Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is this objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. President.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TIANANMEN CRACKDOWN

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, 1989 was a seminal year in world history. Late in the year, on November 9, the Berlin Wall fell. And like dominoes, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria went from being Soviet satellites to nascent democracies.

The revolutions of 1989 would set the tone for the quick and peaceful break-up of the Soviet Union. The winds of change were bringing democracy and freedom to the oppressed. I look forward to hearing the peaceful revolutions of 1989 later this year.

But I want to speak today about the revolution that never was, an event that took place 20 years ago this week, in a country where people remain subject to totalitarianism and tyranny—a peaceful prodemocracy rally that was snuffed out with a brutality the world had not seen since the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the USSR in 1968.

It started much like the revolutions of 1989. Hu Yaobang, the Sixth General Secretary of the Communist Party of China, was famous for supporting ideas like political reform and capitalism—not much different from Lech Walesa of Poland or Vaclav Havel of Czechoslovakia.

When he died on April 15, 1989, thousands of Chinese students began a peaceful protest in Tiananmen Square in his honor and to call for support of his views. Protestors continued to assemble for weeks, calling for nothing more than a dialog with their government and party leaders on how to combat corruption and how to accelerate economic and political reforms such as freedom in democracy.

More than a million people would eventually gather in Tiananmen Square in the shadow of the Forbidden City and the monument in front of Chairman Mao’s mausoleum. That 1 million people segregated were just in Beijing. Protests had spread across the vast expanse of China, in city after city and community after community.

On the night of June 3, 1989, 15,000 soldiers with armored tanks stormed Tiananmen Square to put down the protesters.

On June 4, the Chinese Red Army fired upon the protestors and those in the surrounding areas.

There, the world witnessed one of the pivotal moments of the 20th century—20 years ago, this unknown protestor stood in front of a column of Chinese Army tanks. He stood alone. Surely he wanted the tanks to stop. Just as surely, he wanted to stop the violent crackdown. He has become an enduring symbol of freedom and democracy in this country and around the world—but not in China, where the image and accounts of the heroic act are banned, attempts to erase it from history.

The identity and fate of this young man are not known. However, it is generally agreed that he died in a Chinese prison for his brave act of nonviolence.

The Chinese Government continues to deny Western estimates of 300 dead and 20,000 arrests and detentions during the Tiananmen crackdown.

The United States responded to the crackdown by suspending all government and commercial military sales and all high-level government-to-government exchanges. And like political reform and capitalism, that manipulation is a pure and simple subsidy—a coerced and false price reduction—on everything it produces. It puts our manufacturers at a disadvantage, but there is so much money to be made by U.S. investors that investors and large corporate interests and our government simply look the other way.


Today, in Beijing, police are on the streets in and around Tiananmen Square to preempt—not to control but to preempt—any observance of the anniversary.

One year, in Hong Kong, 150,000 people showed up for a candlelight vigil in remembrance of those who died 20 years ago this week.

The government has shut down much of the Internet, including Western news sources, for fear that its citizens may learn what really happened. The police are using umbrellas to block cameras. It is a spectacle and it is a travesty.

For too long, the West has looked the other way as China declares a war on human rights.

For too long, the West has rewarded China with lopsided trade policies while China continues to carry out a war on minority cultures.

The United States should not endorse the Chinese system. Instead, we should support democracy, human rights, and economic freedom. We should hold China accountable for its actions. Not only does China continue to hold people in jail based on their actions at the Tiananmen protest, but the fear from the crackdown continues to remind Chinese citizens of what they may face should they try again to bring freedom and political reform to their nation.

In America, in Beijing, police are on the streets in and around Tiananmen Square to preempt—not to control but to preempt—any observance of the anniversary.

It is not just the Chinese who are pushing for the status quo. Investors...
who profit from their investments in China—American investors. American companies—actively support a regime that is trying to become a global competitor with our Nation. Multinational corporations know no boundaries. Too often these companies leave their moral compass.

The United States and all democratic governments should stand up to, rather than apologize for, China’s brutal regime. If China seeks to become a responsible member of the international community, its actions should match its aspirations.

Since the Tiananmen Square protest and crackdown, China has continued to deny its people basic freedoms of speech and religion and assembly. It has increased severe cultural and religious suppression of ethnic minorities such as the Tibetans, the Taiwanese, and the Uighurs in western Muslim parts of China. It has increased persecution of Chinese Christians. It has increased harassment and harassment of dissidents and journalists and has maintained tight controls on freedom of speech and the Internet.

Earlier today I had the pleasure of meeting again with someone I worked with 10 years ago, Wei Jingsheng. Wei Jingsheng, who is about 60 now, has been called the “father of Chinese democracy.” He spent 18 years in prison. He was an electrician at the Beijing Zoo. He spent 18 years in prison for the cause of freedom and democracy in his home country. He was jailed because the Chinese Government accused him of conspiring against it by writing about democracy. Since his release from prison for the second time, Wei Jingsheng this time was exiled to Canada. He has been a force for democratic change for his nation, founding the Overseas Chinese Democracy Coalition and the Wei Jingsheng Foundation. He has been nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize seven different times. He lives in Washington, the capital of our democracy, but he continues to fight for democracy in his home country.

The Chinese people, like Americans, are trying to live meaningful, peaceful lives and create a better world for their children. Unfortunately, they are held hostage by a brutal, one-party Communist totalitarian regime. This regime benefits from many of our country’s policies, from lax trade enforcement to the abuse in the face of blatant human rights abuses. The United States, by its acquiescence, has contributed to prop up the Chinese Communist party. The partner in working to prop up the Chinese Communist party is large U.S. corporations.

Wei Jingsheng told me, as we walked the halls of the House of Representatives in 1999 during the discussion and debate on the permanent normal trade advantages in 1999 during the discussion and debate on the permanent normal trade advantages in 1999, that the American CEOs who walked the halls of Congress in 1989—our President Obama remembers this—who walked the halls of Congress in 1989 lobbying on behalf of the Chinese Communist party dictatorship to get trade advantages to China. It was the CEOs of many of America’s largest corporations who walked from office to office in the Senate and in the House of Representatives begging Members of the House and Senate to vote to give trade advantages to this Communist party dictatorship that oppresses its people, that inflicted violence on those people in 1989, and has ever since. It was American CEOs who lobbied for trade advantages for China so that China, in the end, would take millions of jobs from the United States of America—from Galion, OH, and Toledo, OH, and Akron and Youngstown and Dayton—hundreds of thousands of jobs in my State because American CEOs lobbied this House, this Senate, and lobbied the Congress down to the hall to give trade advantages to the Communist party dictatorship in China. We have paid the price. The Chinese people have paid an even more important price.

I am proud to join with Senator Inhofe to be introducing with him a resolution acknowledging the 20th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square protest and crackdown. The resolution is simple. It honors those who died in the protest. It demands that China release its political and its religious prisoners.

Today as we look back on the Tiananmen protest, we honor the lives of those who died in a struggle for freedom. Let’s remember that brave, unnamed protestors in front of the tank who 20 years ago believed, like Wei Jingsheng believes, that one person can change the world through peace and nonviolence. Think what a whole nation could do.

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

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. BURR. 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. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for up to 30 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAMILY SMOKING PREVENTION AND TOBACCO CONTROL ACT

MR. BURR. Mr. President, when I yielded the floor to allow Senator Brown to speak, I was in the process of describing a substitute amendment to the base bill, H.R. 1256. Before I go back to that, let me share with my colleagues the response to a letter from the Campaign For Tobacco-Free Kids. They assessed the substitute bill and they provided in a letter to the committee why they found the substitute to be wrong. I will use that word.

Let me take some of the things they expressed in that letter. They said that the Burr-Hagan bill would create a new bureaucracy that lacks the experience, expertise, and resources to effectively regulate tobacco products. I think I made it abundantly clear earlier today that under our current regulatory framework for tobacco, every Federal agency in the United States has jurisdiction in it, except for the Food and Drug Administration. So to suggest that the Food and Drug Administration has the experience or the expertise or the resources to effectively regulate this would be disingenuous. They have no experience, because they haven’t been involved in regulation. They do have expertise, but expertise to prove safety and efficacy of products is not to conclude that a product is unsafe and kills. Yet they are not going to do anything to restrict its access or provide resources to effectively regulate tobacco products.

Incorporated in this base bill H.R. 1256 is, in fact, a surcharge on the tobacco industry of $700 million over the first 3 years to fund—to provide the resources—for the FDA to regulate the tobacco industry. And it doesn’t stop there, because they can’t do what they can’t do anything they can’t set up the regulation until they have the ability to do the surcharge it requires, in putting it in the FDA, that you come up with $200 million to fund the initial effort to set up the infrastructure to regulate this product. So, in fact, there were no resources. Within H.R. 1256, it creates the resources to create the framework, to create the personnel, to regulate a product they have never regulated before.

And my colleagues that in the substitute amendment, we set up a new Harm Reduction Center under the guidelines of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, within Health and Human Services, the same place that the FDA is. When we asked the Secretary of HHS how much does it take to fund that, they provided us a number of $100 million a year; $700 million for the baseline, H.R. 1256; $100 million for this new Center of Harm Reduction, overseen by the same Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Granted, I will be the first to say that if we are creating a new agency, the agency for harm reduction, it does not have the experience, the expertise, or the resources yet, but it can search within the global hire to find the individuals, and the Secretary of HHS has already said $100 million will permit us to do that function in a harm reduction center. So the first complaint, hopefully, I have disposed of.

I remind my colleagues that in the bill, the Campaign For Tobacco-Free Kids as to why they would not support the substitute amendment: The Burr-Hagan bill does...