work. That was the opinion here in too many SUVs and that it was making Ford and General Motors know that it was making car companies, and most of them will hold hearings, probably many times.

Car company executives who need to be making complex enterprises will be reduced to the status of an assistant secretary in a minor department hauling briefings books from subcommittee to subcommittee.

You can imagine what the questions will be and the president of each company will probably be asked these questions: What will the next model look like? What plant should be closed and which one opened? How many cars should they build? What will the work rules be? What will the salaries be? Where will the conferences be held, and in which cities should they not be held?

Congressmen will want to know why the Chevy Volt is using a battery from a South Korean company when it can be made in one of their congressional districts. There will be a lengthy hearing about the number of holidays allowed, and thousands of written questions demanding written answers under oath.

And it is not just the Congress we have to worry about. The President of the United States has already called the mayor of Detroit to reassure him that his car company’s General Motors should stay in Detroit, instead of moving to Warren, MI. And the mayor of Detroit has announced his satisfaction with talking with members of the President’s auto task force to make sure that the executives of the car companies do not get any ideas about moving their own headquarters.

Then there is the Treasury Secretary—and his Under Secretaries—who will want to keep up with what is happening to their taxpayers’ $50 billion investment in the New General Motors. There is a very active economic czar in the White House. He will have some questions and opinions as well about how to run the car companies, not to mention the Environmental Protection Agency officials who might be busy overriding what size cars they ought to build.

And, of course, it was not very long ago that this administration let General Motors know that it was making too many SUVs and that its Chevy Volt was going to be too expensive to work. That was the opinion here in Washington. And the President of the United States himself fired the president of General Motors.

Giving the stock to the taxpayer who paid for it will get the government out of the companies’ hair and give the companies the chance to succeed. It will create an investor fan base of 120 million people, many of whom may be a little more interested now in what the next Chevrolet will be. Think of the fan base of the Green Bay Packers, whose ownership is distributed among the people of Green Bay.

This is a day back to the wise principle: If you can find it in the Yellow Pages, the government probably shouldn’t be doing it. More than the money, it is the principle of the thing.

The other day, a visiting European automobile executive said to me with a laugh that he had come to the “new American automotive capital: Washington, DC.”

To get our economy moving again, let’s do auto companies out of the hands of Washington and back into the marketplace. Let’s put the stock in the hands of 120 million taxpayers, the sooner the better.

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. DODD. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I gather we are still in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

FAMILY SMOKING PREVENTION AND TOBACCO CONTROL ACT

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I wish to take a few minutes to speak about the importance of what we are doing to address the issues raised by my friend and colleague from North Carolina, Senator Burr, who has raised some important issues. We are debating, of course, very historic public health legislation. The bill before this body will, for the first time, give the Food and Drug Administration authority to regulate the tobacco industry and to put in place tough protections for families that smoke and for the children that smoke. It is the first time that we will achieve that goal.

As I have said, particularly over the last couple days, I don’t think we can afford to wait any longer on this issue. I think all colleagues are aware that every single day we delay action on this legislation, another 3,500 to 4,000 children across the nation are snared by tobacco companies that target them with impunity as they try smoking for the very first time in their lives, 3,500 every single day. Smoking kills more Americans every year than alcohol abuse, AIDS, car accidents, illegal drug use, murders, and suicides combined. As tragic as all deaths are, particularly ones caused by the circumstances I have raised, if we took all of them together, they do not total the 400,000 people who lose their lives every year as a result of tobacco-related illnesses. Absent action by this Congress, more than 2 million children who are alive today will die from smoking, including the 76,000 or so in my home State of Connecticut.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the bill before us would reduce adult smoking by 900,000 Americans. That is not an insignificant number. It represents about 2 percent. The CBO estimates that over the next 10 years, 2 million children will not take up smoking, if we are able to pass this legislation and have an effect on the marketing of these products to kids. That is 11 percent of children across the country. That is 700,000 people we would be able to have an influence on, convincing them not to take that first cigarette, to begin the habit of smoking.

Unfortunately, flaws in the Burr substitute will not achieve those goals. It would result in much less regulation of tobacco products, allow the tobacco industry to play many more games and hide more of the harm their products cause and leave children and others more vulnerable to the scourge of tobacco. Instead of using the FDA, a proven agency of 100 years, with experienced regulation and health care responsibilities, to carry out the purpose of this bipartisan bill, the Burr substitute creates a flawed agency, with inadequate resources, and limits the authority of that agency to take meaningful action to curtail the harm caused by tobacco products and their marketing.

The Institute of Medicine, which is highly respected by all of us, and the President’s cancer panel have both endorsed the Food and Drug Administration as the federal authority. The Food and Drug Administration has 100 years of experience in regulating almost every product we consume in order to protect public health. A new agency is not the answer. Obviously, one more bureaucracy would be able to have an influence on, the country. That is 700,000 people we would be able to have an influence on, convincing them not to take that first cigarette, to begin the habit of smoking.

Unfortunately, flaws in the Burr substitute will not achieve those goals. It would result in much less regulation of tobacco products, allow the tobacco industry to play many more games and hide more of the harm their products cause and leave children and others more vulnerable to the scourge of tobacco. Instead of using the FDA, a proven agency of 100 years, with experienced regulation and health care responsibilities, to carry out the purpose of this bipartisan bill, the Burr substitute creates a flawed agency, with inadequate resources, and limits the authority of that agency to take meaningful action to curtail the harm caused by tobacco products and their marketing.
I would bet that if we asked every parent who smokes—my parents did, my sister—who smokes, and ask them every single day. To say that our pets at home have better regard for public health. That is the scientific evidence. The Burr substitute prevents the tobacco manufacturers from misleading consumers in that regard. The Burr substitute also bases its tar and nicotine stand on the results of a specific test that the Federal Trade Commission recently rejected because it does not provide meaningful information about the health risks of different cigarettes. In its statement last August, the Federal Trade Commission wrote:

“Our action today ensures that tobacco companies may not wrap their misleading tar and nicotine ratings in a cloak of government sponsorship. Simply put, the FTC will not be a smokescreen for the tobacco companies’ shameful marketing practices. That is from the Federal Trade Commission, hardly an ideological or partisan organization. That is their quote on discrediting the test the FTC conducted.”

In addition, the National Cancer Institute has determined there is no evidence that reducing tar to a degree even greater than called for in the Burr substitute actually reduces the risk of disease. The Burr substitute makes it likely that Americans will continue to be misled by nicotine and tar figures that appear to have the government stamp of approval, believing that cigarettes with lower tar numbers are safer. The National Cancer Institute is an organization that is highly credible and respected. The Burr substitute does not adequately protect consumers from misleading health claims about tobacco products, a very serious problem. The bipartisan bill sets stringent, but reasonable, scientific standards before manufacturers of cigarettes and smokeless tobacco products are allowed to claim that their products are safer or reduce the risk of disease.

The Burr substitute completely exempts smokeless tobacco products from these standards, no matter how spurious and even if those claims are likely to cause youth to take up tobacco for the first time. Supporters of the Burr substitute argue we should allow and encourage the use of smokeless tobacco because it is less harmful than smoking. But this was refuted in 2003.
by Surgeon General Richard Carmona, who was appointed by President Bush, when he addressed a congressional committee.

Let me quote the Surgeon General:

Do not fall for the myth—a very dangerous public health myth—that smokeless tobacco is preferable to smoking.

Again, this is the Surgeon General.

Going back several administrations, Surgeons General, Secretaries of Health and Human Services, this is an issue that does not divide people. President Bush’s Surgeon General was a man, Richard Carmona. I see my friend from Arizona. I believe Richard Carmona is from Arizona. I had an opportunity to meet with him and talk with him in the past, and he did a good job.

I will quote him again:

Do not fall for the myth—a very dangerous public health myth—that smokeless tobacco is preferable to smoking.

He went on to say, and I quote him further:

No matter what you may hear today or read in press reports later, I cannot conclude [as Surgeon General] that the use of any tobacco product is a safer alternative to smoking.

And the 2008 Update of the U.S. Public Health Service Clinical Practice Guidelines regarding tobacco cessation concluded:

[T]he use of smokeless tobacco products is not a safe alternative to smoking, nor is there evidence to suggest that it is effective in helping smokers quit.

Senator Burr’s substitute only allows the agency to look at the health impact on individual users of tobacco products. It does not consider whether the reduced risk claim would increase overall public health harms by increasing the number of youth who begin using tobacco products or reducing the number of current users who quit. Senator Burr’s and our colleague Senator Hagan’s standard would allow health claims that would increase tobacco use levels and increase the total amount of harm caused by tobacco use.

To prevent health claims from being used to increase the number of tobacco users, our bipartisan bill gives the Food and Drug Administration authority over how these products are marketed. Senator Burr’s substitute eliminates that authority, putting our youth at greater risk. If you eliminate that authority, then, obviously, you have torn the heart out of what we are trying to achieve.

Senator Burr’s substitute fails to give even the new agency the authority to incentivize healthy living styles. What an irony it would be, on the eve of the emerging debate about prevention, that we would have the opportunity and make a difference in doing just that, with having 900,000 adults who stopped smoking and 700,000 kids—maybe those are numbers that are not as impressive as we would like this to be—but if we can have 700,000 children’s lives and 900,000 adults, to have them stop smoking and not get involved in this habit, what a difference it would make.

I have talked about deaths. There are people who live with this stuff—the emphysema. The cost—even if you are not impressed with the ethics of it, the morality of it, if the numbers is the only thing that drives you, we are spending billions of dollars every year to provide for people suffering from smoke-related illnesses.

So on the eve of the great health care debate, what a great way to begin that by saying, at least in this one area, we are going to do something about the one thing that we can do right away. We are going to do something that is long overdue on the manufacturing and the marketing, as well as in the production of these products. We are going to say to the Food and Drug Administration: Take over here. Take a look at all of this. Provide the regulations and the guidelines. If we can do it for the produce or the foodstuffs we provide for every pet in this country, we ought to be able do it for the American children. With that, I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Udall of New Mexico). The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

NORTH KOREA

Mr. Kyl. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss recent events in North Korea. On April 5, the North Koreans tested a long-range Taepo Dong 2 missile, which traveled nearly 2,000 miles before falling into the South China Sea.

This test, which the North Koreans described as an attempt to launch a satellite into orbit, represented an improvement in the range of North Korea’s missiles. In 2006, the Taepo Dong 2 only traveled 1,000 miles and did not successfully reach a second stage, as the most recent missile did.

U.N. Security Council Resolution 1718 prohibits the country’s use of ballistic missile technology, and the United Nations Security Council issued a statement on April 12 condemning the recent launch and calling on member states to implement existing sanctions against North Korea.

In response, North Korea abandoned the six-party talks, promising to reactivate its nuclear program and never to return to the six-party negotiating table.

Less than 2 weeks later, North Korea conducted a nuclear test. Between the Taepo Dong 2 test and the nuclear test, North Korea also launched at least five shorter range missiles. Intelligence reports also indicate another long-range test is in the offing for later this month or early July.

So far, world response to this latest illicit behavior has been one-dimensional, with leaders around the globe issuing condemnations of varying strength. President Obama issued a clear condemnation of North Korea’s action, stating:

North Korea’s ballistic missile programs pose a great threat to the peace and security of the world and I strongly condemn their reckless action.