

care consumer protections is both wide and deep.

It is more than half a year since the President's Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry proposed, virtually unanimously, the adoption of a Bill of Rights. For many months it has been clear that strong support exists for the enactment of a genuine Patients' Bill of Rights. A number of bills including the Patients' Bill of Rights Act (S. 1890), the patients' Access to Responsible Care Act (S. 644) and others have such support and demonstrate that many members are in favor of bipartisan patient protection legislation.

It is therefore both troubling and puzzling that there has been a delay in consideration of this legislation. We believe that it is wrong to obstruct congressional consideration of genuine patient protection legislation. Your colleagues want such legislation. America's families need it. And it is a violation of fundamental fairness, and a disservice to families seeking health care, for you to block a vote on this important legislation.

We hope that you will lend your support to efforts to enact genuine managed care patient protection legislation—not a watered-down version and not one that is combined with "poison pills." We urge you to schedule quickly a full and fair debate on such legislation. Protecting America's families should be your number one priority. We urge you to act now.

Sincerely,

ACT UP Golden Gate, AIDS Action, AIDS Legal Referral Panel, AIDS Policy Center for Children, Youth and Families, AIDS Treatment News, Alzheimer's Association, American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, American Academy of Neurology, American Academy of Physician Medicine and Rehabilitation, American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy, American Association for Psychosocial Rehabilitation, American Association for Respiratory Care, American Association of Children's Residential Centers, American Association of Pastoral Counselors, American Association of Private Practice Psychiatrists, American Association of University Women, American Association on Mental Retardation, American Board of Examiners in Clinical Social Work, American Cancer Society, American Chiropractic Association, American Counseling Association, American Dental Association, American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO).

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), American Group Psychotherapy Association, American Lung Association, American Medical Association, American Medical Rehabilitation Providers Association, American Nurses Association, American Occupational Therapy Association, American Protestant Health Alliance, American Psychiatric Association, American Psychiatric Nurses Association, American Psychoanalytic Association, American Psychological Association, American Society for Adolescent Psychiatry, American Society of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgeons; American Speech-Language-Hearing Association; American Therapeutic Recreation Association; American Thoracic Society, Anxiety Disorders Association of America; Arc of the United States, Asian & Pacific Islander Wellness Center, Association for Ambulatory Behavioral Healthcare, Association for the Advancement of

Psychology, Association of Women's Health, Obstetric and Neonatal Nurses, Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, Brain Injury Association Inc (BIA), Center for Patient Advocacy, Center on Disabilities and Health, Child Welfare League of America, Children and Adults with Attention Deficit Disorders (CHADD), Clinical Social Work Federation, Consumer Coalition for Quality Health Care, Consumer Federation of America, Corporation for the Advancement of Psychiatry, Families USA, Family Voices, Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quaker), Gay Men's Health Crisis, Health Initiatives for Youth, Human Rights Campaign, International Association of Psychological Rehabilitation Services, League of Women Voters of the United States, Legal Action Center, Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

National Alliance for the Mentally Ill, National Association for Rural Mental Health, National Association for the Advancement of Orthotics and Prosthetics (NAAOP), National Association of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Counselors, National Association of Developmental Disabilities Council, National Association of People with AIDS, National Association of Protection & Advocacy Systems, National Association of Psychiatric Treatment Centers for Children, National Association of School Psychologists, National Association of Social Workers, National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, Inc., National Citizens' Coalition for Nursing Home Reform, National Council for Community Behavioral Health, National Council on Aging; National Easter Seal Society, National Education Association, National Marfan Foundation, National Mental Health Association, National Minority Aids Council, National Organization for Rare Disorders (NORD), National Organization on Disability, National Osteoporosis Foundation, National Parent Network on Disabilities, National Partnership for Women & Families, National Patient Advocate Foundation.

National Therapeutic Recreation Society, National Women's Law Center, Neighbor to Neighbor, OWL, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Project Inform, RESOLVE, The National Infertility Association, San Francisco AIDS Foundation, Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Summit Health Coalition, United Cerebral Palsy Association, United Church of Christ, Office of Church in Society, Women's AIDS Network.

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 3978

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I ask for regular order of H.R. 3978, for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3978) to restore provisions agreed to by the conferees to H.R. 2400, entitled the "Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century," but not included in the conference report to H.R. 2400, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I ask unanimous consent for the second reading of H.R. 3978.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). Morning business is closed.

#### NATIONAL TOBACCO POLICY AND YOUTH SMOKING REDUCTION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 1415, which the clerk will report.

The bill 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, we have now been on this legislation for 3 weeks. We have taken some very important votes, and the bill has been significantly modified. I think it is time for us to complete our business and do so with dispatch. Obviously, if we don't, the proponents of the status quo will achieve by delay what they can't with a majority of votes; and that is, obviously, to kill tobacco legislation that is aimed at saving the lives of over 1 million children.

The bill, as it has been modified, contains measures of enormous benefit to the Nation, including vital antiuse smoking initiatives that will stop or reduce the compelling aspect of this entire legislation—that is, the 3,000 children a day from taking up a habit that will kill a third of them. There is critical funding for ground-breaking health research, assistance to our Nation's veterans who suffer from smoking-related illnesses, a major antidrug effort to attack the serious threat that is posed by illegal drugs, the magnitude and importance of which was described very effectively by the Senator

from Georgia, the Senator from Idaho, and others.

This legislation contains one of the largest tax decreases ever, and it eliminates the marriage penalty for low- and moderate-income Americans and achieves 100 percent deductibility of health insurance for self-employed individuals. It provides the opportunity to settle 36 pending State cases collectively and in a timely fashion.

I argue that those provisions which I just described—research, veterans, tax cut, attacking the problem of illegal drugs, and settling pending legislation—I believe have made this legislation far more important than it was when it was introduced.

We all know that the time is to finish the business and move the process forward. I think it is also clear for anyone who has turned on the television or listened to the radio or read the newspaper that the objective of the tobacco companies is to kill the legislation. I am sure they have come to expect a return on their enormous campaign contributions.

If we kill the bill, it doesn't do anything to stop tobacco companies from marketing to kids, it doesn't do anything to stop the death march of teenagers who are taking up a killer habit, and it does nothing to promote groundbreaking research on new treatments and cures for these terrible diseases, including cancer and heart and lung disease. We will not take a step forward to stop the flow of abuse of illegal drugs, and we will do nothing to assist our Nation's veterans. Inaction doesn't do anything to relieve the burden on the Nation's taxpayers, a burden not only in the form of a marriage penalty but in the \$50 billion taxpayers have to shell out to treat smoking-related disease, which is almost \$455 tax per household per year.

As I was driving from one place to another last night, I heard another one of these commercials. I do want to again express my appreciation to the tobacco companies for raising my name ID all over America, especially in the States of Arizona, Iowa, and New Hampshire. So I am very appreciative of almost making my name a household word—what kind of a household word, obviously, is up to interpretation. But I just want to repeat that there are two attacks that the tobacco companies are making on this legislation. We polled it, and one is that it is a "big tax bill," and the other is the issue of "contraband." I have addressed those issues before, but I want to point out again and again because the attacks are made again and again. Right now, today, \$50 billion per year is paid by the taxpayers to treat tobacco-related illness. Mr. President, that number is bound to go up. If teenage smoking is going up, then the tax bill is going up.

Now, you can argue, as some in the tobacco companies have argued, and some of my colleagues particularly on this side of the aisle have argued, that

there is no way you can reduce teen smoking; that there is nothing you can do; that raising the price of price of cigarettes won't work and antismoking campaigns won't work.

This tax bill is big and it is getting bigger. Some don't accept—and I am not clear why—the view of the Centers for Disease Control that teenage smoking is on the rise in America. I think a visit to any local high school in your State or district might indicate that teenage smoking is on the rise. But, more important, people whose statistics on these public health issues that were unchallenged are now being challenged as to whether teenage smoking is on the rise or not. I think the burden of proof is on those who disagree to prove that these statistics are wrong, given the credibility of the organizations who state that teenage smoking is on the rise. If you accept the fact that teenage smoking is on the rise, then over time there would be more people who would require treatment for tobacco-related illnesses. The tax bill goes up. It is sort of elemental, but it needs to be said over and over again. If we are paying this huge tax bill to treat people as a result of tobacco-related illness, and it is getting bigger, then it seems to me that you have a much bigger tax bill than the costs associated with this legislation.

Mr. President, I believe we are reaching a crucial point, as I mentioned earlier in my remarks. We are either going to have to invoke cloture and address the germane amendments, which is still part of cloture, part of the Senate procedures after the invocation of cloture, or we are going to have to move on to other things. At that point, as is usual, we assess winners and losers. That is appropriate and fun here, especially inside the beltway. I don't disagree with that approach.

I think we ought to understand who the losers will be. The losers will be the children of America. They are the only ones who lose. Anybody else who loses can probably survive, probably go on to other things, probably lead their well and healthy lives. But I don't believe that the American people will treat us kindly, nor should they, if we fail to act on this issue. Is it the most important and compelling issue that affects America today? Probably not. Crime is important, drugs are important, education is of critical importance. But do we use that rationale to ignore this problem? Is that appropriate logic? Do we say, well, crime and education are far more important issues to the American people than teenage smoking; OK, so therefore ignore it?

I don't get that logic, Mr. President. I was reading in some of the newspapers this morning that there are polls out now that have convinced some Americans—and perhaps in the view of some pollsters, a majority of Americans—that this is a "big tax bill." A lot of Americans believe we really aren't going to do anything about kids smoking. Why would any-

body be surprised at that? If you spend \$100 million, which is what many—or suppose only \$50 million on advertising, it is going to sway American public opinion. But the effect of those kinds of advertising campaigns fades. The American people then focus back on the problem because the problem will remain. And if we do nothing to address it as a body, I think the American people have every reason to be less than pleased at our performance at addressing what I believe most Americans correctly view as a very important issue, which is—obviously, we have stated many times—our children.

So I think it is important that we recognize that we are now ending the third week of considering this legislation, and we are going to have to either file cloture and move forward with a vote on it, and if the vote carries, move to a conclusion. Otherwise, I believe that we should obviously move on to other things, and with the full and certain knowledge that the issue is not going away because the problem is not going away.

I understand that my friend from Massachusetts will have an amendment, and that an agreement has been made with the majority leader. I hope we can reach a time agreement on that and then move to our side for an amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERRY. 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. KERRY. Mr. President, I will be sending up an amendment shortly. When that amendment is called up, I will ask unanimous consent that we have 1½ hours—Mr. President, a small change, a quick change in plan, which is not unusual in the last 2½ weeks. We are going to debate this amendment. It is our intention to debate this amendment for an hour, at which time there will be a motion to table, and hopefully after we have disposed of this amendment, should we be able to do so, we would proceed to the Faircloth-Sessions-McConnell amendment on attorneys' fees.

That is the current plan. We hope to be able to proceed with that plan. I, therefore, ask that amendment No. 2541 be called up.

AMENDMENT NO. 2689 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2437

(Purpose: To reduce youth smoking)

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I withdraw that request, and I send this amendment to the desk and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), for himself, and Mr. BOND, Mr.

CHAFEE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. GRAHAM proposes an amendment numbered 2689 to amendment numbered 2437.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

( ) ASSISTANCE FOR CHILDREN.—A State shall use not less than 50 percent of the amount described in subsection (b)(2) of section 452 for each fiscal year to carry out activities under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.).

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the amendment that I am offering, together with Senator BOND, Senator CHAFEE, Senator KENNEDY, Senator DODD, Senator WELLSTONE, Senator JOHNSON, Senator BOXER, Senator SPECTER, Senator LANDRIEU, Senator DURBIN, Senator GRAHAM, and others is a bipartisan amendment with considerable support, I believe, both in the Senate and outside of the Senate. It would be my hope that we would be able to dispose of it rapidly.

Over the course of the last couple of weeks we have had some very contentious issues on the floor of the Senate regarding liability, regarding look-backs, the marriage penalty, and drugs. I won't suggest that the drug penalty didn't have some focus with respect to children. Of course it does.

But this is primarily children. This amendment is the primary focus of this legislation. This amendment goes to the core effort of how we will best get this legislation to assist in the effort to reduce our young people from smoking. That is why this amendment, I believe, has broad support. That is why this amendment has been supported by editorials across the country. That is why this amendment is supported by different advocacy groups on behalf of children across the country.

We have been debating for 2½ weeks now about the Nation's first opportunity to try to deal comprehensively with tobacco, and, in so doing, comprehensively try to address the question of reducing teenage smoking. This is an amendment that can directly improve the lives of our children by adopting a national policy with respect to tobacco and our approach to children that is workable, proven, and fair.

I believe the reason that a number of colleagues on both sides of the aisle, from different political ideologies, have come together on this amendment is for the very simple reason that not only is it focused on children, not only is it about children, but it comes with a proven track record of making an impact on choices that children will make.

This is, frankly, not about politics. This is certainly not an effort to stall the bill. This is an effort to make this bill as constructively as possible a bill that is really going to assist us in ac-

complishing the purposes of the bill; that is, principally to raise a generation of young people who are able to live up to their potential, free from the grasp of what we know to be a dangerous drug.

This is an effort to try to guarantee that those 3,000 children who we have talked about day in and day out who begin smoking won't start smoking, and they won't start smoking because there is an intervention in their lives that is significant and meaningful at the time that it counts.

Senator BOND, I am pleased to say, comes to this amendment with considerable experience in how these kinds of efforts work. When he was Governor of Missouri, he started the parents and teachers plan there. There are few people in the Senate who I think speak with as much conviction about the difference that it makes for young people when adults are adequately involved in their lives and when the kind of structure is available in their lives so that we can make a difference when it makes the most importance to those children.

In my judgment, and I think in Senator BOND's judgment, Senator CHAFEE's judgment, Senator SPECTER, and others who are part of this legislation, this seeks to have an impact at the most direct connected level with our young people.

The legislation on the floor, Mr. President, currently directs that about 40 percent of the funds that are raised through the tobacco revenues be directed directly to the States over 5 years. That is in the billions of dollars. Those billions of dollars that are directed straight back to the States are divided into two groups. Half of that money is restricted to a certain set of programs in which the States can engage. Half of it is completely unrestricted, as many people in the Senate think it ought to be. That is so that the States can choose, on their own, what they think might make the most difference with respect to tobacco and how they would like to spend the proceeds in an effort that, after all, the States were significantly involved in. The States' attorneys general are the ones who brought the lawsuits and helped significantly to put us in the position to be able to try to arrive at a comprehensive national settlement. So that is the theory behind which those funds were distributed appropriately to the States.

However, given what has happened in the last days here on the floor, where a considerable portion of this legislation has now been diverted to a specific tax cut, and another considerable portion of the legislation has seen money directed specifically to the Coast Guard, or to the DEA, or to other drug-fighting efforts, it is even more compelling and more appropriate that at this point in time we seek to guarantee that some of those available funds are really going to go to the children on those activities that will most impact those children's choices.

So we want to assure that at least 50 percent of the restricted funds—not the unrestricted but 50 percent of the already restricted funds—will be spent on those activities that already exist within the menu of what the restricted funds can spend it on. We want to guarantee that it will go to the after-school programs, to the early childhood development, and to the child care that every expert in the field will tell you will make an enormous difference to the lives of those children.

Mr. President, let me just share with my colleagues an article that appeared in the Washington Times yesterday. It is called "After-School Crime Busing." It is an article by Edward Flynn. In fact, he is the chief of the Arlington Community Police Department. He writes:

In fact, the tobacco bill is an opportunity for Congress to take its most powerful step ever to fight crime—by investing half the new revenues in the child care and after-school programs proven to prevent crime and make communities safe.

This chief of police says to all of us in the Washington Times:

The tobacco companies are worried about their bottom line. I look at crime's bottom line. Educational child care for young children and after-school programs for school age kids are two of the most powerful weapons to fight crime and protect our kids from getting hooked on tobacco. For example:

Studies have shown that denying at-risk toddlers quality educational child care may multiply by up to five times the risk that they will become chronic lawbreakers as adults, and by up to ten times the risk that they will be delinquent at age 16.

What's more, as a recent Rand report shows, these programs actually produce savings to Government—primarily from lower criminal justice and social service expenditures— as much as four times higher than their cost.

But today millions of Americans who must work earn less than the cost of quality child care for two kids.

And then it goes on to discuss the availability of child care.

Police Chief Flynn says the following:

FBI data tells us that violent juvenile crime triples in the hour after the school bell rings, and half occurs between 2 p.m. and 8 p.m. The good news: After-school programs can cut crime by as much as 75 percent. And they help kids do better in school, treat adults with respect and resolve conflicts without violence.

Unsupervised after-school hours aren't just prime time for juvenile crime. They're also prime time for youngsters to become crime victims and for other threats to children's health like teen sex and substance abuse.

That is what we are talking about here—substance abuse, tobacco.

There is good evidence that after school supervision can cut in half the risk that kids will smoke, drink or use drugs.

So in addition to their proven anticrime impact, after-school programs—because of the supervision they can offer while parents are at work and their positive effect on kids' values—are powerful antismoking and anti-drug programs as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Times, June, 10, 1998]

AFTER-SCHOOL CRIME BUSTING

(By Edward A. Flynn)

If you've been reading the huge ads the big tobacco companies have been running recently, you might think tobacco legislation will cause a new American crime problem by creating a black market in cigarettes.

In fact, the tobacco bill is an opportunity for Congress to take its most powerful step ever to fight crime—by investing half the new revenues in the child care and after-school programs proven to prevent crime and make communities safe.

The tobacco magnates' claims deflate when you look at the facts:

They use grossly inflated projections of cigarette cost increases, as much as three times higher than the \$1.25 or so the Treasury Department and most economists agree will be added to the price of cigarettes.

They ignore protections in the bill like requiring that each pack of cigarettes carry a serial number so it can be daily traced, that will probably reduce the smuggling that now occurs between states.

While there could be some increase to international smuggling, the best way to deal with that is to make sure a bit of tobacco revenues are left available to enforce the new law—not to eliminate tobacco penalties that would reduce smoking, save lives and compensate taxpayers for the billions we've paid to treat health problems caused by smoking.

In fact, if Congress allocates at least half of the new revenues to support educational child development and after-school programs, it can dramatically reduce crime, violence and addiction.

The tobacco companies are worried about their bottom line. I look at crime's bottom line. Educational child care for young children and after-school programs for school-age kids are two of the most powerful weapons to fight crime and to protect our kids from getting hooked on tobacco. For example:

Studies have shown that denying at-risk toddlers quality educational child care may multiply by up to five times the risk that they will become chronic law breakers as adults, and by up to ten times the risk they will be delinquent at age 16.

What's more, as a recent Rand report shows, these programs actually produce savings to government—primarily from lower criminal justice and social service expenditures—as much as four times higher than their cost.

But today millions of Americans who must work earn less than the cost of quality child care for two kids. Because Head Start and child care block grants don't have the resources to help most of those who need them, parents are forced to leave their children in poor-quality care—little more than "child storage." That damages child development, including kids' ability to get along with others and succeed in school, and ultimately puts your family's safety at risk.

FBI data tells us that violent juvenile crime triples in the hour after the school bell rings, and half occurs between 2 p.m. and 8 p.m. The good news: After-school programs can cut crime by as much as 75 percent. And they help kids do better in school, treat adults with respect, and resolve conflicts without violence.

Unsupervised after-school hours aren't just prime time for juvenile crime. They're also prime time for youngsters to become crime victims, and for other threats to children's

health like teen sex and substance abuse. There's good evidence that after-school supervision can cut in half the risk that kids will smoke, drink or use drugs.

So in addition to their proven anti-crime impact, after-school programs—because of the supervision they can offer while parents are at work, and their positive effect on kids' values—are powerful anti-smoking and anti-drug programs as well.

Law enforcement leaders nationwide—from the Police Executive Research Forum and the Major Cities Chiefs organization to the National District Attorneys Association and Fight Crime: Invest In Kids—have called on legislators this year to provide the funds so communities can ensure all kids access to educational child care and after-school programs while parents are at work.

The way to do that—the one-two punch that also fights teen smoking—is by designating at least half of new federal tobacco tax revenues to support child care and after-school programs.

This would be one of the most powerful steps Congress has ever taken against crime, and a tremendous investment to help America build a healthy and productive generation for the twenty-first century, decrease long-term government financial burdens like welfare and crime costs, and start saving innocent lives today.

Mr. KERRY. I will discuss some further evidence of why this is so vital, but let me emphasize to my colleagues what we are doing in restricting this 50 percent of the already restricted funding is not a new program. We are not creating any new program. We are not creating any new bureaucracy. We are not requiring any new line of expenditure. We are using the existing child care development block grant, and we employ a mechanism that both parties, in a bipartisan fashion, have already accepted.

This existing, successful bipartisan program already helps States to invest in child care but not adequately. And it already helps this investment in early childhood development programs but still not adequately. I believe all we have to do is look at the example of President Bush, who signed the block grant into law originally, and the bipartisan effort of Senator HATCH and Senator DODD, who pushed the Senate to make this investment a reality.

This amendment spells out explicitly the truth that has been implicit in all of this debate, that children are at the heart of the debate about tobacco in this country. We know—and we now know it to a shocking degree because we have discussed it at length on the Senate floor—through the tobacco companies' own memoranda, the degree to which tobacco companies targeted young children for decades. We went through, about a week ago, some of the extraordinary documents that now exist as a result of the lawsuits that show the million dollars of advertising that researched ways in which the tobacco companies could target young children and, the tobacco companies themselves acknowledged, "get them when they're most vulnerable." The language was the most shocking and explicit statement of a kind of craven policy of how to corrupt young people

that you have ever seen. And literally they said, get them hooked early, get them with all these symbols, get them with the advertising, and we won't say anything about the aftereffects because the pharmacological impact, they said—that is the way they politely labeled getting hooked—the pharmacological impact would see to it that the kids continued to buy down the road.

So here we have an opportunity to protect our children from exactly that kind of predatory practice that is unacceptable. We believe that is the compelling reason why the Senate should adopt this amendment.

According to a January 1998 poll, 83 percent of American voters support what I just said—83 percent of American voters believe that tobacco legislation ought to include significant investments in our children. It is a bipartisan consensus in this country that we ought to do that.

Two-thirds of the Republicans who were polled by Lake, Sosin and Associates strongly agreed that the funds from the tobacco bill ought to be invested in child care and other childhood development programs that will make a difference as to whether or not those kids would then pick up smoking.

In the Philadelphia Inquirer, the editorial page recently praised this amendment, saying, "Using tobacco settlement proceeds for child care meshes with the goal of cutting the health toll of smoking and could produce benefits that go far beyond that."

The Deseret News in Salt Lake City, UT, recognized that support for child care programs "saves billions of tax dollars down the road." The Syracuse Herald-Journal on its editorial page, in urging the Senate to pass this amendment, said, "Let the tobacco bill do some good." The editors of that newspaper reminded us that "there are good reasons why tobacco revenues should go into child care. Child care and development block grant program, put in place during the Bush administration, simply doesn't have enough of a budget to fulfill the needs of working families—it wouldn't even if \$20 billion is allotted. But it would be a start." And that is what these voices are telling us—that we ought to make the start.

There is, in addition to broad editorial support, Mr. President, the coalition of more than 100 national, State, and local organizations, called Child Care Now, fighting for this amendment because they recognize the connection between kids and smoking. And in that coalition you will find the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA, the YWCA of the USA. I have a letter that I received from the children and parents of Camp Fire Boys and Girls, 700,000 members strong, asking each Senator to support this amendment because, "Children engaged in constructive after-school activities are less likely to smoke." These are mothers and fathers of working families,

and they understand the tremendous pressures and temptations of smoking, and they have asked each and every Senator to support the notion that that is where a significant component of this revenue ought to go, to give their kids a fighting chance.

This amendment responds directly to the plea of parents who desperately seek help in the area of child care and early childhood development to help keep their kids away from the cigarettes that they know they are being exposed to during the hours when, because they are working, because they are compelled to be away from the home, and because they do not have enough money to provide adequate support otherwise, their kids are being exposed. And we have an opportunity here to help them do that.

Scientific research at the University of Southern California and the School of Public Health at the University of Illinois shows that 13-year-olds who are left home alone after school or during the day are significantly more likely to smoke cigarettes than children who participate in structured after-school activities. But today, only one-third of inner-city schools offer those programs, and, not coincidentally, it is in those very inner cities where youth smoking rates are now rising and going the highest.

The National Women's Law Center, committed to protecting the rights of women, but also committed to the economic security of low-income women, wrote to Senator BOND and to me in favor of this bill, because they recognize that under the child care development block grant today only 1 out of 10 eligible children in a low-income working family currently gets the child care assistance they need.

So if we are intent on reducing the number of kids who are smoking, and if we are really worried that smoking among high school seniors is at a 19-year high, and we are really worried about what the Senator from Georgia said when he came to the floor and talked about the drug problem, the marijuana increase among young people, then it is critical we focus on the 3 million young children in this country who are eligible but do not get it. We need to leverage the capacity of every State and local community to be able to take kids off the street corners, where they too often cave in to peer pressure and smoke each day, and put them instead into a structured environment that brightens their future, not one that jeopardizes it.

So if we are serious about reducing youth smoking, it is imperative that we engage now in this effort to cultivate a whole generation of young people who have the capacity to make the right decisions.

I have a letter from Dr. T. Berry Brazelton of the Harvard Medical School. Many people in America know him well, personally, and think of him as America's pediatrician. I would like to point out that he wrote, along with over 50 other doctors, public health officials and child development experts,

to Senators about the early child development component of sound decisionmaking for our children. Among those who joined Dr. Brazelton were Julius Richmond, former Surgeon General of the United States, and the Chairman of Pediatrics at Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, and Elizabeth McAnarney, the Chairwoman of the Department of Pediatrics at the University of Rochester. They tell all of us that scientific study after scientific study shows that the brain development in those first years of life is the most important—I quote from the letter of Dr. Brazelton:

... for laying the foundation for adequate development, which results in self-confidence, smart decisionmaking, and the ability to later resist destructive habits like smoking.

So these aren't ideas that have been cooked up on a political basis somehow. These are the foremost experts in the field. They are telling us if we want to raise a generation of children who are able to make these decisions, who will not fall prey to the lure of tobacco, it is vital that we invest in their capacity to do so.

Again, I return to their letter, and read directly from it:

We urge Congress to craft a comprehensive program for reducing teen smoking—and to ensure that such an effort includes an essential investment in early childhood development and after-school programs. You can support a down payment on this investment by voting for the Kerry-Bond amendment.

I think Dr. Brazelton said it best in a recent editorial when he said—simply—

As a prescription for preventing teen smoking, I'd say that early childhood development and child care programs are just what the doctor ordered.

We also know from police officers and prosecutors like Ed Flynn, Chief of Police in Arlington, Virginia, who are leading a fight to invest tobacco money in child care. Chief Flynn has said that child care and after school programs "help kids learn the valuable skills to become responsible adults." An entire organization led by police, prosecutors, and crime victims is pushing the Senate to pass this amendment because:

The hours from 2:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. are not only the peak hours for juvenile crime, teen sex and teen experimentation with drugs, but also the hours when teens are most likely to get hooked on tobacco. After-school programs are not only our best protection against juvenile crime, but also may be the most powerful anti-smoking programs available. Being unsupervised in the afternoon doubles the risk that kids will smoke, drink, or use drugs.

It is those individuals closest to our children who know this is the right way to deal with youth smoking.

This is an amendment every Senator ought to support.

I want to especially thank Senator MCCAIN for supporting this amendment. In view of the pressure on Senator MCCAIN, the Senator's support means a lot to me. I think I can speak for Senator BOND when I say we are honored to have JOHN MCCAIN by our side on this fight. I also want to thank Senators CHAFEE, CAMPBELL, and SPECTER for cosponsoring this amendment.

I think it proves that this is an amendment which is based not on Republican ideas or Democrat ideas, but simply on good ideas in touch with the mainstream view in this country.

Under the Kerry-Bond amendment states will enjoy the flexibility of the child care development block grant. The truth is we would simply be articulating once and for all the important standard which the public health community and most Governors have already endorsed: that child care and early childhood development are vital tools in reducing the rates of children smoking in this country. We then leave it to the leadership at the state and local level to meet that standard, to design the programs that meet the local needs in places as different and diverse as Illinois, where Gov. Jim Edgar, a Republican, is experimenting with child care, and Rhode Island, where Gov. Almond has made after school care an integral part of preparing children in his state for the next century.

The Kerry-Bond amendment empowers communities to find their own way of saving a new generation from smoking. We know how after school programs like Girls Inc. of Worcester, MA have effectively incorporated anti-smoking curriculum designed to teach their participants about the dangers of tobacco and equip them with the values to resist the peer pressure to smoke. I have met with the case workers from Central, MA who tell you that the "Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters" helps parents and teachers join in community partnerships to raise healthier kids. But in all these communities and around the country you will find that there are waiting lists for the services—for the programs which teach kids about responsible decision-making, for the anti-smoking programs and the programs which take kids off the streets and give them structure—and the demand far exceeds our capacity to serve. At the Castle Square Early Child Development Center in Boston, there were 67 kids in the program and 500 on the waiting list. I believe it's a moral dilemma that you have 500 children there who aren't receiving the structure they need to resist smoking, that today we have limited ourselves to saving just 67 of those kids. The Kerry-Bond amendment can change that, by ensuring that half of the restricted funds would go to child care programs which can play such an important role in reducing youth smoking.

I return to the original premise of this debate, the reason we are here on the floor of the Senate debating a bill that a few years ago would have been considered too hot to handle. We are all fortunate to have Republicans like Senator BOND here in the Senate who believe it is wrong to ignore our children in this tobacco debate. I want to

especially thank him for his leadership in this discussion, for his initiative in pushing to include children in our legislation. Senator BOND has helped set a tone of bipartisan cooperation and along with Senator MCCAIN I think he has laid the benchmark for fairness. KIT BOND and I believe this Senate can find room in fair and workable tobacco legislation to put hundreds of thousands of children on the road to good health and responsible decisionmaking. In truth I wonder if we can really believe that fair tobacco legislation could ignore the kids who brought us here today as one unified Senate. Let us prove once again that the moral center can hold in this debate and let us join together in passing the Kerry-Bond amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I particularly thank my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts for yielding to me. I am very pleased to join with him in offering this critically important amendment.

Late last year, Senator KERRY and I introduced legislation, which is bipartisan legislation aimed at providing support to help families give their children the kind of encouragement, love, early training and a healthy environment they need to develop their social and intellectual capacities. I have had the opportunity in my years both as Governor and in the Senate to work with children and work in the development of children. I am convinced that many of society's problems today—the high school dropout rate, drug and tobacco use, juvenile crime, even adult crime—can all be linked to inadequate child care and early childhood development opportunities.

Let me just tell you a brief story about the first really broad-based early childhood development program that we put into effect in Missouri. Our Parents As Teachers Program was designed to provide assistance through educating and informing and giving helpful advice to parents of children from birth to 3 years old—how they could relate to the children, how they could establish better contact with the children, how they could excite the child's curiosity, to get involved with reading and learning. I was having a difficult time getting it through the Missouri legislature. I recommended it in 1981 and 1982 and 1983, and someone always had a reason to vote against it. I never got it through.

Finally, in my last year as Governor I said we are going to make an all-out push because this program is making a difference. We were seeing in the pilot projects in four school districts that children whose parents had been in Parents As Teachers came to school ready to learn. Their parents had taken responsibility. The parents were involved in their education. They had developed the pattern of involvement. The program itself identified potential

learning disabilities or physical disabilities early on, which could be best corrected at those early ages.

I told everybody I was going to focus attention on early childhood development. Without my direct suggestion or intervention, the Director of Corrections, the Missouri Department of Corrections, the man who managed all of the prisons and the parole and probation efforts in Missouri, Dr. Leroy Black, on his own, came before the committee that was hearing testimony on Parents As Teachers. We had just gone on a major prison-building exercise in Missouri. In that 4 years of my second term we had increased the prison spaces 88 percent. People were wondering whether we could ever catch up with the prison population.

He came before that committee with a very simple, straightforward message. He said if we want to cut down on the need to keep building prisons in the future, we are going to have to deal with early childhood development. He said the failures in early education, the failures of parental responsibility, the failures of the parents to be involved—for some care giver to make sure these children were getting an education, being taught responsibility—is the greatest cause of the increase in crime and the increase in prison population.

He was successful. He was a great help in getting this program established on a Statewide basis. Yes, as Senator KERRY mentioned, we now have studies based on this program and others that show a child's social and intellectual development is deeply rooted in the early interaction and nurturing a child receives in his or her early years and the scientific research shows that infant brain development occurs much more rapidly than previously thought.

We used to think of those cute little infants, birth to 3 years old, as being cuddly, wonderful things without much going on. But brains are developing—50 percent of a child's mature learning capabilities are developed by the age of 3. They are in a very rapid mode of development.

Anybody who has tried to teach a child to speak two languages instead of one language will find a very small child—you think they would learn English slowly—but they will learn another language, too, just as quickly, where an adult is having a great deal of difficulty trying to learn another language. They are in a rapid mode where they can accept new inputs and they are learning rapidly.

The role parents and adults play is critical. That is when the patterns are established for the future learning of future responsibility of the children. I had long said the first 3 years of life was the greatest learning experience for a child. I found when our son Sam was born, that the first 3 years of his life were the fastest learning experience in my life. I learned a lot more in those 3 years than I had learned in many years as Governor and various offices that I had held.

Learning about a child and learning how important that education is, is quite an experience. Frankly, some of the people who attacked our early childhood development program, Parents As Teachers, were accusing it of being subversive. They thought it was subversive because we were encouraging government to come in and take over the raising of children. That is not the purpose of the program. We provided the parents the tools to be the first educators of the children.

Guess what happened. It was subversive in that it hooked the parents into the child's development and well-being and welfare and education. When we are talking about discouraging children from using tobacco, and as we did in the amendment adopted this week, from using drugs, from using alcohol, parental responsibility is a vitally important part of that program.

We believe establishing responsibility can best occur with assistance through early childhood development. Parental responsibility is very important. Yet, there are times when parents need some help. That is what the other part of this bill does. Parents today face a variety of stresses that were unheard of a generation ago. Many families with children rely on more than one paycheck. That doesn't necessarily mean two 9-to-5 paychecks. Many families are working tag-team shifts or part-time only, or own home-based businesses so one parent can always be with the children. The challenges are tremendous and the challenges are not going to get any easier.

As we all know, the most dangerous time of the day when children engage in harmful activities, such as tobacco or drug use or crime, is between the hours after school and before parents get home from work.

In an average week in America, over 5 million children under the age of 13 come home to an empty house. These are the kids who are most vulnerable and who engage in activities which may threaten their future.

Providing increased funding for early childhood development and constructive after-school activities will serve as a powerful deterrent to these damaging behaviors.

Ultimately, however, it is important to remember that the likelihood of a child growing up in a healthy, nurturing environment is most impacted by his or her parents and family. While government cannot and should not become a substitute for parents and family, we can help them become stronger by equipping them with the resources to meet every day challenges.

The Kerry-Bond amendment achieves that goal.

This amendment will lay the foundation needed to realize meaningful reductions in tobacco and drug use, juvenile crime, and other social ills which plague our society.

Again, prevention is the key. Investing in early childhood development initiatives and before and after school activities is an important weapon in our

fight against our Nation's unhealthy and life-threatening activities.

The future well-being of our children is too important for us to break continually along partisan lines. I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, and I thank my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts for his hard work and dedication to this cause.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The hour of noon having arrived, under rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture on the modified committee substitute to S. 1415, the tobacco legislation.

The assistant 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:

Thomas A. Daschle, Carl Levin, Jeff Bingaman, Daniel K. Akaka, John Glenn, Tim Johnson, Daniel K. Inouye, Dale Bumpers, Ron Wyden, Mary L. Landrieu, John D. Rockefeller IV, Paul S. Sarbanes, Harry Reid, Richard H. Bryan, Kent Conrad, J. Robert Kerrey.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the quorum call under the rule is waived.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the committee substitute amendment to S. 1415 shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) is absent because of illness.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 43, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 156 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Akaka	Feingold	Levin
Baucus	Feinstein	Lieberman
Biden	Glenn	Mikulski
Bingaman	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Harkin	Moynihhan
Breaux	Hollings	Murray
Bryan	Inouye	Reed
Bumpers	Johnson	Reid
Byrd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Cleland	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kerry	Torricelli
Daschle	Kohl	Wellstone
Dodd	Landrieu	Wyden
Dorgan	Lautenberg	
Durbin	Leahy	

NAYS—56

Abraham	DeWine	Hutchison
Allard	Domenici	Inhofe
Ashcroft	Enzi	Jeffords
Bennett	Faircloth	Kempthorne
Bond	Ford	Kyl
Brownback	Frist	Lott
Burns	Gorton	Lugar
Campbell	Gramm	Mack
Chafee	Grams	McCain
Coats	Grassley	McConnell
Cochran	Gregg	Murkowski
Collins	Hagel	Nickles
Coverdell	Hatch	Robb
Craig	Helms	Roberts
D'Amato	Hutchinson	Roth

Santorum	Smith (OR)	Thompson
Sessions	Snowe	Thurmond
Shelby	Stevens	Warner
Smith (NH)	Thomas	

NOT VOTING—1

Specter

AMENDMENT NO. 2689

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent Senator BINGAMAN and Senator KOHL be added as cosponsors to the pending amendment.

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

Mr. DODD. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is amendment 2689, offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I think this is a very fine amendment. I want to commend our colleagues, Senator KERRY and Senator BOND, for offering this amendment. I strongly support it.

This amendment is designed to invest in the well-being of our children in this country. It is a measure that ensures that the children of our Nation will get the right start for a far brighter tomorrow.

As our colleagues have already discussed, the amendment will earmark 50 percent of the Federal share of the tobacco funds going to the States for child care. Specifically, Mr. President, these funds will be used to increase our investment in child care and development block grants—a piece of legislation we were very proud to offer with my good friend from Utah, Senator HATCH, some 8 years ago.

The idea, Mr. President, is not to create here a new Federal child care program, but rather to do a better job with the well-established program that enjoys wide support from our States and Governors, Republicans and Democrats alike, across this Nation.

The child care and development block grant was created in 1990, as a partnership between the States and the Federal Government, to improve the availability and affordability and quality of child care. The block grant is a very efficient and popular way of providing States with sorely needed child care funds, and the States enjoy it. The reason is because it is so flexible. Perhaps most important, this is why parents also support the program.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in some cases, raised concerns during the child care debates that somehow our intent with this child care legislation is to limit the ability of parents to choose how their children would be cared for, that somehow we would like to see the Federal Government deciding how to raise them. Of course, Mr. President, this rhetoric could not be further from the truth.

The child care and development block grant is predicated upon parental choice. With assistance from the block grant, parents can choose to enroll their children in church-based care, they can choose to have their children

cared for by a neighbor down the street, or they can choose to have a family member care for their child. If they wish, they can choose to enroll their child in a child development center. But the benefits of this program are offered to far too few families. It is terribly underfunded. Only 1 out of 10 children in America who are eligible for child care assistance receives it. That still leaves far too many families without the help they need in child care. Full day care can easily cost \$4,000 to \$10,000 per child per year, which is equal to what some families pay for college tuition plus room and board in a public university in America.

I know concerns have been raised and are apt to be raised about giving any direction to the States in their use of these funds. I would like to remind our colleagues that half of the tobacco funds that would go to the States are unrestricted. These are the funds that reimburse States for their tobacco-related Medicaid expenses. Many States do with this money what they will, and they should be able to do so. However, since the other half of the funds to the States represents the Federal contribution, we feel we should have something to say about how those dollars are spent.

As this bill is currently written, the Federal share of the money earmarked for States would be restricted to a list of six programs. While child care is on the list, there is no guarantee that any of the funds would be used for that care. There is no guarantee that child care would get a single dime of these dollars. I think that would be unfortunate, Mr. President. We have talked a lot about child care, about caring for children during this debate on tobacco. We have talked a lot over the past weeks about things that, frankly, have little or nothing to do with the well-being of children in this country. Affordable, accessible, high-quality child care is about the well-being of children. The tobacco industry has preyed on America's children—all of us agree on that—stunting their growth and stealing their futures. This amendment is about turning the tide and making an investment in children and their families from the very beginning.

Mr. President, experts tell us that the first 3 years of the life of a child are critical to brain development and to laying the ground for self-confidence—a sound foundation for a healthy future. Investing early in childhood development is the best prevention against a whole host of problems, not the least of which is teenage smoking. Experts, again, including Fight Crime, Invest in Kids, an organization representing law enforcement officials from around the country, tell us time and time again that quality after-school activities are extremely important to preventing problem behaviors and criminal activity. Scientific studies support their claims that nearly 5 million children left

home alone in the afternoon are much more likely to engage in at-risk behavior, from smoking to drugs and sex than their peers who are engaged in stimulating, productive activities.

Mr. President, the Senate has an opportunity in the next few hours to ensure that we make a concrete commitment to investing in the health and safety of America's children. Setting aside a specified percentage of funds—funds that we have already agreed to spend for the child care needs in this country—says to the American public that we will provide for a solid foundation for the future good health of America's children. Many of my colleagues know that I have introduced a comprehensive child care bill along with 26 other colleagues, including the sponsor of this amendment. This amendment is an important first step that I think we can take in making good and fulfilling the promise of that bill. Is this all we need to do? Obviously not, but it is a good beginning.

I hope that our colleagues, in considering this amendment offered by Senators KERRY and BOND, in a bipartisan way, would find a way to support expanding this block grant. It doesn't create any new programs. It is designed to give maximum flexibility to families across this country. It can make a huge difference for those parents, who don't have the choice about whether or not to be at home, to be able to afford that needed child care.

That \$10,000, as I said a moment ago, is equivalent to the cost of a higher education and room and board. It is expensive. Child care is very expensive. If we can assist in the cost of that and relieve the financial burden and the tremendous anxiety the parents feel about wondering where their child is as they must work, then, in addition to doing something about reducing smoking among young people in this bill, that will be amplified by providing assistance to these families and seeing to it that their child care needs are going to be met, or at least it will take a significant step in meeting those needs. I commend my colleagues for offering this amendment and urge colleagues to support it.

I yield the floor.

Ms. LANDRIEU addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I join my colleague, Senator DODD from Connecticut, and commend him, Senator BOND, and Senator KERRY for offering this very important amendment to this very important bill. I want to say a few words, if I could, as a supporter.

The issue that has been most contentious about this tobacco legislation has been how do we really stop people—children, adults and young people—from smoking? We have debated that. Many of us feel like the best way, the surest way to stop people from smoking, from using a dangerous product that has now been proven beyond a shadow of a doubt to be dangerous, is

to raise the price of a pack of cigarettes high enough to discourage as many young people as possible from even starting to smoke and, frankly, discourage adults, who most certainly have a choice, from continuing a habit. It is a purposeful levy. If we could stop people from smoking by not raising the price of a pack of cigarettes, perhaps we should consider that. But I am convinced, as many Members of this Chamber are, that this is the best and most effective way, along with counteradvertising, advertising restrictions, and other restrictions, which, in fact, will be effective.

The question becomes, what do we do with the proceeds generated? Because it is going to fall regressively, in a sense, on poorer people, I think we should try to get the money back to those who are going to pay the tax. We can do that in a number of ways. One way is to target a general tax relief, which, as this bill moves through, I hope we can do. But another way that my colleagues have come up with is targeting some of this money back to hard-working American families—in most instances, with both parents working full time and, in some instances, there is only one parent—to help them with the great costs they are incurring and the great challenge that they have, which is how to be good workers and how to be good parents. It is incumbent upon us to try to get some of this money back to these families that are going to pay this tax and their children for one reason: Because children were targeted by the industry. There is no question about it. They were targeted by the industry. In my opinion, they should benefit from the proceeds generated in this tobacco settlement. To leave the children out and not specifically designate a portion for them, even though they are going to get some benefit from their research that is done, would be a shame. It still gives States discretion about how they would like to spend a part of the money coming in. But it says that we want you to use at least 50 percent of your restricted funds to support child initiatives, child care particularly, and to improve the quality of child care. Because children were targeted, they should benefit. Because families who are paying the tax—poor families primarily, lower-income families—this amendment targets this benefit to them and allows them to get accessible, affordable, and quality child care.

Let me say one other thing that in some way angers me as a working mom myself. Some people would like to maybe make judgments about families that choose to work, or parents outside of the home, or inside of the home. I would like to say maybe ideally it would be great for every child in America to have two parents, and perhaps it would be ideal if one of those parents would stay home full time. But this is not an ideal world; this is a world where families have to make tough choices.

Frankly, we have an economy now in America that depends on almost every able-bodied person over 18 to work. If people haven't noticed, there is a worker shortage in America for skilled work, for talented work. Our businesses can't survive unless there are workers working. So we have to do both. We have to work outside of the home. We have to be good parents to our children, and one way is to have the Government help parents who are doing everything that they can do. One way we can do that is to help them, be a partner with them, to find good-quality child care, because investing in our children is the best thing we can do to help our families, to help our country, to keep our economy strong, and do what is right with the proceeds of this tobacco bill.

So I urge all of my colleagues. I think this has great bipartisan support. It would be a shame to pass this bill without this amendment on it and to fall down in our commitment to the children and working families of our country.

Thank you, Mr. President.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. 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. BAUCUS. Mr. President, good afternoon.

#### ENGAGING CHINA IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to address the upcoming summit in China and to stress the importance of this visit to U.S.-China relations.

Mr. President, as the age old adage says, "A journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step." We should begin this journey with the first step—by defining our goals in Asia, and, more directly, in China.

America's goals are simple: we want peace; we want prosperity and fair trade; and we want a decent world to live in.

How do we achieve these goals? First, by guaranteeing peace and stability in the Pacific. That means preserving our permanent military presence in Asia. Remaining committed to our alliances with Japan, Korea and Southeast Asia. Defining our interests clearly to China.

But it also means preventing unnecessary conflicts. And to do that we must find common ground. Remain engaged. Preserve and foster our working relationship with China. We must build and strengthen our diplomatic ties.

In many ways China remains a challenge—a great wall in and of itself. Its intransigence in many areas of trade, human rights and arms proliferation presents a clear challenge for U.S. policy. Whether the topic is pirated software or the incarceration of political