something we might try to get up Thursday night or Friday, or not later than next Monday. We also have pending before us a number of other important bills, including the higher education legislation and nuclear waste. So there are a number of bills that are waiting.

Again, I ask for the cooperation of the Senators on both sides of the aisle to work with the chairman of the Finance Committee and ranking member to get an agreement on how we can proceed. Let's have a good debate, relevant amendments, and let's complete this job.

Even the President, who originally resisted IRS reform, on his radio show Saturday said what has been happening at IRS is outrageous and that we should act on this legislation and get it to him as quickly as possible. I hope we will move forward, now that we have him involved in this effort, and complete this important legislation.

Mr. President, I note that there are no Senators waiting to speak. I believe the managers of the legislation will be here at noon. From now until noon will be a period of morning business.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for not to extend beyond the hour of 12 o'clock noon, at which time, under the previous order, the Senate will proceed, for debate only, to the consideration of H.R. 2676.

Under the previous order, the Senator from North Dakota is recognized at this time.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my understanding is the 30 minutes that I am able to use under a previous unanimous consent agreement will bump up against the 12 o'clock time. I ask unanimous consent that the 12 o'clock time be modified so I may use the entire 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is permitted to speak until 12:15 p.m.

ISTEA

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to visit about a couple of things this morning. First, I want to talk about the highway bill that is in conference between the House and the Senate. It is now May 4, 1998. The highway bill, or a piece of legislation people commonly refer to as ISTEA (the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act) was supposed to have been completed last year, but it was not. The highway bill was extended until May 1, and then the authorization for the highway bill expired.

We are now on May 4 without highway legislation that is authorized, and the highway officials and Governors around the country are wondering, appropriately, what is going to happen to this highway bill? With what authority can I obligate money? What about the projects we have to do in our States to build roads and repair bridges?

I don't blame State and local highway officials and others who are rightly furious with the Congress that it has not gotten its work done. It is a shame, in my judgment, that almost a year after the legislation should have been done, not only was the legislation not done, but we have already had an extension and that has expired. Now, here we are with no highway bill at all.

I ask those who run this Congress and those who are convening the conference on the highway bill, let's decide to get this thing done. This isn't rocket science; it is building highways. We know how to do that. If the political will doesn't exist to do what is necessary to reach a compromise on a highway bill, then I suppose that those who run the Congress should say to the Governors and the highway commissioners, ''We can't be counted upon to do this work.''

I hope in the coming days people will understand the urgency of this. I come from the State of North Dakota, and we have a relatively short construction season. It is not fair to our States for this Congress not to do its work on time. We should do it, it ought to be done, and it ought to be done soon.

TOBACCO LEGISLATION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I came to the floor today to talk for just a moment about the tobacco legislation that is to be brought to the floor of the Senate. My understanding is that we will consider, in the next perhaps month, the tobacco legislation that was enacted by the Senate Commerce Committee, of which I am a member.

The Senate Commerce Committee considered a comprehensive tobacco bill. We passed it, and the vote was 19 to 1. The legislation is controversial, to be sure, and the tobacco industry has now ratcheted up an enormous amount of money and energy directed at trying to kill the bill.

I thought it would be interesting to read into the RECORD a few comments here and there dealing with the tobacco companies and why they are so interested in killing this tobacco legislation. We will see an enormous amount of money spent on advertising to try to kill this legislation.

My colleague, Senator CONRAD from North Dakota, chaired a task force on the issue of tobacco and created a piece of legislation. He has done a wonderful job, in my judgment, dealing this with issue, and the Senate could well take its cues from the work Senator CONRAD has done. Incidentally, the Senate Commerce Committee took much from the legislation Senator CONRAD introduced in the Congress.

The reason we are concerned about the tobacco issue is the targeting of teenagers in this country to get them to smoke. I have said before on the floor that almost no one reaches age 30 and wonders, ''What more could I do to fulfill my life?'' and decides they should start smoking. Almost no one reaches majority age and says, ''Gee, what am I missing?'' and concludes what they have really missed is, they have not smoked and they need to start smoking cigarettes. The reason they don't arrive at that answer is that by that age, they know that cigarettes can kill you.

Mr. President, 300,000 to 400,000 people a year die in this country from smoking and smoking-related causes, and the only future customers for tobacco are kids. The only conceivable future customers for cigarettes are children, and that is why many in this country, myself included, believe it is important for us to say to the tobacco industry, ''Never again shall you target America's children to addict them to tobacco, addict them to nicotine. We won't allow it.'' That is what the tobacco legislation is all about.

What did the tobacco companies know, and when did they know it about the subject of nicotine? We are now hearing a lot of testimony and discussion about that. Tobacco companies have been at the forefront of nicotine research in the last several decades. In fact, the tobacco companies, since the early 1960s, claimed that nicotine was not addictive and anyone who smokes makes a free choice to smoke.

By the 1960s, however, all of the reports we are now seeing, including confidential memoranda and data from a tobacco company, showed us they had developed a very sophisticated understanding of nicotine pharmacology and they knew very well that nicotine was pharmacologically addictive. The release of internal tobacco company documents makes it clear. They realize the impact and significance of nicotine.

In 1963, a British American Tobacco document said:

> Nicotine is by far the most characteristic single constituent in tobacco, and the known physiological effects are positively correlated with smoker response.

In 1969, a draft report to the Philip Morris board of directors said:

> In the past, we at R&D—that is research and development—have said that we're not in the cigarette business, we're in the smoke business. It might be more pointed to observe that the cigarette is the vehicle of smoke, smoke is the vehicle of nicotine and nicotine is the agent of a pleasurable body response.

In a memo from 1978, Brown & Williamson, signed by H.D. Steele says:

> Very few consumers are aware of the effects of nicotine, i.e., its addictive nature and that nicotine is a poison.

That is a tobacco industry paper.

There is little doubt if it were not for the nicotine in tobacco smoke, people would be less inclined to smoke than they are to blow bubbles or to light sparklers.

M.A.H. Russell, 1974.

1983, Brown & Williamson:

Nicotine is the addicting agent in cigarettes.

1983, Brown & Williamson:

Raleigh and Belair smokers are addicted to smoking. . . . They smoke primarily to reduce negative feeling states rather than for pleasure. Given their low income, smoking represents a financial drain on family resources. Saving coupons for household items helps reduce guilt associated with smoking.

How about the health effects of tobacco? What do the tobacco companies know about that?

The vice president of a tobacco company, in 1963, said:

At best, the probabilities are that some combination of constituents of smoke will be found conducive to the onset of cancer or to create an environment in which cancer is more likely to occur.

That is ''at best,'' he says. That is a fellow who helps run a tobacco company.

1970, lung cancer experiments that were done by the general manager of research prepared for the managing director of Gallaher Electronic Telegraph:

One of the striking features of the Auerbach experiment was that practically every dog which smoked suffered significantly from the effects of the smoke either in terms of severe irritation and bronchitis, pre-cancerous changes or cancer.

A top research official for the American Tobacco Company, 1970:

[W]e believe the Auerbach work proves beyond reasonable doubt that fresh whole cigarette smoke is carcinogenic to dog lungs and therefore it is highly likely that it is carcinogenic to human beings.

[T]he results of the research would appear to us to remove the controversy regarding the causation of human lung cancer . . .

How about tobacco companies targeting kids?

1981, Philip Morris, a report from a researcher to the Vice President of Research and Development at Philip Morris. He says:

Today's teenager is tomorrow's potential regular customer, and the overwhelming majority of smokers first begin to smoke while in their teens. At least a part of the success of 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.

Teenage smokers. A memorandum from the tobacco industry:

To improve our ability to forecast future trends, this report examines the demographics and smoking behavior of 14–17 year old smokers.

This is a company now that is doing detailed research on 14- to 17-year-old smokers. ''Forecasting future trends,'' that means ''they're our customers. We're interested in them. We want to keep them smoking.''

One company was concerned because their share of teenaged smokers declined while the share of teenagers who purchased a competitive brand increased. That concerned the company a great deal.

Another tobacco industry statement:

It is important to know as much as possible about teenage smoking patterns and attitudes. Today's teenager is tomorrow's potential regular customer. . . . it is during the teenage years that the initial brand choice is made.

And that is the statement from a tobacco company.

Now, the consequences of tobacco smoking are quite clear. Tobacco is a legal product, and in my judgment shall and will be legal in the future. But it is not a legal product for children. An industry that has record profits and has targeted children, because it believes that children are its future customers, is an industry that, in my judgment, is sadly out of touch with its responsibilities.

The U.S. Senate and the Congress has a responsibility to take up the tobacco bill. We passed it out of the Senate Commerce Committee now nearly a month ago under the leadership of Senator MCCAIN. I noted today in the newspapers that Senator MCCAIN indicated that, I believe he said $50 to $100 million is to be spent by the tobacco industry to defeat efforts in Congress to pass a comprehensive tobacco bill.

I hope the American people take note that this industry is the same industry which said tobacco is not addictive when in fact they knew it was addictive. They were saying we are not targeting children when in fact they were targeting children.

I hope the American people understand, as well, that when the tobacco industry launches a massive effort to try to derail the efforts of the Congress to pass a comprehensive tobacco bill, the American people have the capability in this system of ours to make the difference. They can weigh in. They can make their views known about whether or not they believe this Congress shall pass a piece of legislation to stop this industry from targeting America's children and from trying to addict America's children to cigarettes.

Mr. President, my colleague from North Dakota, Senator CONRAD, is on the floor. I would like to yield to him as much time as he consumes to discuss another issue, and at the conclusion of his remarks, it is my intention to follow up on the issue he is going to discuss. Let me yield the time that he consumes to Senator CONRAD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank you very much, and my colleague from North Dakota, Senator DORGAN, for this time.

AGRICULTURE DISASTER IN NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. CONRAD. I have come to the floor this morning to talk about a disaster that is happening in my home State, but it is receiving very little attention. People who are watching and my colleagues might recall that last year we had a set of disasters in North Dakota that had tremendous national publicity and national attention.

We had the worst winter in our history, followed by the most powerful winter storm in 50 years, followed by the worst flood in 500 years; and in the midst of that, fire broke out that destroyed much of downtown Grand Forks, ND. It was really almost apocalyptic. But this year we have another disaster occurring, and it is receiving very little attention. I call it the ''stealth disaster,'' because it is really flying below the radar screen. There are almost no national stories, no national attention. In fact, I believe very few people know this disaster is occurring. But it is occurring and it is an extraordinary disaster that is hurting the farmers of my State.

We are in a wet cycle. This wet cycle has bred disease, disease that cost us about a third of our crop last year. That, coupled with very low prices, has meant that our farmers are not cash-flowing.

I was just home during a series of farm meetings and in each and every stop was told we will lose perhaps 3,000 farmers this year in North Dakota. We only have 30,000. So losing 3,000 in 1 year would really be quite extraordinary.

But these farmers are facing a cash-flow crunch as a result of bad policy, as a result of low prices, as a result of this incredible disease that has broken out. And again, this is a disaster of really staggering proportions in that it gets very little attention, and there is very little the Federal Government is prepared to do.

It is very interesting, if you have a disaster like this. Last year when this disaster occurred, or these sets of disasters occurred in North Dakota, and we searched to find if there was Federal help, we found that indeed there was. The SBA rushed to help. The Federal Emergency Management Agency was there. The Housing and Urban Development Program was there with CDBG funds. There was a marvelous, marvelous response that has helped the devastated communities recover.

But now we have a different kind of crisis and a different kind of disaster. And when we look for assistance, we find there is virtually none. What you will find is, about the only thing that is available is low-interest loans.

Now, additional debt for those who can't cash flow because of a terrible outbreak of disease and because of low prices and because of weak farm policy, saying ''Take on more debt,'' doesn't sound like a very good deal. But that is exactly what we are faced with, because we no longer have a disaster program for farmers; it doesn't exist. The only thing we have is low-interest loans; that is it. When farmers experience a disaster, the Federal response is to help them go further into debt. It doesn't make much sense.