claims are likely to cause youth to take up tobacco for the first time.

When smokeless tobacco manufacturers aggressively marketed their products to young people in the 1970s, often with themes suggesting that they were less harmful than cigarettes, use of those products increased among adolescents.

The Burr substitute only allows the agency to look at the impact of health claims on individual users of tobacco products.

It does not allow the agency to consider whether the reduced risk claim would increase the harm to overall public health by increasing the number of youth who begin using tobacco products or reducing the number of current users who quit.

The Senator from North Carolina has criticized the Kennedy bill for limiting tobacco advertising to black-and-white text—only material in publications with significant youth readership.

His substitute, he says, goes further by banning tobacco advertising. That is an attractive talking point. But like so much tobacco advertising, it is misleading. It has a barbed hook buried in it.

The fact is, a broad, indiscriminate ban on tobacco advertising would likely be struck down by the courts. The courts would probably rule that it is an impermissibly broad limitation on speech.

They would say the ends are not sufficiently tailored to the means, and they would conclude that it violates the first amendment.

That is what constitutional scholars tell us.

The result of the Senator's amendment would be a continuation of current law—a continuation of the insidious advertising the industry currently uses to lure new customers. Under the guise of a total advertising ban, he would give us the status quo.

And the tobacco industry would thank him for it.

My colleague from North Carolina has improved the warning labels he would require on cigarettes. But they would not be strong enough.

The Burr substitute would allocate 25 percent of the bottom front of the package to a warning label.

In contrast, the Kennedy bill reflects the latest science on warning labels by requiring text and graphic warning labels that cover 50 percent of the front and back of the package.

Clearly, a health warning that takes up the top half of the front and back of a package will be more noticeable and easier to read than one that takes up only a quarter of the bottom of the package—and that may be hidden by the sales rack.

Senator KENNEDY’s bill also gives the FDA the authority to change the warnings in light of emerging science. Under the Burr substitute, the agency would not have any authority to change the warning labels.

And the Burr amendment’s required warning labels for smokeless tobacco products read more like endorsements than warnings.

For example, one of the required statements is a warning that the product has a significantly lower risk of disease than cigarettes. That is not a healthy warning—it is an unhealthy promotion.

We have an historic opportunity to finally put some real and meaningful regulations in place, and that will stop some of the tobacco industry’s most egregious practices.

For decades, the industry has lied to us, and I don’t know why we would trust them now to do the right thing.

We should not accept the underlying premise of the Burr substitute, that a lifetime of addiction and a high risk of premature death must be accepted, and that our strategy should be to steer people towards “reduced harm” products.

That is the smokeless tobacco approach, not the public health approach.

The Kennedy bill is a strong and carefully crafted solution that puts the public health first.

The Kennedy bill is the bill that should be enacted.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). Is there objection?

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when I conclude my remarks, the time be extended until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

GUANTANAMO

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, if you got up early this morning—like about 6 a.m.—and turned on the television, you would have heard a historic speech. President Barack Obama is in Cairo, Egypt, this morning—our time this morning—speaking to an assembled group at a university in Cairo about the relationship of the United States and Muslims around the world.

It is a critically important speech. All of us know what happened on 9/11/2001. We know our relationship with people in the Middle East has been strained at best, and we have been troubled by the threats of Islamic extremism, and so the President went and spoke in Cairo. I listened to his speech. Now, I am biased because he was my former colleague from Illinois and I think he was so highly of him, but I think what he tried to do was to explain to them how we can develop a positive relationship between people of the Islamic faith and America, and I thought he laid out the case very well in terms of our history, our tolerance, the diversity of religious belief in our country, and the elements of Islam—extremist elements of Islam—are not even operating in a way consistent with their own basic values and principles.

The reason I refer to that speech is that one of the points that was important was when President Obama said to this assembled group—to their applause—that the United States was going to change its policies under his leadership. He said we are not going to use torture in the future, and he received applause from this group. He said we are going to close Guantanamo, and they applauded that as well.

What the President’s statement said—and basically the reaction of the audience told us—is that regardless of our image of the United States, for some people around the world there are things that have occurred since 9/11 which have created a tension and a stress between us that need to be addressed honestly. President Obama made it clear that we are starting a new path, a new way to develop friendships and alliances around the world to stop terrorism and stop extremism, and he understands that torture—the torture of prisoners held by the United States—unleashed a tension between the United States and other people in the world. They know it of because of Abu Ghraib, the graphic photographs that are emblazoned in our memory, and theirs as well, of the mistreatment of prisoners in Iraq. They know it from the photographs that have emerged and the documentary evidence about the treatment of some prisoners at Guantanamoto.

It has, unfortunately, become a fact of life that Guantnamo is a symbol that is used by al-Qaida—the terrorist group responsible for 9/11—to recruit new members. They inflame their passions by talking about Guantnamo and the unfair treatment of some prisoners. President Obama knew this and said in his first Executive order that the United States will not engage in torture and within a year or so we will close the Guantnamo corrections facility. I think it was the right decision but the right decision but the right decision. If we are truly going to break with the past and build new strength and alliances to protect the United States, then we have to step up with this kind of leadership.

The President inherited a recession, two wars, and over 240 prisoners in Guantnamo, some of whom have been held for 6 or 7 years. Many of these people are very dangerous individuals who should never, ever be released, at least as long as they are a threat to the safety and security of the United States or a threat to other people. Some should be tried. They can be tried for crimes
and, if convicted, they can be incarcerated. Others may be sent to another country, maybe returned to their own country of origin.

One of these prisoners I happen to know a little about because he is reported to be in Guantanamo. He is Palestinian. He is from Gaza and was captured when he was 19 years old. He has now been held in prison for 7 years. He is now 26 years old. Last year, our government notified him and his attorney that we have no current charges against him. But they have been trying to find a place to send him. He stayed another year in prison while we are trying to determine where he should be sent.

Each of these 240 cases is a challenge to make sure we come to a just conclusion as to each person and never compromise the safety of the United States.

A little over a week ago, the President went to the National Archives and gave a speech about Guantanamo and what we are going to do, and he made it clear that some of these people will be tried in our courts, some of them may end up in prisons in the United States, some of them may end up being held in this prison. We have enemies everywhere and a danger to the United States, and some may be sent to other countries. They are trying to work out 240 different cases. It is not an easy assignment.

The reason I raise this is because it is clear that as long as Guantanamo remains open, it is going to be an irritant to many around the world and lead to the recruitment of more people to engage in terrorism against the United States. Don’t accept my conclusion on that. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ADM Mike Mullen, said:

The concern I’ve had about Guantanamo in these wars is it has been a symbol, and one which has been a recruiting symbol for those extremists and jihadists who would fight us.

On the floor of the Senate this morning, shortly after the President’s speech, the Republican minority leader, Senator McConnell of Kentucky— as he has many times before—came to discuss Guantanamo. He said explicitly—and he may have said this before, but I just want to make it clear that I am reading from the transcript of what he said on the floor this morning—”Like most Americans, I’m for keeping Guantanamo open.” So he clearly disagrees with the President. He wants Guantanamo to stay open. I certainly hope that it doesn’t. I don’t want this recruiting tool for terrorists to continue.

Senator McConnell has raised the question repeatedly of whether it is safe for us to bring Guantanamo detainees to the United States for a trial or for incarceration. I think it is, based on the fact that we currently have 347 convicted terrorists serving time in American prisons today. Over half of them are international terrorists, and some of them are in my State of Illinois at the Marion Federal penitentiary. They are being held today. As I traveled around southern Illinois last week, I didn’t hear one person step up and say: I am worried about the terrorists being held at the Marion prison.

In fact, I went to the Marion prison, met with corrections officers and guards, and asked them this: What do you think about Guantanamo detainees?

Well, they were somewhere between insulted and angry at the notion that they couldn’t safely incarcerate a Guantanamo detainee. One of the guards said to me: Senator, we have more dangerous people than that in this prison. We have serial killers, we have sexual predators, we have terrorists from Colombia, we had John Gotti—the syndicate kingpin. We held these people safely, and we can do it. That is what we do for a living. So don’t you worry about putting them in this prison. We can take care of them. We have not had an escape, and we are not going to.

So when Senators come to the floor and suggest that these detainees cannot even be brought to the United States for trial and held in a prison while they are going to trial, that it is somehow unsafe to America, defies logic and experience. If there is one strength we have in this country—and you can debate it—we know how to incarcerate people. We have put more people in prison per capita than any nation on Earth, certainly in the supermax facilities, and we must continue to. And this idea that we have to keep Guantanamo open because there is not a prison in America where they can be held safely is not true. The 347 convicted terrorists being held in America today are living proof that is not true.

This tactic of opposing the closing of Guantanamo is based on fear—fear that is being pedaled on this Senate floor that these people cannot be held safely and securely in the United States. It is the same fear that led people to conclude that our Constitution wasn’t strong enough to deal with a war on terrorism, and therefore we had to create a special court that violates due process, everything that we hold dear, certainly in the supermax facilities, and we must continue to. And this idea that we have to keep Guantanamo open because there is not a prison in America where they can be held safely is not true. The 347 convicted terrorists being held in America today are living proof that is not true.

When the bill is presented on the floor, then I will come back and talk about the specific amendments that are going to be considered in the first tranche of amendments.

First, I rise today in strong opposition to the tobacco regulatory bill on the floor. This sweeping legislation would dramatically increase the FDA’s regulatory authority outside the scope of original congressional intent. This is something that Congress did not intend to give the FDA when we wrote the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, and that intent was even upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in 2000. Yet there are still some of my colleagues who believe it would be safer for the American public to regulate tobacco under the FDA. They argue that, by doing so, we will help reduce the negative effect of smoking and prevent underage smokers.

As a grandfather of 39 grandchildren, believe me, I want to keep cigarettes out of the hands of kids. But the bill before us today does not do that. It is not strong enough to eliminate our national tobacco industry. The big problem with this approach is that our Nation’s tobacco