

by many estimates, up to \$125 billion. A unified budget deficit of that magnitude is hard to believe in the context of where we have come from, and I certainly believe that requires rethinking our fiscal strategy if we are to be responsible about how we manage the fiscal affairs of this Nation.

That is a doubling of the previous estimates of the unified deficit and, frankly, it doesn't even count the new spending that is expected from President Bush on requests that will deal with antiterrorism and homeland defense. For individual spending, whole life, trying to manage budgets, I consider this a stark and dangerous problem that could undermine the fiscal and, ultimately, the economic health of the Nation.

They highlight a fact that is equally disturbing to me and to a lot of my colleagues, which is that this year we are going to use Social Security payroll taxes that people had thought would be put in place to build up the Social Security trust fund almost completely, if not entirely, to fund these deficits.

I think this is a misuse of the Social Security contributions. I think it is one that the American people would be troubled with if they understood what was happening. I think it would require us to truly rethink our overall fiscal strategy. We should not be using Social Security funds to pay for anything other than Social Security, let alone financing these tax cuts that are a misallocation of resources relative to our Nation's needs—particularly, at a time when we are asking people to sacrifice on a whole series of issues regarding our national security.

I think I speak for many, if not most, Democrats in emphasizing this point, particularly as it relates to the Social Security trust fund.

In the long term, raids on Social Security threaten the security of hard-working American families. But there is also a second danger with regard to Social Security that is equally as important as the fiscal danger, and I think that is very important, quite obviously.

Last December, President Bush's Social Security Commission prepared privatization plans that call for deep cuts in Social Security benefits. In fact, it talks about taking \$1 trillion out of the Social Security trust fund for transitional costs to a privatization program.

Under these proposals that are on the table, some of the cuts in Social Security may be as much as 25 percent for those who will be retiring in about 20 years and could be as much as 45 percent for later retirees.

Think about that: 25 percent to 45 percent. The average Social Security benefit for an American is \$10,000. We ought to put that in context. If we are going to take 25 percent, or \$2,500, away from that \$10,000 or, God forbid, the 45 percent, or a \$4,500 cut, and apply it to the \$10,000, one wonders how our seniors are going to meet their fi-

nancial obligations with this poor social safety net.

Mr. President, \$10,000 is not lavish, but the idea of a \$5,500 benefit seems pretty scary in a world where one can spend that much on prescription drugs in a given year, before even paying for rent and other needs. Certainly in New Jersey—and I am sure this is the case in Vermont—nobody is going to be living high on the hog on \$10,000, and certainly not \$5,500.

We have a real issue with privatization of Social Security, as well as with this fiscal problem. They come together, and this is what I wish to talk about.

I know a lot of people believe we have to fight these cuts, and we probably will over the long run, because most people think they are just wrong. But we also need to make sure Social Security has the resources to maintain the benefits structure that is in place. The entire Social Security shortfall, according to the Social Security actuaries—that is the administration itself—is \$3.7 trillion over the 75-year measured period. That may sound like a lot of money, and I guess it is.

I sit at Everett Dirksen's old desk, and he used to say: A billion here, a billion there is a lot of money. Mr. President, \$3.7 trillion is a lot more money, but it is not a lot in the long-term fiscal potential of our Nation. In fact, last year's tax cuts alone will cost the Nation, over that 75-year period, \$8.7 trillion. So we have \$3.7 trillion to secure Social Security, and there is an \$8.7 trillion tax cut. We can put those two together and say: Where are our priorities? What should we be emphasizing?

The Social Security shortfall is less than a half of the cost of last year's tax cut. Some tax cut was very good, and most of us would argue that is very much the case. It is just a matter of whether it is overreaching and whether it is, in the context of today's world, something we should continue to pursue.

Like most Democrats, I am fully committed—I actually think most of us in this Chamber are committed—to protecting and defending Social Security. This is an issue that deserves full and complete debate. Unfortunately, a number of folks, for political strategy reasons—particularly the leaders in the House and also President Bush, I suspect—have been trying to push this issue to the back burner. I do not think we can do that in this context of the deteriorating fiscal health of the Nation. We need to have this debate about the future of Social Security in front of the elections this year so that the American people can express their points of view.

Interestingly, the chairman of the Republican National Committee just this week, Gov. Mark Racicot, said Congress should debate Social Security privatization this year. I embrace that statement and think he is right. As a matter of fact, Mr. LEVIN, the distin-

guished Senator from Michigan, and I have sent a letter commending Governor Racicot for making his statement and encouraging that debate.

Social Security is going to impact every American—those retired today but, more importantly, those who will be retiring in the future.

I call on my colleagues in the House and Senate to get on with this privatization debate so that the public can make its choice whether they believe we ought to pull out and undermine guaranteed benefits that the American public has come to expect.

I do not think they are aware of the nature of some of the recommendations that have come out of the Commission, so-called "Save Social Security," that President Bush put together and came up with its report that would lead to 25- to 45-percent cuts in Social Security benefits.

I come here today to make two points. We have a serious reason to have a debate about the changed conditions of our fiscal policy. They are going to put pressure on a whole series of choices we make. As we go deeper and deeper in debt, and as we erode that \$5.6 trillion that was the basis of how we made our judgments over the last 18 months, and certainly with regard to that tax cut, we need to understand that the world is different today, and it is particularly different as to how we are going to fund and secure Social Security in the months, years, and decades ahead. I, for one, think we need to get on with that debate, a fair debate, because it is important for the American people to participate in that process.

I hope all of us will stand up for those issues in which we believe. I certainly do, and I believe my colleagues on this side of the aisle believe strongly that Social Security should be placed first in our fiscal priorities, right after securing our national security and national defense.

Those are the points I wanted to make because I believe the numbers are real, they are telling, and they make it very clear that we need to have this overall review of our fiscal strategy in the context of a very seriously deteriorating situation.

I thank you, Mr. President, for this opportunity.

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

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

ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my understanding is a cloture motion has been filed on the motion to proceed on the Andean trade bill; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DORGAN. And a cloture vote will occur on what date?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture vote will occur on the next day of session.

Mr. DORGAN. I will spend a few moments today saying a few words about the trade bill. We are now going to segue into a big debate about international trade. It comes by way of the Andean trade initiative, which will be amended with the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act, and then amended further, I understand, by something called Trade Promotion Authority, or TPA. TPA is a euphemism for what has traditionally been called fast-track trade authority. I am opposed to it, and I will describe why and what it has meant to our country in recent years.

The Constitution of the United States has something to say about international trade, at article I, section 8: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations. . . ."

It doesn't say "the President"; it doesn't say "the U.S. trade ambassador"; it doesn't say a bunch of trade negotiators on an airplane heading to a foreign land to negotiate a trade agreement. It says: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations. . . ."

Congress has largely ceded its power on international trade issues to the executive branch. Fast-track trade authority is a mechanism in which Congress is told, after a trade agreement is negotiated and brought back here, you have no right to offer one amendment, not even one amendment. Up or down, yes or no, expedited procedures, but no amendments.

That is fast track. It is the Congress saying: let's get together and handcuff ourselves. We have done it five times. Now we are prepared to do it again. I didn't support giving fast-track trade authority to President Clinton, I don't support giving it to President George W. Bush and I intend to explain why.

Will Rogers once said that the United States of America has never lost a war and never won a conference. He surely must have been speaking about international trade. When we talk about recent trade agreements, in almost every circumstance, we have given away too much and gotten too little.

Those who come to this floor of the Senate and talk about trade are always saying, the whole purpose of trade is to strike down the barriers in foreign markets that prevent American goods from getting into foreign markets. Were that the case, I would say good for us. I aspire to that goal. That is what we should be doing. We don't get enough pork into China. We don't get enough beef into Japan. We don't get enough cars into Korea. We don't get enough grain into Canada. We don't get enough high fructose sugar or sweetener into Mexico. We don't get enough wheat flour into Europe. I can talk

about the barriers. They are chronicled in a book that is inches thick.

What happens with international trade when we have another trade agreement? Our trade deficit goes up, up, up, and up, to the point that we now have a merchandise trade deficit that is well over \$400 billion a year. Every single day in this country we experience a trade deficit of well over \$1 billion more coming in than we export.

Is that helpful to our country? It is the largest trade deficit in human history. Nobody seems to care much about it. Is it helpful to our country? No, it weakens our country.

Let me describe one of the trade agreements we negotiated and see what happened with that trade agreement. We negotiated a trade agreement with Canada and Mexico. It was called NAFTA, North American Free Trade Agreement. We had all these economists telling us it would create hundreds of thousands of new jobs, what a wonderful thing it would be.

When we negotiated it, we had a slight trade surplus with Mexico and a modest trade deficit with Canada. That was in 1993. Eight years later, we have a huge deficit with Mexico and a giant deficit with Canada. Has that trade agreement worked out? Has that been in our country's best interests? I don't think so.

Incidentally, currency fluctuations immediately emasculated these trade agreements. The high U.S. dollar against the Canadian dollar and the devaluation of the Mexican peso just emasculated NAFTA, as far as our trade with those countries is concerned. But that is an issue for another day.

My point is this: When we negotiate bad trade agreements and then we have some difficulty, we do not have the backbone or nerve as a country to stand up and say: Wait, on behalf of our American companies and workers, we demand fair trade. We will compete with anybody at any time, but we demand fair trade.

Let me give an example of how we behave.

Europe is upset with us about a recent 201 case, so Europe threatens retaliation. Do you know what Europe says it is going to retaliate on? Steel, textiles, and citrus products. Europe is going to get tough, they say.

So we have a trade dispute with Europe over beef exports, and it is our turn to threaten Europe with retaliation. Even the WTO says that we are authorized to retaliate, and we get to pick the products with which to retaliate. Do you know what our negotiators choose to retaliate on? Truffles, goose liver, and Roquefort cheese. The Europeans are still laughing over that one. And not surprisingly, our retaliation on truffles, goose liver, and Roquefort cheese has not done anything to get the Europeans to open up their markets to U.S. beef.

My point is we don't have the backbone and the will, as a country, to say

to Europe, Japan, Korea, Canada, Mexico, China: We want to trade with you. Our country seeks free trade, open trade, and fair trade. Our market is open to your producers. God bless you; come in. Our consumers appreciate your goods. By all means, our markets are open to you. But your markets must be open to American producers as well—they must. If they are not, then you sell your goods in Kinshasa, in the Congo, and see how quickly they sell. The condition of access to the American marketplace must be fair trade; you must allow American goods into your marketplace.

Let me give an example with respect to Korea. I have talked about this before, and recently I received a letter from an association of Korean auto manufacturers, who are upset with me.

Last year, Korea sent 618,000 Korean automobiles to be sold in the United States of America. That is fine with me. Hyundais, Daewoos, I am sure they are fine cars—618,000 cars were manufactured in Korea and sent to the United States.

Do you know how many automobiles the United States was able to sell in Korea last year? It was 2,800. For every 217 cars that the Koreans shipped to our country, we were able to sell just one in Korea. Why? The letters from the Korean automobile organization say: You are just not competitive here; you are making the wrong kind of cars. But that is not it. They just don't want American cars in Korea.

Let me show you the market share. This chart shows the market share of automobiles in Korea. This will tell the story: 99.4 percent of the Korean marketplace for automobiles is for Korean automobiles. Why? Because that country says: We want only Korean automobiles sold inside our country.

They are interested in creating jobs in Korea to ship their cars to us and access our marketplace, but not interested in allowing our car manufacturers and auto workers to access their marketplace. Fair trade? I don't think so. Is anybody running around here trying to figure out how to fix that? I don't see any progress where it counts.

How about the issue of Brazilian sugar? Like many countries, we have limits on the importation of sugar, to make sure that our sugar producers are not undermined. But Brazilian sugar gets into our country through a loophole you can literally drive a truck through. Brazilian exporters send their sugar to Canada, where the sugar is loaded into molasses, so it becomes what is called stuffed molasses. The stuffed molasses are shipped to Michigan. The sugar is taken out of the molasses, and then the molasses are shipped back to Canada to get another load of sugar. That is how you move Brazilian sugar into the United States to undermine our sugar producers. Fair trade? No. Is anybody willing to do anything about it? Hardly.

My point is, time after time after time, these trade agreements leave us

in a situation where the trade is unfair—unfair to our companies and unfair to our workers—and our trade officials shrug and say: Tough luck. They just want to go negotiate another new agreement with some other country.

My message is very simple. How about fixing a few of the problems you have created? Just fix a few of the problems that have been created in the last 20 years in international trade for American companies and American workers before you go negotiate a new agreement. Just fix a few.

If someone had demonstrated to me they wanted to fix a few of these problems, I would be here on the floor saying, God bless you, hooray for you. But you can't find anybody interested in fixing them. That is why I don't think we ought to give fast-track trade authority to anybody.

What we ought to do is demand on behalf of our country, with respect to an exploding trade deficit that is going to burden every American citizen and every American child with future obligations that are outrageous—what we ought to do is demand some action on these trade problems.

Our negotiators just want to negotiate new trade deals. It's what they enjoy. I would suggest that they wear jerseys, like they do in the Olympics, that say "USA." I think our trade representatives would benefit by being able to look down, from time to time, and see whom they represent. Judging from the trade deals they have negotiated in the past, I am not hopeful.

Let me tell you of my firsthand experience with that. I have mentioned many times previously my experience with Canada. I was serving in the House of Representatives, at the time that we negotiated a United States-Canada free trade agreement. A Trade Ambassador named Clayton Yeutter led the negotiations, and then other negotiators in USTR completed the deal. They came back and said what a terrific deal for America, what a wonderful thing this United States-Canada free trade agreement is.

The deal was brought to the Congress under fast-track trading authority for a vote. The vote in the Ways and Means Committee was 34 in favor and one against, and I cast the single vote against the deal. I was told by everybody that it was imperative to get a unanimous vote in this committee for this United States-Canada free trade agreement. But I still voted against it.

Why? Because what these negotiators have done is to pull the rug out from under our family farmers. They have weakened the trade remedies for unfair trade. They have pulled the rug out from under us, and shame on them. I voted against it. But the agreement passed overwhelmingly.

Almost immediately, an avalanche of unfairly subsidized Canadian grain came rushing across the border, sold to us by the Canadian Wheat Board, a monopoly which would be illegal in this country. The Canadian Wheat Board

just flooded America with durum wheat.

As I have explained many times on the floor of the Senate, one day I went to the border with a man named Earl Jenson in a 12-year-old little orange truck with 200 bushels of durum wheat, raised on his farm in North Dakota, to take it across the border into Canada. All the way to the border were all these 18-wheeler trucks going south, dumping this grain into our marketplace. I bet we saw 20 to 25 18-wheel trucks in a matter of a half-hour bringing Canadian grain south.

But when we got to the border in that little 12-year-old orange truck, to try to take a small amount of durum into Canada, we were turned back. We could not do it.

Unfair trade? You bet you life it is unfair. It has been hurting our family farmers for years. No one is willing to do much about it.

Our trade ambassador just went through a long process investigating this, along with the International Trade Commission. USTR concluded that, yes, indeed, Canada is guilty of unfair trade—over a decade after we passed the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement. Yes, Canada is guilty of unfair trade; but what is the USTR doing about it? The USTR says that it will take Canada to the WTO. Which means that maybe your great grandchildren will see results—but maybe not—decades and decades into the future.

The fact is, once again, our country lacks the will, the nerve, and the backbone to stand up for American producers. The question is, when can our country expect that our Government will stand up for its interests? When will we tell our trading partners, you had better treat our producers, our companies, and our workers fairly because we will treat you like you treat us. If your market is wide open to us, then our market is wide open to you; but if it is not, then this country is prepared to protect and support its companies and its workers.

This country has fought for 75 and 100 years for some basic principles about fairness in the workplace. We have had people die on the streets in this country because of violence over the issue of the right to organize as a labor union. We have had a major battle over the question of child labor laws, major confrontations over the issues of whether a manufacturing plant can dump chemicals into the water and pollutants into the air. Big battles about issues such as the minimum wage.

So after many decades of hard-fought labor struggles, we now have a country in which you can organize. Labor can organize a union in this country. We must have safe workplaces. We will not allow people to hire 12-year-old children, pay them 12 cents an hour, and work them 12 hours a day in this country. We will not allow that. The question is, will we allow the importation of products that come from a country

that has 12-year-old kids, working 12 hours a day, paying them 12 cents an hour?

A group of us, when we consider the trade issue next week, will offer a range of amendments dealing with those issues: labor issues, environmental issues.

I am going to offer an amendment that deals with the issue of secrecy. The NAFTA tribunals that consider claims by foreign investors are still conducted secretly. This country should not be involved in secret tribunals. There is a responsibility to have those tribunals open, so people can see what is done in those dispute tribunals. I will have an amendment on that.

I regret that so-called trade promotion authority—TPA, as they call it, which is a euphemism for fast track—is brought to this floor as an amendment to an Andean trade bill. This is a very big issue. Having the Congress tie its hands and be unable to offer an amendment, as I was unable to do with the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement, is not in the Congress' interest or the country's interest, in my judgment.

Had I been able to offer an amendment to the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement some years ago, we probably would not have the kind of trade problems we now have, many with Canada in the area of agriculture.

We have used so-called fast-track trade authority five times. But we have negotiated many trade agreements without fast-track trade authority. Those who say you must have this to negotiate a trade agreement are just wrong.

We used fast track to negotiate, the Tokyo round of GATT, U.S.-Israel, U.S.-Canada, NAFTA, and WTO. I must say that after the last three, and also the GATT Tokyo round, we have seen a much, much larger trade deficit. We are not gaining ground; we are losing ground.

The question for this country and this Congress, as it confronts this issue in coming days, is, will we decide to handcuff ourselves and put us right back in the same position, where someone will negotiate an agreement in secret, bring it here, and say, "Oh, by the way, you have no right to amend it"? I hope we do not do that.

We have not used procedures that prevent amendments even on such things as nuclear arms agreements, which are very important, large issues. We have never had expedited procedures that prevent someone from offering an amendment, even on the most complicated nuclear arms control procedures and agreements we had with the old Soviet Union, and others.

So I do not think that we ought to consider granting fast-track authority to this President. As I said, I did not support giving it to the last President. I don't support giving it to this President.

What I would like to see, instead of fast track, is a demonstration on the

part of the administration and our trade authorities to decide they are going to fix some problems—just a few; I am not asking them to fix a lot of problems—demonstrate their interest in fixing some problems, and clean up the mess that was made, rather than running out to create a new mess.

I feel as strongly as anybody in this Chamber, I want China's market to be open to us, I want Japan's market to be open to us, and I want the European and Korean markets to be open to us, and, yes, Canada and Mexico as well. The fact is, they are not open to us now, and they are restrictive on a range of our products. The negotiations that we engage in, by and large, have not forced those markets open. The negotiations have not been successful.

I think it is time for our country to try something different. We ought to have, as I said, a little backbone to stand up to these countries and say: If you are not going to allow our products into your marketplace, then, my friends, your products are not coming into ours. It is that simple. It is not about being punitive or about building walls or about retarding expanded trade that most of us want. It is just about prying open foreign markets.

You will not do that by being weak. You will only do it by being strong. And it is not being strong to send the same negotiators out to negotiate the same soft-headed kind of agreements we have had for decades, and then bring it back here and say: Oh, by the way, none of you men and women serving in Congress have a right to offer an amendment, not a single one. That is not being strong or thoughtful. That is being thoughtless in a way that, in my judgment, jeopardizes this country's long-term economic interest.

So, we will have a lot more to say about this subject next week when we turn to the specific issue, first on a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to the Andean trade bill, and then on subsequent cloture votes. There will be a great deal of debate. But, in the end, my hope is that enough Senators will agree that it is time for this country to do something different in forcing open foreign markets and forcing the components of fair trade to be central to our trade relationships with other countries.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. 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. REID. Mr. President, we have completed our difficult week, but we were able to complete the energy bill. I remind everybody that last night I proffered, on behalf of the majority, efforts to move forward with hate crimes legislation. That was objected to: And

also the terrorism legislation, which was objected to. We will renew the requests next week.

We believe the time has long since passed that we should have hate crimes legislation that becomes law in this country. Certainly, with all we have heard from the insurance industry, the real estate industry, and the financial industry around this country, it is high time we did something with the terrorism insurance that they have indicated is so badly needed. So we would be ready next week to move forward on that. I am disappointed that we do not already have an agreement that would allow us to move on that next week. It is certainly something that should be done.

The majority leader has, in the past month or so, been able to do dual-track legislation. As a result, we were able to get some action taken. During the time we were doing the energy bill, we passed the border security legislation. We also passed the election reform legislation while we were working on the energy bill. So the mere fact that we are going to the trade bill should not, in any way, stop us from beginning and completing work on hate crimes legislation and certainly the terrorism legislation.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for a period not to exceed 5 minutes each.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REGARDING THE CAREER OF JEFFREY KOPLAN M.D.

• Mr. HARKIN. I come to the floor today to recognize the accomplishments of an outstanding public servant, Dr. Jeffrey P. Koplan.

While it is a great loss to the Federal Government that he is leaving the Directorship of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, it is through his successful 26 years of public service that we have a healthier nation and world today.

I have come to know Dr. Koplan over the past 3½ years, during which he has so admirably led our country's premier disease prevention agency. I can say without reservation that you could not find a person with greater conviction and integrity. Dr. Koplan was the founding Director of the National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. As such, he led the nation to recognize the critical need for strong public health programs to address these leading causes of death and disability.

During his tenure, CDC has worked with a myriad of partners to raise and sustain immunization coverage levels

to unprecedented levels. That effort has resulted in the lowest number of vaccine-preventable disease cases ever recorded for many diseases. In fact, during Dr. Koplan's watch, measles transmission in the United States was interrupted for the first time ever. I do not have the time to list all of Dr. Koplan's accomplishments, but these few highlight the reasons that Senator SPECTER and I have worked so closely with Dr. Koplan in funding the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. He has been a model of cooperation between all levels and types of government working together to meet the needs of the nation.

On the personal side, I have come to know Dr. Koplan as: A man of great integrity and a scientist of great distinction; always putting the protection of people's health first—willing to make difficult decisions and take action on the basis of the best science available; recognizing the global dimensions of health—that infectious diseases, environmental hazards, bioterrorism, and chronic illnesses cross all borders—so we must learn from other countries and lend our support to them; and well known for his quick wit, extensive grasp of health issues, and complete dedication to CDC and its mission of protecting the health and safety, not only of all Americans, but the people of the world.

It is with regret and admiration that I say farewell to Dr. Koplan. He will be a hard act to follow.

Mr. SPECTER. I would like to echo the comments of my partner on the Appropriations Committee. Over the years, Senator HARKIN and I have funded the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and we've been able to watch its growth under the able leadership of Dr. Jeffrey Koplan.

Let me list for you just a few of his many successes while working at CDC and as its Director.

Perhaps most important was Dr. Koplan's ambitious and much-needed campaign to upgrade CDC's buildings and facilities, enabling the agency to better protect the nation's health and safety. He invited Senator HARKIN and I to visit the CDC labs in Atlanta, where we found our nation's laboratories in a deplorable condition. We've been happy to support his effort to upgrade these facilities and, if any of you had the same opportunity to visit the CDC labs, I'm sure you'll agree that this effort was long overdue and will serve this country well for years to come.

Dr. Koplan had many other accomplishments during his tenure at CDC including the establishment of a system that will take the pulse of our nation's health through a quick computerized disease reporting system to which local health departments will be linked; focusing the nation's attention on the obesity and diabetes epidemics threatening the health of millions of Americans; and summarizing patterns of tobacco use among women and