

imported Chinese weapons into this country, killing Americans, who is responsible? If we have a major Chinese cigarette manufacturer influencing our policy and contributing to our campaigns and influencing our elections? Let it all hang out.

I am personally offended by what they have tried to do here today to our Chairman who has on every occasion acted in an honorable fashion. I think a disruption of this process is a shame on this House of Representatives.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules is scheduled to meet in 3 minutes today to consider a rule providing general debate only for H.R. 3616, the Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 1999.

We will meet at 3 o'clock next Tuesday to make in order other amendments to that legislation. The rule that we will put out today will be for general debate only.

Mr. Speaker, additionally, unfortunately, the minority leadership has decided to personally attack Members of the majority side this morning on the House floor. Also, there has been a decision by the minority to oppose on two occasions immunity for four witnesses which the Department of Justice approved before a House investigative committee.

Due to these unfortunate circumstances which the minority has brought to the House floor, the Committee on Rules will add to its afternoon agenda the following measures: H.Res. 432, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the President's assertion of executive privilege; and H.Res. 433, by myself, calling upon the President of the United States to urge full cooperation by his former political appointees and friends and their associates with congressional investigations.

Mr. Speaker, these measures will be considered on the House floor next week under an appropriate rule. Since the Democratic leadership has regrettably decided to embroil the floor in this kind of partisan and personal attacks, the House will consider resolutions next week which will bring some perspective to the current discussion of ethics in Washington, D.C.

□ 1500

#### TOBACCO FARMING IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McKEON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion about to-

bacco settlements. If Congress is serious about passing tobacco settlement legislation this session, we need to act in a measured and collaborative way.

Let me say, though, that I do not smoke and I do not encourage others to smoke, and indeed, I support the efforts to discourage our teenagers from smoking. However, the decision to smoke is one best left to mature adults, and even then, after careful consideration. Children should not smoke, nor should they be enticed to smoke, and therefore, a public policy discouraging them from smoking and having enforcement to make sure that tobacco companies do not entice them is indeed appropriate.

With regard to the pending tobacco settlement, no matter how you feel about tobacco, one must view it for what it is; it is a legal commodity, grown by many American farmers.

These North Carolina farmers, our tobacco farmers, want the same thing as other Americans: a good quality of life overall for them and their families, for their children to have a good education, for them to have sufficient resources with which to provide their families with food, shelter and other amenities of life, saving for their retirement, a secure environment in which to live and to work, and most importantly, hope for the future.

These farmers, our tobacco farmers, care about their children as well as about other children in their community, instilling in them the values of honesty, hard work and a sense of community.

Mr. Speaker, like other American farmers, like those in your home State, these North Carolina farmers prepare their land, till it carefully, plant their crops, tend their fields, harvest their yields and market their products, much like commodities such as corn and wheat.

Tobacco is one of the main reasons that many small farmers are still able to stay in business, because no other crop yields as much income per acre. Most of these farmers are unable to find an alternative crop, although several of them are seeking them. To find an alternative crop with a comparative income indeed has eluded many. It would take almost eight times more acres of cotton, 15 times more acres of corn, 20 times more acres of soybeans, and 30 times more acres of wheat to equal the income from a single acre of tobacco.

The money earned by farmers and those employed in tobacco-related businesses flows into their communities, spreading these profits around. It has been estimated that the agricultural dollar turns over an average of 10 times in the farming local community. Do the math: \$7.7 billion, which is estimated as the income to our State, equals \$77 billion. \$77 billion flows from those citizens who sell the seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, farm machines, groceries, clothing, as well as other important goods and services.

These monies make life possible, bearable, and sometimes even determine the quality of life in rural communities. That revenue also streams into the county, State and Federal tax coffers, supporting education and health care.

The total income impact is also felt in terms of jobs. Over 108,650 North Carolinians are tobacco farmers or are employed in tobacco-related jobs. Therefore, it is absolutely critical, as we continue the process from which a settlement will emerge, and it should go forward, that those who are in the House as well as those in the Senate should permit these hard-working farmers to continue to earn an honest living doing what they do best, farming, and sometimes, growing tobacco.

The public policy to restrain young people from smoking is an appropriate one. Equally as important, as we seek this public policy, we should not have a public policy that brings great devastation on large numbers of unintended victims; and I submit to you, the rural communities and farmers are unintended victims.

Mr. Speaker, these small farmers are essential to the continuation of agriculture in North Carolina and the vitality of our rural areas.

#### ORIGINAL COSPONSORSHIP OF H.R. 3868, THE BIPARTISAN NO TOBACCO FOR KIDS ACT OF 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California, Mr. BILBRAY, is recognized five minutes.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 3868, the Bipartisan No Tobacco for Kids Act of 1998. This legislation, which was authored by my colleagues, Representatives JAMES HANSEN and MARTY MEEHAN, is aimed exclusively at preventing kids from smoking and reducing the adverse health effects of tobacco on children.

According to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), 3,000 kids each day become regular cigarette smokers. In light of recent statistics that shows youth smoking on the rise, I believe it is imperative that we act assertively here in Congress to crack down on youth smoking and access to tobacco.

Before I came to Washington, D.C., I served on the San Diego County Board of Supervisors and was responsible for passing one of the most stringent anti-smoking ordinances in the country. Because of my prior commitment to and involvement with this issue at the local level, and the startling statistics that show youth smoking on the rise, I am only too glad to support H.R. 3868 as an original cosponsor. H.R. 3868 is the only anti-tobacco bill in Congress (including the Senate) which has received the endorsement of former Surgeon General C. Everett Koop and former Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Commissioner David Kessler. In fact, Koop and Kessler stated that other bills in both the House and Senate do not go far enough to reduce and prevent youth smoking.

This legislation establishes strong financial disincentives for tobacco companies that do

not reduce tobacco consumption by minors by specified target dates. It has the stated goal of reducing tobacco use by children by 80 percent over the next ten years. This provision allows each tobacco manufacturer to determine the manner in which it will reach this mandatory goal. Federal requirements will apply only if the manufacturers are unable to achieve the reduction goals on their own.

H.R. 3868 includes an increase of \$1.50 per cigarette pack, which will provide a financial disincentive for youth tobacco consumption. In addition, H.R. 3868 codifies the FDA provision from last summer's tobacco settlement that provides the FDA authority to regulate nicotine as a drug or a drug delivery device. This provision of the bill also contains added restrictions on advertising and marketing to youth.

H.R. 3868 contains a provision to prohibit smoking in public buildings and facilities, and it authorizes funding for essential federal tobacco education and prevention programs. In addition, the majority of the revenue generated from this legislation will be used to pay down the federal debt. While H.R. 3868 does not provide any special liability protections for the tobacco industry, it does offer to settle pending state tobacco lawsuits, such as the one recently settled in Minnesota.

I believe that this legislation will help to create an adequate "firewall" to protect public health and discourage and prevent youth tobacco smoking and possession. I feel very strongly that we should not tolerate youth smoking in our society with a "wink and a nod." We should treat teenage smoking as harshly as we would teenage drinking. As the father of two young children, I have a personal stake in passing this important legislation and helping to ensure that our kids do not develop this deadly habit. Statistics by the American Journal of Public Health show that minors illegally purchase 256 million packs of cigarettes each year. Our findings show that only 20 states have laws prohibiting tobacco possession by minors. We need to encourage states and localities to adopt and comply with strong anti-possession laws. The need for minor possession laws is illustrated by a CDC finding that 62 percent of minors who smoke say they buy their own cigarettes. In fact, I would support legislative efforts to require states to outlaw tobacco possession by minors as a condition of receiving federal funds.

Mr. Speaker, my father died of lung cancer at the age of 53 due to his smoking habit. All three of my brothers smoke. There is little I can do to change that; however, I can do something to prevent my five children from starting to smoke. H.R. 3868 accomplishes these goals. Congress cannot afford to sit idly by and do nothing while thousands of children pick up their first cigarette every day and begin this deadly habit.

I commend Representatives HANSEN and MEEHAN for initiating this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 3868, and build upon the bipartisan coalition of Members committed to preventing and reducing youth smoking.

#### THE CONSERVATION ACTION TEAM BUDGET FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) is recognized for

60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a new budget that has been introduced out here. There has been a lot of discussion recently about the House budget, or the John Kasich budget as it is sometimes known in the House Committee on the Budget.

I am a member of that committee and I think JOHN KASICH has done a tremendous job putting together a budget. But some of us don't think we have done quite enough in terms of reeling in government spending and getting this whole thing under control out here, so that the American people can keep more of their own money, so that Social Security can again be safe, and again we can start paying down the Federal debt.

So I rise today to talk about an alternative budget called the CATs budget, or Conservation Action Team budget, that promotes a lot of visions that are different.

Washington is truly an amazing place when you start talking about budgets and numbers and things, because everything gets twisted immediately. It amazes me to listen to people talk about how they are cutting spending in Washington, D.C.

I brought with me a chart today to show what happens in these different budget proposals that are being talked about out here. This black line on this chart shows inflationary increases in government spending. So if we allowed Washington or government spending to increase at the rate of inflation, that is what this black line on this chart represents.

The President made a budget proposal, and it is very clear from this that it allows government spending to go up much faster than the rate of inflation. That is growing government.

The United States Senate recently passed a budget, and again you can see that the Senate budget grows government, it allows government spending to increase faster than the rate of inflation.

The American people have a right to know that on the other side of the aisle they are going to call this a spending cut because, you see, since the Senate budget did not spend as much as the President's proposal, they are going to call this distance from here to here a "cut," even though the inflationary increase in government spending is down here at this black line and the Senate proposal increases spending much faster than the rate of inflation.

Some of us out here thought that government spending should not increase faster than the family budget or faster than the rate of inflation, so we put together our own budget. Our budget allows government spending to increase not quite at the rate of inflation, just a little bit slower than the rate of inflation.

For all of my colleagues out there and all the viewers out there that be-

lieve that government spending should not be going up at all, let me just agree with you. If I got to do this all by myself, this green line would be down here, and we would not allow government spending to increase at all.

So let me start by making it clear that this budget that we are talking about, the CATs budget, the Conservation Action Team budget, allows government spending to increase, but at a rate just slower than the rate of inflation.

So when people talk about this Conservation Action Team's budget and draconian cuts, we all ought to understand that what the CATs budget actually does is hold the rate of growth of government to approximately the rate of inflation. So when you talk about cuts in spending, there are no cuts in spending.

Spending in the first year of the CATs budget, the most conservative budget out here, spending in the first year will be approximately \$1,720 billion. That is a lot of money. In the second year it is going to be \$1,749 billion. I am not going to read all the numbers. But the point is the spending, even in the Conservation Action Team's budget, increases each and every year. So when the American people hear about draconian budget cuts in Washington, they ought to understand the fallacy of that discussion.

The reality is the most conservative budget proposed out here, that is the least government spending, allows government spending to increase at approximately the rate of inflation. The Senate proposal, well, that lets government spending go up much faster than the rate of inflation, and the President's proposal, of course, that increases government spending even more yet.

So I start with this discussion about the CATs budget. It is the only budget out here that holds the growth rate of Washington spending or government under the rate of inflation.

There are some other very unique things about the CATs budget I would like to talk about. There has been much discussion, and I am going to spend part of this hour today talking in more depth about Social Security.

There has been much discussion about the problem with Social Security. The President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, Saturday right in that chair, and he put his fist on the table and said, Social Security first; Social Security must be protected for our senior citizens. Well, I brought a chart along to show which budget really protects Social Security for our senior citizens.

The President's proposal has a very limited amount of money set aside to protect and preserve Social Security. The Senate did slightly better than the President, setting some money aside to preserve and protect Social Security. The CATs budget sets more money aside to protect Social Security than any other proposal out here.