

news

November 24, 2003

<http://www.fb.org/fbn/>

Vol. 82, No. 22

In This Issue

The Ag Agenda: A banner year for FB (still) hangs in the balance

2

Key Senate votes on Farm Bureau policy issues

3

Key House votes on Farm Bureau policy issues

4

Key House votes on Farm Bureau policy issues

5

Key House votes on Farm Bureau policy issues

6

Farm Bureau calls for WTO case on biotech labeling

7

Farm Bureau spotlights 'Harvest for All' campaign

8

Corner Post



A traditional Thanksgiving feast for 10 costs more this year than last, but at an average cost of just \$36.28, it's still a good buy. See story on page 8.

Senate delays final energy bill

After only one hour of debate, the House on Nov. 18 passed the final version of comprehensive energy legislation on a 246-180 vote. The bill was introduced in the Senate that same day, but a Nov. 21 Senate vote to limit debate on the bill failed, 57-40, three votes short of the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture.

The failure of the cloture vote opens the door for a continuing attempt to filibuster the bill. But Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist (R-Tenn.) at the last minute changed his vote to oppose cloture so he could bring up another cloture motion early this week. Before Frist changed his vote, energy bill supporters were only two votes short.

"The Senate's failure to move forward with a strategic and comprehensive energy bill deals a harsh blow to America's farmers and our goal of producing more home-grown renewable fuel to help meet America's energy needs," said American Farm Bureau Federation President Bob Stallman after the failed cloture vote. "Farm Bureau will continue to push this issue and will work with all our allies for another vote before the Senate leaves town. America's energy future simply has too much at stake."

Stallman, in a recent letter to members of Congress, said the Energy

Policy Act of 2003 (H.R. 6) would carve out a larger role for America's home-grown renewable fuels and in the pro-

cess create thousands of new jobs, strengthen the economy, cut U.S. de-

See Energy, page 2



PAL class of 2003

Participants in the 2003 Partners in Agricultural Leadership (PAL) awards program visited Washington, D.C., in early November for public policy development training. The PAL program, sponsored by Farm Bureau and Altria Group Inc., through its Shared Solutions Agricultural Initiative, works with former AFBF Young Farmer and Rancher participants to develop leadership skills and train spokespersons for agriculture. The PAL class of 2003 includes (left to right) Matt Lohr, David Nixon, Kerry Wayne Gibson, Amanda Heisner, Thad Willis, Bryan Boll, Carrie Bolt, Marshall Bennett Jr., Lauren Clemmons and Kirk Thomsen.

USTR announces new trade talks

U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick last week notified Congress of the administration's intent to negotiate free trade agreements (FTAs) with five more countries in addition to a handful of agreements that are already in the works.

The administration plans to launch negotiations with Panama, as well as Colombia and Peru under the umbrella of Andean countries, in the second quarter of next year. Ecuador and Bolivia could be included in the Andean agreement later on.

Negotiating an FTA with Panama will help strengthen democracy and support "shared fundamental values" throughout the Western Hemisphere, USTR said in a news release. The agency also said an FTA with Panama will complement the ongoing negotiations on a Central America Free Trade Agree-

ment (CAFTA) and the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA).

"An FTA will also help foster economic growth and create higher paying jobs in the United States by further reducing and eliminating remaining barriers to trade and investment between Panama and the United States," Zoellick said in notifying Congress of the administration's intent to initiate the negotiations. "Additionally, it will enable us to address specific barriers to U.S. goods and services in Panama, including high tariffs on certain agricultural goods, restrictive licensing practices and inadequate levels of regulatory transparency."

Reasons USTR gave for beginning trade talks with the four Andean countries included helping the countries combat trafficking in narcotics, building democratic institutions and pro-

moting socio-economic development. The Andean region produces practically all of the world's cocaine and a hefty portion of its heroin, according to the State Department.

The four countries already have special trade terms with the United States under the Andean Trade Preferences Act, which Congress passed in 1991 and renewed in 2002; it expires at the end of 2006. The law eliminates, or in some cases reduces, tariffs on certain products exported by the Andean countries to create economic alternatives to narcotics production.

Zoellick said an FTA with the Andean countries would also "provide export opportunities for U.S. agriculture, industry and service providers."

Panama and the four Andean countries have worked closely with the

See USTR, page 2

VIEWPOINT

A banner year for FB (still) hangs in the balance

Farmers and ranchers always like to examine their financial bottom lines as the year winds down. The American Farm Bureau Federation also likes to take stock of our progress, but even as this calendar year is drawing to a close, it still looks a little early for us to gauge fully the progress we have made in 2003.

Thanks to the stellar work of our state Farm Bureaus and our grassroots members across the nation, AFBF has come a long way this year on a number of important public policy issues. Many of our year-end victories, however, are yet to be realized.

As I write this column, lawmakers in Washington still have not quite wrapped up their work for the first year of the 108th Congress. Normally, they would have finished their work by now, which would have made it easier for me to write with finality about the outcome of some of our legislative efforts on behalf of America's farm and ranch families.

But, even if the fate of some bills remains unresolved when Congress breaks, lawmakers will pick up right where they left off when they return to Washington early next year. That's why I am looking down the road with a high degree of optimism.

I can tell you with certainty that pro-



tecting the integrity of the 2002 farm bill through the appropriations process is one of AFBF's greatest priorities. Whenever and wherever possible, we strive to present agriculture's viewpoint accurately throughout the process. As of this writing, funding for most major programs in the farm bill remained intact. But, this is a battle we will have to fight each and every year. We will be ready.

We also appear on track to reform what our studies show is a failed U.S. energy policy, which is perhaps the single largest cause for the nation's current energy and natural gas crisis. AFBF estimates the current policy resulted in your paying between \$1 billion and \$2 billion more in 2003 just to plant your crops.

With that in mind, AFBF devoted considerable resources to securing an energy bill that will keep fertilizer, natural gas and other farm inputs at affordable prices. Finding new markets for homegrown fuels like ethanol and biodiesel is also a continuing priority. As this was written, House-Senate conferees had just approved a conference report on the bill, which was followed by full House approval of the measure. Neither political party wants to leave farmers a lump of coal this Christmas, so we're somewhat optimistic that the Senate will follow suit and approve the bill before adjourning for the year.

Also hanging in the balance is the fate of important new legislation that would protect our nation's federally

owned forests. As of mid-November that measure remains in a House-Senate conference. The good news is that the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill are not great, which makes it more likely that any differences should be quickly resolved so the bill can move to the president's desk for signature.

The CARE Act of 2003 is another piece of legislation that remains in limbo because of a temporary roadblock related to the House-Senate conference on the bill. AFBF worked hard to ensure passage of the bill in the House and Senate. Once the political arguments die down, we're confident this bill will successfully make its way through the conference process.

The CARE Act will create incentives to allow all farmers and ranchers to deduct the costs and value of food donated to hunger-relief charities, regardless of how their farming businesses are organized. We estimate the amount of food provided to needy people will increase by 878 million new meals over the next 10 years.

With your help, we can push these issues across the finish line, either now or early in 2004. I am confident, however, that at least one or two of these packages will be gift-wrapped in time for the holiday season.

Energy bill passed in House, stalled in Senate

continued from page 1

pendence on foreign oil and help protect the environment.

Of particular importance to farmers is a renewable fuels provision that would set an initial standard for ethanol and biodiesel use at 3.1 billion gallons per year for 2005. That standard increases to 5 billion gallons per year by 2012. The report also includes a federal phaseout of the environmen-

tally harmful gasoline additive methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), which in several states has been found to pollute groundwater.

"The renewable fuels standard will function as a significant economic stimulus for rural America by creating the need for an estimated \$5.3 billion in rural capital investments and 214,000 new jobs," Stallman said. "It is also estimated that the RFS will add

\$4.5 billion annually to net farm income and decrease our trade deficit by \$34 billion."

The legislation also does away with the current tax credit for ethanol-blended gasoline. Ethanol-blended gasoline currently has a 5.2 cents-per-gallon exemption from the 18.4-cent motor fuel tax, reducing Highway Trust Fund receipts. Under the Farm Bureau-supported provision, ethanol-

blended gasoline would be taxed the same 18.4 cents-per-gallon as regular gasoline; however, a tax refund would be paid from the general fund to ethanol refiners and blenders.

"When weighing this comprehensive energy legislation in its entirety," Stallman said, "there will undoubtedly be a tremendous positive benefit to rural America and the agricultural community."

USTR announces two new free trade agreements

continued from page 1

United States "to advance our common values and objectives" in the World Trade Organization and FTAA negotiations, Zoellick said.

Zoellick said two months ago, after the failure of a WTO ministerial meeting in Cancun, Mexico, that the

United States would move forward with free trade talks with "can-do" countries, meaning those countries that were more willing to negotiate in Cancun. The Cancun meeting, which was to be a turning point in the current round of multilateral WTO negotiations, ended without agreement because several developing countries insisted that developed countries reduce farm subsidies but did not offer anything in return.

According to trade data from the U.S. Agriculture Department, Panama was a \$185 million market for U.S. agricultural exports in 2002; Colombia, \$520 million; Peru, \$214 million; Ecuador, \$143 million; and Bolivia, \$19 million. Panama exported a little over \$35 million in agricultural products to the

United States last year; Colombia, \$929 million; Peru, \$246 million; Ecuador, \$505 million; and Bolivia, \$21 million.

FTAs the United States is already negotiating include the CAFTA, FTAA,

Australia FTA, Morocco FTA, South Africa Customs Union FTA and Bahrain FTA. President Bush signed FTAs with Chile last June and with Singapore last May.

FB NEWSWATCH

Health savings accounts

Congress is expected to vote soon on a Medicare and prescription drug benefit bill (H.R. 1) that also includes Farm Bureau-supported Health Savings Accounts (HSAs). HSAs would allow individuals to set aside income tax-free in order to pay medical expenses.

Farm Bureau
news

(ISSN 0197-5617)

Published semimonthly, except monthly in August and December, by the American Farm Bureau Federation, 600 Maryland Ave., SW, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20024. Phone: 202-406-3600. E-mail: fbnews@fb.com. Web site: <http://www.fb.org>.

Periodical postage paid at Washington, D.C., and additional mailing offices. Subscription rate for officers and board members of county and state Farm Bureaus—\$6, which is deducted from dues. For other subscribers—\$10.

Postmaster: Send address changes to *Farm Bureau News*, 600 Maryland Ave., SW, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20024.

Joseph S. Fields, Public Relations Director
Don Lipton, Deputy Director
Lynne Finnerty, Editor
Jaime Naig, Assistant Editor
Phyllis Brown, Assistant Editor



Key Senate votes on Farm Bureau priority issues

(1) **ANWR**—March 19—The Senate passed, 52-48, an amendment to concurrent resolution 95 on the fiscal 2004 budget. The amendment, offered by Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.), prevents oil exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Farm Bureau favored a “nay” (N) vote.

(2) **Estate tax**—March 20—With a 51-48 vote, the Senate passed an amendment to concurrent resolution 23 on the budget for fiscal 2004. The amendment, offered by Sen. Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.), provides \$46 billion to pay for repealing the estate tax in 2009, a year earlier than under current law. Farm Bureau favored a “yea” (Y) vote.

(3) **CARE**—April 9—The Senate approved, 95-5, legislation (S. 476) that would give tax breaks and other help to farmers who donate food to charities. Farm Bureau favored a “yea” (Y) vote.

(4) **Energy**—June 5—With a 68-28 vote, the Senate approved an amendment to the Senate energy bill (S. 14) to increase production of renewable fuels. Sens. Bill Frist (R-Tenn.) and Tom Daschle (D-S.D.) offered the amendment. Farm Bureau favored a “yea” (Y) vote.

(5) **Energy**—June 12—The Senate rejected, 44-54, an amendment to strike from the Senate energy bill a require-

ment to inventory oil and natural gas resources in the Outer Continental Shelf. Sen. Bob Graham (D-Fla.) offered the amendment. Farm Bureau favored a “nay” (N) vote.

(6) **Energy**—July 31—The Senate approved, 84-14, the energy bill (H.R. 6), including a renewable fuels standard. Farm Bureau favored a “yea” (Y) vote.

(7) **Climate change**—Oct. 30—The Senate rejected, 43-45, an amendment to S. 139, the Climate Stewardship Act, to provide research on climate change, impose mandatory limits on carbon dioxide emissions and mandatory carbon reporting and trading. Sen. Joe

Lieberman (D-Conn.) offered the amendment. Farm Bureau favored a “nay” (N) vote.

(8) **Healthy forests**—Oct. 30—The Senate passed, 80-14, the Healthy Forests Restoration Act (H.R. 1904). Farm Bureau favored a “yea” (Y) vote.

(9) **Labeling**—Nov. 6—The Senate rejected, 36-58, a motion to table the Daschle amendment to H.R. 2673, the agriculture appropriations bill. The amendment was a sense-of-the-Senate resolution urging conferees on the bill to maintain mandatory country-of-origin labeling of red meat. Farm Bureau favored a “nay” (N) vote.

Name Party	Vote	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ALABAMA										
Sessions (R)		N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N	Y	N
Shelby (R)		N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	?	N	
ALASKA										
Murkowski (R)		N	Y	Y	?	N	Y	N	Y	N
Stevens (R)		N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	
ARIZONA										
Kyl (R)		N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N	Y	y
McCain (R)		y	n	Y	n	y	n	y	Y	Y
ARKANSAS										
Lincoln (D)		y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	y
Pryor (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	N	Y	Y
CALIFORNIA										
Boxer (D)		y	n	Y	n	y	n	y	Y	N
Feinstein (D)		y	n	Y	n	y	n	y	Y	N
COLORADO										
Allard (R)		N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N	Y	y
Campbell (R)		N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	?
CONNECTICUT										
Dodd (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	n	N
Lieberman (D)		y	n	Y	Y	?	?	?	?	?
DELAWARE										
Biden (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	n	N
Carper (D)		y	n	Y	Y	N	Y	y	n	N
FLORIDA										
Graham (D)		y	n	Y	?	y	Y	y	Y	N
Nelson (D)		y	Y	Y	Y	y	Y	Y	Y	y
GEORGIA										
Chambliss (R)		N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	y
Miller (D)		N	?	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	?
HAWAII										
Akaka (D)		N	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	Y	N
Inouye (D)		N	n	Y	?	N	Y	y	Y	N
IDAHO										
Craig (R)		N	Y	n	Y	N	Y	N	Y	y
Crapo (R)		N	Y	n	Y	N	Y	N	Y	y
ILLINOIS										
Durbin (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	n	y
Fitzgerald (R)		y	Y	Y	y	Y	N	Y	Y	y

Name Party	Vote	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
INDIANA										
Bayh (D)		y	n	Y	Y	N	Y	y	n	y
Lugar (R)		N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	y	Y	Y
IOWA										
Grassley (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Harkin (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	n	N
KANSAS										
Brownback (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	y
Roberts (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	y
KENTUCKY										
Bunning (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	y
McConnell (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	y
LOUISIANA										
Breaux (D)		N	n	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Landrieu (D)		N	n	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
MAINE										
Collins (R)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	Y	N
Snowe (R)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	Y	N
MARYLAND										
Mikulski (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	Y	N
Sarbanes (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	Y	N
MASSACHUSETTS										
Kennedy (D)		y	n	Y	n	y	n	y	n	N
Kerry (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	?	y	?	?
MICHIGAN										
Levin (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	N	Y	N
Stabenow (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	Y	N
MINNESOTA										
Coleman (R)		y	Y	Y	Y	y	Y	N	Y	y
Dayton (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	Y	N
MISSISSIPPI										
Cochran (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	y
Lott (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
MISSOURI										
Bond (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	y
Talent (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	y
MONTANA										
Baucus (D)		y	n	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Burns (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N

Name Party	Vote	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
NEBRASKA										
Hagel (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Nelson (D)		y	Y	Y	N	Y	?	?	N	
NEVADA										
Ensign (R)		N	Y	Y	?	N	Y	N	Y	N
Reid (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	Y	N
NEW HAMPSHIRE										
Gregg (R)		N	Y	Y	n	y	Y	y	Y	N
Sununu (R)		N	Y	Y	n	y	n	N	Y	?
NEW JERSEY										
Corzine (D)		y	n	Y	n	y	Y	y	Y	y
Lautenberg (D)		y	n	Y	n	y	n	y	Y	y
NEW MEXICO										
Bingaman (D)		y	n	Y	Y	N	Y	y	Y	N
Domenici (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
NEW YORK										
Clinton (D)		y	n	Y	n	y	n	y	n	N
Schumer (D)		y	n	Y	n	y	n	y	n	N
NORTH CAROLINA										
Dole (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	y	Y	N	Y	y
Edwards (D)		y	n	Y	Y	?	Y	?	?	?
NORTH DAKOTA										
Conrad (D)		y	n	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Dorgan (D)		y	n	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
OHIO										
Dewine (R)		y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Voinovich (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	y
OKLAHOMA										
Inhofe (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	y
Nickles (R)		N	Y	n	n	N	Y	N	Y	y
OREGON										
Smith (R)		y	Y	Y	Y	y	Y	N	Y	N
Wyden (D)		y	Y	Y	n	y	n	y	Y	N
PENNSYLVANIA										
Santorum (R)		N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N	Y	y
Specter (R)		N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N	Y	N
RHODE ISLAND										
Chafee (R)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	Y	y
Reed (D)		y	n	Y	n	y	n	y	n	N

Name Party	Vote	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
SOUTH CAROLINA										
Graham (R)		N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N	Y	N
Hollings (D)		y	n	Y	n	y	Y	y	?	N
SOUTH DAKOTA										
Daschle (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	Y	N
Johnson (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	Y	N
TENNESSEE										
Alexander (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Frist (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	y
TEXAS										
Cornyn (R)		N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N	Y	y
Hutchison (R)		N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N	Y	y
UTAH										
Bennett (R)		N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N	Y	y
Hatch (R)		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	y
VERMONT										
Jeffords (I)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	n	N
Leahy (D)		y	n	Y	n	y	Y	y	n	N
VIRGINIA										
Allen (R)		N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N	Y	y
Warner (R)		N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N	Y	N
WASHINGTON										
Cantwell (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	n	y	n	N
Murray (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	n	y	Y	N
WEST VIRGINIA										
Byrd (D)		y	n	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Rockefeller (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	n	N
WISCONSIN										
Feingold (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	n	y	Y	N
Kohl (D)		y	n	Y	Y	y	Y	y	Y	N
WYOMING										
Enzi (R)		N	Y	n	n	N	Y	N	Y	N
Thomas (R)		N	Y	n	n	N	Y	N	Y	N

LEGEND: Y, y — yea
N, n — nay
? — not voting



Key House votes on Farm Bureau priority issues

(1) **Ag spending**—March 21—The House passed, 215-212, concurrent resolution 95 on the fiscal 2004 budget. The resolution instructs the Agriculture Department to reduce spending on mandatory farm programs authorized in the 2002 farm bill by \$18.6 billion between 2004 and 2013. Farm Bureau favored a “nay” (N) vote.

(2) **Energy**—April 10—The House defeated, 197-228, an amendment to strike the provision in the energy bill (H.R. 6) that would allow oil and gas exploration, development and production in Alaska’s Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR). The amendment was sponsored by Rep. Edward Markey (D-Mass.). The American Farm Bureau Federation supports the opening of ANWR to environmentally sound exploration and production of oil and gas, as instability of current energy prices negatively affects agricultural production. American farmers spent \$1 billion to \$2 billion more this year than last on fuel and natural gas to complete the planting season. Farm Bureau favored a “nay” (N) vote.

(3) **Energy**—April 11—With a vote of 247-175, the House approved the Energy Policy Act of 2003 (H.R. 6). The legislation included a renewable fuels standard to increase the use of ethanol and biodiesel and permitted oil and gas exploration, development and production in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska. The House renewable fuels provision required the U.S. fuel supply to consist of 2.7 billion gallons of renewable fuels by 2005, reaching 5 billion gallons by 2015. The bill also contained \$18.7 billion in tax breaks and other incentives, \$6.7 billion of which is for promotion of alternative fuels and energy conservation. AFBF supports a balanced national energy agenda that contains renewable energy allowances and a significant increase in the domestic production of oil and gas supplies to help meet the energy needs of America’s growing economy and population, all while providing a more reliable, affordable and environmentally responsible energy supply. Farm Bureau favored a “yea” (Y) vote.

(4) **Tax cuts**—May 9—The House approved, 222-203, the Jobs and Growth Reconciliation Tax Act of 2003 (H.R. 2). The bill would cut taxes \$550 billion over the next 10 years. It would reduce the capital gains tax rate from the current rate of 20 or 10 percent, depending on income, to 15 or 5 percent. The bill also increases from \$25,000 to \$100,000 the amount of business expenses that small businesses, including farms, could deduct from their taxable income each year. Businesses could also write off as depreciation half the cost of certain capital investments, such as farm equipment, in the year of purchase. The bill also reduces individual income tax rates, increases the Alternative Minimum Tax exemption by \$7,500 for individuals and by \$15,000 for joint filers, increases the child tax credit from \$500 to \$1,000 per child and reduces the so-called marriage penalty. Farm Bureau favored a “yea” (Y) vote.

(5) **Healthy forests**—May 20—With a 184-239 vote, the House defeated an amendment offered by Reps. George Miller (D-Calif.) and Peter DeFazio (D-Ore.) that would have restricted the scope of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act (H.R. 1904) to forests that are more heavily populated, or areas that are commonly called the “wildland-urban interface.” The amend-

ment would have eliminated the bill’s language that is meant to reduce insect and disease infestations and invasive species in forests. Farm Bureau favored a “nay” (N) vote.

(6) **Healthy forests**—May 20—The House approved, 256-170, the Healthy Forests Restoration Act (H.R. 1904) to lower the occurrence of catastrophic forest fires, improve range and grazing conditions, help protect private forest acres from fire and improve water quality and quantity originating from federal forests. Farm Bureau favored a “yea” (Y) vote.

(7) **Tax cuts**—May 22—By a vote of 231-200, the House approved the Jobs and Growth Reconciliation Tax Act (H.R. 2) conference report. The bill reduces capital gains taxes, increases the amount of business expenses a small business can deduct on its taxes, defers capital gains taxes on any profit from selling cattle due to natural disasters and increases the child tax credit and the standard deduction for married couples filing jointly. Farm Bureau favored a “yea” (Y) vote.

(8) **Estate tax**—June 18—The House rejected, 188-239, a substitute amendment offered by Rep. Earl Pomeroy (D-N.D.) to the Death Tax Repeal Permanency Act (H.R. 8). The amendment would have increased the estate tax exemption from the current \$1 million per person to \$3 million per person beginning Jan. 1, 2004, rather than repealing estate taxes fully and permanently. Farm Bureau policy calls for permanent repeal of federal estate taxes, not increased exemptions. Therefore, Farm Bureau favored a “nay” (N) vote.

(9) **Estate tax**—June 18—With a vote of 264-163, the House approved the Death Tax Repeal Permanency Act of 2003 (H.R. 8). The bill, offered by Reps. Jennifer Dunn (R-Wash.) and Bud Cramer (D-Ala.), would repeal estate taxes permanently. Under current laws, death taxes are repealed in 2010, but they will be reinstated in full in 2011 unless Congress votes before then to repeal the tax permanently. Farm Bureau favored a “yea” (Y) vote.

(10) **Health insurance**—June 19—The House approved, 262-162, the Small Business Health Fairness Act of 2003 (H.R. 660) to allow association health plans (AHPs). The bill, offered by Rep. Ernie Fletcher (R-Ky.), would allow farmers and small businesses, which face rising health premium costs, to join together across state lines through associations like Farm Bureau in order to obtain health insurance coverage at lower group rates. AHPs would give small employers and self-employed workers advantages similar to those enjoyed by large employers, and reduce farmers’ health insurance costs. Farm Bureau favored a “yea” (Y) vote.

(11) **Health savings**—June 26—The House approved the Health Savings Account Availability Act of 2003 (H.R. 2596) by a vote of 237-191. The bill would allow individuals to accumulate savings to pay out-of-pocket medical expenses without having to pay taxes on those savings. Contributions to the Health Savings Accounts (HSAs) and Health Savings Security Accounts (HSSAs) created under the bill would be tax deductible and tax exempt. Individuals with health insurance but with annual deductibles of \$1,000 to \$2,500 would be eligible to have an HSA, while HSSAs would be for uninsured individuals or those

with annual deductibles of \$500 for self-coverage and \$1,000 for family coverage. Farm Bureau favored a “yea” (Y) vote.

(12) **Meat labeling**—July 14—With a vote of 193-208, the House rejected an amendment to the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2004 (H.R. 2673) to remove language from the bill that prohibits the Agriculture Department from using funds appropriated in the bill to implement mandatory country-of-origin labeling for meat. Reps. Dennis Rehberg (R-Mont.) and Darlene Hooley (D-Ore.) offered the amendment. Farm Bureau favored a “yea” (Y) vote.

(13) **Public land leases**—July 17—The House rejected, 197-228, an amendment to the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2004 (H.R. 2691) that would have prevented the renewal of farming leases on the Klamath National Wildlife Refuge. Rep. Earl Blumenauer (D-Ore.) offered the amendment. Farm Bureau favored a “nay” (N) vote.

(14) **Cuba travel**—Sept. 9—With a vote of 227-188, the House approved an amendment that would ease restrictions on U.S. citizens traveling to Cuba. Rep. Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.) offered the amendment to the Transportation, Treasury and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act of 2004 (H.R. 2989). The amendment would require the Treasury Department to approve travel for Americans who plan to visit Cuba to facilitate sales of U.S. agricultural products. Sales of food products to Cuba have been allowed since 2000, when Congress enacted the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act. Although Cuba did not begin purchasing U.S. food until late 2001, sales of wheat, corn, rice, soybeans and dairy and poultry products quickly grew in 2002 and could reach \$200 million by the end of this year. In addition to facilitating future agricultural sales, Farm Bureau believes easing the 41-year-old travel ban would increase demand in Cuba for high-quality U.S. food products, and help bring freedom and democracy to the Cuban people through increased interaction with Americans. Farm Bureau favored a “yea” (Y) vote.

(15) **Energy**—Oct. 15—The House passed, 229-182, a motion to instruct conferees on the energy bill (H.R. 6) to oppose language in the Senate bill that allows the collection of information regarding U.S. energy resources in the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). Rep. Lois Capps (D-Calif.) offered the motion. The motion was in response to an attempt by Sen. Pete Domenici (R-N.M.) to include in the energy bill conference report a Senate-passed provision that would allow for a natural gas inventory study of the OCS. Inventory study proponents claim that policy-makers need the information when making natural resources decisions. Opponents argue a study might jeopardize the decade-long moratorium on natural gas exploration in OCS areas. It has been estimated that nearly 100 trillion cubic feet of natural gas remains under the moratorium. Farm Bureau favored a “nay” (N) vote.

LEGEND: Y,y — yea N,n — nay
 ? — not voting * — Vacant
 S — Speaker



Key House votes on Farm Bureau priority issues

Name Party	Vote	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
ALABAMA																
1 Bonner (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	n	n	N		
2 Everett (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	?	N	Y	N			
3 Rogers (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	N			
4 Aderholt (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	?	N	n	n	N		
5 Cramer (D)	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	?	Y	Y	N			
6 Bachus (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	n	n	N		
7 Davis (D)	N	y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	Y	Y	Y		

Name Party	Vote	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
ALASKA																
AL Young (R)	y	?	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N		

Name Party	Vote	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
ARIZONA																
1 Renzi (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	N			
2 Franks (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	N			
3 Shadegg (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	N			
4 Pastor (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	n	y	Y	Y			
5 Hayworth (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	?			
6 Flake (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	Y	N		
7 Grijalva (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y				
8 Kolbe (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	Y	N		

Name Party	Vote	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
ARKANSAS																
1 Berry (D)	N	N	n	n	N	Y	n	y	Y	n	n	n	y	Y	Y	
2 Snyder (D)	?	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	n	n	n	Y	Y		
3 Boozman (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	Y	N		
4 Ross (D)	N	N	Y	n	N	Y	n	y	Y	n	n	n	y	Y	N	

Name Party	Vote	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
CALIFORNIA																
1 Thompson (D)	N	y	n	n	y	N	N	n	n	n	y	Y	Y			
2 Herger (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	Y	N		
3 Ose (R)	y	N	n	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	n	N			
4 Doolittle (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	?			
5 Matsui (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
6 Woolsey (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	?	Y					
7 Miller, George (D)	N	y	?	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
8 Pelosi (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	?	Y	Y				
9 Lee (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
10 Tauscher (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
11 Pombo (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	Y			
12 Lantos (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
13 Stark (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
14 Eshoo (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
15 Honda (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
16 Lofgren (D)	N	y	n	n	n	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
17 Farr (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
18 Cardoza (D)	N	n	n	y	N	Y	n	Y	n	Y	Y					
19 Radanovich (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	?			
20 Dooley (D)	N	N	Y	n	Y	n	Y	Y	n	Y	N					
21 Nunes (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	?			
22 Thomas (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	N			
23 Capps (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
24 Gallegly (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	Y			
25 McKeon (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	N			
26 Dreier (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	N			
27 Sherman (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
28 Berman (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
29 Schiff (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
30 Waxman (D)	N	y	?	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
31 Becerra (D)	N	y	n	n	n	n	n	n	?	Y	Y					
32 Solis (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
33 Watson (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
34 Roybal-Allard (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
35 Waters (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	?	Y	Y					
36 Harman (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
37 Millender-McDonald (R)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	?	?	Y	Y				
38 Napolitano (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
39 Sánchez, Linda (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
40 Royce (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	Y			
41 Lewis (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	N			
42 Miller, Gary (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	N			
43 Baca (D)	N	N	Y	n	Y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
44 Calvert (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	?			
45 Bono (R)	y	N	?	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	?				
46 Rohrabacher (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	N			
47 Sanchez, Loretta (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
48 Cox (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	Y			
49 Issa (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	Y	N		
50 Cunningham (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	Y			
51 Filner (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
52 Hunter (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	N			
53 Davis (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					

Name Party	Vote	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
COLORADO																
1 Degette (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y					
2 Udall (D)	?	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	Y	?	Y				
3 McClinnis (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	N			
4 Musgrave (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	N			
5 Hefley (R)	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	Y			

Name Party	Vote	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
6 Tancredo (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	n	n	N		
7 Beauprez (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	n	n	N		

Name Party	Vote	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
CONNECTICUT																
1 Larson (D)	N	y	n	n	?	n	n	n	n	n	n	Y	Y	Y		
2 Simmons (R)	y	Y	Y	n	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	n	Y				
3 Delauro (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	n	Y	Y				
4 Shays (R)	y	n	Y	n	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y					
5 Johnson (R)	N	y	n	Y	N	Y	N	n	Y	Y	Y	Y				

Name Party	Vote	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
DELAWARE																
AL Castle (R)	N	y	n	n	N	n	Y	Y	Y	n	n	N	Y	Y		

Name Party	Vote	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
FLORIDA																
1 Miller (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	n	Y			
2 Boyd (D)	N	n	n	?	N	Y	n	n	n	Y	n	Y	Y			



Key House votes on Farm Bureau priority issues

Name Party Vote 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

MISSISSIPPI															
1 Wicker (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	n	N	n	N		
2 Thompson (D)	N	N	n	n	N	n	y	n	n	n	Y	y	Y	y	
3 Pickering (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		
4 Taylor (D)	N	N	n	n	N	n	?n	Y	n	Y	y	Y	N		

MISSOURI

1 Clay (D)	N	?	n	n	y	n	n	Y	n	n	Y	?	?	?	
2 Akin (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
3 Gephardt (D)	N	?	?	n	?	n	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
4 Skelton (D)	N	N	n	n	N	n	y	Y	n	Y	y	n	N		
5 McCarthy (D)	?	?	?	n	y	n	n	n	Y	n	Y	y	Y		
6 Graves (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
7 Blunt (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
8 Emerson (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
9 Hulshof (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			

MONTANA

AL Rehberg (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		
----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	--

NEBRASKA

1 Bereuter (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	n	Y	Y	n	y	Y	N		
2 Terry (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N			
3 Osborne (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N			

NEVADA

1 Berkley (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	Y	n	Y	?	?	n	y	
2 Gibbons (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	n	N			
3 Porter (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1 Bradley (R)	y	y	n	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	y		
2 Bass (R)	y	y	n	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		

NEW JERSEY

1 Andrews (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	N	n	n	Y	y	n	y	
2 Lobiondo (R)	y	y	n	Y	n	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	n	y	n	y	
3 Saxton (R)	?	y	n	Y	n	Y	N	Y	Y	n	y	n	?		
4 Smith (R)	y	y	n	Y	n	Y	N	Y	?	Y	Y	n	y		
5 Garrett (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	n	N	n	N		
6 Pallone (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	Y	y	n	y		
7 Ferguson (R)	y	y	Y	Y	n	Y	N	Y	Y	n	?	n	y		
8 Pascrell (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	n	y	n	y		
9 Rothman (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	Y	n	Y	n	y	n		
10 Payne (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	?	y	Y	y		
11 Frelinghuysen (R)	y	y	n	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	y	n	y		
12 Holt (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	y	Y	y			
13 Menendez (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	y	n	y			

NEW MEXICO

1 Wilson (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		
2 Pearce (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	n	N		
3 Udall (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	y	Y	y			

NEW YORK

1 Bishop (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	y	Y	y			
2 Israel (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	Y	Y	n	Y	y	y		
3 King (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	n	N			
4 McCarthy (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	Y	n	Y	y	y			
5 Ackerman (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	Y	n	Y	n	y			
6 Meeks (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	Y	y	y			
7 Crowley (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	Y	y	Y	y				
8 Nadler (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	?	n	Y	y	Y			
9 Weiner (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	Y	y	Y			
10 Towns (D)	N	y	?	n	y	n	n	n	n	Y	?	y			
11 Owens (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	?	y	Y	y			
12 Velázquez (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	Y	n	Y	?	y			
13 Fossella (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	?				
14 Maloney (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	y	Y	y			
15 Rangel (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	?	y				
16 Serrano (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	?	y				
17 Engel (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	n	y				
18 Lowey (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	y	Y				
19 Kelly (R)	y	y	Y	Y	n	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	n	y			
20 Sweeney (R)	y	y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	n	?			
21 McNulty (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	?	n	Y	y				
22 Hinchey (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	?	y	Y				
23 McHugh (R)	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	n	?			
24 Boehlert (R)	y	y	n	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	y	Y			
25 Walsh (R)	y	y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	n	y			
26 Reynolds (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	n	n	N			
27 Quinn (R)	N	N	?	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	n	y			
28 Slaughter (R)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	y	Y	y			
29 Houghton (R)	N	?	?	n	N	Y	N	n	Y	n	n	Y	N		

NORTH CAROLINA

1 Ballance (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	Y	y	y			
2 Etheridge (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	N	Y	y			
3 Jones (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	n	y			

Name Party Vote 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

4 Price (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	n	y	Y	y		
5 Burr (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	y			
6 Coble (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
7 McIntyre (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	Y	Y	n	n	N	Y	y		
8 Hayes (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
9 Myrick (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	?	N	n	N			
10 Ballenger (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
11 Taylor (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
12 Watt (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	Y	y	Y	y		
13 Miller (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	y	Y	y			

NORTH DAKOTA

AL Pomeroy (D)	N	y	Y	n	y	Y	n	y	n	n	n	Y	N	Y	N
----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

OHIO

1 Chabot (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	y			
2 Portman (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	y			
3 Turner (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	?			
4 Oxley (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N			
5 Gillmor (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	y			
6 Strickland (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	y	Y	y			
7 Hobson (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
8 Boehner (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
9 Kaptur (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	y	Y	y			
10 Kucinich (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	y	?	?			
11 Jones (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	y	Y	?			
12 Tiberi (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N			
13 Brown (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	y	Y	y			
14 Latourette (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N			
15 Pryce (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
16 Regula (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	n	N			
17 Ryan (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	Y	n	Y	y	Y	y		
18 Ney (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N			

OKLAHOMA

1 Sullivan (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
2 Carson (D)	N	N	Y	n	y	n	N	Y	n	n	y	Y	N		
3 Lucas (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
4 Cole (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
5 Istook (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	n	N			

OREGON

1 Wu (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	N	n	y			
2 Walden (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	n	N			
3 Blumenauer (D)	N	y	?	n	y	n	n	n	n	Y	y	Y	y		
4 Defazio (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	Y	N	Y	y			
5 Hooley (D)	N	y	n	n	y	n	n	Y	n	Y	Y	N	Y	y	

PENNSYLVANIA

1 Brady (D)	N	N	Y	n	?	n	y	n	n	n	Y	y	Y	y	
2 Fattah (D)	N	y	?	n	y	n	n	n	n	n	Y	y	Y	y	
3 English (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
4 Hart (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
5 Peterson (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N			
6 Gerlach (R)	y	y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
7 Weldon (R)	y	?	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	Y	y	y			
8 Greenwood (R)	y	y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	Y	N			
9 Shuster (R)	y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	n	N	n	N			
10 Sherwood (R)	y														

Farm Bureau calls for WTO case on biotech labeling

The American Farm Bureau Federation is urging the Bush administration to challenge European Union rules that require biotech food and feed to be labeled as products of biotechnology. The rules violate World Trade Organization (WTO) obligations, AFBF said, and will cause U.S. agriculture significant loss of export sales.

AFBF and other agricultural groups plan to send a letter to U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick requesting that he engage the EU in a WTO dispute settlement proceeding concerning the labeling rules. If the administration were to pursue the case, a WTO dispute settlement panel would determine whether the EU rules are illegal and, if so, could authorize retaliatory

tariffs to pressure the EU to repeal the rules.

The EU on Oct. 18 published its labeling and traceability rules, which it called a prerequisite to lifting the five-year-old moratorium on approving agricultural biotech products for sale or planting in the EU. The rules establish a seemingly arbitrary threshold of 0.9 percent biotech content for foods to be labeled as containing ingredients whose genetic makeup has been modified from that of conventional ingredients.

AFBF said the labeling rules are just as trade-restrictive as the moratorium, if not more so, because they would affect even the few biotech products approved before the moratorium went

into place, and consumers could perceive the labels as warnings against consuming biotech foods.

AFBF and the other agricultural groups said the labeling rules clearly violate WTO commitments. WTO agreements concerning sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) protections—measures needed to protect the food supply and domestic plants and animals—as well as an agreement on technical barriers to trade require that protective measures not discriminate between imported and domestic product and not be overly restrictive to trade. The SPS agreement also requires that protective measures must be science-based. The groups said the EU's labeling and traceability rules run

afoul of the agreements on all those counts.

"It is important that the administration challenge the EU's new regulations in anticipation that other countries will come under pressure to adopt similar requirements and restrictions," the groups said in a letter to Zoellick.

If the administration were to initiate the WTO case, it would be the second formal U.S. challenge to the EU's policies on agricultural products of biotechnology. The United States in August, at the urging of Farm Bureau and other farm groups, initiated a dispute settlement proceeding against the EU's biotech moratorium. The dispute settlement panel has not yet rendered a decision in that case.

Decision on methyl bromide exemptions delayed

A decision on granting exemptions for the use of the popular fumigant methyl bromide was delayed earlier this month as countries could not reach agreement on how large the exemptions should be.

Delegates attending a meeting of the parties to the Montreal Protocol, created to reduce ozone-depleting substances, agreed that they needed additional time to decide whether to approve critical use exemptions (CUEs) for certain countries. The group plans to meet again in March 2004 to try to reach agreement.

Methyl bromide is a highly effective fumigant used to control insects, nematodes, weeds and pathogens in more than 100 crops, and in forests and orna-

mental nurseries. It is scheduled to be phased out in 2005 under the 1987 United Nations Montreal Protocol.

Until phaseout is complete, countries that signed the treaty can request CUEs from parties to the Protocol. The U.S. government in February submitted a request for an exemption on 39 percent of the U.S. baseline in 2005.

"We're very pleased that the administration held the line on the 39 percent CUE," said Rebeckah Freeman, American Farm Bureau Federation crop protection specialist. "The U.S. request is based on sound science, and the United States has made its case to receive the full exemption."

The Protocol's phase-out schedule differs for developed and developing

countries. The United States was required in 2002 to reduce methyl bromide use to 50 percent of the 1991 baseline. The United States now must scale back use to 30 percent by 2004 and 0 percent by 2005.

Opponents of the full phaseout of methyl bromide who support the CUEs believe that no cost-effective, reliable or environmentally friendly alternative has been developed to take the place of the fumigant.

"In the end, American consumers will suffer most from the loss of methyl bromide," said Bill Pauli, California Farm Bureau Federation president, in recent testimony before a House Energy and Commerce subcommittee. "The phase-out means the United States will in-

crease its dependence on imported, international food sources that are less regulated, less reliable and less safe."

FB NEWSMAKERS

Garin Bray is the new *director of state affairs* for the **Colorado** Farm Bureau. Bray's primary responsibilities include coordinating the state affairs program, serving as CFB's chief lobbyist at the state capitol, providing state legislative information to Farm Bureau members and working with state agencies. She began working for CFB in October 2000 as a regional manager, and in July 2002 became director of policy and governmental relations. Bray is originally from Norwood, Colo., where her family continues to ranch.

Jane Hamilton was named *executive director* of the **Alaska** Farm Bureau. In her new post, Hamilton will be organizing the annual meeting and symposium, keeping track of membership and handling grant projects. She is recently retired from the Agriculture Department's Farm Service Agency, where she worked for 11 years. Hamilton also has been a member of the Delta Chapter of the Alaska Farm Bureau for 11 years.

Kevin Rogers was elected *president* of the **Arizona** Farm Bureau Federation at the organization's 82nd annual meeting. Rogers served as first vice president under former president Ken Evans. Rogers produces hay, grain and cotton in the Phoenix area.

New hazmat rule affects farmers

The Transportation Department recently issued a rule that applies to the transport of certain hazardous materials used in commercial activities such as farming and ranching. At the request of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the department last week clarified the applicability of the rule to agricultural operations.

According to DOT, the rule applies to agricultural producers who ship or transport certain hazardous materials in quantities already requiring placards, the triangle-shaped signs that indicate what type of materials are on board. For many years, placards have been required for anyone transporting hazardous materials in quantities exceeding 199 gallons or 1,000 pounds.

Under the new rule, producers who require placarding must develop and implement a transportation security plan. DOT said the rule is intended to thwart acts of terrorism and illegal activity, as well as limit a producer's liability if an illegal act occurs.

Farmers who do not ship or transport hazardous materials in amounts that require placards do not need a transportation security plan, according to the department. Exempt activities include: if a supplier delivers hazardous materials to the producer's farm; if the producer picks up hazardous materials from the supplier in amounts less than those requiring a placard; and if the producer only transports hazardous materials among his or her fields. Additionally, a transportation plan is not required for hazardous materials that are stored on a farm for later use or for the actual application or use of those materials.

Hazardous materials used on the farm that require placards when transported in certain amounts include propane, anhydrous ammonia, gasoline, pesticides with DOT poison labels, ammonium nitrate fertilizer, diesel fuel, dynamite and detonators.

The department provided AFBF with specifics about the requirements of a hazardous materials transportation

security plan, which must have three components:

- **Personnel security:** If a producer uses employees to pick up and transport placarded hazardous materials from a supplier to his or her farm, the security plan must include measures to confirm information provided by the employee on his job application or resume.
- **Unauthorized access:** The security plan must include measures to protect against unauthorized access by using locks or physical/visual observation.
- **En route security:** The plan must include measures to ensure the security of the materials between the time the producer picks the materials up and the time the producer arrives at his or her farm.

Further information on the rule and its requirements, as well as a sample security plan, can be accessed online at http://hazmat.dot.gov/hmt_security.htm. Anyone who needs additional information can call the hazmat information hotline at 1-800-467-4922.

GRASSROOTS

Farm Bureau spotlights 'Harvest for All' campaign

The relatively small, peaceful town of Rapid City, S.D., was the site of Farm Bureau's national rollout for its Harvest for All campaign. About 30 young farmers and ranchers from across the country converged in the town Nov. 14 to serve lunch at a local charity, sort food at a large food bank and bring attention to their national community service program.

The young farmers and ranchers served lunch to nearly 100 people at the Cornerstone Rescue Mission in Rapid City. They also sorted about 25,000 pounds of food at the Black Hills Regional Food Bank. According to staff at the food bank, it would have taken them two weeks to do the job by themselves.

AFBF is also donating \$500 each to the mission and the food bank.

Bob Forney, president and CEO of America's Second Harvest, and Ken Gordon, public affairs manager for Syngenta, joined Jeff Gatzke, chairman of the American Farm Bureau Federation's Young Farmer and Rancher Committee, in Rapid City to talk about their roles in the Harvest for All campaign.

Farm Bureau is working with Second Harvest-affiliated food banks around

the country to increase donations. Syngenta is financing additional donations of \$5,000 each by the YF&R committees that donate the most food, money or time.

"Today's initiative exemplifies the dedication and commitment of our organizations to work together to feed America's hungry," said Forney. "And our efforts will not

Syngenta's Gordon said the company's products help farmers to be more productive, and helping to get some of that production to people who need it is a logical extension of the company's interests. Syngenta makes and sells

pest control products and crop seeds for use in agriculture.

Rapid City is in rural South Dakota, yet it's a small city

According to America's Second Harvest, the nation's largest network of food banks, about 11.5 percent of rural households in 2000 were food insecure, meaning they couldn't be sure where their next meal would come from. At 15.5 percent, the rural West reported more food insecure households than any other region.

Meanwhile, rural areas are where America's agricultural bounty is produced. Farmers need to help ensure that bounty makes it to the plates of every hungry American, according to Gatzke.

"In recent years, more farmers have been donating large amounts of food to their local food banks, and letting volunteers glean food from their farms that would otherwise go to waste," Gatzke said at the news conference on the front lawn of the Cornerstone Rescue Mission. "But, we know we can do more. As farmers, we feel our job isn't fin-



Amy Lucas, a YF&R Committee member from Elmer, Okla., sorts donated food at the Black Hills Regional Food Bank. The committee members sorted about 25,000 pounds of food in half a day.



Jeffery Gatzke (right), chairman of AFBF's national YF&R Committee, welcomes Bob Forney, president and CEO of America's Second Harvest, to Rapid City, S.D., where the two rolled out the national Harvest for All campaign.



YF&R Committee members serve lunch to about 100 people at the Cornerstone Rescue Mission in Rapid City, S.D. The mission serves more than 120,000 free meals per year.



stop here in Rapid City. Harvest for All is being implemented throughout the nation by farmers and ranchers working side-by-side with local hunger-relief organizations, food banks and food rescue organizations to help eradicate hunger."

with some of the same problems as larger cities: a homeless population; people with low-wage jobs and no health insurance who may have to forgo a meal to pay for medicines; and high unemployment due to the sluggish economy.

ished as long as there are hungry Americans."

Rapid City-area TV stations and the local newspaper, the *Rapid City Journal*, covered the Harvest for All event, which was part of the YF&R Committee's annual fall meeting.

Thanksgiving dinner cost up, but still affordable

A traditional Thanksgiving dinner—including turkey, stuffing, cranberries, pumpkin pie and all the trimmings—remains affordable, but will cost more this year than last, according to a survey conducted by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

In AFBF's annual informal survey of the price of basic items found on the Thanksgiving Day dinner table, the average cost of this year's feast for 10 is \$36.28, a \$1.72 price increase from last year's survey average of \$34.56.

"One of our greatest blessings as Americans is the abundant, affordable and safe food supply we enjoy. As we sit down together this Thanksgiving with family and friends, it is appropriate to remember that it all starts with our farmers and ranchers," said AFBF President Bob Stallman.

The AFBF survey shopping list includes turkey, stuffing, sweet potatoes, rolls with butter, peas, cranberries, a relish tray including carrots and celery, pumpkin pie with whipped cream and beverages of coffee and milk, all in quantities sufficient to serve a family of 10.

The cost of a 16-pound turkey, at \$15.47 or roughly 97 cents per pound, reflects an increase of 4 cents per pound, or a 63-cent increase in the total average, compared to 2002. This is the largest contributor to the overall increase in the cost of the 2003 Thanksgiving dinner.

"The increase in the price of turkey is probably due to limited beef supplies and strong consumer demand for meats in general. Whichever protein diet one wants to point to, all have led to very strong consumer demand for beef, pork and all poultry products," said Robert Young, AFBF chief economist. "Understand as well that our volunteer shoppers are asked not to use prices that require promotional coupons or purchase deals, such as spend \$50 and get a free turkey. The fact that our volunteer shoppers still find the average price of turkey below a dollar per pound is an amazing value by any standard."

Items showing a decrease this year included cubed stuffing and brown-and-serve rolls.

Items that increased in price this

year were pumpkin pie mix, two nine-inch pie shells, sweet potatoes, frozen green peas, whole milk, whipping cream and fresh cranberries.

A combined group of miscellaneous items including coffee and ingredients necessary to prepare the meal also increased in price. The price of a combined pound of celery and carrots used for a relish tray also increased.

AFBF first conducted the survey in 1986 when the average cost of a Thanksgiving meal for a family of 10 was \$28.74.

The survey is unscientific, but is a gauge of actual price trends across the nation. Bargain shoppers in all areas of the country should be able to purchase individual menu items at prices comparable to the Farm Bureau survey averages. Supermarkets in some areas are increasingly offering ready-to-eat Thanksgiving meals for up to 10 people, with all the trimmings, for less than \$40.

A total of 97 volunteer shoppers from 28 states participated in this year's survey. Shoppers are asked to identify the best in-store prices, ex-

cluding promotional coupons and special deals. Farm Bureau's survey menu has remained unchanged since 1986 to allow for consistent price comparisons.

NEWSPAPER HANDLING

FARM BUREAU NEWS