

The time, however, it just seems like madness.

On Monday, the Louisville Republican announced he was abandoning his support for the tobacco program and siding with Sen. Richard Lugar, R-Ind., chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, in seeking to have it abolished.

It could be the biggest political story of the decade. Imagine a Texas lawmaker suggesting that vehicles propelled by fossil fuel cause too much pollution and embracing a proposal to convert to cars that run on electricity. That's what McConnell has done—in spades.

Burley is Kentucky's number one cash crop, pulling in \$1 billion per year. But it's more than that. It's grown on 60,000 farms, permitting uncounted numbers of men and women to retain their beloved rural way of life.

This is not Nebraska or Kansas, where thousands of acres of wheat and soybeans are grown as far as the eye can see on huge spreads. Kentucky's farms are small, family owned and operated, and the hilly and rocky terrain prohibits a lot of row crops.

That's why tobacco has proved invaluable over the decades. Folks on these small farms take city jobs but tend to a tobacco crop that brings in enough money to permit them to stay on the land. It is, in every sense, Kentucky's cultural legacy.

That heritage has been protected by the tobacco program. The amount of burley produced every year is limited by a quota system. It elevates the price and stops farmers from other states from planting their own tobacco crop from fence row to fence row.

Without the tobacco program, which operates at no net cost to the federal government, it's hard to imagine small family farms surviving for very long in Kentucky. It's that simple. There's no crop that pays enough to take its place. Folks don't earn enough in the factory to maintain their small plot of heaven without it.

McConnell insists he is acting in the interest of these farmers by killing the program. Its demise is inevitable, he says, noting that support programs for wheat, corn and other commodities have already been eliminated. Considering the anti-tobacco fervor that seems to be overwhelming Washington these days, he maintains that the responsible political position is to join in the slaughter and broker the best deal possible.

The rationale makes absolutely no sense.

For one thing, there remain some commodities, such as peanuts, that continue to operate under a support system. Many anti-tobacco activists support the tobacco program because it limits production and keeps prices higher than they otherwise might be—working as deterrent to smoking.

President Clinton, who has hopped on the anti-tobacco band wagon with both feet, has expressed support for keeping the price-support program.

The tobacco bill that passed out of committee contained a provision offered by Senate Minority Whip Wendell Ford, the Democrat from Owensboro, Ky., that offers a voluntary buyout while keeping the price-support program.

There is absolutely no detectable groundswell to kill the program despite the continuing animus for the tobacco industry itself.

McConnell, suddenly, is leading the charge against what is arguably the most important federal program in the entire state when there is no army to lead.

But consider it politically. The Lugar plan calls for a three-year phase out at a cost of \$18 billion. Each farmer, under the proposal, will receive \$8 per quota pound.

What exactly has McConnell gained for Kentucky's small farmers by colluding with the senator from Indiana?

Prior to what some are portraying as McConnell's betrayal, the worst-case scenario for Kentucky farmers had the Senate killing the price support program over objections from Ford, McConnell and other tobacco state lawmakers—under the terms of the Lugar bill, which hasn't changed significantly in recent months.

McConnell's defection hasn't changed the terms of the abolition debate, only provided cover to those who may have been on the fence.

McConnell is a power in Washington these days and he generally has served in the state's best interest.

But this move is inexplicable and the Republican Party he has built and served with distinction could ultimately suffer.

Mr. FORD. Madam President, let me just pick out a couple of headlines here. "The best deal? Plan McConnell backs brings in quick cash, but would ultimately kill off small farms." "Untimely demise. McConnell plan kills tobacco program too fast."

These are in the RECORD.

My colleague, Senator MCCONNELL, referred to Congressman RON LEWIS who is for his position. Well, let me just say this, that Congressman RON LEWIS said that blood would run through Congress before he would give up the fight for the quota system. Then all of a sudden he now is for selling out. The Republican nominee to replace me for the U.S. Senate is for the LEAF program, not for the side that Senator MCCONNELL is on. So it raises a lot of suspicion in the minds of my folks back home. Are Senator MCCONNELL and Senator LUGAR supporting the manufacturers or are they supporting the farmer? Because if the Lugar plan would go into effect, it would save the tobacco manufacturers a minimum of \$1 billion a year over the next 25 years.

And so when you have one major statewide official in Kentucky, elected official, representing the tobacco farmers in Kentucky for one position, the others the other way—our Governor supports the LEAF plan—I just do not understand. Maybe it is the big bucks for the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee to kill this bill and, in fact, killing the bill, then can say that the farmers continue to grow as they are. But then everybody is worried about their demise. And if you have a demise of the tobacco program, then we are in mighty bad shape without funding.

I was criticized for supporting Senator McCain and \$1.10, but then we find the Lugar-McConnell plan is using that money to pay the farmers. If we didn't have the money, we would not be able to pay the farmers.

So, this thing gets awful mixed up. I will be very hopeful about those who read this and those who understand what is happening.

I have a lot here I could talk about, but we have ENACT, that supports the Ford-Hollings plan; an open letter from the tobacco States, from all of the health groups and the tobacco groups supporting our plan. It just seems some way, somehow, there is something

more than trying to do something for farmers here and those who are trying to defeat the program.

I might just say in closing, here is the Chicago Tribune today: "Health Funds Lose In Tobacco Talks: Everybody else gets their project on and youth are forgotten." If we are going to forget youth in this bill, maybe it is time we send it back to the Commerce Committee and try to write a bill that will be on target, that will save the youth from smoking.

I think these young pages, after they hear the debate here, will never want to smoke, and I hope that is true. But when they become 21, they can do basically whatever they want to do. At that point, if they have not started smoking, they probably will not. But at the same time, we have a lot of folks who depend on this program. What we have done is help phase it out rather than cut it off at the knees.

One of the things my friends on the other side, Senator LUGAR and Senator MCCONNELL, fail to say is when they do away with the program and the farmers get some money, they lose the value of their land. By some \$7 billion in Kentucky alone, the value of farmland will be reduced, because the farmland is based on the tobacco quota. When you advertise a farm for sale, you put what the tobacco quota is in that farm sale.

So, if we lose the farm program, as they would try to do, then we lose \$7 billion in farmland value almost immediately. Some farmers could go to bed at night with their farm at one price, get up in the next morning and their farmland is at a lower price and it doesn't cover the mortgage, and the bank will foreclose on those farmers.

People have not thought this through: "Pay them some money, and get out of the business." Pay them a little bit of money, help them through the transition period here so we might be able to save their way of life.

If my 5 minutes is up, I thank the Chair. I thank my friend from Delaware. He is always gracious, and I appreciate him as a friend very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, I ask to proceed as in morning business.

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

#### RESOLUTION OF THE KOSOVO PROBLEM

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, I rise at this moment to deplore the ongoing, brutal Serbian repression of the people of Kosovo and to lay out principles for American policy to deal with the crisis.

Analysts have known for years that the Serbian province of Kosovo is a potential tinderbox for the entire southern Balkans. Approximately ninety percent of Kosovo's population is ethnic Albanian, known as Kosovars. Because of emigration to—not from—other parts of Serbia and because of a

low birth rate, ethnic Serbs now constitute only about 7 percent of the province's population, down from a quarter of the population in the early 1970's.

Kosovo is revered, as you know, Madam President, by Serbs as the cradle of their culture. Near the provincial capital Pristina lies Kosovo Plain, the site of the epic battle of June 28, 1389 in which medieval Serb knights and other Europeans were defeated by the Ottoman Turks, who remained in control of much of the Balkans into this century. Many of the holiest monasteries of the Serbian Orthodox Church lie within Kosovo's borders.

The ethnic Albanians also have long historical ties to Kosovo, tracing, in fact, their origins to the Illyrians who inhabited the area in ancient times. Senator BYRD often talks of this heritage when he recites, as he does better than anyone, the history of Rome and its impact on the region.

In 1974, Yugoslav President Tito made Kosovo, along with Vojvodina in the north, an autonomous region within Serbia.

After Tito's death as the old Yugoslav Federation was beginning to disintegrate, an ambitious, demagogic Serbian politician named Slobodan Milosevic used Serbian nationalism and resentment of the Kosovo Albanians as a springboard to national power.

In 1989, Milosevic abrogated Kosovo's constitutional autonomy, concurrently launching a purge of ethnic Albanians from the province's civil service and curtailing government funding for public institutions, including the schools.

In response, the Kosovars, led by Dr. Ibrahim Rugova, a Sorbonne-educated intellectual, set up a shadow government and began a campaign of non-violent resistance to the Serbian oppression. The Kosovars set up and ran a system of public schools and maintained other public services. Rugova advocated attaining independence for Kosovo through Gandhian tactics. For most of this decade he was able to keep the lid on popular resentment and prevent violence.

Rugova's position began to be undermined when the Kosovo Question was left off the agenda at the Dayton Peace talks in November 1995. Younger Kosovars increasingly began to ask why they should hold fast to non-violence when the Bosnian Serbs were rewarded for their violence and brutality with their own quasi-state within Bosnia.

In 1996 the beginnings of armed resistance to the Serbs appeared. A clandestine group calling itself the Kosova Liberation Army—KLA in English acronym or UCK in the Albanian acronym—carried out isolated attacks on Serbian police.

By this past winter the frequency of KLA attacks increased, and Milosevic decided to respond. In late February his special police units, backed up by the Yugoslav Army, stormed into the

Drenica area, killing and mutilating civilians who they said were harboring KLA militants.

Some of you will remember, some of the people listening will remember, that's the circumstance in which the Yugoslav authorities would not allow the international community to examine the bodies. They rapidly buried them in mass graves and would not let outsiders come in and see what they had done.

But, Madam President, it is essential not to fall into the trap that some have done by making false parallels to Milosevic's vicious military repression.

These people, either for want of logic or perhaps as Serbian apologists, assert that Milosevic's storm troopers were only doing what any state would do against rebels.

But, Madam President, if Milosevic had not robbed Kosovo of its legal autonomy, had not closed its schools and other institutions, and had not summarily brutalized and fired thousands of Kosovars, the armed resistance never would have materialized.

Just yesterday in Moscow, Milosevic refused to deal with the KLA saying, "I see no reason to conduct negotiations with terrorists." I will return to these prospects for negotiations in a minute, but let me just respond to Milosevic's comment by saying that acting just as he did in Croatia and Bosnia, as he is acting in Kosovo, I ask the rhetorical question: Who is the terrorist? Milosevic is a terrorist and a war criminal. He has demonstrated that over the past 5 to 6 years in Bosnia, and he is revealing it again in Kosovo.

Since the February and early March massacres by his troops, Milosevic has diddled the Western world, utilizing his classic "bait-and-switch" tactics.

First, he agreed to negotiate with Dr. Rugova and, thereby, earned from the United States an ill-advised postponement of a ban on foreign investments in Serbia.

While talking, but not seriously negotiating with Rugova, Milosevic was busy setting in motion the next step in his state of terrorism. Late last month, his notorious special police sealed off western Kosovo and began a murderous campaign of ethnic cleansing, driving some 65,000 refugees into neighboring Albania and others into Montenegro. After killing hundreds and burning entire towns to the ground, Milosevic's forces have reportedly even resorted to strafing fleeing refugees from Yugoslav helicopters.

One would hope that the West has learned something from its pathetic temporizing in Bosnia earlier in this decade. Perhaps we have, but maybe we have not. The so-called Contact Group, made up of the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Italy, and Russia, has met regularly to try to hammer out a unified policy on Kosovo before it spins out of control. In spite of the fact that it operates by consensus, which means the "lowest common denominator," the Contact

Group has agreed upon economic sanctions which, given time, will worsen the already catastrophic conditions of the Serbian economy.

But, Madam President, time is of the essence. Not only are thousands of innocent civilians—most of them Kosovars, but also some ethnic Serbs—being killed or driven from their homes, but the continuing fighting threatens the stability of neighboring Albania and also of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, which itself has restive ethnic Albanians who constitute between one-quarter and one-third of its population.

Maintaining the integrity of Macedonia—a fragile democracy with a Slavic leadership genuinely committed to interethnic reconciliation—must be the cornerstone of U.S. policy. Above all, however, is the stark obvious fact that everyone should have learned from Bosnia, and that is, Slobodan Milosevic will only react to superior force being employed against him. He will not react otherwise.

Lest anyone forget, while economic sanctions against Yugoslavia may have modified Milosevic's position in Bosnia, it was only the use of American airpower for 3 weeks in the fall of 1995 that brought Milosevic and his Bosnian Serb puppets to the bargaining table in Dayton. So now, Madam President, we, once again, are faced with an unpalatable fact that force may have to be employed in order to prevent the need for even greater force later. But there is no decision more difficult than considering whether to send American troops into action.

I have been a Senator for 25 years. I started here when the Vietnam war was still underway, and I am here today. I find the single most intimidating decision that need be made by any of us is when we vote, as we have in the past, to put American forces in harm's way, and Kosovo is no exception.

Let me outline some of the basic principles that have to be part of that decision, outline whether or not that the decision, although difficult, will have to be made.

First, I believe that, except for those who prefer to withdraw to a "Fortress America" posture, no one doubts the strategic importance of the south Balkans to the United States.

Second, before we embark upon any military or political action, we must have our goals firmly established.

Third, I also believe that most of my colleagues will agree that NATO remains the cornerstone of American policy in Europe and should be the vehicle by which we act in Kosovo.

Fourth, it goes without saying that a primary concern in any military planning is to minimize the risk of American lives while ensuring the success of the mission.

With these principles in mind, let me examine our options in the Kosovo crisis now.

The United States has declared itself against independence for Kosovo,

thereby putting itself at odds with the Kosovar leadership and people, the very ones who are currently being brutalized.

Madam President, I agree with the position our nation is taking. Whatever one may think of a broader decision made at the beginning of the 20th century as the Turks were pushed out of most of the Balkans, the ethnographic mix of the area simply precludes homogenous states, except through ethnic cleansing, which we must oppose. To put it bluntly, I would use force to stop massacres of innocent civilians. I would use force to prevent cross-border invasions. I would use peacekeepers backed up by force to guarantee the rights of minorities. But I would not risk American lives in a cause of a "greater Albania" which would probably destroy the Macedonian state and set off a chain reaction of incalculable proportions in the south Balkans.

On the other hand, I cannot imagine asking the Kosovars to accept a return to the pre-1989 autonomy with Serbia. If Milosevic could summarily revoke the autonomy one time, he can do it again.

Therefore, my own preference as a political goal would be giving Kosovo full republic status within the Yugoslav federation, on an equal footing with Serbia and Montenegro. Perhaps we would also have to have republic status for other parts of Serbia.

I recognize there are problems with such a solution. Milosevic will be dead set against it, since a Kosovo Republic would ipso facto consign Serbia to a minority role in the upper house of the Yugoslav Parliament and probably mean the end of Milosevic's quasi-dictatorial rule.

My response is that we and the Kosovars and the democratic leadership of Montenegro and the remaining democrats in Serbia should look at the probable outcome as an opportunity, not a problem.

Both Dr. Rugova and the KLA have insisted upon independence for Kosovo, but if they keep in mind the scenario I just outlined, they might, in the course of negotiations, agree to a "third republic" or "fourth republic" compromise.

But how about Milosevic? It is clear to me that only one principle continues to guide his policy, and that is clinging to power. In fact, since he took power in Serbia, Milosevic has been a dismal failure at everything, except staying in power.

His wars of aggression in pursuit of a goal of a "greater Serbia" have resulted in the extinguishing of hundreds of years of Serbian culture in the Krajina and in Slavonia, and hundreds of thousands of Serbian refugees, and in the impoverishment of most Bosnian Serbs, and all this at a cost of over 300,000 persons killed.

Meanwhile, under Milosevic's stewardship Serbia itself has plummeted from having been one of the wealthiest countries of Central and Eastern Europe to a near basket-case.

But Milosevic clings to power. And it is, I regret to have to repeat, only the use of countervailing policy and force, power, that will remove Milosevic.

And this is the central point. While there is no panacea for the Balkan ills, the necessary precondition for restoration of peace is a democratic government in Belgrade that is prepared to coexist with the non-Serb peoples of the area.

In order to move events in that direction the Clinton administration has wisely supported the democratic reformist regime in Montenegro—of which Milo Djukanovic is the president—which is already posing a serious challenge to Milosevic within the Yugoslav parliament.

We must now apply all necessary pressure on Milosevic in Kosovo.

The Contact Group has issued four demands: a cessation of fighting; the unconditional withdrawal of Serbian special police forces and Yugoslav Army forces from Kosovo; a return of refugees; and unlimited access for international monitors.

Milosevic's statement on Tuesday in Moscow after his talks with Russian President Yeltsin did not go far enough. He refused to withdraw his troops or to talk with the KLA—two conditions the Contact Group is asking for.

Milosevic's usual half-way tactics must not dilute the West's resolve to force him to meet all the demands.

NATO has already tasked its military experts to come up with military options for moving against the Serbs and Milosevic.

Reportedly, nine preliminary options have been submitted. They range from stationing troops along Kosovo's borders, to imposing a new "no-fly zone" and a "weapons-exclusion zone" over part of Yugoslavia, to air strikes, and even ground invasions.

In this planning, the possible political ramifications of any military action are, I am sure, being factored in by this administration.

In the immediate future, though, the NATO military planners will flesh out the details of these options. So, I think it would be imprudent for me or for any other Senator to second-guess the NATO military planners who have the relevant expertise and are in possession of the vital intelligence data needed to make a judgment.

What I can say is that the use of force must remain on the table, and that, if at all possible, it must be exercised through NATO.

Within NATO, however, there exists a serious problem. It does not revolve so much around whether or not to use force; for most of our European allies seem to have learned from our Bosnian experience that the use of force in Kosovo may well be necessary.

The dispute is rather over the question of whether approval by the U.N. Security Council is necessary before NATO acts outside the territory of its members. The United States has al-

ways maintained that it is not. As recently as our expansion vote on NATO we insisted that that is not a necessary precondition. A U.N. Security Council mandate is not a necessary precondition to use NATO forces.

This is a position reinforced, as I said, by the U.S. Senate in the Resolution of Ratification of NATO enlargement overwhelmingly passed on April 30 of this year.

Most—perhaps all—of our European NATO allies, including the British, assert that U.N. approval is necessary.

Madam President, this difference of opinion strikes at the heart of the Alliance, for if the European allies' position wins out, the Russians—and even the Chinese—will have a veto power over NATO action in Central and Eastern Europe. This is precisely where Bosnia and Kosovo-like ethnic conflicts are likely to pose the biggest threats to regional security in the coming decades. As much as I support the U.N., I, for one, am not about to yield to the Security Council, the Russians, and the Chinese the decision of whether or not we are able to protect the interests of Europe—requiring their approval ahead of time.

We must make clear to our European allies, and to the Russians, that while we prefer to act within NATO, we see Kosovo as a vital national security interest of the United States and, hence, are prepared to act alone if necessary.

This is an unpleasant exercise, but it is preferable to face it now, rather than to postpone the issue. In fact, it would be good to resolve this intra-alliance dispute in the newest revision of NATO's Strategic Concept, which is now being discussed.

Finally, Madam President, I believe it is absolutely essential for the United States immediately to make contact with the Kosovo Liberation Army.

A withdrawal of Serbian special forces and Yugoslav Army troops, or a NATO bombing campaign, must not be done unless the KLA first agrees to a ceasefire. For I must repeat—the object of U.S. policy is not only to stop the movement toward a greater Serbia on the part of Mr. Milosevic, but it is also not to become a tool for a greater Albania in the South Balkans. It is to halt the fighting and then to start serious negotiations involving all the parties. I have already made clear my preferred political solution, but the outcome is for the parties to thrash out.

We are approaching the moment of truth in Kosovo. As usual, the indispensable element in solving the crisis is the active involvement of the United States, just as it was in Bosnia.

As the U.S. Government continues its negotiations with its allies and its Contact Group partners, and as NATO military planners continue to refine possible military options, I urge my colleagues to recognize the gravity of the situation and to make clear their support for resolute American leadership.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

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

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I hear all kinds of rumbblings that the Republican side of the aisle, at some time today, is going to try to kill or will effectively kill the tobacco bill. I want to take a few minutes to talk about that and try to recap, if I can, why we are here and why we have spent so much time on the tobacco bill.

Three thousand kids every day take up smoking; 1,000 of them will die prematurely. Teenage use of tobacco products is at a 17-year high. And 42.7 percent of high school kids are now using some form of tobacco products. Ninety-one percent of 3-year-olds in this country recognize Joe Camel, and recognize him in a friendly manner. And thanks to the court cases that we have had in several States, we now have the industry documents that reveal years and years and years of lying and deception by the tobacco companies.

That is why we are here. That is why we have a tobacco bill—to put an end to teen smoking, to put an end to the lies and deceptions of the tobacco companies, to save kids' lives.

The Republican leader was on the floor here a week and a half or so ago. I happened to be on the floor at the same time. And Senator LOTT of Mississippi, why, he said, we have to remember what the end game is. Well, I got to the floor shortly after, and I said, yes, we do have to remember what the end game is. The end game is to put an end to what I just talked about and to reduce teen smoking. That is the end game. That is why we are here—to cut down on teen smoking.

But Senators on the other side of the aisle here today, and in the past 4 weeks, have had another agenda. They have had tax cuts, drug money, and limits on attorneys' fees, et cetera, et cetera, and on and on.

Let us look at the RECORD. On Friday, June 5, the majority leader, Senator LOTT, said, and I quote, "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." In other words, the majority leader is saying, if we do not load a lot of stuff onto this bill—marriage penalty, tax relief, drugs—there will not be a bill. That is what he said on June 5.

On June 7, on one of the talk shows, CNN's Sunday Night "Late Edition" interview with Wolf Blitzer, here is Senator LOTT again, 2 days afterward:

Instead of focusing on trying to get something constructive done, what we have now is game playing and rhetoric. What we need is leadership.

Mr. Blitzer said, "When will there be a vote?"—talking about the McCAIN bill.

Senator LOTT, 2 days before on June 5—Senator LOTT had said, ". . . there won't be a bill until we add the marriage penalty, tax relief and drugs."

Now, two days later, Mr. LOTT says:

Well, at this point, it is dead in the water and there may never be a vote on the McCAIN bill. The problem is greed has set in. It is the usual addiction in Washington to taxes and spend. This has gone way beyond trying to do something about teenage smoking. This is now about money grubbing. This is about taxing people and spending on a myriad of programs. . . . We have lost our focus.

What kind of brave new world are we living in around here? On June 5, the majority leader says there won't be a bill unless we load it up. Two days later, he says we have loaded the bill up, we can't have a bill because we have lost our focus, because it ought to be about teen smoking.

Game playing. You want game playing? That is where the game playing is coming from. It is coming from the leadership in the Senate. That is where the game playing is coming from.

I will say it loud and clear right here. The leadership has never wanted this bill, and they want to kill it. What we want—and I don't just mean Democrats, I mean a lot of Republicans, too, we want to put an end to teen smoking, and we want this bill. But, unfortunately, the Republican leadership and some on that side are going to try to make good on their threats to kill the bill.

I understand the Senator from Texas, Senator GRAMM, was on the floor a few minutes ago sort of crowing about killing the bill. Well, I hope those reports are wrong. I hope we have the bipartisan support to pass the bill.

But it seems to me at this point in time the choice is very clear: You are either for tobacco company profits or you are for our kids. You are either for cutting down on the lies and deceptions of the tobacco companies, or you are for saving our kids' lives and keeping them from smoking. That is what it has come down to. Don't let anybody kid you.

Now I heard the Senator from Kentucky, Senator MCCONNELL, a while ago—I happened to be listening—talking about all the taxes, all the taxes the people are going to have to spend if we raise the price of cigarettes. I got to thinking about that. Guess what. Not one person in this country has to pay those taxes. What an interesting set of taxes—taxes you don't have to pay. If you don't smoke, you don't pay the taxes—simple as that. It doesn't tax everybody. You have the freedom to choose. If you want to pay the taxes, smoke; if you don't want to pay the taxes, don't smoke. Yet to listen to the other side talk about it, why, you would think that everyone in this country was going to have to pay taxes. Absolutely not true. Only if you want to smoke. Then you ought to be more than happy to help pay for those who get sick and to help do something about keeping teenagers from smoking.

I don't think I yet have met one adult who has smoked a long time—10,

15, 20 years—I haven't met one yet who has said, "I would recommend a young person take up smoking." I haven't met one yet. Every single one of them says, "Don't do what I did. Don't get in the habit. Don't become an addict like I am."

That is what this bill is about—keeping kids from becoming addicts, addicts every bit as bad as if they took up cocaine or heroin—nicotine addiction. And it is the gateway drug to the others. You want to cut down on marijuana? Cut down on teen smoking of cigarettes. You want to cut down on teen use of smoking crack? Cut down on their smoking cigarettes first. You want to cut down on kids who get into the drug culture? Go after cigarettes first. It is a gateway drug. It is a drug, make no mistake about it, and a highly addictive drug. And it just so happens to be legal.

But we know from industry documents today that they have known for years that nicotine is addictive. They have known for years that it is carcinogenic. They have known for years about the medical costs of addiction to tobacco. Yet through all their advertising, they have lied about it. All this fancy advertising of Joe Camel and that rugged Marlboro Man on that horse and all these young people—do you ever see a tobacco ad that has a lot of old people hacking and smoking and spitting in it? No. All the tobacco ads have nice young people, and they are healthy, and they are vibrant. They look like they are having a great time, and if it weren't for tobacco, they probably wouldn't be having a great time. That is the kind of deception used by the tobacco companies. That is what we are trying to put an end to.

Taxes? No one has to pay these taxes. I see the Senator from Kentucky is on the floor. No one has to pay these taxes, not one single person, if they choose not to smoke. But if they do, then, yes, we want you to pay more for cigarettes, because we want to use that money to stop kids from smoking, which is what you want, too.

Every adult I have known who is addicted to nicotine says kids shouldn't take it up. But these tobacco companies will continue to hook kids because they know that is their replacement smoker. They know that 90 percent of adult smokers who are hooked on nicotine start smoking before the age of 18. If they don't start smoking by that time, chances are they will never take it up and become addicted. That is why we are here. That is the end game—to keep our kids from smoking.

Killing this bill is a death sentence for millions of kids. Killing this bill would be a historic cave-in to the special interests of this country. It would be a historic cave-in to the \$40 million in deceptive ads that the tobacco companies have put out across this land over the last month. It would be a historic cave-in to an industry that has deceived and lied to the American people for the last half century.