for those farm products those farmers are producing.

The question this Nation is facing is do we want to maintain a strong agricultural industry in the United States so that we do not have to be dependent on importing our foodstuffs, our feed, our food, like, for example, we have in energy. We have increased our dependence on petroleum energy to the extent that if OPEC and those countries that send petroleum energy to this country decided to cut off that available supply, we would at least temporarily see our economy collapse, because right now, we are importing almost 58 percent of our total energy supplies. I think it is important that we do not let that happen to agriculture.

Tomorrow, I have an amendment on the agricultural bill that I think will reduce some of the criticism that some Members in this Chamber have of the agricultural farm programs and the payments, Federal payments, the subsidy payments that are made to agriculture. That amendment puts a real limit on how much any one farmer can receive from Federal Government programs in terms of price-support subsidy.

Right now, the limit for price supports is said to be $150,000 per year per farmer. Actually, it is a hoodwinking to suggest that there is a limit, a real limit of $150,000, because what we have in farm programs, and it is somewhat complex, but in price supports, there are four ways that a farmer can achieve the benefits of the price-support program: one is loan deficiency payments; the second is marketing loans; the third is derived from a nonrecourse where the farmer can take out a loan on the commodity and give the Government title to that commodity and receive the same benefits as if they were getting an LDP or a marketing loan. So what they do is an end run, if you will, around the $150,000 limitation, and that $150,000 limitation is reasonable in terms of the acreage that any normal family farm in this country produces.

Let me give my colleagues an example. The average farm in this country is approximately 500 acres in size; but $150,000, based on the last 2 years, one would need to have 6,000 acres of corn, 6,200 acres of soybeans, and 17,000 acres of cotton and, likewise, 1,300 acres of rice to accommodate that limitation of $150,000. Yet, our technical language of this farm bill that we will be taking up tomorrow says any farmer that is big enough, and there are 30,000-, 40,000-, 80,000-acre farms; in fact, in Florida, there is one landowner that owns 130,000 acres, receiving over $1 million in government benefits.

My amendment that I hope this body will consider tomorrow sets a real limit by saying it is not only loan deficiency payments and marketing loans, but it includes limitations on the benefits from certificates and forfeitures from that nonrecourse loan. It is reasonable. It saves, according to the CBO, $520 million over the life of this farm program. That money would be better spent with the kind of farmers that need the help most, and that is the average family farm in this country.

SUPPORT A REASONABLE LIMIT ON FARM PRICE SUPPORT PAYMENTS

(The Associated Press reported recently that over 154 individuals received more than $1 million in farm aid last year! Limit massive government payments to the largest recipients—Vote for the Smith/Clayton/Holden/Armey/Shays/McInnis payment limitation amendment to the Farm Bill!)

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Over the years, Congress has established caps on the amount of money a producer can receive from federal farm program price supports. Unfortunately, these payment ''limits'' on loan deficiency payments, LDPs, have easily been avoided by the unlimited use of commodity certificates, which give the farmer the same dollar benefit as an LDP. In fact, a CRS report on commodity certificates stated that, ''while purported to discourage commodity forfeitures, certificates effectively serve to circumvent the payment limitation.'' (CRS Report 98–744 ENR)

My amendment would establish a REAL PAYMENT CAP by including commodity certificates among the methods of price support that are limited. The Congressional Budget Office has scored this amendment as saving $528 million over the life of the Farm Bill.

The limitation in this amendment will only affect the very largest of recipients. For instance, the average acreage it would have taken to reach this limit in the last two crop years was over 6,000 acres of corn and soybeans, 1,950 acres of cotton, and 13,000 acres