

compared to what we have proposed—I would offer the following:

Our total revenue is \$82 billion over 5 years. The President's budget provides about \$65 billion. Under our formula, \$12 billion would go to the States unrestricted. That is just somewhat more than the President's \$11.8 billion. The States, for improving children's health care and child care, education, would get \$22 billion under our proposal compared to the President's \$15.7 billion.

Research under our proposal: NIH would get \$17 billion over the 5 years; the President had \$25.3 billion for research; \$17 billion—the same \$17 billion that we had—for NIH health research, but he had \$8 billion for nonhealth research. And we believe that really more appropriately should be funded elsewhere, should not be funded out of this stream of revenue.

Medicare: We provided \$3 billion initially; the President, \$800 million. Farmers would get \$10 billion under our proposal in the first 5 years, and \$13 billion would go for antitobacco programs, compared to the President providing \$12 billion for both of those uses.

So we have provided \$10 billion for farmers and \$13 billion for the antitobacco programs, for a total of \$23 billion. The President didn't break that category down; he just provided a total of \$12 billion for both.

Finally, in Social Security: We put \$5 billion in the first 5 years; the President doesn't use any of these proceeds for that purpose. Again, we start with the modest amount of money going to Social Security and Medicare, but we grow that over time as the demographics of the country change and require additional funding.

The HEALTHY Kids Act accomplishes the five objectives that the President sent: Reduce teen smoking, including tough penalties. We provide the full FDA authority. We go a long way towards changing the industry culture. We meet additional health goals that the American people want addressed. And we protect the tobacco farmers and their communities.

The HEALTHY Kids Act also accomplishes the eight goals set out by Drs. Koop and Kessler. They have called for full FDA authority to regulate this drug just as they regulate other drugs. We agree. They provide for protection of youth from tobacco influences. And we agree. They provide for adequate smoking cessation funding. We have provided for it. They ask, for second-hand smoke, expanded regulation. And we provide that. They say there should be no special immunity provisions, no special protection. And we agree. They say with respect to preemptions that local communities ought to judge and should not be preempted by Federal law. And we agree. We provide for no local preemption.

We also are in agreement with them that there ought to be adequate compensation for tobacco farmers and that there ought to be strong international policies.

We have met the five principles laid out by the President. We have met the eight goals laid out by Dr. Koop and Dr. Kessler. We believe that the provisions here are strongly supported by the American people. We did national polling to see if we were in sync with what, in fact, the American people believe. Let me show you what they told us.

They want a significant per-pack price increase. They believe that it is a part of a comprehensive strategy. They support strong look-back penalties. And they say there should be no special protections for this industry. If you go to the polling data directly, what one finds is that the voters support a \$1.50 health fee to reduce youth smoking and they support it on a very, very high level. Mr. President, 65 percent of the American people support a \$1.50-a-pack health fee; 65 percent favor it, only about 30 percent oppose. Mr. President, 65 to 35 percent, people say yes, let's put in a \$1.50-a-pack health fee. And this is on a completely bipartisan basis. There is almost no difference between Democrats and Republicans on this question. In fact, you can see here: Health fee, \$1.50—the blue are Democrats; 69 percent of Democrats support that, and 67 percent of Republicans support a \$1.50-a-pack-health fee. This was done by the well-known national polling firm, Lake, Sosin, Snell, Perry and Associates.

There is also strong public support for a look-back penalty of 50 cents a pack or more. That is what we provide in our legislation. If the industry fails to meet the goals for reducing teen smoking, we put in place a 50-cent-a-pack penalty. By 54 to 34, the American public supports that.

Mr. President, to sum it up, we believe the HEALTHY Kids Act—that has now been cosponsored by 31 Senators, 31 of our colleagues—is strong legislation to protect the public health and to reduce teen smoking. If there is one thing that came through loud and clear in all the hearings that we held, it is that that is what our priority should be. If we keep our eye on the ball, that is what we will do. Protecting the public health is so important. If you listened to those who came and testified, they are saying to us that's the priority.

I remember very well, when we were in Newark we had a series of witnesses, some of them victims. As we went around the country, we made it a practice to listen to those who have suffered the ill-effects that tobacco products cause. I found two witnesses in Newark especially moving. One was a young woman named Gina Seagrave. She told the story of her mother dying prematurely because of the effects of a lifetime of tobacco addiction. She broke down during her testimony as she described the effects on her family of her mother dying at a young age, the incredible impact that had on their family. I do not think there was a person in that hall who was not moved by her story.

She was then followed by a big tough guy, a coach. He was a big, tough strapping guy, but you could hardly hear him when he testified. He spoke in a raspy voice. This big, tough guy could hardly be heard because he spoke in a raspy voice, and he explained that he had a laryngectomy. His larynx had been cut out because it had been filled with cancer after a lifetime of smoking. He told the members of the committee of the terror he felt when he was given the diagnosis. He told those of us who were there listening the profound regret he had that he hadn't listened to the warnings of those who told him of the dangers of smoking.

This man was a coach and an assistant principal, and he told us that every day he goes to school and sees young people doing what he did, taking up the habit. He recalled once he had taken it up how hard it was to quit, he would quit for awhile but he would always go back to it, and how he hoped that some of these young people would learn from his experience.

Mr. President, when you listen to the victims you cannot help but be moved by how serious a threat tobacco usage is to the public health of our country. We ought to do something about it. We have that chance this year.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. 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. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 20 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized to speak for 20 minutes.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Chair very much.

CONGRATULATING WISCONSIN ON ITS SESQUICENTENNIAL

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, recently the senior Senator from Wisconsin and I introduced a resolution congratulating the State of Wisconsin on the 150th anniversary of its statehood. We will celebrate that great occasion on May 29. The sesquicentennial of Wisconsin's statehood is both a time to reflect on the distinguished history of the State and a time to look ahead to the promise of the next 150 years.

Mr. President, every year that I have been a Member of this body, I have traveled to each of Wisconsin's 72 counties to hold what I call "listening sessions." These meetings allow me to learn more about what my constituents think about what is going on in Washington, and they also afford me