

(4) congratulates the people of the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland for their courageous commitment to work together in peace;

(5) reaffirms the bonds of friendship and cooperation that exist between the United States and the Governments of the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom, which ensure that the United States and those Governments will continue as partners in peace; and

(6) encourages all parties to move forward to implement the Good Friday Peace Agreement.

Mr. BROWBACK. Mr. President, I have a series of items I need to go through and a discussion I want to have, but I understand the Senator from Michigan has some comments to make, so I yield the floor to the Senator from Michigan.

TOBACCO RECOUPMENT

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas. I wanted to just briefly speak in relationship to the Harkin-Specter amendment with regard to the tobacco recoupment issue and the issue of exactly what should happen to the funds that the States are now entitled to receive as a result of the legal settlement that was achieved between 46 States and the tobacco companies.

Mr. President, this, to me, should be a pretty clear-cut result. The States entered into this litigation. They did all the work. They made the case persuasively. They were finally able to prevail on the merits, in terms of convincing the other side to engage in a settlement. So, for those reasons, it does not seem to me to be particularly difficult to conclude that the benefits, the proceeds, the settlement moneys ought to go to the States. I believe, since the States did this on their own and since the States are certainly quite knowledgeable about the needs of their constituents, that we should allow them not only to be the recipients of those funds but we should give them the discretion to make the decisions that are necessary as to what priorities to set in spending those dollars.

Let me just begin briefly with the basic case itself. The States joined together. The Federal Government did not play a role in the technical sense, or as a party to the proceedings. Indeed, in his State of the Union Address the President even indicated he was directing the Department of Justice and the Attorney General to bring a separate litigation on behalf of the people of the United States against the tobacco companies. Presumably, one would not bring that case if one did not think that the States' decisions were separate from any kind of Federal component.

Once the States won, of course, money became available. Unfortunately, at that point the Federal Government, through the Health Care Fi-

nance Administration, is attempting to intercede in the President's budget to a very substantial degree, trying to wrest control of a substantial portion of those dollars. As I recall, roughly 60 percent of the first 5 years' revenues to the States which, under the President's budget, would, instead, be diverted to Washington. The basis for their claim is, in my judgment, a weak one, predicated on the argument that Medicaid overpayments are to be returned to the States. This is not a Medicaid overpayment from the Federal Government. This is a settlement between the States and these tobacco companies, a settlement fairly reached and a settlement based on the States' belief that their citizens had been in some ways the victims of the illnesses relating to tobacco.

That said, we have now moved to a slightly different stage. In the content of this supplemental appropriation bill is language which would make it absolutely and explicitly clear that the States will receive these dollars. Now, we have before us an amendment that says: OK, if the States are going to get the money they still have to spend it on the priorities set by bureaucrats in Washington. Indeed, it is my understanding that the proposed amendment would essentially place the Secretary of Health and Human Services in a position to determine what programs qualify for, and whether States are in compliance with, these Federal mandates for 25 years. Basically, what this amendment says is approximately 50 percent, 50 percent of the settlement moneys have to be spent the way Washington dictates, and that the Secretary of Health and Human Services will decide not only what that dictation means but whether the States have done it. The States will be required to engage in extensive recordkeeping and an annual process of appealing for approval, the same kind of bureaucratic redtape that costs money and complicates, in my judgment, far too many things we do already.

If the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and it's not just this Secretary but any Secretary over the next quarter of a century, doesn't agree with the States, they can then veto, in effect, the States' expenditures costing the States as much as approximately \$123 billion during that time.

The bottom line is, I think, a fairly simple one. Who knows best what the needs of the States are, the States themselves or bureaucrats in the Department of Health and Human Services? I believe the States do. I think we can trust the States to make the right decisions as to how to spend the moneys derived from the tobacco settlements. That is assuming, of course, that we have any right to tell them in the first place. I do not even acknowledge that. But assuming there even was a right of the Federal Government

in some respect, I just cannot imagine why anybody here in Washington is going to do a better job than people at the State level in making these judgments.

The priorities that have been set which relate to such things as counteradvertising or youth awareness or public health priorities, are priorities virtually every State has already set for themselves. Many of the States, including I believe my own, have done great things along the way to try to discourage smoking by young people and to address public health needs. If they have done that well, the notion that they now have to spend new moneys recouped through this settlement on these programs at least in my judgment would be a grievous error.

So it comes back to something we talk about a lot around here: Who should set priorities and who knows best? In my view, the people at the local and State level, on issues and problems like this, do know best. They ought to make the decisions as to how the money, which was rightfully won by them in these lawsuits, ought to be spent. And we in Washington ought to be happy that there is going to be an abundance of resources going to the States to address the top priorities of those States.

The notion that we have to dictate how 50 percent or even 30 percent or 10 percent of these dollars have to be spent, I think both, A, incorrectly presumes that somehow we had a stake in the lawsuit and, B, that, somehow we know better. I believe it has been proven time after time that we do not know better, particularly in these types of matters which obviously have peculiarities that differ from State to State.

So, for those reasons I rise in opposition to the amendment. I look forward to working with the Senator from Texas and with a variety of other Senators who have been working together as cosponsors of the legislation that is included in the supplemental appropriation bill, to make sure that first and foremost the States get access to all the money won in the settlements and that, second, the States have the right to make the decisions as to how to spend those dollars.

So, Mr. President, I hope we will be successful in preventing agreement to this amendment. I look forward to working on this until it is completed.

I yield the floor.

REPORT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL COMMISSION ON MILITARY TRAINING AND GENDER-RELATED ISSUES

Mr. BROWBACK. Mr. President, I want to make note of a report that came out today that is one, I think, we are going to be seeing and hearing