

FAIRNESS TO DAIRY FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to also address an issue of agriculture, one that I think is of utmost importance to dairy farmers not only in northeast Wisconsin where I come from but all across this country, an agriculture issue that we are familiar with from some innovative television and prints ads that promote milk and dairy products, not only from Wisconsin but across this great land of ours.

One ad campaign asks, Got milk? Well, we have got milk in Wisconsin. And the question is, have we got fairness? It is another issue.

Right now the dairy farmers in northeast Wisconsin, indeed across the country, every one of them hard working farm families, pay 15 cents for every 100 pounds of milk that they sell. It goes into a fund. It promotes and advertises milk and dairy products. All of these ads are a great boost for dairy products in general. The program is helping dairy farmers everywhere, everywhere sell their milk.

However, there are some dairy producers who benefit from these ads but they do not pay into this promotion fund. They are not farmers from my home district in Wisconsin. They are not farmers in the Northeast or in California.

They are foreign dairy producers, places like Australia and New Zealand, and they in fact reap the rewards of dairy promotion. I think dairy farmers think it is time we shared the cost with all dairy farmers.

I have introduced a bill, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, my first bill to try and level the playing field between American dairy farmers and foreign dairy producers when it comes to promotion, which benefits everybody who looks to advertise their product. It is the Dairy Promotion Fairness Act. I urge my colleagues to sign onto the measure and support it in this Congress.

I think this issue of fairness goes beyond the fact that dairy importers are not paying the same fees as dairy farmers. The importers of other commodities, beef, pork, and cotton, are currently paying into their respective promotion programs, yet dairy importers in America do not.

Also our dairy farmers are required to pay into dairy promotion programs in other countries where we do sell our milk. We are exporters. But those agreements unfortunately at this point are not reciprocal.

This past weekend I had a chance to meet with Reuel Robertson, a dairy producer from Oneida, Wisconsin. He pays as much as \$450 a month from his monthly dairy check into a dairy promotion fund to help the industry sell, in effect, milk, cheese, ice cream and other products to Americans. It is for

Reuel Robertson and for farmers everywhere, not just in northeast Wisconsin, but everywhere in this land that I am working to require foreign dairy producers to pay for dairy promotion. We will not be establishing a new program. We are already marketing milk.

□ 2345

We will be sharing the cost with every producer that sells dairy products in this country. Assessing importers, we will add approximately \$10 million to the resources that pay for milk promotion. That is \$10 million that promotes dairy products all across the country. It is no added extra revenue to dairy farmers in this country, and yet it is added revenue to help promote a product that we do best. Dairy products.

Mr. Speaker, when we ask the question, got milk? The answer should be yes. Got fairness? Unfortunately, for now, the answer is no, but I hope we can change that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. METCALF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. JEFFERSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. JEFFERSON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KINGSTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GEJDENSON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE TOBACCO LOBBY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington, Mrs. LINDA SMITH, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I feel like I am running a rerun. Three years in a row, this is my third year in Congress, I have come to the floor and discussed what seems to be a subsidy that makes no sense.

At first, when I saw that we were subsidizing insurance for tobacco, I thought it was a mistake, because I had arrived with a group of people say-

ing they were going to balance the budget and get rid of things that were not important, not only were not important but unnecessary, and that we were going to clean house.

So I was assured that when we brought that amendment to the floor, a bipartisan group from the oldest Members to the newest Members, that surely it would be gone by the end of the day. The bill was stalled, took a while, seemed to take a few days. I thought it would be one day and it moved to the next. Lost by 13 votes. It seemed a little intriguing until the next year we found the tobacco lobby had cut 165 checks within 48 hours of that vote. Unfortunately, some of them had been passed out here, very close to the vote, very close to where we were voting.

The next year, I thought, well, surely people with the disgust at what the tobacco industry is doing, marketing to our children, we will win this vote on a crop subsidy, targeted to children, intended to harm. But no, lost by two votes, just two votes, as even people did not vote, walking from the floor.

Why is that happening? I could not quite understand it. And I still do not understand it. But today, actually now later in the day, or I guess tomorrow now, we will have the vote again and some will say, as we are voting, well, the small tobacco companies need it, or the farmers. The reality is they are not the ones passing out checks here to keep that. It is the large tobacco companies wanting to keep a hold on what they believe is their position here in Congress, making sure that they still have their insurance subsidized.

I heard the argument that, well, it is only right, they are a crop. Then I realized that we have thousands of crops. Only a few dozen have subsidies, and only a few are insured by the Federal Government. Now, I can understand sugar, although I do not understand why we are subsidizing that. I could maybe understand peanuts, because like sugar, at least it feeds children. But tobacco? Subsidizing the insurance? Charging it to those same children that it is aimed to harm?

No, tomorrow I think this Congress is going to have a chance to show whether we believe in balancing the budget and whether we believe in going to those things that are unnecessary first, and also it will show a little bit about what happens here when money flows from large corporations to campaigns and to parties.

Earlier today it was disclosed that hundreds of thousands of dollars in the last few days had been given to both parties from the tobacco industry in what is called soft money, the soft money being given to the party because, see, if that was given to a candidate or used against a candidate in a TV ad, how would taxpayers feel about seeing that R.J. Reynolds paid for this ad at the bottom of the ad, which is the law. They have to show who pays for the ad, so, instead, they give it to the parties. They launder it through and it

comes out as paid for by the Republican or Democratic Party. Soft money.

See, the tobacco companies are smart. They know they are not popular, but they still want to control. So they give their money, as one of the most lucrative groups in the Nation, to keep their control, to keep their hands around our political system by giving it to the two major parties. The same soft money system that funneled the money that went through the White House to the Democrat Party from mainland China.

Tonight we can surmise, or I will surmise two things: Tomorrow we will see just how much power money has over American politics. Even that power that has to be hidden. And tomorrow we will see whether or not we can say no to those that give the hundreds of thousands, no, actually the millions of dollars to this political system, for something that costs billions. The American people only get 30 minutes because we do not want them to watch law, but they can see tomorrow.

CONGRATULATIONS ON PASSAGE OF STAMP OUT BREAST CANCER ACT; AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF FORMATION OF WASHINGTON WASTE WATCH CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to address my colleagues on two subjects. First, to congratulate the bipartisan fashion the passage of H.R. 1585, the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act, which will authorize a 2-year demonstration project to offer the public a new way to fund research for breast cancer by raising money through especially designed U.S. postage stamps.

This is an idea whose time has certainly arrived, Mr. Speaker. With the increased funding needs at NIH, and working with the important breast cancer groups across this country, we need all we can put together when it comes to detection, treatment, and cure for breast cancer in this country. I congratulate all the groups that were a part of moving this legislation forward. I know that the Senate is also moving forward on the bill and I look forward to the President's signature.

I also want to announce a formation of the Washington Waste Watch Caucus, one that will zero in on the waste, fraud and abuse here in the Federal Government. I worked today with Thomas Schatz, the president of the Citizens Against Government Waste, which is an outgrowth of the Grace Commission, and together with Tom and other taxpayers groups and chamber groups we will work in a bipartisan fashion here in the House and in the Senate to make sure we identify those kinds of projects which are wasteful, which duplicate what States already do

or local governments already do, and that cost too much for the Federal Government and costing, more importantly, too much for the taxpayers.

We want to make sure the taxpayers get their moneys worth, and that is why I am pleased to be working with those who want to see the sugar and peanut subsidies eliminated. Artificially inflated prices for our consumers is not the right way to move America forward.

Certainly as the gentlewoman from Washington, [Mrs. LINDA SMITH] just discussed, to move forward with again adding a tobacco subsidy when in this country we already have a policy that says the surgeon general has determined that smoking can be dangerous to our health, causes lung cancer, emphysema, we should certainly not have the same government saying from a health care point of view that we should though be smoking yet we have tobacco subsidies. Certainly this is the kind of project when it comes to the Washington Waste Watch we will be looking forward to seeing some positive changes in.

We also have legislation calling for sunset review of Federal agencies, to make sure that where we should privatize, downsize, consolidate or eliminate, we will be looking at each agency over a time period to make sure we report back to Congress with our findings.

So for my colleagues who are here tonight and those who may be looking from their offices, at their monitor, I would ask that they get in touch with me through the Washington Waste Watch Caucus, 435 Cannon Building, Washington, DC, with their suggestions, or call me at 202-225-6111.

I am looking forward to making sure that we make the government more responsive and that Congress leads the way working with the American people to make sure that we save money, spend wisely and make sure we look to the future in a fiscally responsible manner.

□ 2355

THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are going to have before the floor of the House of Representatives an historic piece of legislation, H.R. 2003, which is the Bipartisan Budget Enforcement Act of 1997. This piece of legislation is dedicated to the premise that whatever the budget agreement ultimately turns out to be, it has to have enforcement to actually result in a balanced budget by the year 2002.

If we look back 25 years ago to 1975, we can see that the blue area in this pie chart shows that well over 55 per-

cent of the Federal budget was discretionary. That means that it was controlled by the Congress on an annual basis by the appropriators in both the House and Senate. We had about 7 percent interest on the debt, which was the red part of this pie chart. And then mandatory or entitlement spending was the balance, which was about 38 percent.

If we fast forward to the year that we are in now, fiscal year 1997, we can see that 51 percent is entitlement spending, we have 15 percent that is interest on the debt, and the discretionary part of the budget is now down to around 34 percent. If we go to the last year of the budget agreement, which is 5 years from now, fiscal year 2002, the picture is even worse. The interest on the debt is up to 14 percent. Entitlement spending is at 58 percent. So we are at 74 percent uncontrollable spending.

We cannot have a budget agreement that actually results in a balanced budget if three-fourths of the budget is uncontrollable. So what we have done on a bipartisan basis is come up with a piece of legislation that says let us take the numbers that are agreed to by the President and the Congress and enforce them on the spending.

On the spending side, every program would have a cap. Under current law, only discretionary spending has a cap. So we apply the caps to the entitlement portion of the budget. On the revenue side, we take the revenue numbers that are in the budget for tax revenues and make those goals. After the first year of the agreement, in fiscal year 1998, if the revenue numbers are not up to what they are supposed to be, under the agreement we would delay on a contingent basis next year's tax cut.

If spending goes beyond caps, we give the President and Congress three options. They can vote to waive the cap. They can vote to change the program so that it actually comes within the cap. Or if they vote to do nothing; instead of the deficit going up, there is sequestration by program that brings the spending back under control.

If you look at the ratio in the current budget agreement, entitlement spending, which is the blue bar, versus the tax cuts in the bill, which is the red bar, it is a ratio of about 50-to-1. About \$900 billion in entitlement spending the first year of the agreement, and we have about \$10 billion in tax cuts. We can see each year the tax cuts get marginally larger, \$12 million, \$15 billion, \$20 billion. But the entitlement spending continues to go up. So it is over a trillion dollars fiscal year 2001.

So by putting \$85 billion over 5 years on a net basis in tax cuts on the table, we get entitlement caps on \$5 trillion of entitlement spending. That is a 50-to-1 trade-off. We think that is a tremendous agreement. If we look at what the entitlement programs are, these are the top 11 entitlement programs, they have grown at an average of over 9 percent in the last 6 years. Some of