

right direction. I urge my colleagues to support its passage. •

#### ORDERS FOR JUNE 19, 1997

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 10 a.m. on Thursday, June 19. I further ask consent that on Thursday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted and the Senate then be in a period of morning business until 1 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes, with the following exceptions: Senator KENNEDY for 15 minutes, Senator TORRICELLI for 20 minutes, Senator COLLINS for 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Reserving the right to object, would the Senator allow me a couple of minutes so that I can check with another Senator? I may want to make a unanimous-consent request on another matter.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I will yield for the purpose of the Senator from West Virginia to propound a unanimous-consent request, and then I will resume following that.

#### STAR PRINT—S. RES. 98

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, on June 12, Senator HAGEL and I and other Senators introduced Senate Resolution 98, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the conditions of the United States becoming a signatory to any international agreement on greenhouse gas emissions under the U.N. convention. On that same day, in addition to Senator HAGEL and myself, 44 Senators cosponsored that resolution, making the total 46.

Since that time, 14 additional Senators have indicated an interest in being cosponsors. So I will read their names shortly. But in addition to requesting a star print of Senate Resolution 98, I indicate for the RECORD a substantive change in the resolution. It is required that there be a substantive change in order for there to be a star print. I want a star print to show the additional 14 Senators' names. The additional names are: Senator AKAKA, Senator COATS, Senator COCHRAN, Senator DOMENICI, Senator GRAMM, Senator GRAMS, Senator LOTT, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, Senator ROBB, Senator ROCKEFELLER, Senator SESSIONS, Senator SMITH of New Hampshire, Senator SPECTER, and Senator STEVENS.

Now, Mr. President, the substantive change would be in the form of an additional "whereas" clause. I will read it:

Whereas, it is desirable that a bipartisan group of Senators be appointed by the majority and minority leaders of the Senate for the purpose of monitoring the status of negotiations on global climate change and reporting periodically to the Senate on those negotiations: Now, therefore, be it".

That is the new "whereas" clause, and those are the words that would constitute the substantive change.

Therefore, I will ask unanimous consent that there be a star print of Senate Resolution 98 which will indicate the additional 14 Senators' names and the additional whereas clause.

May I say, parenthetically, that I think it would be good for the administration to know that there is an independent group of Senators who have status, who have been authorized by the U.S. Senate to monitor the developments and negotiations on global climate change, and who will be authorized to report periodically back to the Senate concerning those developments. That is the purpose of the additional clause, and I, therefore, make that request.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I will not object—let me again thank the Senator from West Virginia for his leadership in this area and the refinement of this Senate resolution, what he is doing. What now 61 Senators are saying is that this is a very, very important issue for this country, and to the world. And the Senate wants to be active players and observers in the development of this potential treaty because ultimately it gets here to the floor of the United States Senate for us to make that decision.

Senator BYRD has offered us tremendous leadership in this area. I thank him. Mr. President, I, too, know that you have become our leader on this issue, and I appreciate that. Thank you.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Chair will momentarily indulge me, may I say that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, Mr. HAGEL, will be conducting the hearings on tomorrow by this subcommittee which he chairs, the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee on this very subject.

I urge Senators to follow the conduct of these hearings. It is my understanding, in talking with Senator HAGEL that there will be subsequent hearings tomorrow. These will be important hearings, and there will be witnesses appearing who will have testimony that I think will be worthwhile to the Senate as it proceeds on the course of following the negotiations, having a voice in them, and, as it were, leaning over the shoulders of the administration as the negotiations take place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of the resolution that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia just spoke of. I applaud him. I associate myself with the kind remarks that the Senator from Idaho made because it is a very forceful tool, and is a very badly needed tool to make sure that our Constitution and our economy is protected.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will yield without los-

ing the right to the floor, let me also join him and the Senator from Idaho, and compliment the distinguished Chair, and my friend from West Virginia, on what is attempted here.

I just watched the statement today that, if this Tokyo plan goes through, all of our energy generating facilities just go right across the border to Mexico. They are excluded. So all our jobs will go down there. All our electricity will come from there because they are excluded and to the detriment of our people.

So I couldn't compliment the Senator from West Virginia more. He has been diligent in this, and I compliment him. And I just hope I can follow his lead. So whatever he needs from me, let me know.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank both Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the previous unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

#### DRUG FREE COMMUNITIES ACT OF 1997

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 65, H.R. 956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 956) to amend the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 to establish a program to support and encourage local communities that first demonstrate a comprehensive, long-term commitment to reduce substance abuse among youth, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

• Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today the Senate is giving final approval to the Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997. This bill will help protect our children from the deadly danger of drugs. By approving this bill, we are putting more resources in the hands of those who are making a difference in the fight against drugs: parents, teachers, coaches, and civic and religious leaders.

At the same time, though, the bill is fiscally responsible. In this time of tight fiscal constraints, we have created a bill that does not increase the Federal deficit by a single penny. The legislation simply redirects existing Federal funds from less productive areas of the drug control budget to community-based anti-drug coalitions with proven track records in the fight against drugs. What's more, the bill requires a financial commitment from communities that seek funds. The requirement of matching grants will force the communities to demonstrate an even greater commitment to fighting drug abuse before receiving Federal funds.

The Drug-Free Communities Act has attracted the support of more than 150 State and local law enforcement groups, churches, and other organizations. On the national level, it has been endorsed by groups as diverse as Mothers Against Drunk Drivers and William Bennett's Empower America. In my own State, the South Dakota Department of Human Services and Siouxland Cares have also committed their support. As these endorsements suggest, this bill represents a wonderful opportunity to provide meaningful help to community anti-drug coalitions in South Dakota and throughout the country.

I am extremely pleased that my colleagues are supporting this legislation to keep our children away from drugs, and drugs away from our children.●

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for bringing the Drug Free Communities Act to the floor today. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation—and I urge all my colleagues to support it today.

We face an epidemic of drug abuse in this country—particularly among children. Substance abuse by young people has more than doubled during the past 5 years, and children are beginning to use drugs at younger ages. This trend has major implications for public health, which include the dangers of long-term addiction and disease. There also are costs to society as a whole in the form of poorer educational achievement, lost productivity, increased health care costs, and higher levels of crime. The most important cost, however, is the tragic loss of the potential and aspirations of many of our young people.

During America's long fight against substance abuse, community-based coalitions have offered a way to turn this situation around. These coalitions have consistently shown that grassroots efforts to educate young people about the dangers of drug abuse do work. It is clear that a Federal drug abuse strategy must complement and enhance community actions wherever possible.

Recognizing the success of community-based programs, the Drug Free Communities Act will enhance programs that work by providing matching grants to community coalitions with proven track records. This is a sensible approach, because it builds on the hard-won, practical experience of people who have been in the forefront of the fight against substance abuse.

America's children are our most important resource, and substance abuse places them at great risk. The Drug Free Communities Act will enhance the ability of communities across the country to protect the health of their young people. This proposal has great potential for success and deserves our wholehearted support.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today to express support for the Drug-Free Communities Act and I would like to commend its sponsors, Senators

GRASSLEY, DASCHLE, DEWINE, and D'AMATO for their efforts in developing this important legislation.

Unfortunately, a recent poll conducted by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America indicated that younger and younger children are using drugs. This poll is only the latest evidence of a very disturbing trend of increasing drug use by young people. It is important that we act to stop drug use and to prevent the devastation that drug use will have on America's young people.

The Drug-Free Communities Act is an important step in this effort. This legislation provides local community groups, who have proven track records addressing teen drug use, with the funding they need to really combat drug usage. The Drug-Usage Communities Act creates an advisory commission, consisting of local community leaders, who will oversee the program and make sure that funds are directed to those groups that are successful in fighting drug use by America's children. The act provides funding only to those groups that can match the Federal dollars with non-Federal funds, ensuring that viable community groups will participate in the program and sustain anti-drug efforts as the fight continues. Lastly, the Drug-Free Communities Act requires no new funding. Funds will come from the \$16 billion Federal drug control budget.

This legislation is extremely important to the war on drugs. With the latest news that our efforts are flagging, that children are giving in to the temptation of drugs, we must fight back. The drug dealers are not waiting to approach our children, they never hesitate to make a sale. We cannot delay in fighting for them. We must reinvigorate the effort to protect our children. We must pass the Drug-Free Communities Act.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I'm pleased that the Senate is turning its attention today to the Drug Free Communities Act. As a cosponsor of this legislation, I want to thank Senator GRASSLEY for his leadership in developing the bill and the chairman for agreeing to move it through the committee expeditiously. This is an important bill for children and communities, and it deserves to be passed quickly and signed into law.

The Drug Free Communities Act will provide needed support to local partnerships, which play an important role in helping children and teens to resist drugs. My State of Wisconsin currently has 132 such community-based partnerships—groups of parents, teachers, community and religious leaders, youth advocates, and others who come together to teach leadership skills and provide kids with alternative activities and opportunities.

In Marshfield, WI, for instance, the Wood County Partnership Council has focused on activities to reduce drunk driving by teens. Programs sponsored by the council have included regional

teen institutes, parent to parent workshops, and general prevention training of community members.

In Milwaukee, Neighborhood Partners has developed grassroots neighborhood organizations which focus on preventing substance abuse and drug-related crime. These organizations have helped to establish neighborhood watch programs, after school tutorial programs, and block patrols. Two years after founding this partnership, the personal property crime rate in the targeted area fell by 16 percent, as compared with a Milwaukee-wide decrease of 12 percent.

These are the sorts of programs that might apply for funding under the Drug Free Communities Act, in order to help support parents and other community volunteers reach more youths with their important messages.

No new funds will be appropriated under H.R. 956. Instead, funding for qualifying local partnerships will be diverted from the existing \$16 billion drug control budget. In order to ensure that the coalitions receiving these Federal dollars are sustainable, grants will be made available only to broad-based, local partnerships that have been active for at least 6 months, and are able to match their Federal awards dollar for dollar, with either cash or in-kind contributions.

Supporting locally-based prevention initiatives is a critical piece of a comprehensive drug control strategy. The Judiciary Committee, on which I sit, spends a good deal of time addressing issues of crime that stem from youth and adult drug use. I'm pleased that today the Senate is focusing, in a bipartisan way, on preventing the root cause of so much crime, by supporting parents and localities in their efforts to prevent youth drug use.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I will not object—there is no objection on this side. I would like to note that the distinguished Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, who is unable to be here this evening, is a cosponsor of this legislation and endorses it highly.

I have no objection.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I might go beyond that and say this has very, very broad bipartisan support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 956) was passed.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate has passed H.R. 956, the Drug Free Communities Act of 1997, today. Earlier this month, this same bill was approved by a vote of 420 to 1 in the other body. As you know, I, along with 18 of my colleagues, introduced a companion version of this legislation in the Senate

earlier this year. By the close of business today, this legislation has garnered a total of 29 cosponsors.

Mr. President, this is an outstanding show of support for this important piece of legislation. When each of us return home over recess, we meet with the people that we represent. We listen to their problems, and we listen to their solutions. And when we talk about drugs, and talk about what can be done to keep our kids from using drugs, it always comes back to the community. What matters most is what parents, schools, churches, law enforcement, community groups, and businesses do, working together, to keep our kids drug free.

This legislation will support these efforts. It will allow communities with established coalitions, coalitions that have a proven track record, to receive matching funds to support their efforts. It will provide additional resources in the hands of those who make a difference; people that our children respect and listen to: parents. Placing resources at the community level allows parents, teachers, community, and religious leaders to use these funds to make a difference in the lives of our children, our future.

I want to thank my colleagues and cosponsors on both sides of the aisle. I particularly want to thank Senator DASCHLE, Senator DEWINE, Senator BIDEN, and Senator HATCH and many others for their support and efforts in moving this legislation.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, for the information of all Senators, for tomorrow's business it is the leader's hope that the Senate will be able to begin consideration of the very important Department of Defense authorization bill. Also, the leader is hopeful that the Senate will be able to consider the intelligence authorization bill. Therefore, votes can be expected to occur during the session of the Senate on Thursday.

I would remind all Members that there is a lot of work to be done before the Senate adjourns for the July 4th recess. Therefore, the leader would appreciate all Senators' cooperation in order to complete the business of the Senate in a responsible fashion.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. On behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the remarks of the Senator from Iowa.

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

#### DOD'S PROBLEM DISBURSEMENTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to talk about the Depart-

ment of Defense's [DOD] problem disbursements.

I have spoken on the subject many times in the past.

I would like to speak on it again today because the Pentagon's Chief Financial Officer, or CFO, Mr. John Hamre, claims he's whipping the problem.

His claims do not seem to stand up to scrutiny.

The GAO has issued a new report on DOD's problem disbursements. It is entitled "Improved Reporting Needed For DOD Problem Disbursements."

This report rips Mr. Hamre's claims to shreds.

In May 1996, Mr. Hamre claimed he had an \$18 billion problem. Now, it's \$8 billion and falling.

The GAO says Mr. Hamre is understating the problem by at least \$25 billion.

Mr. Hamre is blowing smoke to hide the problem.

He is falling back on the oldest trick in the bureaucrat's book: Redefine the problem to make it appear smaller.

He did it by administrative decree in December 1996.

His decree arbitrarily excludes huge chunks of problem disbursements from official reports to Congress.

He just waved his magic wand and shrunk the universe.

It is not smaller because he cleaned up the books or reconciled delinquent accounts.

He did not do any oldtime book-keeping to get the job done.

In fact, he did not get the job done. He just wants us to think the did.

Mr. President, to understand what Mr. Hamre is up to, we need to understand problem disbursements. What are they, and why are they a problem?

The GAO says there are three types of problem disbursements: in-transit disbursements, unmatched disbursement, negative unliquidated obligations or NULO's.

An in-transit disbursement is one that is floating in limbo.

The check was written and the bill was paid. But the payment has not been posted to an account.

If Mr. Hamre were on the ball, there would be no in-transits. Transactions should be recorded as they occur. That's basic accounting 101 stuff.

That's how businesses operate.

The Pentagon's accounting guru—Mr. Keevey—says that's the right way to do it. I quote Mr. Keevey:

Under a good finance and accounting network, you would never make a payment until you check it against the underlying obligation and the underlying records.

If DOD practiced what Mr. Keevey preaches, there would be no problem disbursements. Period.

Congress has been telling DOD to do exactly the same thing every year for the last 3 years.

Section 8106 of last year's appropriations bill says:

Match disbursements with obligations before making payments.

But the bureaucrats complain: "No can do. It's just too hard."

They think it's normal for disbursements to float in limbo for up to 120 days or even longer. For them, a disbursement floating in outer space for 4 months is OK.

It's not a problem disbursement under Mr. Hamre's exclusion policy.

Here's a prime example of how well Mr. Hamre's policy works.

The GAO discovered, for example, that DOD excludes certain "recurring and routine" transactions.

Mr. President, you should see what the GAO found in the Pentagon's "recurring and routine" basket?

The GAO discovered \$4.5 billion of payroll disbursements from automated teller machines or ATM's that were once located on Navy ships.

They just weren't very fresh.

They were so old that their points of origin had disappeared off the face of the Earth. The ships that carried the ATM's have been decommissioned.

Time passed them by.

Most of these ATM transactions were at least 2 years old but some dated back to January 1988, or 9 years ago.

To the average citizen, a check that is not recorded in a checkbook register for 9 years just might be a problem.

But not to Mr. Hamre.

He says it's "normal and routine" for a disbursement to float around in outer space for 9 years. "It's OK. It doesn't count. Not to worry."

Unmatched disbursements are more troublesome than in-transits.

When in-transits finally reach the accountant's desk, the accountant tries to match the disbursement with its corresponding obligation.

An obligation is like a contractual commitment of money.

When a corresponding obligation cannot be identified, you have a problem—an unmatched disbursement.

In some cases, the hookup is made. Sometimes it takes months or even years. And sometimes, the match is never made.

That's an unmatchable disbursement.

That happens when supporting documentation has disappeared.

When you have a check and no supporting documentation, you have a hot potato.

That's a problem, Mr. President. It's a big problem for anyone responsible for controlling public money.

CFO Hamre found a quick and easy cure for this ugly wart. He just lopped it off.

In 1995, he literally wrote off billions of dollars in unmatchable disbursements.

He just wiped them clean off the books. Problem solved.

When Mr. Hamre did this, I came to the floor and criticized him for doing it. I thought it set a terrible precedent.

Maybe Mr. Hamre had no choice, but when you write off billions of dollars of disbursements, some heads should roll. And it should never happen again.

Sadly, no one was held accountable.