

12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to advocate the phaseout of the Government-run sugar program in this country. The Government-run sugar program is a cartel that the Government regulates that is very much antifree enterprise, it is anticonsumer, it is antienvironment, and it is anti-jobs in this country.

We will have a chance later on this week during the farm bill reauthorization to vote on a 5-year phaseout of this program in the Federal Government. The day of big government is over, and this is a big government program that should be phased out.

The sugar program in the country today is a big government program that keeps the price of sugar at twice the world price. As part of this reauthorization program on the farm bill, there are lots of good changes in the farm program in the country. Chairman ROBERTS and the committee have done a good job to reduce the role of the Federal Government in farm policy in this country.

There are lots of changes in wheat, corn and such, but not in the sugar program. The sugar program is not being reformed in this reauthorization bill. The sugar program is a cartel where the Federal Government controls the total supply of sugar in the United States and as such keeps the price of sugar at twice the world price.

The Federal Government tells every individual sugar farmer in the United States how many pounds of sugar he can sell today. It tells different countries of the world how many pounds of sugar they can sell in the United States. In fact, it is so bad when it tells Australia, for example, that has a free market in sugar, it tells Australia how many pounds of sugar to sell. Australia does not sell it to us at the world price. They sell it to everybody else at the world price of about 12 cents a pound. But, no, no, the United States, we pay 24 cents a pound because we want to pay the U.S. price. It is a crazy big government program. Let me explain why it is a bad program.

For the American consumer, it costs \$1.4 billion a year. This is a General Accounting Office report, an independent study, that says it costs the American consumer \$1.4 billion a year in additional cost on the price of sugar in the store, on the price of the soft drinks, on the price of candy, on the price of cereal, everything that uses sugar. Why should the American consumer get gouged like that? That is absolutely wrong.

It is a corporate welfare program. It is corporate welfare because 42 percent of the benefits of this program goes to 1 percent of the plantations in this country. There are 33 plantations in this country that get over a million dollar a year benefit from the program. There is no justification for this kind of corporate welfare program.

As I have said before, it is the sugar daddy of all corporate welfare. We want

to target corporate welfare, this is one program we should target. In my home State of Florida, 75 percent of the sugar is controlled by two plantations, 75 percent by two companies. That is corporate welfare. It is not the small farmer we are talking about as some people want to make you think.

Environmentally this has been a bad program for Florida. In 1960, when I finished high school, we had 50,000 acres farmed for sugar in the State of Florida. Today we have 450,000 acres of sugar in the State of Florida. As we have increased the production of sugar every year in Florida, the quality of the Everglades and Florida Bay have been declining.

There is a direct correlation to increased sugar production and the damage that is being done to the Florida Everglades. We need to stop that damage that is hurting our environment. It is hurting our economy in Florida. Just the jobs depending on the people in the Florida Keys are impacted by this, for example. So we need to do something about the damage that sugar is causing to the Florida Everglades.

On jobs in general, the sugar program is causing a loss of jobs because refiners are closing. In the past 10 years we have had to reduce sugar refining capacity by 40 percent because under this bill there is a limited amount of sugar being allowed into this county. And the jobs of the manufacturers, Bob's Candy, the largest candy cane company in the United States, is losing jobs. They are the largest manufacturer of candy canes. Candy canes are now coming on cheaper from outside the United States because sugar is so expensive in the United States.

In Canada the price of sugar is almost half the price it is in the United States. That is wrong. The proposal that is in the freedom to farm bill that Chairman ROBERTS will be bringing to the floor does not reform sugar. It keeps the cartel, it remains anticonsumer, anti-environment, antifree enterprise, and the price of sugar is not changed. So we are not seeing any change.

Fortunately, and I hope the Committee on Rules will allow, I have a bipartisan proposal, an amendment that I will be offering with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER]. We have over 100 cosponsors. This is a 5-year phaseout. I hope my fellow colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in advocating a 5-year phaseout.

FURTHER SANCTIONS AGAINST CASTRO ARE WARRANTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the Representative of the second largest concentration of Americans, Americans of Cuban descent in the Nation, to condemn a brutal and cold-

blooded, premeditated killing of American citizens, two of them born in the United States, one of them a Vietnam veteran.

I am tired of hearing the word "exile." They are U.S. citizens.

Our response to the killing of American citizens in international airspace has not been sufficient. I am amazed at Members of this House who come here and in essence by their comments brush aside those facts. And they turn against our own government and look to our government as the alleged cause of the death of American lives. There is only one person who has caused the death of these four U.S. citizens, and that is the Castro dictatorship and Fidel Castro himself. No one who studies Cuba will dispute that only such an order could be given at the highest levels of that dictatorship because of the international consequences that would flow from it.

This is a brutal regime. It is a brutal regime. Castro can come to New York and he can wear an Armani suit. And he can sip Chablis with Madame Mitterrand, but that does not make him a respectable citizen of the international community. His actions would but his actions belie the appearance he tries to give when he comes to visit this country. This ruthless murder came at the end of a week of unprecedented repression in Cuba.

I hear many of my colleagues who disagree with our policy say we want to see peaceful democratic change come to Cuba. So do we. There is a group within Cuba struggling to create peaceful democratic change. Their name is Concilio Cubano, Cuban Council. It is a group of 120 different organizations who simply in the past week wanted to meet, committed to peaceful democratic change within the island, who wanted to meet and have the right to recognize under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the right that we as Americans enjoy every day to assemble and to have a redress of grievances.

What was the Castro regime's actions? It was to create mass arrests. Over 50 of their national leadership were placed in jail. Dozens of others were placed under house arrest. Women were strip-searched so they would not participate with the organization. One of their leaders who I spoke to on the phone directly from the United States to Cuba, after I spoke with him, that evening he was arrested. He has been sentenced to a year and a half in jail. For what? For speaking out. Nothing less than speaking out, nothing more than that.

Mr. Speaker, I flew with Brothers to the Rescue over a year ago. I was on one of those planes. Their mission has been a search and rescue mission of human lives. They have saved thousands of lives in the Florida Strait. On the day that I flew with them, we saved a dozen people who were on a tiny island who had been there for several

days. No one knew that they were there. We threw food and water to them and then radioed their location to the U.S. Coast Guard who subsequently rescued them.

Is there any more prolife efforts that one could have than those of Brothers to the Rescue? Mr. Speaker, the downing of unarmed defenseless civilian pilots calls for a strong response. The President has taken some actions. He has had our ambassador move in the United States, suspending all charter flights, agreeing to move on the Helms-Burton legislation, increasing Radio Marti's penetration into Cuba. But that is not enough.

I expect the President to announce other measures in the days ahead. Among those measures I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, is to begin to limit all licenses for visits to Cuba, revoking the visas of the Cuban interest section here in Washington and making sure that we have a further economic embargo on the island against the regime, which is the only thing that they have understood to create change within Cuba.

THE DEBT CEILING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this morning the headlines on the Congress Daily, the little newspaper that goes out on the Hill every day, says Senator DOMENICI recommends that the increase in the debt ceiling be used as leverage to make sure we get on a glidepath to a balanced budget. There were 160 of us, Mr. Speaker, as you know very well, that sent a letter to the President of the United States saying that we are not going to vote for an increase in the debt ceiling unless we do get on that glidepath to a balanced budget.

I brought this chart this morning to explain why it is so important that we insist to the full extent of our ability that we make changes in some of those entitlement programs, make some changes in those welfare programs that are leading us to pass higher and higher debt ceiling and more and more borrowing.

As my colleagues see on this pie chart, the bottom blue part of that pie chart that now represents 50 percent of the \$1.6 trillion annual spending is the welfare programs and the entitlement programs, the so-called mandatory spending, now using up half of the Federal budget. As a point of reference, I would just suggest that, if we look back to the year, for example, 1955, mandatory spending only represented 3 percent of the total Federal budget spending.

The Constitution of the United States says that Congress is responsible for controlling the purse strings. It is responsible for spending. But what

has happened in the last 40 years is Congress has given away that authority to legislation that says, if you meet these certain qualifications, of age or poverty or whatever, you are automatically entitled to these payments. It is no longer annual appropriation bills that are controlled by Congress. A majority in Congress can no longer control or reduce that spending that is using up 50 percent of this Nation's budget without the consent of the President.

So the question has been, how do you get a reluctant President that does not want to cut spending to make some of the changes in these welfare and entitlement programs? We have suggested that we are going to be as vigorous as we can in suggesting that, look, what causes most of the increased debt is the entitlement programs. Therefore, it is not only reasonable but they are inextricably tied to each other, the debt ceiling increase and changes in some of these welfare entitlement spending programs.

If my colleagues were to take a look at the other provisions of this pie chart, the green represents defense spending. Everybody agrees now that there has got to be a defense spending. In fact, the administration is suggesting that even now we might need a supplemental to cover the expenses of Bosnia. But the hawks and the doves, the Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, all of us agree on defense, there is little difference, a plus or minus 10-percent deviation on what the expenditures should be on defense.

So like the entitlement programs, most of defense is now on, if you will, automatic pilot. It is automatically a spending obligation of this country. What is also on automatic pilot is interest rates. So the interest on the national debt last year at \$270 billion represented the total budget of the United States just back in 1977.

This country, this Government, and the expenditures of this Government and this huge bureaucracy continue to grow out of control because politicians in Washington have found sort of an undercover way to expand the size of government without the safeguards and protections of individual citizens that do not want their taxes raised too high. That is by more and more borrowing.

Somehow we do not feel that that borrowing affects our lives. I stand here today to suggest to my colleagues very aggressively that not only is it immoral to pass on what we consider important expenditures today and make our kids and our grandkids pay for it, out of money they have not even earned yet, but it is also tremendously a negative factor in economic expansion. Government borrows almost 42 percent of all of the money lent out in this country. We are driving interest rates as high as 2 percent more than they otherwise would be.

Chairman Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, suggested that

if we can balance the budget, interest rates would drop 2 percent. If interest rates dropped 2 percent, he and other economists are saying this economy would take off like it has never taken off before in the history of this country and we would have more and better jobs and a stronger economy.

MAINTAIN THE EDUCATION OF OUR YOUNG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, over the last 3 weeks, we had what is known as our district work period when we were back in our home States and our home congressional districts and had the opportunity to have forums and town meetings and meet with our constituents in a way that we really have not had the opportunity since August.

One of the things that the Democratic Members of the New Jersey congressional delegation did was to have an education express, where we went on a bus throughout the State of New Jersey from south Jersey to north and basically got opinions from both high school students and college students about the cuts in Federal education programs that have been proposed by Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership. I was amazed to see how many of these students were concerned and how many were going to be directly impacted by the cuts that not only are proposed in the Gingrich budget but also have started to take place because of the cutbacks in the appropriation levels that have passed this House.

As my colleagues know, since October for education programs, we have not had a regular spending or appropriation bill. Instead we are operating under continuing resolutions, one of which expires on March 15 and has to be renewed if these programs are going to continue this year. We estimate that the funding levels under the current continuing resolution, if continued at the same rate through the rest of this fiscal year, would result in an unprecedented \$3.1 billion cut in education funds, about a 20-percent cut.

I am hopeful that through the grassroots efforts of things like the education express and many of my colleagues coming back from this 3-week district work period, that we will be able to convince the Republican leadership that this level of cuts in education programs cannot and should not continue for the rest of this fiscal year because of the impact on students, on our young people and their education throughout this country.

Just to highlight a few differences between what the Republican Congress has proposed and what President Clinton and the Democrats have proposed on education, as many know, the national service program, or AmeriCorps,