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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MASSACRE OF PRODEMOCRACY DEMONSTRATORS ON TIANANMEN SQUARE

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

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

I know that such sentiments are shared by all Members of this body. After all, who could possibly object to honoring the Chinese student martyrs to democracy on the ninth anniversary of their massacre? After all, our most cherished political ideals are those of inalienable rights and democratic self-rule. Unfortunately, however, we were unable to get the resolution cleared last night on the Democratic side. This objection prevented the Senate from making any statement in memory of the victims of Tiananmen Square on the ninth anniversary of their murder.

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

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

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

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

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

The preamble was agreed to.

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

S. RES. 244

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Whereas the Government of the PRC, as detailed in successive annual reports on human rights by the United States Department of State, still routinely and systematically violates the rights of its citizens, including their rights to freedom of speech, assembly, worship, and peaceful dissent; and

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

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

''POLITICAL CORRECTNESS''—ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

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

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

are not overly busy with other matters. I am sure it is a subject on which not everyone will agree with me. But that doesn't necessarily concern me. I feel that I have something to say, and I am going to say it at this point.

It seems, I say, that concern with so-called ''political correctness'' has been elevated to a near religion in recent years. Well, I have long been puzzled by the doctrine, if it may be termed as such, the doctrine of political correctness. When it comes to benefits of this overtly patronizing assault on thought patterns and contemporary speech, I have to admit that I guess I just don't get it.

It has always seemed to me that one of the intrinsically valuable things about America is its ''melting pot'' aspect. I heard about the melting pot when I was a boy, and there have been many, many, many valuable aspects of the melting-pot policy.

The phenomenon of American life and culture has been its uncanny ability to absorb a reasonable number of people from all around the globe of different races, religions, nationalities, abilities and talents, and inspire them to embrace the ideals of freedom, and work toward the common good of the Republic, without destroying their individuality.

But today's trendy, misguided urge to vigorously emphasize in contemporary thought, and speech, not the value and worth of individual difference, but merely the inoffensive security of ''sameness'' seems to be going against the time-honored grain that has facilitated the successful achievement of a richly diverse, yet united nation.

The gross, linguistic overreaching for the goal of being perfectly politically correct that goes on in most public discussions, both written and spoken, is not only insultingly gratuitous, but, at times sublimely ridiculous as well. It is as if everyone who writes or speaks in the public arena today is making a concerted and rather forced effort to banish from the face of the Earth the obvious differences in gender, race, religion and genetic codes inherent in all human beings through the clumsy device of disavowing verbally all dissimilarities. And the results are often either humorous or downright sad.

In order to avoid offending anyone in anyway we have come up with such linguistic acrobatics as Chair or Chairperson to replace chairman.

When I think of the Chair there in the front of the Chamber, I think of the position. I address the Chair. I am thinking of the position. But the person who is in the chair is not a chair. He is not a piece of wood; he is not a piece of furniture; he is the chairman.

Well, one may say what if it is not a ''he,'' what if it is a lady? Then I would say ''Madam Chairman.'' I would still refer to the person as the chairman. That has been the case for centuries —eons of time. And here in this latter part of the 20th century we have decided we have to change all that. So, I don't think of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who presently presides over the Senate in a very dignified and efficient way—I don't think of him as a piece of wood. If I would refer to him personally, I would not call him ''the Chair.'' I would just as soon that nobody referred to me as a piece of wood, as a ''chair.'' I was the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. If we want to address the Chair, that is the position. I have no problem with that. But don't refer to me as ''the Chair.'' I may object to it.

I see letters that come to my office with reference to the ''chair.'' And I have told my staff, when you respond to such a letter, you should use the word ''chairman.'' Don't use the word ''chair.'' I am not going to get in that parade and go down that road, falling into that pothole of ''political correctness.''

So, we have come up with other linguistic acrobatics, in order to replace any reference to skin color other than white; and Native American to replace American Indian. Well, I am a native American. I was born in North Carolina. If I am not a native American, of what country am I a native? I am a native American. I have no problem with referring to the Indians as ''original'' Americans. But when they are referred to as ''Native'' Americans, I think that is demeaning to the Indians. I am a native American. But I don't pretend to be an original American—the American Indian.

Some day, in the misty future when political correctness is dead and gone, (may that day come with all speed) our descendants may remark on the peculiarity of such terms as ''Chairperson.'' Did it mean that the poor unfortunate soul possessed a body like a chair? Could it refer to the quality of one's intellect? Or maybe it was related somehow to one's lack of mobility—perhaps akin to the popular expression, ''couch potato.''

Gender neutrality, which is an absolute fetish in our country at this time, produces a plethora of strange choices for its adherents. What, for example, to be gender-neutrally correct, do we call a man-hole cover? How do we neutralize the very necessary ''his'' and ''her'' designations on restrooms? And whatever do we do to purge such common expressions as ''man-alive,'' ''he's a macho-man,'' ''he's a ladies man,'' and ''man overboard'' from the population at large?

If one stops to think about such things, it becomes absolutely ridiculous. It is laughable, indeed.

This insane preoccupation has even been carried so far as to apply to the good Lord and his words as related in Holy Scripture, as some ''new age'' Bibles have done.

I don't want any of them in my house. They won't find a resting place in my house. That kind of Bible will find its way to the wastebasket if it ever gets to me or to anybody in my family. We will stick with the King James version.

Personally, I think enough is enough when it comes to political correctness. I think we should all stop this unhealthy preoccupation and consider what effect it has had on the content of public dialogue in general. Far from erasing differences from the public mind, I think political correctness in all of its suspect forms has tended to overly accentuate them. In order not to risk offending anyone, we spend so much time focusing on race, gender, country of origin or whatever aspects of an individual we have to tiptoe around, that we then tend to ignore all of the other truly valuable and important aspects of that individual, such as brainpower, level of achievement, talent or quality of character. In other words, our anxious efforts not to emphasize such surface differences as race and gender have, in my view, paradoxically, had precisely the opposite effect.

On a more subtle level, political correctness has encouraged us to become much less honest with one another and with ourselves and, as a result, much less willing and able to come to grips with the troubling problems which beset our land. In our obsequious efforts not to offend anybody, we in public life thereby mentally partition our population into groups by race or by gender or by some other category, obscuring the inarguable fact that we are all citizens of the United States of America, that our fates hang together, and that public debate should, in the best of all worlds, be about what is good for the country, not what may appease this group or that group or this individual. That is one reason why I absolutely abhor hyphenated-American designations. They separate and divide us into arbitrary categories which are based for the most part solely on what the eye can readily see. And we find the same problem in our textbooks in the schools.

How can we help the entire population of our land, the men, the women, the blacks, the Hispanics, the white or the Asian populations, if we submerge honest and forthright discussions of what is best for the Nation in favor of pandering to the sensibilities of this group or that group? The answer is we can't. And the real answer is we don't want to. It is far easier to observe the customary taboos and the popular, awkward, and thoroughly phony norms of political correctness than to actually grapple with real problems in a meaningful and substantive way.

Personally, Mr. President, I hope that ''political correctness'' will soon go the way of high-button shoes or the lace-up corset. It is shop-worn window dressing far, far too constraining for a fast-moving, difficult age, crying out for courageous leaders, frank discussion, and innovative solutions.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I believe we are in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for as much time as I may consume in morning business.

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

KIDS AND SMOKING

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we have been debating the tobacco bill in the U.S. Senate and will continue to debate that piece of legislation into next week and perhaps even beyond. I will begin a discussion on the subject of kids and smoking, and I will read into the RECORD pieces of information from the tobacco industry itself. Then, at the conclusion, I will ask the question and have all Americans ask the question: Were the tobacco companies and was the tobacco industry in America targeting our children as customers for their tobacco products?

If the answer is yes, then the question is not any longer whether there should be tobacco legislation; the question will be exactly what kind of legislation must we pass and how quickly can we enact it.

Let me begin with a few quotes. These are quotes from the tobacco industry that have been unearthed in various lawsuits and discovery proceedings.

Brown & Williamson, a 1972 company document:

It's a well-known fact that teenagers like sweet products. Honey might be considered.

Talking about the potential of adding honey to cigarettes to make them more appealing to teenagers.

RJR tobacco company, 1973:

Comic-strip-type copy might get a much higher readership among younger people than any other type of copy.

Talking about advertising, clearly a strategy that says—how do we advertise to kids? This from the RJR tobacco company.

Brown & Williamson, 1973:

Kool—The brand Kool—has shown little or no growth in share of users in the 26-and-up age group. Growth is from 16- to 25-year-olds . . . at the present rate, a smoker in the 16- to 25-year-age group will soon be three times as important to Kool as a prospect in any other broad-age category.

Is this a company interested in getting kids addicted to cigarettes? Sure sounds like it to me.

Philip Morris, 1974:

We are not sure that anything can be done to halt a major exodus if one gets going among the young. This group—now speaking of the young, according to Philip Morris—follows the crowd, and we don't pretend to know what gets them going for one thing or another . . . Certainly Philip Morris should continue efforts for Marlboro in the youth market . . .

R. J. Reynolds, 1974:

They represent tomorrow's cigarette business . . . As this 14- to 24-age group matures, they will account for a key share of the total cigarette volume—for at least the next 25 years.

In a 1975 report, a Philip Morris researcher writes:

Marlboro's phenomenal growth rate in the past has been attributable in large part to our high market penetration among young smokers . . . age 15 to 19 years old . . . my own data, which includes younger teenagers, shows even higher Marlboro market penetration among 15- to 17-year-olds.

That is a 1975 report from a researcher in Philip Morris. These are internal company documents:

To ensure increased and longer-term growth for Camel filter—This according to a 1975 RJR memo—the brand must increase penetration among the 14- to 24 age group which has a new set of more liberal values and which represent tomorrow's cigarette business.

RJR Nabisco, 1975, talking about increasing penetration among 14- to 24-year-olds.

R. J. Reynolds, 1976:

Evidence is now available to indicate the 14- to 18-year-old group is an increasing segment of the smoking population. RJR-T must soon establish a successful new brand in this market if our position in the industry is to be maintained . . .

Fourteen to 18-year-old kids. This is a tobacco document that says, ''We have to go after this to maintain our position.''

1978, Lorillard cigarette company:

The base of our business is the high-school student.

Philip Morris, 1979, writes:

Marlboro dominates in the 17 and younger category, capturing over 50 percent of this market.

What a cause for celebration at Philip Morris in 1979!

Marlboro dominates the 17-and-younger category, capturing over 50 percent of this market.

Marlboro Red, 1981, a Philip Morris researcher writes:

. . . the overwhelming majority of smokers first begin to smoke while in their teens. At least part of the success of our Marlboro Red during its most rapid growth period was because it became the brand of choice among teenagers who then stuck with it as they grew older.

Does this sound like a set of documents—and I am going to go on at some length to talk about these documents from the industry—does it sound like a set of documents from an industry without morals, without values? From an industry that sees 14-year-olds with dollar signs painted on their baseball cap?

Is that a company or an industry without values? I think so.

The Tobacco Institute, 1983. It says:

[Brown & Williamson] will not support a youth smoking program which discourages young people from smoking.

Well, there it is, I guess. They know who their customers are, and they target their customers. They try to addict these kids to cigarettes. And then they say, ''We will not support a youth smoking program discouraging young people from smoking.''

''Strategies and Opportunities,'' by R.J. Reynolds, 1984:

Younger adult smokers have been the critical factor in the growth and decline of every major brand and company over the last 50 years. They will continue to be just as important to brands [and] companies in the future for two simple reasons: The renewal of the market stems almost entirely from 18-year-old smokers. No more than 5 percent of smokers start after age 24. . . . Younger adult smokers are the only source of replacement smokers. . . . If younger adults turn away from smoking, the industry must decline, just as a population which does not give birth will eventually dwindle.

That is according to a strategies memo from R.J. Reynolds.

R.J. Reynolds, 1986, Camels.

[Camel advertising will create] the perception that Camel smokers are non-conformist, self-confident, and project a cool attitude, which is admired by their peers. . . . Aspiration to be perceived as cool [and] a member of the in-group is one of the strongest influences affecting the behavior of [young adults].

Well, those are just some, and the list is long.

After reading what has been unearthed from the bowels of the records of the tobacco industry about their attempts to addict our children to cigarettes, starting with a single sentence by one cigarette company that says ''the base of our business is the high school student,'' does anyone doubt that we have a tobacco industry who, for years in this country, has decided that their customers must be children? Because when you reach age 30—just as one of the researchers suggested, and wonder what will further enrich your life that you are now missing, you will not conclude that smoking is the activity you have missed. No adult that I know says, at age 30, ''Gosh, if I could just start smoking, I would further enrich my life.'' The only opportunity for new customers for the industry is to addict a child.

That brings me to the point of the legislation on the floor of the Senate. Some say this is punitive. Some say, ''What's all the fuss about?'' Well, fuss is about a country that says to the tobacco industry:

Tobacco is a legal product, but for adults, and it is amoral to try to addict our children, and we want to stop it. We want to say to the industry, ''We will not allow you to continue to profit by trying to addict America's children to nicotine. We will simply not allow it. And if you don't like it, tough luck. And if you lose money, too bad. But you cannot continue with impunity in this country to try to addict America's kids to cigarettes.'''

There have been a lot of claims about this legislation. I want to talk about a couple of those claims. We know from statistics that America is full of a lot of wonderful people. I do not know anyone that I am acquainted with who would want to live elsewhere. It is not that the rest of the world isn't wonderful—this is just a great place. And we are blessed to be able to live here in this time.

But there are challenges. Among those challenges is that every day 3,000