smoking, because the overwhelming body of evidence says that it does. Everybody is entitled to their opinion but not everybody is entitled to the facts.

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. WELLSTONE. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 15 minutes as if in morning business.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

HUMAN RIGHTS CONDITIONS IN CHINA AND TIBET

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, earlier this week, I spoke of a resolution on China that I introduced and that we will offer as an amendment as soon as there is a vehicle to work with, I think probably next week—certainly before the President's visit to China. I wanted to briefly summarize it. Let me just say that I am really pleased to have the support of Senator LUGAR, Senator DURBIN, Senator LEAHY and Senator FEINGOLD, and I think there will be very strong bipartisan support for this, what will be an amendment.

The focus is on human rights conditions in China and Tibet. Let me just say I don't come to the floor in a spirit of bashing our President. Since our President will be the first head of state of our country to visit China since the 1989 crackdown where really students—I see pages here—young people your age were murdered, gave their lives, and for the ''crime'' of just simply calling for the country to be a democracy, I wish the President would not go to Tiananmen Square. I think that is a mistake. My worry is that regardless of what statements the President makes about human rights in China—and I hope he will make some powerful statements—the symbolism of visiting that very sacred place where students were murdered will overwhelm everything else and will be taken, will be used by the Government or will be interpreted by people in China as reflecting a kind of carte blanche support of the Government. I think that would be a mistake.

Now, I want to refer to the State Department's China country report this past year on human rights and practices. This is not my report. This is our own State Department report.

> The Government continues to commit widespread and well documented human rights abuses in violation of internationally accepted norms stemming from the authorities' intolerance of dissent, fear of unrest, and the absence or inadequacy of laws protecting basic freedoms.

I think the Assistant Secretary of State, John Shattuck, who has focused on human rights, has really done some magnificent work, and I think this State Department report is extremely important.

What we are going to call on the President to do in our amendment—and we will have a vote on it next week. I think it is terribly important the Senate go on record before the President's visit, because the President is going to visit China. Whether Senators think he should or not, the President is going to visit. I personally think it is not unimportant to be having a discussion with the Government there. I am not opposed to a discussion. But the question is what kind of discussion, what kind of visit, and what does the President say.

At the very minimum, we are going to call upon the President to secure from China's leaders a pledge to remove by a certain date the names on the official reentry black list, which now contains the names of more than 50 Chinese living in the United States who cannot return to China because of their advocacy of democracy and freedom. In other words, there are some people in our country who think the fact that Wei Jingsheng, who was released from prison, is now in our country, exiled in our country is a sign he has his freedom. I doubt any American would feel he or she was free if they were exiled from our country and told, if you come back to the United States, you will be immediately arrested. That hardly represents freedom. So we want to make sure that by a certain date the Chinese Government removes these names on this official reentry blacklist.

Second of all, that the President—and let me emphasize this. I emphasized it this morning—visit family members of the victims of the 1989 massacre, many of whom still suffer from political harassment, discrimination, or persecution.

I will say in this Chamber: Mr. President, if you are going to visit China, I hope you don't go to Tiananmen Square. I hope you will give some forceful speeches on human rights, but at the very minimum you could convey a very powerful message to the world, to people in China, to the Chinese Government, and to these families if you would visit the family members, or some of the family members of victims of the 1989 massacre, many of whom today suffer from political harassment and discrimination and persecution. I think that would be a powerful message. I believe the President should do this.

Third of all, I think the President absolutely has to urge Chinese leaders to engage in a meaningful dialog with the Dalai Lama, with the aim of establishing genuine cultural and religious autonomy in Tibet. In the past year, matters have only gotten worse in Tibet. No one is arguing to the contrary. No one is arguing to the contrary.

The President must call upon China to revise its vague, draconian security laws, including the provisions on ''endangering state security,'' which were added to the criminal code in March of 1997; and release unconditionally all political, religious, and labor activists detained for their peaceful, nonviolent involvement. In other words, it is important to understand, when someone like Wei is released, that releasing some individuals doesn't deal with 2,000 political prisoners that you have in prison. That doesn't deal with all sorts of prisoners in forced labor camps. The President has to call upon the Chinese Government to live up to basic human rights standards—that is where our country should be; that is what we should stand for—and review the sentences of more than 2,000 who have been convicted of so-called counterrevolutionary crimes with a view toward granting full amnesty.

Mr. President, I come to the floor today because it is the anniversary of the massacre at Tiananmen Square, and I think it is really important that we speak up. I think the Chinese Government would like nothing more than for Americans not to speak up. I think the Chinese Government would like for the world to forget what happened. We cannot. But above and beyond that, I do not want this just to be dramatic in the worst way or symbolic. I think what the President can do if he is going to visit China is not go to Tiananmen Square, certainly visit the families of the victims of Tiananmen Square, and certainly give some powerful speeches and statements while in China which call upon the Chinese Government to release people who are in prison for having committed no other crime than to speak out for democracy and freedom; for the President to say to the Government of China—frankly, we should be saying it to governments all over the world that do this—you cannot persecute people because of their religious practice or because of their political viewpoint. We have to be on the side of human rights throughout the world. I really hope that next week, if not tomorrow—the first opportunity I get I will bring this amendment to the floor —we would get very strong support for this amendment.

Mr. President, I see my colleague from Nevada is here, and I will yield the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, first, I would like to thank my colleague from Minnesota for his unfailing courtesy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might speak as if in morning business for a period of time not to exceed 7 minutes.

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

Mr. BRYAN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BRYAN pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 243 are located in today's RECORD under ''Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.'')

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL TOBACCO POLICY AND YOUTH SMOKING REDUCTION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Senate debate on this landmark youth smoking reduction bill began more than two weeks ago. The time for debate on this legislation is rapidly drawing to a close. Each of us has had ample opportunity to state our views. The Senate should commit to a vote on final passage within a week. We owe it to our children who are being entrapped into a life of addiction and premature death by the tobacco industry every day.

The opponents of this legislation have used every parliamentary tool at their disposal to extend the debate and to divert attention to unrelated issues. They want to talk about every subject but the impact of smoking on the nation's health. However, the real issue cannot be obscured by their verbal smokescreen. It is time for us to move from talking to voting.

Each day that the opponents delay final Senate passage of this bill, 3,000 more children begin to smoke. A third of these children will die prematurely from lung cancer, emphysema, heart disease, or other smoking-caused illnesses.

Each day that we delay, the price of a pack of cigarettes will continue to be affordable to the nation's children, and more and more of them will take up this deadly habit.

Each day that we delay, Big Tobacco will continue to target children with billions of dollars in advertising and promotional giveaways that promise popularity, excitement, and success for young men and women who start smoking.

Each day that we delay, millions of nonsmokers will be exposed to secondhand smoke. According to the Environmental Protection Agency, secondhand smoke causes 3,000 to 5,000 lung cancer deaths each year in the United States—more than all other regulated hazardous air pollutants combined. Secondhand smoke is also responsible for as many as 60 percent of cases of asthma, bronchitis, and wheezing among young children.

Each day that we delay, tobacco will remain virtually the only product manufactured for human consumption that is not subject to Federal health and safety regulations, despite the fact that it causes over 400,000 deaths a year. In fact, Kraft Cheese is more heavily regulated than Marlboro cigarettes, although both are manufactured by Philip Morris.

With so much at stake for so many of our children, it is truly irresponsible for the opponents of this legislation to practice the politics of obstruction. Let the Senate vote.

There are two pending amendments before us today—the Gramm amendment on the marriage penalty and the Durbin-DeWine amendment on the youth smoking reduction lookback. I would like to address each of them in turn.

The pending amendment by the Senator from Texas seeks to divert $52 billion over the next 5 years away from smoking prevention, away from smoking cessation, away from medical research, and away from reimbursing states. He proposes to take 80 percent of all the money raised by the cigarette price increase and use it for unrelated tax cuts. No funds would be left for programs which are essential to reducing youth smoking and to helping current smokers quit.

By offering such an amendment, the Senator from Texas shows his true intent. It is he who wants to convert this legislation from a youth smoking prevention bill into a piggybank for unrelated projects. Although he has complained that the tobacco bill is a piggybank that Democrats are using to fund new programs, in fact it is the Gramm amendment which would hog 80 percent of the money taking resources which are needed to prevent young Americans from beginning to smoke and to help current smokers overcome their addiction. These numbers speak for themselves. This tax cut was not designed to help working families—it was intended to destroy the underlying smoking prevention legislation.

The criticism of the Gramm amendment has been so strong and so widespread that even the sponsor has agreed to reduce the size of the proposed moneygrab. Under his new proposal, he only wants to take one-third of the revenue generated in the first 5 years and one-half of the money in succeeding years. That would amount to approximately $60 billion over a 10-year period. It would still cripple the smoking prevention and cessation efforts which are essential to effectively reducing youth smoking.

All of the money raised by the cigarette price increase contained in the legislation is currently earmarked for smoking related purposes: 22 percent is directed to smoking prevention and cessation, 22 percent is to be used for medical research, 16 percent is for transitional assistance for tobacco farmers, and 40 percent is to compensate states for the cost of medical treatment of smoking related illnesses. There it is, Mr. President.

Which of these smoking related initiatives would the Senator from Texas eliminate? Does he propose to eliminate all compensation to the States for their tobacco related health costs? After all, it was the State lawsuits which provided the genesis for this legislation and which exposed the most dramatic evidence of industry wrongdoing. That would not be fair. Even if every dollar intended for the States was taken to fund the Gramm amendment, it would not be enough to cover the cost.

Does he propose to eliminate all transition assistance for tobacco farmers and communities? It would not even cover one-third of the cost of the Gramm amendment.

All of the remaining dollars are directed to smoking prevention, to smoking cessation, and to medical research. These initiatives are the heart of the legislation. If we are serious about stopping children from smoking and saving lives from tobacco-induced diseases, we have to make these investments. Would the Senator from Texas propose that we take money from these programs and use it to fund an unrelated tax cut instead? How can we in good conscience raise the price of cigarettes and then refuse to fund programs which will address the evils of smoking? These programs work. Let me give you a few examples:

Every dollar invested in a smoking cessation program for a pregnant woman saves $6 in costs for neonatal intensive care and long-term care for low-birthweight babies. The effect of the Gramm amendment would be to reduce funds for these programs, and that makes no sense.

The Gramm amendment would take funds intended to assist states and communities to conduct educational programs on the health dangers of smoking. The tobacco industry spends $5 billion a year—$5 billion—on advertising to encourage young people to smoke. Shouldn't we spend at least one tenth of that amount to counteract the industry's lethal message?

Counteradvertising is a key element of an effective tobacco control strategy. We know that if children are easily swayed by the tobacco industry's marketing campaigns, which promise popularity, excitement, and success for those who take up smoking, we can reverse the damage by deglamorizing the use of tobacco among children with counteradvertising.

Both Massachusetts and California have demonstrated that paid counteradvertising can cut smoking rates. It helped reduce cigarette use in Massachusetts by 17 percent between 1992 and 1996, or three times the national average. Smoking by junior high students dropped 8 percent, while the rest of the nation has seen an increase. In California, a counteradvertising campaign also reduced smoking rates by 15 percent over the last 3 years.

The Gramm amendment also would take money from law enforcement efforts to prevent the sale of tobacco products to minors, even though young people currently spend $1 billion a year to buy tobacco products illegally.

The Gramm amendment will diminish funding for medical research on tobacco-related diseases, which kill 400,000 Americans each year and incapacitates millions more. Given the