farmers are the ones who are going to pay the price. Not once in this bill did I read any language that would provide any type of protection to our tobacco farmers— not even once. This is why I have introduced the four amendments, table me give you their numbers: 1236, 1237, 1238, and 1239.

If the FDA is going to regulate tobacco and require sweeping changes within the industry, I want to ensure that the small farmer has a voice at the negotiating table. My amendments do this. Not only do they allow for fair grower representation, but they help ensure that those who will be most affected by this legislation will not be forced to pay the biggest price.

Let me be clear that I oppose the FDA regulation of tobacco. I have said that as long as tobacco is a legal commodity, it should be regulated through the USDA, the United States Department of Agriculture, not the FDA. If we are going to discuss giving the FDA this authority through this or similar legislation, I want to make sure that we consider the impact on agriculture.

In Kentucky, the family farm is the foundation for who we are as a State. For over a century, the family farm in Kentucky has centered around one crop—tobacco. Tobacco barns and small plots of tobacco dot the Kentucky landscape. We are proud of our heritage and proud that tobacco plays a role in our history. Even after the buy-out, tobacco still plays a prominent role in my State’s agricultural landscape.

We have tried to broaden our agricultural base. We have had some success with several types of vegetables, cattle, and even raising catfish. But at the end of the day, nothing brings as much of a return to the small farmer in Kentucky as tobacco. It is big business for small farmers.

With the current economic conditions, more and more farmers in my State are turning to growing tobacco to supplement their income or, in a lot of cases, tobacco is their sole source of income. The money they get from tobacco pays their mortgages, puts their kids through school, and actually allows them to stay on the farm.

Outside of the western part of my State, Kentucky does not have tens of thousands of acres of flat land. We have a lot of rolling hills and this is the climate where tobacco thrives. It can be raised very cheaply on small plots of land that simply cannot accommodate other crops. Whether we like it or not, tobacco remains an economic staple for rural Kentucky. It is profitable and farmers rely on it. That might not be popular today, but it is an economic reality that we have to face.

Whatever the opponents of tobacco say, there is no denying that this bill will add unnecessary mandates and expenses on the farmers in the attempt to punish the big tobacco companies. Sure, this bill will hurt big tobacco companies. They might have to move offshore. They might have to start exporting more of their products. But they will survive. But Kentucky’s tobacco farmers do not have these options available to them. They are the ones who are going to be hurt by this type of legislation.

Some of my colleagues might support this legislation because they wish to outlaw tobacco. The last time I looked, tobacco was still a legal product in this country. If my colleagues want to make tobacco honest and upfront about it. Let’s consider legislation to make it illegal. We can fight that here, out on the floor of the Senate. But let’s not keep trying to slip it through the back door; through over-regulation and taxes in the name of preventing underage smoking.

Children should not have cigarettes. They should not. This is why we have age limits and advertising limits. We should do all that we can to keep cigarettes out of the hands of our kids. But the bill before us is not the answer. We can do better and should do better. All this bill does is move the regulation of a legal product from several agencies to another, one that has no jurisdiction to regulate it.

The only people this bill is going to hurt in the end are not the big tobacco companies, but the small and honest farmers who depend on tobacco to pay their bills. This is why I have offered four farmer-friendly amendments to the bill. I want to explain for a few minutes the four.

One, Bunning amendment No. 1236, clarifies that nothing in this bill would prevent our farmers from growing and cultivating tobacco as they have been able to do for the past hundred-plus years.

My second amendment, No. 1237, establishes a grower grant program that would help ease the financial burden of this bill on our farmers.

Amendment No. 1238 gives growers a seat at the negotiating table. The underlying bill establishes a Tobacco Scientific Advisory Committee made up of 12 members. Seven of those members are from the medical field to ensure that public health needs are taken into account. There is one of the public, and three representatives from the tobacco industry. There are two manufacturers and one grower. All members of the committee are voting except for the last three—the tobacco representatives. My amendment is simple. It gives the representatives the right to vote and adds two more grower positions. That way, all three forms of tobacco—burley, flue cured and dark leaf—are represented at the negotiating table.

The third Bunning amendment, No. 1239, asks the FDA if they are going to impose any new restrictions or requirements on farmers, then they should consider and conduct a feasibility study so that we know the effect on the farm level.

When my amendments come up, I encourage my colleagues to support them.
like. Yesterday the presidents of General Motors and Chrysler spent 4 hours in front of congressional committees talking about dealerships.

I assume they drove themselves here from Detroit in their congressionally approved method of transportation, probably relying on 25 of their tax-funded employees to do it.

They did not have much time yesterday to design, build, or sell cars and trucks for their troubled companies. Unless we get the stock out of the hands of the Washington, this scene will be repeated over and over again.

There are at least 60 congressional committees and subcommittees authorized to hold hearings on auto companies, and most of them will hold hearings, probably many times.

Car company executives who need to be managing complex enterprises will be reduced to the status of an assistant secretary in a minor department hauling briefings books from subcommittee to subcommittee.

You can imagine what the questions will be and the president of each company will probably be asked these questions: What will the next model look like? What plant should be closed and which one opened? How many cars should be built? How many people? What will the work rules be? What will the salaries be? Where will the conferences be held, and in which cities should they not be held?

Congressmen will want to know why the Chevy Volt is using a battery from a South Korean company when it can be made in one of their congressional districts. There will be a lengthy hearing about the number of holidays allowed, and thousands of written questions demanding written answers under oath.

And it is not just the Congress we have to worry about. The President of the United States himself fired the president of General Motors.

Giving the stock to the taxpayer who paid for it will get the government out of the companies’ hair and give the companies a chance to succeed. It will create an investor fan base of 120 million people who may be a little more interested now in what the next Chevrolet will be. Think of the fan base of the Green Bay Packers, whose ownership is distributed among the people of Green Bay.

This is why I say back to the wise principle: If you can find it in the Yellow Pages, the government probably shouldn’t be doing it. More than the money, it is the principle of the thing.

The other day, a visiting European automobile executive said to me with a laugh that he had come to the “new American automotive capital: Washington, DC.”

To get our economy moving again, let’s get the auto companies out of the hands of Washington and back into the marketplace. Let’s put the stock in the hands of 120 million taxpayers, the sooner the better.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DODD. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I gather we are still in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

FAMILY SMOKING PREVENTION AND TOBACCO CONTROL ACT

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I wish to take a few minutes to speak about the importance of what we are doing to address the issues raised by my friend and colleague from North Carolina, Senator Burr, who has raised some important issues. We are debating, of course, very historic public health legislation. The bill before this body will, for the first time, give the Food and Drug Administration authority to regulate the tobacco industry and to put in place tough protections for families that for too long have been absent, when it comes to how cigarettes are marketed to children.

As I have said, particularly over the last couple days, I don’t think we can afford to wait any longer on this issue. As I think all colleagues are aware, every single day we delay action on this legislation, another 3,500 to 4,000 children across the Nation are ensnared by tobacco companies that target them with impunity as they try smoking for the very first time in their lives, 3,500 every single day.

Smoking kills more Americans every year than alcohol abuse, AIDS, car accidents, illegal drug use, murders, and suicides combined. As tragic as all deaths are, particularly ones caused by the circumstances I have raised, if we took all of them together, they do not total the 400,000 people who lose their lives every year as a result of tobacco-related illnesses. Absent action by this Congress, many more children who are alive today will die from smoking, including the 76,000 or so in my home State of Connecticut.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the bill before us would reduce adult smoking by 900,000 Americans. That is not an insignificant number. It represents about 2 percent. The CBO estimates that over the next 10 years, 2 million children will not take up smoking, if we are able to pass this legislation and have an impact on the marketing of these products to kids.

That is 11 percent of children across the country. That is 700,000 people we would be able to have an influence on, convincing them not to take that first cigarette, to begin the habit of smoking.

Unfortunately, flaws in the Burr substitute will not achieve those goals. It would result in much less regulation of tobacco products, allow the tobacco industry to play many more games and hide more of the harm their products cause and leave children and others more vulnerable to the scourge of tobacco. Instead of using the FDA, a proven agency of 100 years, with experienced regulatory and health care responsibilities, to carry out the purpose of this bipartisan bill, the Burr substitute creates a flawed agency, with inadequate resources, and limits the authority of that agency to take meaningful action to curtail the harm caused by tobacco products and their marketing.

The Institute of Medicine, which is highly respected by all of us, and the President’s cancer panel have both endorsed the FDA authority. The Food and Drug Administration has 100 years of experience in regulating almost every product we consume in order to protect public health. A new agency is not the answer. Obviously, one more bureaucracy is hardly the direction we ought to be going. Our bipartisan bill provides adequate funding to effectively regulate tobacco products through a user fee paid by the tobacco industry.

The Burr substitute does not provide adequate resources to get the job done either. In the first 3 years, the Burr substitute provides just a quarter of the funding provided in the Kennedy proposal, which has been with us for the last 7 or 8 years and has been endorsed by 1,000 organizations, faith-based organization, State-based organizations, and virtually every major public health advocacy group in the United States.

Our bipartisan bill gives the FDA strong authority to regulate the content of both existing and new tobacco products, including both cigarettes and smokeless tobacco products. The Burr