

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I commend our colleague, the Senator from South Dakota, Senator JOHNSON, for drawing the attention of this body to the extraordinary tragedy in South Dakota. I think all of us were stunned to see those photos of this town, the town of Spencer, which was just wiped out. It really is stunning to see the complete devastation of that small town.

I remember seeing the press reports and seeing the pictures and being reminded of the devastation we suffered in North Dakota last year with the 500-year flood, on top of the worst winter in history, the most powerful winter storm in 50 years, and in the middle of all that, the fires that destroyed much of downtown Grand Forks, ND.

Our hearts go out to the people of South Dakota. Our hearts go out to the people who have suffered this extraordinary tragedy, to those who lost their lives, to those whose lives have been disrupted forever. And I think it is important for them to know that those in this body on both sides of the aisle will reach out and will help. We certainly saw that in our tragedy, and we will never forget the assistance of our colleagues. We want our friends in the South Dakota delegation to know that we are prepared to help and to reach out and to be of assistance, just as they were of help to us in our disaster. So we want to say to our colleague, Senator JOHNSON, when you are back home talking to the people who have suffered, they can count on this Federal Government to reach out and be there to help in their time of need, just as they were there to help others when they were afflicted.

I also want to say to Senator DASCHLE, the other Senator from South Dakota, obviously, those of us in the Dakotas have a special bond. We will do everything we can to help as you go through this difficult process of rebuilding.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, it is interesting how each of our States has experienced disasters in the last several years—you a 500-year flood, we a 500-year flood, and now this devastating tornado. In April, we have had four natural disasters in Georgia: a flood, an early freeze wiping out the entire first peach crop, and three separate tornadoes. No matter how many times you experience it, the power of it is just mind-boggling. I remember years and years ago, on the eve of my high school graduation in Lee's Summit, MO, being hit by one of these tornadoes that leveled 700 homes to the foundation. I have never seen anything like it. It was like a bomb hit.

You are right. All of our colleagues have been so responsive, and it makes an enormous difference when you are faced with that kind of situation when neighbors and friends across the country are there to help. So I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from North Dakota.

## CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for morning business is closed.

### NATIONAL TOBACCO POLICY AND YOUTH SMOKING REDUCTION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1415.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1415) to reform and restructure the processes by which tobacco products are manufactured, marketed, and distributed, to prevent the use of tobacco products by minors, to redress the adverse health effects of tobacco use, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Gregg/Leahy amendment No. 2433 (to Amendment No. 2420), to modify the provisions relating to civil liability for tobacco manufacturers.

Gregg/Leahy amendment No. 2434 (to Amendment No. 2433), in the nature of a substitute.

Gramm motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report back forthwith, with amendment No. 2436, to modify the provisions relating to civil liability for tobacco manufacturers, and to eliminate the marriage penalty reflected in the standard deduction and to ensure the earned income credit takes into account the elimination of such penalty.

Daschle (for Durbin) amendment No. 2437 (to amendment No. 2436), relating to reductions in underage tobacco usage.

Lott (for Coverdell) modified amendment No. 2451 (to amendment No. 2437), to stop illegal drugs from entering the United States, to provide additional resources to combat illegal drugs, and to establish disincentives for teenagers to use illegal drugs.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2451

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, we are returning to the tobacco legislation, by previous order, and specifically to the amendment that I introduced last evening along with Senator CRAIG of Idaho and Senator ABRAHAM of Michigan, which is now commonly called the drug amendment.

To put this in context, Mr. President, the point that we are making is that you cannot talk about teen addiction and be silent on the No. 1 teen addiction problem, which is drug abuse. So the purpose of this amendment is to make certain that any legislation being considered by this Chamber about teen addiction and teen problems must also include a title to deal with the raging epidemic in our country—teenage drug abuse.

Mr. President, in the last 6½ years, teenage drug abuse has increased by 135 percent. Well, what does that mean? Does that mean that 10 more youngsters are using drugs than were 6 years ago? No. It means that almost 2 million teenagers are using drugs today that were not 6½ years ago.

This is a massive problem and it is a consequence, unfortunately, of altered Federal policy. We decided early in this administration that the battle against

drug abuse would be altered, changed, downsized. The drug office was virtually closed, interdiction facilities were drastically reduced, the Coast Guard was diminished in the Caribbean, and we quit talking about the problem. Simultaneously, we entered into new trade agreements with Mexico, which enormously increased the amount of travel between the two countries, upwards to 4 million vehicles now. So that interdiction apparatus was down and the transportation across the border was up, and we quit talking about the problem. Well, consequently, massive amounts of new drugs came into the country, and because they were coming in such quantities, the price fell. So we had a product that was everywhere, inexpensive, and very, very dangerous.

You can go into any school in the Nation and ask students and they can tell you the name of all these designer drugs; they can tell you exactly where to buy them, and in most cases, it doesn't take over 30 minutes. As I have said, the price plummeted 50, 60, 70 percent. Dropped interdiction, increased border crossings, flooded the market with drugs, the price falls, and the targets are kids, age 8 to 14 years of age. What happened? It doubled and almost tripled drug abuse among teenagers.

Today, in high schools across the country, one in four are using drugs regularly. In junior high, it is 1 in 10. We now have almost 2 million more kids caught up in this lethal snare, drug abuse. To be specific about the numbers, in 1979 at the peak of the last epidemic, 14.1 percent of the entire teenage population ages 12 to 17 was using drugs regularly. The Nation said we can't tolerate this. And from the President to the sheriff, the whole Nation began to fight this epidemic. And what happened?

By 1992, we had reduced drug use among this population by two-thirds. Instead of 3.3 million teenagers using drugs, we drove it down to 1 million. This is very important because it demonstrates that we can correct this problem. There are some in our society, and very powerful people, who would like Americans to believe you can't do anything about this. That is an utter absurdity. We have proven, and very recently, that you can attack this problem and make a difference. But in 1992, as I said a moment ago, we quit talking about the problem. And so today, 2 million-plus are back using drugs regularly. It is a very, very disturbing situation. It just sort of snuck up on us.

A lot of our parents are not talking to their children about this problem, which is very unfortunate, because we know that if parents are talking to their children about this issue, the odds of the children using drugs are cut in half. It is cut in half. But if you went into a classroom, and there are 100 students out there, and say, "How many of you talk to your parents about this problem?" you would be lucky if 10

held up their hands. There is just not that interplay, which explains a little bit here this recent survey. It is most interesting. Forty-three percent of parents believe their teens could find marijuana easily. Sixty percent of the teenagers said it is easy to find. Thirty-three percent of the parents thought their children viewed marijuana as harmful. But only 18 percent of the kids thought it was harmful. It is just a complete disconnect going on here. Forty-five percent of parents felt teens had a friend who smoked marijuana. But if you ask the kids, 71 percent know somebody smoking marijuana. It is just a total disconnect.

So one of the purposes and reasons of this amendment is to assert Federal policy, bold Federal policy that attacks this drug epidemic at every level—at the border, in our communities, in our law enforcement agencies—everybody. It substantially increases funding for interdiction and for education, and it attacks it at every level. If this is put into play, within 24 months there will not be a poll that has 21 percent thinking their teenage children knew someone who experimented with marijuana while 44 percent of the teens said they actually had. This disconnect will be ended in America, and you will begin to drive the numbers of teenagers using drugs down. But not if we bring a major bill about teenage addiction to the Senate and before the American public and never mention drugs and just totally be silent on it as if that is not a problem.

Teenage drug abuse is the No. 1 teenage problem. It is No. 1. Myself, my colleague from Idaho, and my colleague from Michigan felt this almost is damaging if it is so much focused on teenage smoking, which is a problem, but it is a fourth problem. The first one is teenage drugs. So you would almost be saying, "Look, we are accomplishing something here," and looking completely away from the fact that we are in the midst today in this country of one of the most singular alarming epidemics we have ever faced: teenage drug abuse.

I am going to yield, because I see the Senator from North Dakota is prepared to talk here in a minute on the bill.

But one of the saddest things about this whole teenage drug abuse epidemic is that in the last epidemic, in the 1960s and 1970s, most of those teenagers were 16 to 20 in age. Now they are 8 to 14. The cartels have focused. We talked about tobacco focusing on teenagers. It is an unconscionable policy. But the narcotic cartels are totally focused on a young teenage market 8 to 14, as vulnerable a market as could be.

We will pay an unbelievable price—and are—if we do not attack this problem forcefully with the Nation's will, and boldly; not *deja vu*, just another day. We have to turn this thing around.

Mr. President, I am going to yield to my colleague from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am going to speak on a number of subjects this morning. I am going to talk about a Web site contest that I sponsored in North Dakota on this question of tobacco. I am going to talk about the marriage penalty debate that we have ongoing. Then I am going to file a cloture motion on behalf of the leader.

First of all, I want to say to my colleague from Georgia that there are some of us who agree that dealing with drugs as part of this legislation makes some sense. We hope we are able to work together and see if we can't find a formula that works so it can be included here. We know there are others who do not think it is appropriate to include it here, and we respect their views. But some of us do believe it is appropriate to deal with the question of other drugs in this bill. Hopefully, we can find a way to be successful at the end of the day. There is no question that it is a serious problem, just as tobacco is a serious problem that imposes enormous health and financial costs on society. Illegal drug use is also creating enormous difficulties.

When we are in Washington, my wife and I live eight blocks from the Capitol. From the steps of the Capitol, we can look right down the street that leads to the house we live in here in Washington. In 1991, my wife was abducted at gunpoint by a crack addict. I tell you, I will never forget the trauma it caused our family. It is an epidemic in many parts of our country. I am proud to say it is not an epidemic in North Dakota, but even there we have a problem.

I think all of us who are serious about improving the lives of people we represent want to address this problem in this bill if we possibly can. So I thank the Senator from Georgia for the effort he has made.

Mr. President, I sponsored a Web site contest for kids from my State on the question of tobacco use. I asked them to create electronic pages, or electronic posters, to help spread the word that tobacco use causes problems. We just had an outpouring of kids from around the State who entered the contest. One of the winners was Justin Grueneich of Ellendale, ND. His Web site said, "Smoke Is No Joke." He is right. His Web site was packed with statistics and information.

One of the things that impressed us was, we found there was more information there than we have heard on the Senate floor. He actually found facts that we haven't heard in the debate on the Senate floor.

So Justin did a superb job.

Another person who did excellent work was Anne Erickson, a senior at Cavalier High School. She was very creative. Her graphic design was great, and her messages were right on target. She wrote, "To smoke or not to smoke, there is no question." She also posted that in addition to being unhealthy, smoking was also unattractive.

As we know, the tobacco industry has tried to present smoking as cool and attractive and sophisticated. She wasn't buying it.

So thank you, Anne, for seeing through those advertising gimmicks by the industry.

Six fifth graders from Dakota School in Minot joined forces and created a Web site they called "The Healthiest Web Site in North Dakota."

Congratulations to Cierra Bails, Christina Leyrer, Mikey Perron, Jr., Nicole Rogers, Jessica Sarty, and Nicki Taylor for their excellent work.

These fifth graders designed a colorful and informative Web page that included links to North Dakota facts and laws on tobacco. They did really a great job in reminding kids that buying tobacco is illegal and it is unhealthy.

Now, younger students also entered the contest and published electronic posters on the Internet. I brought some of them here to the floor to share with my colleagues today. These are from third graders at North Hill Elementary School in Minot, ND. These are very young children, some as young as 7 years old. This one was done by Annie Kirchofner. It has a very simple message. Fruit is healthy, yes to grapes and apples, no to cigarettes. That is Annie Kirchofner.

Devin Blowers doesn't think that smoking is cool. He says, "Smoking is bad for you. Be cool. Don't smoke." And then he has down here this alligator figure. I guess this is his alternative to Joe Camel, and he has sunglasses on the top of his head here and he says "Yuk" to tobacco.

That is pretty good for 7- and 8-year-old kids. They certainly have the message.

Courtney Sluke, another third grader, produced this poster: "Do not smoke." She is saying to her friend, "Hey, you should not smoke." Again, a third grade student from Minot, ND.

The next was Nicole Belgarde. She had a very interesting message. She says, "Don't always take the advice off T.V." That is a pretty good message. She realizes. Here is the television and it is sending the message that "Smoking is cool." And a fellow youngster is picking up that message saying "Smoking is cool" and she is countering it saying, "No, smoking is not cool."

Alex Deck gets right to the point. He says, "Smoking is bad." He has the universal symbol here, the crossing out of the cigarette, and he has this little figure who is chanting "Smoking is bad."

Bryan Moe, he also was able to get right to the heart of it. He says, "Don't smoke cause you might die." He put the victim right in his deathbed. He was on top of this. And he has X's for his eyes. Pretty tough message. If you smoke, you die. That poor victim is right on his deathbed.

The first place winner—the first place winner is Amanda Roise. She

shows that price does matter. I really like very much what she did.

Now, remember, these are 7- or 8-year-old children who designed these. And these are electronic posters. It is just amazing; these kids posted them on the Internet after we had a call statewide: Send us your ideas. And really we got a tremendous response from all around the State.

Her theme is, "Don't waste your money on cigarettes." And here they have a price of \$2.95 and a customer saying, "I don't have enough." And here is a sign "Don't do drug." She ran out of room so she put the "S" down here. "Don't do drugs." And it is a store, obviously, and one of my favorites is she has excellent coloring, wonderful coloring. These are Cheerios boxes, and I like to eat my Cheerios every morning, so I thought this was especially good. Amanda Roise, the first place winner in our contest for electronic posters.

Congratulations to all of the winners and all of the contestants. We are going to be having fun with this when we go back home presenting the awards to not only these very young children but older ones as well who participated in this web site contest. Gee, we have had so much fun with this. I can tell you, we had a number of distinguished judges make the determinations, and my thanks to them as well.

Mr. President, I wanted to direct my main remarks this morning to the question of the marriage penalty because that has become an important part of the debate here as to what alternative we ought to pursue in addressing the marriage penalty. I thought it might be helpful to discuss for a moment what the marriage penalty is, who is really being hurt by it, and what we could do to address it in some rational way.

Let's put up the first chart that shows the question of who really is facing the marriage penalty. This is according to the Congressional Budget Office, and it shows that 51 percent of noncorporate filers in this country are singles. So, of course, they don't face the marriage penalty. Of all the noncorporate filers, 51 percent are single people. They don't have a problem with the marriage penalty. And 3.5 percent are joint returns that are unaffected by the so-called marriage penalty, so we don't need to focus on them.

Then when you look at the rest, what you find is that 24.5 percent, in fact, face the marriage penalty; that is, they pay more taxes because they are married than if they were filing separately. Interestingly enough, 21 percent get a bonus by being married; that is, they pay less by being married than they would pay if they filed separately as single individuals.

I want to indicate that the Democratic alternative to the Gramm amendment focuses its relief on those taxpayers who are actually being penalized. That seems to make sense. Unfortunately, Senator GRAMM's offering

deals not only with those who are actually being penalized but he also gives relief to those who are getting a bonus. I am not quite sure what logic there is to that, but that is, in fact, what the amendment of the Senator from Texas would do, and as a result there are insufficient resources to help those who are really hurt by the marriage penalty. What sense that makes escapes this Senator.

What we have done is instead of diluting the relief that would go to couples paying a marriage penalty, we focus on those who are paying the marriage penalty. It seems to me that tax fairness would require that married couples with equal incomes ought to be taxed equally. That seems to be a basic kind of concept, one that makes common sense.

The Democratic alternative recognizes, as did the Congress in 1981 when it enacted the Kemp-Roth tax cuts, that to eliminate or reduce the marriage penalty, it is necessary to draw a distinction between one-earner and two-earner couples. As in 1981, the most efficient way to provide relief to couples who are incurring a marriage penalty is to allow a percentage of the earned income of the spouse with the lower earnings to be, in effect, free from income tax. Because the alternative offered by the Democrats is targeted on low- and moderate-income couples, we can make this two-earner deduction more generous than the one that was enacted in 1981. At that time, they provided the 10-percent deduction. Our alternative, when fully phased in, will provide a 20-percent deduction from the lower earner's income. This represents a much more potent assault on the marriage penalty than either the 1981 provision or the proposal offered by the Senator from Texas.

Let me direct my attention for a moment to the proposal of the Senator from Texas. His proposal is a one-size-fits-all approach that scatters the modest relief that it provides to all joint filers, whether they actually incur a marriage penalty or not. He gives it to those who have a bonus from being married instead of focusing on those who actually are penalized by being married. As a result, he gives much less help to those who actually are paying a penalty. Again, the logic of his approach I do not think holds up under scrutiny.

In fairness, there is marriage penalty relief in the Gramm proposal, but there is also a considerable tax cut for people who are already getting a marriage bonus. I just do not think that makes sense. The Senator from Texas would spend about half of the revenue he is all too willing to take away from health research and public health efforts in order to spend the money on tax relief for people who already enjoy an advantage under the system and, in the process, shortchanges the couples who are actually being penalized.

The next chart demonstrates the weakness of the Gramm approach in

comparison to what we are offering. This looks at the alternative that we are proposing on the Democratic side to cut the marriage tax penalty more than the Gramm proposal does for most families. This would be in 2002, when fully phased in. The first example is for a couple earning \$35,000 a year, split, with one member of the couple getting \$20,000 a year of income and the other, \$15,000 a year of income. The Gramm amendment would provide a tax deduction of \$1,650. Our proposal would provide a deduction of \$3,000—far more generous, because it makes much more sense, in order to provide actual relief to those who are being penalized by the marriage penalty.

The second alternative is a couple earning \$50,000, evenly split between the two. Again, the Gramm amendment, the one-size-fits-all approach, gives a deduction of \$1,650. That doesn't really make much sense because, again, he is conferring benefits not only on those who are being penalized by the marriage penalty but he is conferring benefits on those who are already getting a bonus, those who are being given favorable treatment. He treats them all alike. Those who are helped, those who are hurt—he treats them all alike. We say you ought to focus the resources you have on those who are hurt, so we say a \$5,000 tax deduction for that couple who has \$50,000 a year of income, evenly split between the two.

By the way, this is precisely the situation in which the largest marriage penalties occur, yet Senator Gramm treats them the same way as the others. And, in addition, he is giving that same benefit to couples who are actually advantaged by being married because of their tax circumstances under the current Tax Code. Again, the Gramm approach just does not stand up under much scrutiny.

I think if we analyze what has happened here, the fact is that we know who the taxpayers are who face a marriage penalty and we know that some penalties are harsher than others. Why should we opt for an approach that treats everybody the same, especially when it is substantially more expensive than a tailored approach that responds to the marriage penalty in a proportional way on a couple-by-couple basis?

Senator GRAMM calls our approach a figleaf. I think moderate-income families who are struggling on two incomes would welcome our figleaf when they compare it with the pine needle the Senator from Texas would provide. The fact is, ours is far more generous to those who are actually experiencing a marriage penalty. If we are going to call it marriage penalty relief, we ought to target it to those who are actually facing a marriage penalty.

I think it is also important to say that when the Senator from Texas asserts that this bill which is moving through Congress is regressive and imposes a harsh penalty on those who are

at the lowest end of the income continuum in this country, that there is another side to the story that he is not telling. The fact is, smoking is a huge tax on low-income Americans. An average pack-a-day smoker will spend more than \$25,000 on cigarettes over his lifetime. An average pack-a-day smoker will have an additional \$20,000 in medical costs over his or her lifetime. And the average low-income American, both smokers and nonsmokers, will pay his or her share of the \$4.7 trillion in costs that smoking will impose on society over the next 25 years. That is something that has been left out completely by the discussion of the Senator from Texas.

He talks a lot about tax increases, but he does not mention the hidden tax that is being imposed on members of this society every year: \$130 billion that this industry is imposing in costs on society—\$60 billion in health costs, \$60 billion in lost productivity, and \$10

billion in other costs. The fact is, low-income workers' payroll taxes are paying for about \$18 billion a year in Medicare costs; low-income workers' income taxes are paying for about \$12 billion a year in Medicaid costs. Those are hidden taxes that low-income people are paying each and every year because of the costs being imposed by the tobacco industry in this society. The fact is, low-income workers are also paying higher health insurance costs and getting lower wages as a result of the costs to our health care system of smoking.

Again, let me stress the bottom line: \$4.7 trillion in costs being imposed on this society over the next 25 years. The biggest tax cut that we could give low-income Americans is to reduce that cost. The McCain bill will cut smoking by about a third. That would produce savings of about \$1.6 trillion for this society from the \$4.7 trillion price tag imposed on us by the tobacco industry.

That is the smart way of helping low-income Americans. Obviously, when we couple that with the proposal of the Democrats to focus on the marriage penalty, not to be giving the same treatment to those whether they are hurt or helped by the current tax system, we have a potent combination.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office describing what causes the marriage penalty and what causes the marriage bonus, so people might see how it comes about, the situations in which people are adversely affected by the marriage penalty, and how others benefit by being married and actually pay less taxes than they would pay if they were filing as singles.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 3.—FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER COUPLES FACE MARRIAGE PENALTIES OR BONUSES, 1996

Tax parameter or feature	Conditions leading to marriage penalty	Conditions leading to marriage bonus
Personal Exemptions (\$2,550 for all individuals, regardless of marital status) ..	None .....	One spouse cannot use full single exemption but other spouse would have positive taxable income if taxed as an individual.
Standard Deduction (\$4,000 for singles, \$6,700 for couples) .....	Combined use of two single deductions exceeds value of married deduction	One spouse cannot use full single deduction but other spouse would have positive taxable income if taxed as an individual.
Tax Brackets (Lower brackets for singles are 60 percent as wide as those for couples; top bracket starts at same income for all).	Spouses have more nearly equal incomes; as married couple, more of combined income taxed at higher rate; high earners have more income subject to top tax rate.	Spouses have unequal incomes; as singles, income of higher-earning spouse taxed at higher rate.
Earned Income Tax Credit (Parameters same regardless of filing status) .....	Low-earning parent married to spouse whose income causes loss of some or all of earned income tax credit.	Low-earning childless person married to parent with no or very low earnings.
Phaseout of Personal Exemptions (Starting income for singles equals two-thirds of that for couples).	Spouses have more nearly equal incomes; as married couple, more of total income falls in phaseout range.	Spouses have unequal incomes; as singles, more income of higher-earning spouse subject to phaseout.
Limitation on Itemized Deductions (Starting point same regardless of filing status).	Spouses have more nearly equal incomes; as married couple, more of total income falls in limitation range.	None.
Other Fixed Dollar Limitations (For example, income limit for individual retirement accounts, thresholds for taxation of Social Security).	Either marriage does not increase limit or increase is less than spouse adds to measure subject to limit.	Marriage increases limit and one spouse adds less to measure subject to limit than the increase in limit.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Democratic leader, I would like to close by sending this cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the modified committee substitute for S. 1415, the tobacco legislation.

John Kerry, Bob Kerrey, Kent Conrad, Harry Reid, Paul Wellstone, Dick Durbin, Patty Murray, Richard Bryan, Tom Harkin, Carl Levin, Joe Biden, J. Lieberman, John Glenn, Jeff Bingaman, Ron Wyden, and Max Baucus.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank my colleague from Georgia for his indulgence and his patience.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I suspect this most recent cloture motion has the potential of engendering some controversy. It puts into rather tenuous circumstances the amendment we are discussing, because if we cannot vote—if cloture were secured, this amendment would not be in order,

along with a number of other very core components of the debate about this very contentious legislation. So I hope that is being thought through very carefully by all parties concerned, that this is a very significant piece of legislation that has an enormous effect on our country and there are some very important amendments that cloture could arbitrarily remove from the debate.

I will leave that to the leadership and another day.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2451

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, returning to my amendment for a few minutes—I see Senator GRAHAM has been waiting—I will take a couple of minutes and then yield the floor. But I want to reiterate the importance of this amendment that puts teenage drug addiction in the mix.

I have said repeatedly throughout the debate that I think it is unconscionable policy to be talking to the country about teenage addiction and skip the No. 1 problem of teenage addiction, which is drug abuse. It almost is an extension of the silence that we have witnessed over the last several years about this problem. This Senator does not intend to allow that silence to occur here. In other words, the idea being we will pass a bill that deals with teenage smoking and somehow will have comfortably addressed teenage addiction problems is the wrong mes-

sage. It certainly should be part of the message that we are dealing with teenage smoking, but we cannot—I repeat—cannot ignore the teenage drug issue which is, of course, related to smoking.

I point out here, someone who smokes marijuana regularly may have many of the same respiratory problems that tobacco smokers have. These kids may have daily cough and phlegm, symptoms of chronic bronchitis and more frequent chest colds. Continuing to smoke marijuana can lead to abnormal functioning of lung tissue injured or destroyed by marijuana smoke. Regardless of the THC content, the amount of tar inhaled by marijuana smokers and the level of carbon monoxide absorbed are three to five times greater than among tobacco smokers. This may be due to marijuana users inhaling more deeply and holding the smoke in the lungs.

A very large component of teenage drug abuse is directly related to the smoking of the most prominent drug abused by teenagers, which is marijuana. When they smoke marijuana, the effects and damage are far greater.

Again, I reiterate, as I will repeatedly, you cannot talk about teenage addiction without the two. You have to talk about teenage smoking of tobacco, but you cannot be silent on the smoking of marijuana or the other drug-related abuses.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I look forward at the appropriate time to discuss the amendment of the Senator from Georgia because I agree with his premise that there is a relationship between tobacco smoking and the use of drugs. I have spent a great deal of my time in public office trying to increase our ability to deal with illicit use of drugs, both in terms of effective enforcement at all levels of government and those things that will reduce the likelihood of persons desiring to use drugs.

Let me say the most fundamental relationship between the tobacco issue that we debate today and the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is that virtually no one starts with the use of illicit drugs. Tobacco is the gateway to the use of illicit drugs. So our ability, by effective legislation or otherwise, to substantially reduce the number of persons who commence the process of experimentation, use and then addiction to tobacco will make one of, if not the most, fundamental contributions to the reduction of the use of illicit hard drugs. That is an issue that we will have an opportunity to discuss in more detail later.

My concern today is a series of ads that are being run, ads that are being run either under the specific sponsorship of the tobacco industry or by organizations which we know are supported by the tobacco industry.

Typical of these ads is one in which there is a lady, a waitress who is looking into a television camera and is stating how much her cost of smoking will increase if legislation such as that proposed by the Senate Commerce Committee were to become the law.

There are other ads that make the same point through other appealing messages. There is a fundamental error in those ads. There is a fundamental deception. There is the latest example of the manipulation for which this industry has become so well known. What is that error? What is that fraud? What is that manipulation? It is the assumption that the status quo is an option. It is the assumption that we can roll back the events of the last several years and go back to 1970 and everything will be as it was then; that that lady in the ad will not be threatened with the possibility of higher prices for her cigarettes.

The fact is that the status quo is not an option. There are two basic options that are before us as we continue this debate, and I think that it is important that we reassert what our real alternatives are.

Our alternatives are either comprehensive, and I believe as Senator CHAFEE and Senator HARKIN and I have believed for many months, that it also must be bipartisan, health-oriented national legislation. That is one alternative.

The other alternative is not the status quo. The other alternative is a con-

tinuation of the pattern of State-by-State litigation, a pattern which has already increased the price of cigarettes in America between 17 to 20 cents per pack to pay for the settlements that have been reached thus far in only four States—Mississippi, Florida, Texas and Minnesota.

It is projected that if the increase in cigarettes that will be a result of the other 46 States successfully pursuing litigation against the tobacco industry is at the same per capita level as these first four States, Mr. President, that the cost per pack will go up by an additional dollar or to a level higher than that which is being proposed by the Senate Commerce Committee.

So the option that we have is not one of whether there is going to be an increase in the price of cigarettes; the question is whether it will come through a comprehensive, bipartisan, health-oriented national legislation, or whether it will come by a series of State-by-State litigations augmented by the kinds of litigations that are now being brought by Blue Cross-Blue Shield as an example of insurance carrier litigation, being brought by labor unions on behalf of their members and, Mr. President, I believe eventually will be brought by the Federal Government to secure its appropriate compensation for the additional cost that it has paid for tobacco-related illnesses through programs such as Medicare, the Veterans' Administration, CHAMPUS—the health care program for military personnel and their dependents—and a variety of other programs in which the Federal Government is either the total or a substantial contributor to their financing.

The choice is either we do this through comprehensive, bipartisan, health-oriented national legislation, or it occurs on a State-by-State, litigation-by-litigation basis.

My personal feeling is that by every criteria that we have used to assess what is the public interest, that the public interest would be better served by a comprehensive, bipartisan, health-oriented national legislation.

What are some of those interests? Our most fundamental interest, the issue that has brought us here today and for the last several days and will for several more to come, has been our concern over teenage smoking. We know that every day 3,000 American youth, under the age of 18, commence the process that will eventually lead to the regular use of tobacco. We know that of that 3,000, that a third—1,000—will become so addicted to tobacco that they will die, that they will die prematurely of a tobacco-related affliction.

That is the fundamental objective of this legislation, to reduce this unnecessary carnage of America's youth and adult population because of the continuation of a youthful introduction to tobacco.

Which of the two approaches is most likely to achieve the objective of re-

ducing youth smoking? We know some things, Mr. President, as to what is the effective combination of initiatives. We know that the most effective plan will be a broad-based, comprehensive public health-oriented plan. It will include items such as the funding of smoking cessation programs and the funding of education programs on the consequences of the use of tobacco. It will include limitations on marketing and promotion. It will include penalties against the industry and individual companies which fail to meet national standards for the reduction of teenage smoking. It will include, and probably most significantly, a substantial increase in the price of cigarettes, because it is that increase in price that will have the greatest deterrent effect on the use of cigarettes.

The Centers for Disease Control has estimated that in the initial stages of an increase in price, that for every 10-percent increase in price, there is a 7-percent reduction in use. Those relationships begin to change as you reach higher levels of price increases. But the legislation that the Senator from Arizona has presented to us is projected to have, by the price alone, a reduction in teenage use of in the range of 40 to 50 percent.

It is also important, Mr. President, that that price be instituted on a shock basis. If the price increase is gradual, incremental, drop by drop, then it is more likely to be absorbed, become the norm, and set the foundation for acceptance of the next increase. But if that price increase is dramatic—is imposed quickly—it will have the greatest affect in terms of achieving our objective of reducing teenage smoking.

It is obvious that on all of those counts, comprehensive, bipartisan, public health-oriented national legislation will better achieve our objective of reducing teenage smoking than will the pattern of State by State, litigant by litigant courtroom action that will be the alternative to a national, comprehensive, bipartisan public health-oriented resolution of this issue.

On the standard of enforcement, much is made in these ads that the tobacco industry is promoting that there will be a burgeoning of black-market sales if there is a substantial increase in the price. The fact is that by a legislative settlement—which among other things will provide the funds for those areas of enhanced enforcement that may be necessary, a national settlement that can contain provisions for strengthening our enforcement, a national settlement that will result in less variation State to State in terms of the price of cigarettes, and therefore less likelihood of black-market sales domestically within the United States—that a national legislative settlement will reduce the potential of black-market activities to a substantially greater degree than the alternative of State-by-State litigation.

We also know that, on the issue of tobacco farmers, there is great recognition of the necessity to provide some

transition. That transition is contained in every serious piece of legislation that has been introduced in the national Congress.

There will be a debate over which of those alternatives is preferred, but the fact that it is a recognized part of a national, comprehensive, bipartisan health-oriented tobacco resolution is unanimously agreed to. But, Mr. President, that has not been included in the State-by-State settlements, and will not likely be included. Only a relatively small number of States are directly affected by the issue of tobacco farmers and, therefore, could not be expected to include, in their settlements with the tobacco industry, funding for tobacco farmers.

If there is going to be a transition, it has to be done at the national level, not at a State-by-State level. So the interest of that constituency and that important part of this overall complex issue will be much better served by national legislation than they will be by a State-by-State settlement.

Finally, having a rational distribution of the funds, yes, this is going to raise a substantial amount of money. It may raise more money on the State-by-State basis, it may impose higher costs on the industry, and eventually on the users of this product than national legislation, but in either event there will be a substantial amount of funds raised by either national legislation or by State-by-State litigation. But it is at the national level that we will have a better likelihood of being able to allocate the funds to important programs, such as research in our national health institutes so that we will learn more about the consequences of past tobacco use and an effective means of avoiding such use in the future.

It is less likely that the States will be equitably treated through a series of State-by-State matters as opposed to doing it on a national basis. There will not be the funds likely to be available for effective counteradvertising, which will require a national program just as the national program that the Federal Government is now underwriting as it relates to advertising against the use of illicit drugs.

So, Mr. President, based on our principal objective, which is the reduction of youth smoking, and other important subissues of this current effort, including appropriate use of the funds, enforcement against black marketing, the effect on tobacco farmers, it is much more likely that we will achieve our objectives through a national legislative settlement than what is the real alternative, which is for us to do nothing and then allow the course of action which is already in place, State by State, private, soon to be, I hope, Federal litigation against the tobacco industries to be the alternative.

So, Mr. President, as we conclude this week's debate, I hope as we return next week we will be prepared to focus on what the real options are and get

the business of America done and stop the carnage of American children that is resulting every hour we delay in this effort to mitigate the carnage of American youth that occurs as they take up the use of tobacco.

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Jason Westin of my staff be allowed floor privileges for the remainder of the consideration of this legislation.

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

Mr. HARKIN. Would the Senator yield for a question? I compliment the Senator on his outstanding statement and thank him for all of his diligence and hard work on the whole issue of cutting down on teen smoking. I know the Senator from Florida has made that one of his key principles, which is in this bill. Really, the essence of this bill is to cut down on teen smoking. I appreciate all of the work he has done, and with Senator CHAFEE and with me on this.

I know Senator CHAFEE will be speaking next. We hope to engage in some colloquy here on the Senate floor to talk about some of the issues that have come up that are extraneous—important issues, but extraneous to the bill.

I just want to basically ask the Senator from Florida—before I know Senator CHAFEE will make his opening statement—about that aspect, about the other issues that seem to be coming up on this bill and whether or not we could address those later on and just keep the focus on the main issue here.

Mr. GRAHAM. Senator, I agree with your statement. We have one principal objective with this legislation, and that is to reduce teenage smoking, to reduce this unconscionable level of death and damage that is inflicted upon our young people by their early addiction to tobacco.

There are other issues that are being suggested—from reforming the tax law to an enhanced enforcement effort against illicit drugs—which are all important issues, and many of us have supported and advocated and led the charge on those issues on other days and in other forums.

Our concern is—and I will not impugn the motives of any of the advocates of those other provisions—that some outside, and maybe a few inside, this Chamber would be pleased at the objection of these “tantalizing but extraneous issues” because they would see them as a means of delay, obfuscation, and, eventually, defeat of comprehensive national legislation.

What stuns me is that they don't also see what the alternative is. The alternative is not that defeat here will mean the American public will throw up its hands and say, “I guess we have to accept the fact that 125 American young people will take up smoking every hour of every day of the 365 days of the year.” That will not be the alter-

native. The alternative will be that the American public, having disdained of our ability to deal with this problem, will go to their States, will go to their labor unions, will urge their insurance carriers to enter the fray, as they have in other States, and we will have a 50-State shootout in the courts on this issue.

We will move toward our objective, but not nearly as effectively as if we accept the responsibility and the opportunity to probably make the greatest contribution to the enhancement of public health of Americans that has occurred in this century by the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, over the past several days it seems to me that the Senate debate on the tobacco bill has taken a very unfortunate turn. It is a turn away from what I strongly believe are the purposes and objectives of the legislation. I want to remind my colleagues that the very name of the bill that we are dealing with is the National Tobacco Policy and Youth Smoking Reduction Act. I want to accent the “Youth Smoking Reduction Act” portion of the title.

Now, the purpose of this tobacco legislation is to fundamentally change the way tobacco products are marketed and sold in this country. Clearly, there is an epidemic sweeping the Nation. That is the rapid growth of teenage smoking and tobacco use. The Centers for Disease Control, as has been said many times on the floor, estimates that every day 3,000 young American children, teenagers, take up smoking and that one-third of these 3,000 will die prematurely because of smoking-related diseases.

Thus, if you multiply that out, it is a million children a year, a million young American children under the age of 18, who join the ranks of adult smokers, and more than 300,000 of them will die prematurely. Over a 25-year period, that amounts to 8 million Americans dying early because of smoking. That is more Americans than were lost in all the major wars that our Nation has been involved with.

As has been pointed out also frequently, tobacco use is the largest preventable cause of death in America today. In other words, if we want to look where can we do something about preventing deaths in our country, and should we tackle alcohol or should we tackle accidents or should we deal with illegal drugs or automobile accidents—yes, all of those are important, but none of them compares with the reduction in fatalities that would occur if we could eliminate smoking among the young people.

The statistics are chilling. Tobacco-related deaths are four times the number of Americans who die every year from alcohol-related deaths. Tobacco-related deaths kill 9 times the number who die from accidental deaths and 44 times the number of Americans who die from illegal drugs. In America

alone, 419,000 deaths occur as a result of tobacco-related illnesses, diseases. Nearly half a million every year in our country die from tobacco-related diseases.

So, obviously, the way to prevent and discourage young people from taking up tobacco is in the beginning and doing all we can to encourage adults to cease smoking.

Some of the amendments before us would take us far afield from that purpose. In other words, the objective of the exercise is to reduce teenage smoking, prevent it if possible, and to encourage adults to give up smoking. But these amendments we have before the Senate now go far afield from that.

Let me begin with the drug amendment currently pending. This amendment would take \$3 billion annually out of this bill to combat illegal drugs, which means we will have \$3 billion less per year available for the war on tobacco. Now, we already have a war on drugs, and we are spending billions of dollars every year to combat the serious problems of illegal drugs. This may be a meritorious amendment. Maybe we should spend \$3 billion more fighting drugs. But this isn't the place to do it. If there is an antidrug amendment to be brought up, bring it up as a freestanding amendment. See if the money is there somewhere to fund this initiative. If it is all that important, let's find the money for it. But it doesn't belong on this bill.

Now, the next one, Mr. President, the marriage penalty tax relief proposal. Now, maybe that is a good proposal, but it has no place in this legislation. Correcting a bias in the Tax Code may make sense, but not on this bill. As the fiscal year 1999 budget process advances, we will have a chance to consider the marriage penalty. Indeed, the Senate budget resolution which we adopted here has \$30 billion provided for tax cuts. That is the place where marriage penalties should go if it is that important. The budget resolution reported from the House Budget Committee calls for \$100 billion in tax cuts. There is ample opportunity to do something about tax cuts and the marriage penalty.

Now, I know one of the arguments for doing a tax cut in this bill is, it is enunciated they want to return some of the money that will be paid in the form of higher cigarette prices paid by smokers. It is said that the great majority of smokers are in the low-income or the middle-income group and that we ought to do something for them. Somehow that has a twist to it that isn't really sensible. I reject the argument that these individuals somehow need to be reimbursed. The fact is, because of the smoking of individuals in America, we all are paying vastly higher taxes than we ever would otherwise. We are paying higher Medicare costs, we are paying higher Medicaid costs, we are paying higher private health insurance premiums, because smokers insist on smoking, and they are the ones

in whom, unfortunately, so many smoking-related illnesses occur.

The fact of the matter is, smoking is a hidden tax on all taxpayers. The direct medical costs of treating smoking-related illnesses exceed \$60 billion a year. We are all paying that—higher premiums on our health insurance, as I mentioned before. The current Federal excise tax on cigarettes does not begin to approach offsetting these additional costs. Thus, in my judgment, it is perfectly proper that smokers pay more than they are currently paying in taxes on cigarettes.

Now, let me conclude by making a simple point. Here, the original McCain bill provided an increase in revenues of \$65 billion. How is that money to be spent?

It was to be spent with \$26 billion going to the States. This is over 5 years—\$26 billion to the States. NIH is to get \$14 billion plus. In other words, cessation and prevention programs were to receive \$14 billion. Agriculture, \$10 billion over 5 years. This is the total; it comes to \$65 billion.

But now what is happening, Mr. President, is a whole series of things have been added on. Yes, the States stay at \$26 billion. In comes illegal drugs, \$15 billion, and marriage penalty, \$15 billion. Veterans—we adopted that already—is at \$3 billion, agriculture at \$18 billion, public health at \$14 billion, and NIH at \$14 billion. In other words, the spending equalling the revenue—the revenue being \$65 billion over 5 years, and suddenly it is up to \$105 billion. Obviously, the traffic can't bear that. That is not what the taxes are going to produce. So something has to give.

Mr. President, I remember this: There is a strong constituency for the States. Oh, yes, they want their money. The marriage penalty is very enticing and veterans has already been adopted. In agriculture, there is a strong constituency. What is going to fall out is the NIH and the public health programs.

Mr. President, I think that is terribly unfortunate. And we see here what is going to lose. When we talk about health-related programs, we are talking not only about NIH, which is a separate thing, but there are cessation, prevention/education, counteradvertising, antismuggling, and youth access restrictions. Those are the things that are so important if we are truly concerned with reducing smoking amongst our young people, as the very name of this legislation provides. These are the things that will go out if we adopt these other proposals, attractive though they may be, for marriage penalty and antidrug activities.

Mr. President, the point is there won't be resources for these programs that are so important. So I don't think that is where we want to be at the end of the day. I don't think we want to end up with these programs losing out because we have adopted the others. If

the others are all that important—the antidrug provisions, illegal drugs, the marriage penalty relief—there will be a chance at another time to address those. But in this legislation let's stick with the objective, which is to reduce teenage smoking, prevent it from occurring in the beginning, and do all we can to encourage those who are smokers to give up that unfortunate habit.

So for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to reject the antidrug and the tax cut amendments. They are not about tobacco; they should not be in this bill.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, first, I listened with great interest to the comments of the Senator from Rhode Island about these two amendments. I urge him to think about the end game and not just look at this vote or this amendment at this time. Like everybody else around here, people are assuming that if we have a bad bill at this point—which we do—or if we add an amendment here or there, that is going to become law. Somebody needs to think about how do we get to an end result that will achieve the things we want.

If there ever is a bill, it will have a teenage smoking cessation campaign and it will have a drug abuse cessation campaign. It is very appropriate that we tie these two together. It will have additional help for health programs that have been affected by smoking. NIH, obviously, would be a major beneficiary, and it should be. We need research on the health problems caused by smoking. Medicaid and Medicare—that would be the end result. Somebody better think about how do you ever get an end result. If we don't add something on marriage penalty, tax relief, and on drugs, there won't be a bill. There will not be a bill.

I want to remind everybody how we got to this point. First of all, Senator MCCAIN, the manager of the bill, chairman of the Commerce Committee, had hearings; his committee met. They reported the bill out. I think it was 19 or 20-1. Republicans and Democrats voted for it. All of them had to sort of hold their noses, knowing there were too many things in here that were the wrong thing to do, and they had gone too far. They had some problems, but they got it done. It was a Republican chairman and every Republican but one voted to report it out of that committee.

I want the record to show, once again, that I am the guy that called up this legislation for it to be considered. But I am here to say that at this point it looks to me like it is over because of the games that are being played. Now, efforts were being made this very morning to work out a reasonable compromise on the tax cut proposal by Senator GRAMM. We were going to have to have a good debate and a vote on



this drug-related amendment. There were going to have to be additional votes on the attorneys' fees issue. There is going to have to be votes on the substitutes, if offered, by Senators HATCH, GRAMM and DOMENICI. At that point, perhaps cloture could begin. That is not what has been happening.

Yesterday, Senator DASCHLE filed a cloture motion and, frankly, I did not appreciate the way that was being done. We are not ready for cloture on this. We have some other issues that have to be considered before cloture would ever be invoked. And now, for the information of all Senators, the junior Senator from North Dakota, Senator CONRAD, has filed a cloture motion on the pending committee amendment to the tobacco bill. Now, who else is going to file a cloture? We have a good man back here in the cloakroom, Tiny; maybe he can file cloture on this bill. Is everybody going to wander in and file a cloture? Do we want two cloture votes on Tuesday, or one every day, or do we want a bill?

Frankly, Mr. President, I am offended by this. I consider it a breach of the good faith that we have worked in within this Chamber. I was not notified this was going to happen until 5 minutes after 11. I never had a discussion with my counterpart on the other side, and then Senator CONRAD files his cloture motion at about 11:20. I resent it. I don't appreciate it. It is counterproductive and it is killing this bill. So I truly regret this action by our minority colleagues.

As all Senators know, rule XXII, the cloture rule, is one of the most rigid of our rules, as far as imposing an arbitrary schedule for the consideration of a bill. Amendments and even dictating the convening time of the Senate with respect to the time of a cloture rollcall vote are locked in under this rule. The bill before us would require eight cloture motions—that is an important point—to be invoked and each of the eight cloture items to be disposed of with up to 30 hours of debate on each.

They are as follows: cloture on the Commerce Committee amendment; cloture on the bill, S. 1415; cloture on the motion to proceed to a House revenue bill; cloture on the substitute amendment to insert the Senate text into the House revenue bill; cloture on passage of the House revenue bill; cloture on the motion to insist on the Senate amendment required to send the bill to conference; cloture on the motion to request a conference with the House on disagreeing amendments; and cloture on the appointment of conferees.

I am not the only guy in the Senate who knows where all these cloture motions can be filed. Of course, that is assuming you get cloture, which then would require 30 hours and hundreds of amendments. This is a very complex, very important piece of legislation, no matter what your viewpoint is, for or against. Everybody has to acknowledge that it has many moving parts, is very complex, and there are many opportu-

nities for amendments to be offered and for mischief to be caused. It could take forever or, in fact, never, as far as this bill being completed, unless we have some modicum of cooperation on both sides of the aisle and some effort to be fair to Senators that do have amendments that they think should be offered.

So I am disappointed. But if this is the way we are going to proceed, if it is going to be done this way, then I will join the ranks of those that are going to use every procedural parliamentary tool to work against this legislation, and we can just go ahead and admit that it was a good thought.

We tried our best. It didn't work. I think that is unfortunate. But the way that this is set up now, that is exactly where we are.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am disappointed that the majority leader has taken the floor to criticize what has occurred this morning. I notified the majority leader last night of our intention to file cloture again. We have been on the bill 42 hours, 39 minutes as of 11:53. Eight days we have been here debating. We have sought some cooperation from our colleagues on the other side in terms of reaching some agreement on how we can proceed on amendments. We have attempted to do that. We were getting nowhere. It was only after we filed cloture last night that we were able to get a vote finally on the Durbin amendment.

The majority leader talks about fairness being the criterion by which we judge a Senator's right to offer an amendment. In the name of fairness, we need to offer Senators their opportunity to come to the floor to offer amendments. I wish we would use the same standard. Let's use the same standard for the tobacco bill as we used for the Coverdell bill, as we used for all other bills that we have had before the Senate this year. We were arguing fairness when Senators were denied the opportunity to offer amendments. In fact, somebody said, "Can you believe they are offering a tax amendment on the Coverdell bill?" We said, "Well, this is a tax bill." But we were accused of destroying what harmony there may have been to reach some agreement. And Senators on this side of the aisle were precluded from offering amendments on the Coverdell bill even though it was a tax bill, because they said this is an education bill. Do you remember that debate? Because it was "an education bill," we were not supposed to offer tax amendments. But it was a tax bill.

Now we have the tobacco legislation, and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are saying we want to offer a tax amendment. We are saying this is a tobacco bill. They say it doesn't matter. We are going to offer this tobacco amendment, and you are not being fair

unless you ensure that we have a right to offer tax amendments.

I am just asking, let's play fair. Let's use the same standard. That isn't too much to ask. Once we have agreed on what that standard is, let's accommodate Senators on both sides who have amendments they wish to offer. We have a tax amendment. We don't understand why it would be that difficult for us to come to some agreement about having a vote on two competing ideas on the same exact issue. Let's have our debate. Let's lay the amendments down. Let's have a vote back to back on the amendments, and let's move on. We will have an amendment to the amendment that has now been offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. We laud him for many of the things that are incorporated in his amendment. There are some concerns that we have. If we can't work through those, we will certainly have an alternative there as well.

But it seems to me that we have a double standard here, Mr. President. When it was in circumstances in the past, we had one set of rules. Now, with circumstances with this bill, there is another set of rules. Let's play by the same rules. Let's work together and see if we can't find some resolution of this problem. I think that can be done, but we have a ways to go.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I listened with interest and great attention to the words spoken by the majority leader. He used the phrase, "Let's keep in mind the end game." I go back to what my colleague from Florida, Senator GRAHAM, and Senator CHAFEE just spoke about before the two leaders took the floor. What is the "end game"? It is right here. This is the end game. The number of high school students smoking is going up at a precipitous rate, higher than ever. The end game of this bill is to cut down on teenage smoking. That is the end game.

The majority leader says if there is no marriage penalty tax in there and no illegal drug money, then there is going to be no bill. I hope I still have some rational reasoning power. I have to ask, Why? Why is that? The majority leader didn't expound on why that would be. You mean to say that we are holding these teenagers being addicted every day—3,000 teenagers every day being addicted to tobacco—hostage to the marriage penalty tax provision or illegal drug money? Holding them hostage? Yet, the majority leader says there will be no bill unless we have this. I don't understand that. The committee-reported bill didn't have them in it. The committee-reported bill that was reported out by a huge vote under the leadership of Senator MCCAIN didn't have that in it.

And the majority leader went on to say—I don't understand where he is



getting his figures—that we are going to have money for research, we will have money for cutting down teenage smoking. I don't know where he is going to get the money. Look, I am using the same chart that Senator CHAFEE used just a minute ago. Here is the original McCain bill: \$65 billion over 5 years for public health, NIH, health research, States, and agriculture. Add it up—\$65 billion. If we keep the States at \$26 billion, we keep agriculture, we add in illegal drugs, the Coverdell amendment, the marriage penalty, and veterans, we are up to \$65 billion, and we have no money for NIH and no money for public health, period.

Does the majority leader mean to say that he is going to bring another bill on the floor to magically find some money floating around someplace for NIH research and for public health for cutting down on teen smoking? I am sorry. The facts are simple.

If you put in the \$15 billion on the illegal drugs, the \$15 billion on the marriage penalty, the veterans' \$3 billion, agriculture \$18 billion, you can forget about public health and NIH. There is no money left, unless, of course, the majority leader is going to come back on the floor with a provision to raise the price of tobacco to even more than \$1.10 a pack. Maybe the majority leader would like to raise the price of cigarettes to \$1.50 a pack or \$2 a pack. That might get you the money. But with the \$1.10 a pack you have in there now, you are not going to have the money, period.

So I just do not understand what the majority leader can possibly be talking about and where he could possibly be finding all of this money that he is going to have.

The majority leader said he was offended. Enough happens around here to offend each and every one of us every single day of the year, I suppose. But I have learned after 13 years here—14, I guess—that you can't be too offended too much by what goes on around here.

I guess you have to look at the reality of the situation, and the reality is very simple. There are those in this body who do not want a tobacco bill, period. They do not want the tobacco companies to have to shell out this money. They don't want to have a bill that will provide for an increase in the price of cigarettes per pack. That is legitimate. That is their viewpoint. They are welcome to it. They can defend it all they want. Maybe they have good reasons they can defend it. But that is the reality of the situation.

For example, the Senator from Texas, I believe, propounded the amendment on the marriage penalty tax, doing away with that. I believe—I think I am correct—that he even said if this amendment was adopted he would still vote against the bill.

So what kind of games are being played around here? I don't take offense at that; I just simply point it out for the reality of the situation. The reality is that we have a battle going on

on this Senate floor, a big battle, and it is a battle between those who want to stop 3,000 kids a day from starting to smoke, 1,000 who will die from it, and those who say business as usual; the tobacco companies, that is OK; let them go ahead; it is a legal product.

We don't have to do anything to them. And if we just add all these amendments on, it is going to fall of its own weight.

That is the game being played around here. It's a game that is played all the time. That is just sort of the way the Senate operates. What I guess we have to do is continually point out what is in fact being done.

Now, let's talk about at least illegal drugs. We all want to stop illegal drugs. I have been here 13 years, 14 now. It seems like every year we have a bill to do something about illegal drugs: We are going to beef up the Border Patrol; we are going to raise the penalties; we are going to have mandatory sentencing. Year after year after year we go after illegal drugs because it makes nice headlines and we know that 100 percent of the American people are against it so it is kind of an easy thing. It makes you feel good. You can hit at illegal drugs. It gets popular support. It gets in the newspapers. That's all well and good.

But, Mr. President, what are we talking about? When you are talking about death and illness to the youth of America, illegal drugs doesn't hold a candle to tobacco. And here are the figures. I welcome anyone to dispute the findings by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. If someone would like to take the Senate floor and dispute this, please let me see the data you have. But the data we have from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention says, "Tobacco kills more Americans than alcohol, car accidents, suicides, AIDS, homicides, illegal drugs and fires combined" every year. Here is tobacco over here: 418,000 deaths in 1 year. Here is illegal drugs, 9,463. What's important? Year after year we come here going after illegal drugs, and we let the biggest killer and destruction of youth in America go by—tobacco. Let it go by every year. And we are about to do the same right here by loading on all these amendments.

Now, the marriage penalty needs addressing. I think I would agree with others who have said it before, yes, it needs to be addressed. Yes, it is an unfair tax. But we are going to have a tax bill later this year. It is not going to take effect until next year anyway. Address it at that time.

Illegal drugs, we can address that at another time. Keep our eye on what the majority leader said, "the end game." Is the end game of this bill to go after homicides or illegal drugs? No. It is go after tobacco. That is the end game. And the end game is to make sure that we have the money to fight it.

That is what this is all about. It is not just about getting tobacco compa-

nies to put a lot of money into the Federal Government. If that is all that was happening, I would be opposed to it. What it is about is saying to the tobacco companies you have for years through your advertising, through covering up the health risks, you have for years hooked a whole generation of Americans on tobacco. You know that it is carcinogenic. You know that nicotine is addictive. You know that it causes emphysema and cancer and heart disease. And yet through your slick advertising year after year you hook more young Americans.

We know what the tobacco companies have known for years, that smoking begins early, that by age 18, 89 percent of all adult smokers have started smoking. We know that. Tobacco companies know that. Oh, they have said for years, no, no, we advertise for brand selection, to get people off of one brand and onto another. Hogwash. They know that if they can hook someone when they are young, they have them later on.

As I have said many times, Joe Camel never appealed to me. Joe Camel does not appeal to someone my age. Neither do all these slick advertisements of young people on the beach and having a lot of fun and they are all looking healthy and they are out there. They don't appeal to older people. The Marlboro gear that you can get with your coupons, that doesn't appeal to older people. They are after young people. How many older people do you see wearing the Joe Camel beach togs. You don't see that. How many older people do you see wearing Marlboro gear. You see teenagers wearing it but not older people.

The tobacco companies systematically for years have been targeting young people because they knew if they got them hooked young, they got them later on.

What we are saying today is no, tobacco companies, don't dump a lot of money into the Federal Government so we can take care of the marriage penalty, illegal drugs, this and that. We are saying, we are telling you that you are going to have to pay money in so that we can put the money out for public health, to help take care of those people you hooked years ago, to bring money in so we can put it into NIH on research, so we can put money into the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on research on how to cut down on smoking, how to keep kids from smoking, have smoking cessation programs and prevention programs in all of our schools.

That is what we are after right here. NIH Health Research. End game: NIH health research, smoking cessation programs, smoking prevention and education in our schools, counter advertising, which we know is very effective and which the tobacco companies probably dread more than anything else, antismuggling, and youth access restrictions.

This is the comprehensive bill that we are talking about. You add in the

add-ons that are now before us and all of this is gone. Every single one of these is gone because you don't have the money for them unless again can someone please get on the floor and tell me where are we going to find the money if in fact we adopt all of these extraneous provisions.

So that is what the end game is about. It is saying to the tobacco companies it is time for you to cough up, cough up enough money to take care of those you have addicted through your advertising and that you did not warn about the health aspects even though you knew what the health aspects were going to be. It is time for you to cough up enough money for research in heart disease and lung cancer and emphysema and all the illnesses that tobacco plagues us with. It is time for you to cough up enough money so we can go out to our schools and we can have prevention programs and education programs for our kids. It is time for you, tobacco companies, to cough up enough money so we can have counter advertising, not the slick ads that tell you how good smoking is but ads that really tell you how death and illness will occur if you do in fact take up smoking.

That is what this money is all about. It is not about the marriage penalty or illegal drugs or anything else. It is about taking care of the youth of America who have been hooked on tobacco. For the life of me, I don't understand why it is the majority leader can say that if these add-ons are not adopted, the tobacco bill is dead. I would like to see a vote out on the Senate floor. I think we ought to vote on the amendment by the Senator from Texas on the marriage penalty. Let's vote it up or down. Let's vote on all these amendments. Let's just vote on them. And then let's have a final vote on this bill and see where we come down. Let's cut out the games. Let's cut out all this game playing.

I bet the tobacco industry CEO's today, Mr. President, are slapping each other on the back and they are laughing all the way to the bank, gleefully watching us hack away at the programs designed to prevent young people from smoking and to help those smokers quit who have already taken it up.

They must be really happy watching us go through all of this when they know that tobacco is the biggest killer of youth.

This is the end game right here. This is the end game. I have used this chart before on the floor. Two young, attractive women coming in to buy cigarettes. Which one is 16? You don't know. You don't know which one is 16. Melissa and Amy—it turns out Melissa is 16 and Amy is 25.

We want to keep Melissa from taking up tobacco, and if Amy has taken it up, we want her to quit. That is what the end game here is all about. It is not about marriage penalty or anything else. To those who say it is, to those

who say, as the majority leader said, that if we don't have these extraneous measures on here the bill is going to die, I say, come out and explain to the American people why it is we had a bill reported from the Commerce Committee under the leadership of Senator MCCAIN that came out with one dissenting vote, out of committee, and we cannot have a vote on that bill here on the Senate floor; why it is we are going to have all these extraneous measures, and they have to be adopted, according to the majority leader, or the bill will not pass? These were not in the committee bill, and it passed out of committee with only one dissenting vote.

So, I don't know what the majority leader is talking about, unless what the majority leader is talking about is that he really wants this bill killed, that he wants no tobacco bill, that he wants to load it down with a number of amendments that will surely mean the end of any tobacco legislation this year.

I hope that is not the case. As I said, I do not know what the majority leader had in mind. All he said was if these amendments are not adopted, the bill is dead. I don't know what he means by that. Hopefully, in the coming days, he will explain himself further in that regard.

Mr. President, our charge is clear and simple here. Our charge is only one—cut teen smoking. We know what does it. The Senator from Florida, Senator GRAHAM, spoke about it. It has to be a comprehensive bill encompassing a rapid and significant increase in the price of tobacco; and, second, smoking cessation and education programs, research, and counteradvertising. If you do all of those, you will cut teen smoking. You can save those lives. You will save a lot of illness in America. That is what we have to be about.

Senator CHAFEE and Senator GRAHAM and I have worked very hard on this legislation in a bipartisan manner going back several months. I think we can still, hopefully, have a good bipartisan bill come out. The committee bill was bipartisan. I am sorry to see that we have gotten now into this partisan wrangling over the marriage penalty, or motions, cloture motions and things like that. I think our leader, Senator DASCHLE, had it right. We ought to have one set of rules and we ought to abide by those rules. Whatever those rules are for one bill, we ought to attach them to the other bill.

I think the best course of action for us here is to vote on these amendments, move on, and vote on final passage. Let's exercise the Senate's will. We have been on the bill long enough. Hopefully, we can finish it next week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues Senator COVERDELL and Senator CRAIG in offering the Drug Free Neighborhoods Act as an amendment to the tobacco bill.

I fervently believe that we must do everything we can to reduce teenage smoking. But we are not here to deal with one issue a year. We are here to deal with the priorities of our constituents and our country. So I think we also must address the serious problem of teenage drug use in America today as well.

In my view it is crucial, given our continuing struggle in the war on drugs, that we send an unwavering and unambiguous message to all Americans, and to our children in particular, that the use and sale of illegal drugs is dangerous, wrong, and will not be tolerated.

As the father of three young children, I am deeply disturbed by recent trends in drug use. Indeed, since 1992 Washington has been losing important ground in the war on drugs. Let me cite just a few of the alarming statistics:

First of all, over the past five years, the average number of Federal drug defendants prosecuted has dropped by almost 1500 cases from the 1992 level. And the average number of drug convictions has gone down by a similar amount since 1993.

The drug interdiction budget was cut by 39 percent from 1992 to 1996 and drug surveillance flights were cut in half.

The impact on our kids has been serious. In the last six years, the percentage of high school seniors admitting that they had used an illicit drug has risen by more than half.

Incredibly, 54 percent of the Class of 97 had used an illicit drug by graduation.

For 10th graders during that same time, drug use has doubled.

And—perhaps worst of all—nearly 20 percent of our 8th graders use illegal drugs.

Faced with this bad news, this year the Administration finally submitted a comprehensive long range National Drug Strategy to Congress.

Unfortunately, it took them nearly five years to take this step. And, as the numbers show, our children have been paying the price.

That is why today we are offering the Drug Free Neighborhoods amendment. This amendment addresses the alarming trends in drug use among teenagers. Let me describe briefly what this amendment entails:

First, it provides additional resources for drug interdiction programs in the U.S. Customs Service, the Coast Guard, and the Department of Defense. It would double the interdiction budget for each of these departments.

Second, this amendment provides additional resources to combat drugs that reach our schools and neighborhoods. For example, it authorizes \$50 million per year for the Drug Free Communities Act. It also promotes drug free schools by allowing federal funds to be used for voluntary random drug testing programs—and to provide school choice for K-12 students who are victims of drug-related school violence.

Third, the amendment increases disincentives for teens to use illegal drugs through the Drug Free Student Loans Act. This act would deny student loans to those convicted of drug possession. In addition, the amendment's Drug Free Teen Drivers Act, would provide grants to States that enact and enforce laws to crack down on teen drivers who use drugs.

Finally, this amendment would ban taxpayer funding for needle exchange programs. In my judgment, Washington must constantly reinforce the message to our kids that drugs are dangerous, and drug use is unacceptable.

Federal funding of needle programs sends the wrong message. And the statistics gathered from programs in Vancouver, Montreal, Zurich and Manhattan all clearly show that these programs significantly increase drug use. Every program studied has shown a significant increase in the use of narcotics among those receiving free needles—every study.

Mr. President, we owe it to the thousands upon thousands of families struggling to protect their children from the scourges of drugs and drug violence to stay tough on the criminals who prey on their neighborhoods.

Washington has to renew the war on drugs. We must provide needed resources, and we must reinforce the message that drugs aren't acceptable and that drug dealers belong in prison—for a long time.

Our kids deserve no less.

Mr. President, let me close by just commenting briefly on the majority leader's earlier remarks. There are, obviously, a lot of issues that are on this floor. I don't want to attempt to address every one of them. But I think the point the majority leader is trying to make, as he outlined some of his thinking as to the final version this legislation might take, is a very important point for us to remember, which is that the tax dollars we are talking about here are not coming from tobacco companies. They are coming from taxpayers. They are coming from citizens. They are coming from people, for the most part, in lower-income categories. So I think we do have a responsibility to determine, if we are going to increase taxes on working families in this country, exactly how those resources ought to be spent.

The notion that we cannot, in any sense, change any of the formula for the expenditure of those resources or we are somehow undermining this legislation, I think is an incorrect conclusion. This bill, like every other bill we have, is about priorities. In offering the amendment that we are offering, that the majority leader spoke to in his comments, we are trying to establish as a priority of this Congress that we will do more in the battle against illegal drugs.

There may be some Members—I am not sure in which States—but there may be some Members in some States where illegal drug use is not a signifi-

cant problem in their communities, where they are not hearing from their constituents about this, where this is not a serious problem. Maybe that is the case. I do not know. I cannot speak for other States, but I can speak for my State, and when I go around my State I hear families in virtually every corner of Michigan talking about the problems, the threat to their kids, of drugs.

If we are going to tax the families of this country to the tune of billions of dollars a year—not the tobacco companies but the families—billions of dollars a year, and the notion we are not going to do anything about illegal drugs, that this is somehow inappropriate on this legislation, that the majority leader is wrong to come to the floor and say there needs to be a drug component here—I don't know what State that represents, but it doesn't represent mine.

I think the majority leader is right on target, and I think this amendment is a critical part of this legislation. I think it makes sense for us to do this now. We are not going to have many more opportunities to do this, and I think we will be sending a terrible message to the people of this country and our kids if we pass this legislation and say we are worried about tobacco and we are worried about smoking, but drugs can wait for another day. In my State, that won't sell. Maybe it will in other places. The majority leader is right, Senator COVERDELL is right, Senator CRAIG is right, and I am happy to join them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, first, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Michigan. I think his comments on the appropriate nature of this amendment as it relates to teenage drug abuse is absolutely correct.

I was taken aback by the suggestion by a couple of our colleagues that somehow teenage addiction to drugs was something that ought to be left for another day. I suggest my colleagues need to ask Americans what they think the most important teenage problem is today. When you ask American families, not CDC or some think tank, but you ask American families what they think the No. 1 teenage problem is, it is drug abuse—No. 1, and there is not even a close 2.

The Senator from Iowa has a chart from CDC that shows the numbers of deaths. Of course, that is over a lifetime of the entire population. It shows substantial more deaths related to tobacco than to drug abuse on an annual basis. I don't dispute the numbers, but I do dispute the point he is trying to make. He is trying to say that tobacco is the most significant problem, and I guess just measured against deaths, he is correct. But I wonder if he would be

interested in looking at America's prison population, the millions of Americans in prison today. There is just one little kernel, one nugget that would be of interest to him, and that is that 80 percent—80—8 out of 10 prisoners in America are in prison on a drug-related charge, direct or indirect—80 percent of the prison population.

Drugs are fueling havoc in our cities, in our States and communities because they fuel crime and they fuel violent crime, disconnected mindless crime. We all know that the nature of criminal activity, particularly among our juveniles, is becoming more violent. We have had a lot of discussions about it. It is drug driven. The fact that we are talking about addiction and silent on the most pressing problem facing teenagers, in my judgment, isn't even debatable; it is unconscionable.

The Senator from Michigan alluded to it when he said we will be sending the wrong message, it will be sending a message, "Well, we've gotten to the most prominent, most difficult problem for teenagers because we have passed a program dealing with teenage smoking."

Teenage smoking is up. It is up about 40 percent, and it needs attention. Drug abuse among teenagers is up 135 percent and escalating as we stand here, fueling not only enormous personal disruption, family disruption, but community disruption as it expands itself into criminal behavior.

Not long ago, I was at a youth detention center in my State. It was a female center. There were about 20 young people aged 12 to 16. They were in this detention center for prostitution, assault and battery, auto theft, attempted murder, and the root of every one of the crimes was drugs. The real reason they were there was drugs. You can walk into any school, I venture to say in any State, and you ask the children what the No. 1 problem is—alcohol, cigarettes, drugs? Ninety-five percent, drugs.

If we are going to talk about addiction of teenagers, we have to talk about the combined problem. Yes, tobacco. It is not healthy for them to use tobacco products, and we want to direct our guns at that. But the most important problem, Mr. President, for teenagers is drugs. It is almost an extension of the message coming out of this city for the last 6 months: We don't want to talk about drugs; we will shut the drug czar's office; we will cut the interdiction in half. And we are surprised because suddenly we are in an epidemic of teenage drug abuse? The message was silence. To let a teenage addiction bill come through this Senate and be silent on drugs is unconscionable.

I, along with my colleagues, Senator CRAIG of Idaho and Senator ABRAHAM of Michigan, are not going to allow that to happen. We are going to talk about teenage addiction, yes; we are going to talk about tobacco, but we are going to put drugs in the mix because it is the No. 1 problem.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MASSACRE OF PRODEMOCRACY DEMONSTRATORS ON TIANANMEN SQUARE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 244 submitted earlier today by Senators COLLINS, LOTT, HUTCHISON, and ABRAHAM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 244) expressing the sense of the Senate on the ninth anniversary of the massacre of prodemocracy demonstrators on Tiananmen Square by military forces acting under orders from the Government of the People's Republic of China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, yesterday was the ninth anniversary of the massacre of hundreds of prodemocracy students on Tiananmen Square in Beijing by troops acting under the orders of the Communist Government of China. In memory of the brave students who suffered and died there for speaking out peacefully against political repression, and in memory of those who are imprisoned still, last night I attempted to introduce this resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that our Government should remain committed to honoring the memory of these victims of oppression and also that supporting China's peaceful transition to democracy should be a principal goal of our foreign policy.

I know that such sentiments are shared by all Members of this body. After all, who could possibly object to honoring the Chinese student martyrs to democracy on the ninth anniversary of their massacre? After all, our most cherished political ideals are those of inalienable rights and democratic self-rule. Unfortunately, however, we were unable to get the resolution cleared

last night on the Democratic side. This objection prevented the Senate from making any statement in memory of the victims of Tiananmen Square on the ninth anniversary of their murder.

I am pleased, however, to report today that the cold light of morning has helped bring some perspective to this issue and that the objection to my resolution has now been withdrawn. I am very grateful for the cooperation of the Democratic leader in resolving the issue on his side.

I spoke at some length last night about the purpose of this resolution, so I will not repeat those remarks now. Let me merely say that it is deeply gratifying to see all of us join together in expressing our heartfelt commitment to democracy and human rights in China and in honoring the memory of those slain in the pursuit of these ideals. It may be 24 hours late, Mr. President, but history will not find the U.S. Senate to have been voiceless in remembrance of the victims in the Tiananmen Square massacre of June 4, 1989.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 244) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 244), with its preamble, reads as follows:

#### S. RES. 244

Whereas in the spring of 1989, thousands of students demonstrated in Tiananmen Square in Beijing in favor of greater democracy, civil liberties, and freedom of expression in the People's Republic of China (PRC);

Whereas these students' protests against political repression in their homeland were conducted peacefully and posed no threat to their fellow Chinese citizens;

Whereas on the evening of June 4, 1989, these students were brutally attacked by infantry and armored vehicles of the People's Liberation Army (PLA) acting under orders from the highest political and military leadership of the PRC;

Whereas hundreds of these students were killed by the PLA in Tiananmen Square on June 4, 1989 for offenses no more serious than that of seeking peacefully to assert their most basic human, civil, and political rights;

Whereas many of the leaders of the student demonstrations thus attacked were subsequently imprisoned, sought out for arrest, or otherwise persecuted by the Government of the PRC;

Whereas during or shortly after the brutal assault of June 4, 1989, at least 2,500 persons were arrested for so-called "counter-revolutionary offenses" across China and dozens of persons were executed;

Whereas the Chinese government has never expressed grief for its actions on June 4, 1989, still imprisons at least 150 persons in connection with the Tiananmen Square demonstrations, and has continued to deny its citizens basic internationally-recognized human, civil, and political rights;

Whereas the Government of the PRC, as detailed in successive annual reports on human rights by the United States Department of State, still routinely and systematically violates the rights of its citizens, in-

cluding their rights to freedom of speech, assembly, worship, and peaceful dissent; and

Whereas the Tiananmen Square Massacre has become indelibly etched into the political consciousness of our times as a symbol both of the impossibility of forever denying a determined people the right to control their own destiny and of the oppressiveness and brutality of governments that seek to do so: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That, in the interest of expressing support for the observance of human, civil, and political rights in China and around the world, it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States Government should remain committed to honoring the memory and spirit of the brave citizens of China who suffered and died in Tiananmen Square on June 4, 1989 for attempting to assert their internationally-recognized rights; and

(2) supporting the peaceful transition to democratic governance and the observance of internationally-recognized human, civil, and political rights and the rule of law in China should be a principal goal of United States foreign policy.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia for allowing me to precede him.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, what is the state of things at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in view of the fact that my statement may require more than 10 minutes—it may not—that I may use as much time as I may consume, with the understanding that I will not use more than 15 minutes.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wonder if the Presiding Officer might entertain a consent request that I be allowed to follow Senator BYRD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

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

#### "POLITICAL CORRECTNESS"— ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it seems that concern with so-called "political correctness" has been elevated to a near religion in recent years.

I thought it might be well to speak on this subject this afternoon when we