

you will reduce the number of kids who are smoking, you will ultimately reduce the numbers of people who are addicted and you will significantly reduce the costs overall.

So America has a choice. You can reduce the costs, reduce the number of kids who are addicted, reduce the number of our fellow Americans who die, reduce the overall costs to our hospitals and ultimately wind up with a better and healthier society as a consequence of that, or you can take the alternative route, which is the only alternative to what the Senator is saying, and vote to leave it the way it is and let the tobacco companies continue to addict the next generation without making a legitimate effort. I think the case ought to be very, very clear.

COSPONSORSHIP OF AMENDMENT NO. 2446

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, on Tuesday, June 2, during Senate consideration of the McCain-Kerry and others amendment No. 2446, I was added as a cosponsor of that amendment, however, the RECORD of June 2 does not reflect my cosponsorship.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected to reflect my cosponsorship of Senate amendment No. 2446.

In addition, I now ask unanimous consent my cosponsorship of Senate amendment No. 2446 appear in the RECORD at the appropriate place.

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

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TIANANMEN SQUARE MASSACRE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, today represents the ninth anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre. This is the day that commemorates the culmination of the crackdown—very bloody crackdown—that occurred 9 years ago in Beijing, China.

I think it would be wrong for us not to take note of that on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I think it is incumbent upon all of us, as freedom-loving Americans, to not forget the lessons that we continue to learn from China.

I would like to, in the next few minutes, read an excerpt from a book entitled "Mandate of Heaven: The Legacy of Tiananmen Square," by Orville Schell. This book recounts, among other things, what occurred during the

2 months leading up to the Tiananmen Square massacre and the events that night. I have taken only a few excerpts from that, but I think it will help us to put into perspective the sacrifices that were made, the tragedy that occurred, and I think the tragedy of American foreign policy which today ignores that it was, in fact, Jiang Zemin, mayor of Shanghai at the time, who said that there should not be one ounce of forgiveness shown to those student protesters who dared raise the voice of dissent, who dared to speak for freedom and democracy in China. So I will read from "Mandate of Heaven: The Legacy of Tiananmen Square":

Although a palpable sense of foreboding hung over the Square, few could bring themselves to believe that the People's Liberation Army might actually harm "the people." Not even under the vindictive Gang of Four had troops opened fire with tens of thousands of demonstrators had spontaneously occupied the Square to mourn the death of Zhou Enlai in 1976. So many ominous-sounding government threats had come to naught since April 15 that most ordinary Chinese were now inclined to view this latest salvo of warnings as more overinflated rhetoric. The triumphs, symbolic and otherwise, of the preceding weeks had given many, especially protesters, an exaggerated sense of their own invincibility.

But there were some Chinese who understood that when threatened, the Party would ultimately stop at nothing to preserve its grip on power. They understood the old adage "When scholars confront soldiers, it is impossible to speak with reason." Most of these pessimists were from the older generation of educated Chinese who had learned through bitter experience that the Party rarely allowed such challenges to go unchallenged. "The Day the Soldiers Enter the City, Then the Blood of the People will Flow," declared one banner . . .

Around dusk the Flying Tigers began bringing back reports that soldiers equipped with automatic weapons and backed up by armored vehicles were moving toward the city center from several directions at once. In response, the strengthening of barricades reached fever pitch. By the time the first troops neared key intersections on the city's outskirts, an estimated 2 million people were again in the streets. At first, these citizens' brigades continued to rely on the same defensive techniques that they had used two weeks earlier, and by dark, many unarmed units were again bottled up around the city . . .

By 10 p.m. the assault from the west was in full swing. As several infantry and armored divisions pushed toward the Military Museum, they soon found their way blocked by a wall of angry citizens and Dare-to-Die squads of workers pledged to defend the students and the Square until death. The juggernaut of military vehicles ground to a halt, allowing government propaganda to cite these instances of hesitation as evidence that the army had exercised a "high degree of restraint" while entering the city. Such "restraint" did not last long.

The next volley of gunfire was aimed over the heads of the resisters. The crowd refused to disperse. Finally, an officer in a jeep was reported to have yelled out through a megaphone, "Charge, you bunch of cowards! Sweep away this trash!" A volley of concussion grenades was lobbed into the crowd. Only when steel-helmeted soldiers carrying truncheons and riot shields were ordered to charge did those resisting give way.

It was around 11 p.m. before advancing troops approached Muxidi Bridge near the

state guesthouse. By then the order to "go ahead at any cost" and to shoot at anyone obstructing the soldiers' path had been given. Before soldiers had even arrived at the giant barricade constructed out of articulated city buses, large earthmoving trucks, commandeered minivans, and tons of urban detritus, the first wounded were being rushed on bicycle carts to hospitals. As troops approached the bridge, someone torched the fuel tank of a bus, turning the barricade into a raging wall of fire. The column had no choice but to halt. With Gallic flair, Pierre Hurel, a French journalist writing for Paris Match, described the scene:

"In front of the flaming barricade, facing the soldiers alone, four students with their feet planted wide apart make the heavy air snap with the sound of the waving scarlet banners. In an unbelievable gesture of defiance, they are naked martyrs before a sea of soldiers in brown combat helmets and tense with anger. The silk of their university banners gleams in the fire's light, and behind them a crowd, waiting for the worst, applauds. It is 11:30 p.m. and for the first time tonight, the soldiers have had to pull back."

As the convey began pushing forward again a short while later, a noise resembling the sound of popcorn popping was suddenly heard over the dim of the crowd. Out of the smoky darkness, troops armed with AK-47s charged the barricades, shooting as they advanced.

"Soldiers were shooting indiscriminately; there were bullets flying everywhere; dead bodies and injured people were lying in the streets," reported one anonymous foreign journalist cited in a subsequent Amnesty International report. "Crowds of residents from the neighboring lanes had left their houses and stood unprotected in the streets. They did not try to hide because they did not seem to realize what was going on. They were in a state of shock and disbelief."

All along the Avenue of Eternal Peace, equally ferocious battles broke out as citizens stood their ground with an almost religious fanaticism before advancing troops. Bystanders who ran into surrounding alleyways for safety were chased down and sprayed with automatic-weapons fire. Those who tried to rescue the wounded were shot in cold blood. The slaughter was so merciless that rumors began circulating that the soldiers had been administered some kind of drug as a stimulant.

By 1 a.m. soldiers had neared the intersection where Xidan crosses the Avenue of Eternal Peace and began lobbying tear-gas canisters into the crowds. Moments later several buses serving as barricades burst into flames. Then another order to fire was given. "Several lines of students and residents instantly fell," claimed one BASF eyewitness. "Dozens were killed, and several hundred were wounded."

Yang Jianli, a Ph.D. candidate in mathematics from the University of California at Berkeley who was back in China on a visit, watched in horror as these shock troops advanced, firing their automatic weapons as if they were assaulting a heavily armed enemy position. "Tanks and truckloads of soldiers armed with machine guns were rolling in, one after another, toward the Square," he remembered. "At the intersection we heard perhaps a thousand people shouting, 'Down with Fascism!' . . . [Then] flashes spouted from the muzzles of soldiers' rifles. We ran back a bit and threw ourselves on the pavement. 'Did they really fire?' I asked H. 'I still can't believe it!' Some people continued to stand up, saying nonchalantly, 'Don't be frightened, they're only using rubber bullets.' But before they had finished speaking I heard someone scream, 'Look out! There's a cart coming through!' Two men with gunshot wounds were being carried away. . . . Suddenly, there was more gunfire, and we

dropped to the ground again, my heart jumping from sheer fright."

"His blue T-shirt was soaked with blood, and his eyes were blood-red," recalled Yang of one outraged citizen. . . .

"Troops have been firing indiscriminately and still people would not move back," BBC News Chief Correspondent Kate Adie reported in a television broadcast after visiting both the western and eastern reaches of the Avenue of Eternal Peace. "Indeed, it was hard at the time to grasp that this army was launching into an unarmed civilian population as if charging into battle. . . . There was not one voice on the streets that did not express despair and rage. 'Tell the world!' they said to us."

Since that 1989 tragedy and this famous photo of a lone student who stood defiantly in front of the line of tanks, there has been every June 4th efforts within China, efforts there at Tiananmen, to remind the world of the tragedy that occurred, of those brutal, visible oppressions, and forcibly removing a voice of freedom that the world has known in generations.

I continue from Schell's book as he recounts some of the symbolic gestures that have been made since that original June 4th, 1989.

He writes:

"Like an uninterred body, June 4th continued to cry out for an appropriate and respectable barrier."

There are those, if I might just add, who would like to say we are in a post-Tiananmen era but somehow that chapter has been closed. The fact is the Communist Chinese government in China does not allow that chapter to be closed. So Schell refers to it as an uninterred body which continued to cry out for appropriate and respectable barrier.

The yearning that many continued to feel for some sort of commemoration could never be fulfilled by parades or crimson stars fashioned out of potted flowers. But since the government stubbornly refused to acknowledge the tragic significance of what had happened, much less allow for a ceremony at which those who had died could be properly remembered, the Square remained charged with unresolved energy and, like a lodestone, kept drawing defiant demonstrators back into its embrace to engage in solitary acts of guerrilla mourning.

Such observances were, or course, politically suicidal. As soon as anyone began such a ritual protest, plainclothes policemen materialized as if out of nowhere. Within moments the offenders were surrounded, seized, and dragged away. Only on those rare occasions when foreign journalists had been alerted in advance or happened to be at the Square for other reasons were such fleeting moments of defiance recorded. But then, like shooting stars in the night sky, these usually nameless protesters would disappear.

He writes:

On the first anniversary of June 4, a lone figure had walked up to the Monument and nervously fumbled to display a handmade banner; moments later he was seized and taken away. That night [at the university], a young economics student named Li Minqui, who had been active in the outlawed BASF, tried to mark the anniversary by addressing a spontaneous midnight rally on campus where he indignantly referred to China's current leaders as "wild and savage autocrats" and called for an elective Government that

could supervise the Communist party. Li was not only promptly expelled but arrested, labeled a "chief instigator of an anti-party conspiracy," accused of counterrevolutionary propaganda and incitement," and sentenced to 2 years and in prison.

I just think of how many Members of the Senate and how many Members of the Congress would be incarcerated if that were the standard. This one who dared to lift a voice to say we ought to have free elections and called the autocrats "wild and savage" served 2 years.

Schell continues to write:

On the second anniversary of the massacre, a young woman dressed in funeral white appeared in front of the Monument to observe a moment of silence. "I came to remember," she told a South China Morning Post correspondent before drifting away just as suspicious undercover agents began to close in.

Incidentally, white being the symbolic color of mourning in China, we have chosen the white color, white ribbons to commemorate in mourning those who lost their lives at Tiananmen Square. So that is what happened on the second anniversary.

And then Schell writes:

In 1992, on the third anniversary of the massacre, a young worker named Wang Wanxing appeared not far from where a new sign warned visitors that it was illegal to lay memorial wreaths in front of the Monument without prior approval. After unfurling a banner calling on Deng to apologize for the crackdown following the protest, he was seized, dragged away and committed to a mental hospital. In a letter to U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali smuggled out of China a month later Wang asserted that not only was he being held against his will in Shanghai's Ankang Psychiatric Hospital for the criminally insane, but he was being forced to take psychotropic drugs.

Computer hackers were also busy that spring waging electronic warfare by introducing rogue viruses into software programs used on government computers. One such virus caused the words "Remember June 4" to appear on display terminals while another flashed the slogan "Bloody June 4" as soon as computers at certain state enterprises were booted up.

Despite increased campus surveillance, on May 28, 1991, [university] students managed to hang cloth streamers out of two dorm windows declaring "We Will Never Forget June 4." Leaflets recalling the events of 1989 also appeared in the student canteen.

An excerpt from the leaflets said this:

Those were days that woke the heart and moved the spirit. Then the hue and cry became the sound of suffocation in a pool of blood.

There are those who would say that to call the world's attention to the tragedy of Tiananmen Square in 1989 is empty moralizing on the part of self-righteous Americans who want to impose our views of freedom and liberty upon the rest of the world and other cultures. May I say to those who would argue such that liberty and freedom are not American values, that it is not empty moralizing to point to a young Chinese student who defied the symbols of oppression and onrushing tanks. And I would say to those who would say don't talk about Tiananmen

Square and don't talk about the massacre, we must not forget that these are not American values: these are universal human values and human rights. For us to sacrifice what this Nation has always stood for on the altar of free trade, on the altar of commercial and corporate profits is unconscionable.

Jiang Zemin was quoted on the front page of the People's Daily 3 weeks after the massacre. This is what he said. He was mayor of Shanghai at the time, not President of China. But this is what he said:

Toward these cruel enemies—

That is that young man standing in front of the tanks—

there must not be even one percent of forgiveness. If we go easy on them, we shall commit an error of historic proportions.

That is the man whom the President is going to meet and greet in Beijing in a few short weeks, the one who said that toward these cruel enemies we dare not show even one percent of forgiveness. And they didn't, true to his word.

Nine years later, Jiang is President of China and the students whom he called the cruel enemies, many remain imprisoned, those who survived. And Jiang, true to his word, showed not 1 percent of forgiveness. He has never apologized. He has never acknowledged the cruel, inhumane, and barbaric response of the Government at Tiananmen Square. The Chinese Government has never investigated, they have never even investigated this tragic incident; they have only defended the crackdown and the killing of hundreds of students as an appropriate response to peaceful dissent.

So this man, Jiang Zemin will be the leader greeting our President, this man who declared not 1 percent of forgiveness. And more recently, lest you think he may have changed his mind and changed his attitude and lest we are under the misimpression that suddenly the Government of China has grown compassionate and that, in the words of President Clinton, they now are becoming a thriving democracy—lest we think that, President Jiang, when asked by Barbara Walters how he looked back on the events of 1989, replied, "It's much ado about nothing."

So on this anniversary of the Tiananmen massacre, we all need to remind the world we will not forget and we will not allow the courageous sacrifice of those hundreds of students at Tiananmen Square to be demeaned, to be disrespected and to be devalued.

The Washington Post, in an editorial today entitled "China: Two Views," speaks of a view that I would share:

A strikingly different view from inside China, from someone with pretty fair credentials to judge China's practices, Bao Tong, 65, was Chief of Staff of China's premier and Communist Party chief until he was jailed in 1989.

Why was he jailed, by the way? He was jailed:

Because he opposed the crackdown against protesting students in Tiananmen Square.

Mr. Bao spent 7 years in prison, three of them incommunicado, showing that China has a way to go when it comes to rule of law. He now lives under house arrest but recently gave an interview to the Post's Steven Mufson and John Pomfret.

Mr. Bao challenged the notion that economic strength, in the absence of real democratization, inevitably will make China more benign.

By the way, let me repeat what he challenged, because it is the very thesis espoused by those who say constructive engagement is going to bring about change in China. This is the very theory espoused by those who say, "We will just trade sufficiently, we will increase trade and do enough increased commerce with China, and everything will be better." So he challenged the notion that economic strength in the absence of real democratization inevitably will lead China to be more benign.

China "has already gone mad twice in the last 40 years," he said, referring to the cultural revolution and the Tiananmen massacre. "You have to ask yourself a question. What will it do on the international scene? Is it a source of stability or a potential source of instability? When it doesn't have enough power, its attitude will be restrained. But once it develops and becomes strong, what kind of role is it going to play without a complete structural change?"

That is the question I would pose. For all of the advocates of the current administration's policy, I would pose this question raised by this very knowledgeable individual, Mr. Bao, who himself has spent 7 years incarcerated. The question he poses: Once China develops, opens, and becomes strong, what kind of role is it going to play without a complete structural change?

What he means by "complete structural change" is democratization. It is his argument that economic development in China, the embrace of free markets, and the embrace of market capitalism will not be sufficient to make them benign, to make them a partner in world peace, and that that will not happen without a structural change—free elections, freedom of press, freedom of speech, freedom of religion—that until those things become realities in China, then we cannot expect that there are going to be responsible citizens in the international stage of affairs.

The Post editorial concludes:

Mr. Clinton should meet with dissidents when he visits Beijing later this month. A sit-down with Bao Tong, if the government would release him from house arrest long enough, might be a useful addition to the president's official schedule.

And I suggest it certainly would.

So I want to conclude on this anniversary of an event that should never, never, never be forgotten, by making this plea: Mr. President, delay your trip to China. There are ongoing investigations; there are ongoing hearings. So, please, we are not talking about isolating China. It could not happen if we wanted it to. We are not talking about breaking off contacts, dialog and

communications with China. But we are saying, under the current cloud and with all of the questions about the web of interrelationships between the Chinese Government, the American administration, and corporate America and multinational corporations—delay this trip.

Then second, Mr. President, if you must go, if you must go ahead with this planned trip, then I plead with you to express the desire of millions of Americans by not going and not being received at Tiananmen. As this young man took his stand as a symbol of freedom against the symbols of oppression, I ask our President, take one small stand by not going to Tiananmen Square; not being received, simply saying: Mr. Jiang Zemin, I will not be received where these students were slain. I will not show disrespect and disdain for the sacrifice that they made by being received at a State visit on that location. To be received there is to demean and devalue the stand those students took.

Third, I plead with you, Mr. President, that if you insist on going to China, that you should insist on meeting with the families of those champions of democracy who were either slain or remain in prison. I ask that as our President goes, and if he goes, that he should forcefully denounce the repression and the human rights abuses ongoing in China; if he goes to Tiananmen Square that his message should be this: Never again. And in the spirit of Ronald Reagan at the Berlin Wall, let him say, "This is wrong. Never should it happen again." I ask that in China he visit with house church leaders, those who, because of their conscience and because of their religious convictions, have not registered with the Communist Chinese Government and, because they have not registered, because they have not signed up and received official sanction by the Government, stand in harm's way, stand in jeopardy of losing their freedom.

I ask that our President visit with banned journalists, for there are no free newspapers. There are no independent journalists. There are no expressions of dissent against the Communist Chinese Government. So, Mr. President, meet with those journalists who would like to have a newspaper, who would like to be able to write a column, who would like to be able to freely express their views of freedom and democracy, but are not allowed to because of the current regime. Meet with them. Hear their story. Take your stand for freedom.

And then I ask that before you leave for Beijing, if you must go, that you sign the China sanctions package that has already passed the House of Representatives by a huge, overwhelming bipartisan majority. Some of those provisions have already been added to our State Department authorization bill which we will be debating, hopefully, next week. Some of those have already

been set. But I ask that the President sign those and, in so doing, express sincerity in wanting to decry the human rights abuses that are going on.

Let me just conclude. In a Washington Post article, not an editorial but a news article today on the Tiananmen anniversary, the article, a Michael Laris report, concludes:

... China has not yet turned irrevocably toward a liberal political approach. [That's an understatement.] It maintains a massive state security apparatus, which monitors the private affairs of anybody it deems a threat to the Communist Party's monopoly on political power. The jails hold more than 2,000 political prisoners, including 150 or so arrested after the Tiananmen Square protests. Among the 200,000 other people in labor camps, at least some are political offenders.

[I assume yesterday] Early this evening at the Beijing University bulletin board, which was a center of protest information in 1989, a woman read announcements of lectures on the environment and the Asian financial crisis. "Many of my friends think those students were foolish," she [this student] said. "I think they were very brave. I wish more people now had that much passion. Some people now have the same passion, but they know not to express it in the same way."

For those who believe it is all better now in China, listen to the words of this student who says the students in China today have learned, passion for freedom they may have, but if they cherish being free, if they cherish the right to be a student, if they don't want to be incarcerated, they better not express it as these students did 9 years ago today.

So to all freedom-loving Americans—not as Republicans and not as Democrats—but to all freedom-loving Americans, we say to those Chinese who love freedom as well: We will not forget what happened June 4, 1989.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I inquire what is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is now considering the tobacco bill. The Senator may speak on any subject he wishes.

Mr. GRAMS. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. GRAMS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GRAMS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2130 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRAMS. Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor, and 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. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

NATIONAL TOBACCO POLICY AND YOUTH SMOKING REDUCTION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I don't know how many days it is that we have been on the tobacco bill now, but it is clear that we are not making any progress. I am increasingly frustrated by the degree to which many of our Republican colleagues, in the name of amending the bill, have stalled, obfuscated and, in many ways, attempted to defeat the legislation without any real sign of progress, without any real sign of coming to closure, without any real effort to find some resolution.

I have expressed my continued patience, my continued desire to find ways in which to move this legislation along. I give great credit to the manager of the bill, the chairman of the Commerce Committee, Senator McCAIN, for his tireless efforts to move both sides along.

This has not worked. We have continued to be thwarted in the name of compromise, and in the name of negotiation, and in the name of consultation. Frankly, I don't know what other options there are but to file cloture on the bill. We may not win. I am prepared to acknowledge that unless we get many of our Republican colleagues to join us, we will not win. But I also understand that if we don't move this legislation forward, we will continue to be in a position of having to say no to other bills the majority leader may wish to bring up until we resolve this matter. We have said, as late as Tuesday, that we are not in a position to move to any other legislation until we finish this bill. I don't know how we can say it more clearly than that.

We want to finish this legislation so we can move on to other bills. There are a number of other pieces of legislation that ought to be addressed, and we recognize that. We are prepared to enter into time agreements on amendments. We are prepared to come to some time limit on the bill itself. But we have now virtually wasted the better part of a week waiting for colleagues to offer amendments, waiting for some resolution to the Gramm amendment, waiting, procedurally, to find some solution to the impasse that we now are experiencing.

So, Mr. President, I really have no choice but to offer a cloture motion, with some frustration, and with the realization that it may take more than one. We may have to file several cloture motions. But, beginning today, I will take whatever action is necessary to expedite the consideration and ultimately the solution and the conclusion to this legislation.

We have a lot of people who have invested a good deal of effort into this legislation; three of them are on the floor right now. I thank them for all

they have done to bring us to this point. But unless we take it to its final conclusion, all of the thousands of hours spent by the Senators who are on the floor already, invested in time and good-faith efforts to move us to this point, will be for naught. I don't want to see that happen. I don't want to see this necessarily as a Republican versus Democratic debate. But, frankly, it becomes more and more apparent that we are not getting the help—with the one stellar exception of my friend and colleague from Arizona—in getting this legislation passed. So we are very hopeful that we can move this legislation and find some way to resolve the matter.

I understand that I can't file until 2:15 under a previous agreement. I will certainly wait until then.

Let me just make sure that our colleagues understand where things stand. Right now, we are discussing the motion to recommit offered by the Senator from Texas, Senator GRAMM, with amendments pending to that motion. The Gramm amendment would cost \$52 billion. It would rob the bill of any real opportunity to address research in health care, to address the targeted approach that we are attempting to make on advertising and reducing teenage smoking. It would reduce every option that we have available to us to reverse the trend and reduce teenage smoking in this country. Why? Because the Senator from Texas believes that we ought to address the marriage penalty.

Unfortunately, Senator GRAMM's amendment doesn't address the marriage penalty alone. In fact, one could argue that it has little to do with the marriage penalty. It has everything to do with spending the tobacco revenue raised in the health fee. We are presented with an option that is a Hobson's choice for many: reduce taxes for those who are under \$50,000, or reduce teenage smoking, reduce the number of children who are dying from smoking. That is the choice. While we debate this choice, 3,000 kids a day choose to smoke for the first time. A large percentage of those—some say 40 percent—are people who ultimately will die from the habit at some point in their life. They get cancer and ultimately succumb to cancer because they started smoking too early, without knowing the facts, without being able to quit once they had started. That is the issue here.

Can we prevent young people from acquiring this terrible habit and from dying because of it? Can we target advertising and research, and can we find ways in which to ensure that we can turn the trend around for the first time? Or are we going to spend that money for something else? Mr. President, Democrats have come up with an alternative.

Mr. McCAIN. Will the distinguished minority leader yield for one question?

Mr. DASCHLE. Without losing my right to the floor, I yield to the Senator from Arizona for a question.

Mr. McCAIN. I appreciate the Senator's frustration, and to a large degree I share it. I wonder if, with the knowledge that the Senator from Texas and I are continuing negotiations in the next few minutes, the distinguished Democratic leader would agree to withhold that until, say, an extra additional 15 minutes just so I can make one final attempt to get an agreement with the Senator from Texas on his amendment. Then I think we may be able to move forward.

Mr. DASCHLE. I will agree to withholding filing of the motion so long as I don't lose my right to file the motion. If that takes retaining the floor, I intend to do so. But I will certainly allow the Senator from Arizona whatever time he may require to talk to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, let me just say that is really the essence of this argument. Can we stop kids from smoking? Can we turn this around, or not? And can we find a way with which to address the concerns expressed to us by many of our colleagues?

We believe we can address the marriage penalty for a whole lot less than \$52 billion. But our objective is not to gut the bill. Our objective isn't to say we are going to use up all that money because we don't want to spend it on stopping kids from smoking; we don't want to spend it on research; we don't want to spend it on tobacco farmers; we don't want to recognize what has already been achieved in the State-by-State negotiations on this issue and the tremendous effort put forth by attorneys general all over the country in an effort to resolve this at the State level. The Federal Government didn't do that. For whatever reason, we didn't go to court. The States did. Now that the States have racked up their victories, and now that they are expecting some way to resolve this matter, we are saying: We are going to use that money, too; we are going to take the money that you have already won in court fairly and squarely against the tobacco companies, and we are going to spend it; we are going to spend it on a tax cut.

So this gets interesting as we go on. We are saying we ought to respect the decisions made by the attorneys general, we ought to respect the decisions made by the committees of the Congress, and the Senate in particular, in recognition of the fact that we have to find new ways to target those who are most vulnerable to campaigns by tobacco companies today to get them to smoke. We think that is worth an American investment. We think it is worth an American investment to put some real effort into research on how we cure diseases that have been connected to smoking. We think it is important that we find ways with which to rid this country of the production of tobacco products and to encourage tobacco farmers to find other ways to make a living. That is what this is about.