

They should expect votes, obviously, on this Monday and on this Friday. There is even a possibility that we will have to go over in session on Saturday to resolve the State, Justice, Commerce appropriations bill and/or the tuna-dolphin bill. Then we will have votes the following Monday and we will have votes, if necessary, on Friday of next week, so that we can complete action on these two very critical conference reports. But I feel very good about the prospects of doing that. There are those who are concerned right now, can we complete that work. I think the way to do it is just redouble our efforts and develop the attitude that we are going to complete action. I know the President and his administration wants us to get this done before we leave for the August district and State work periods.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

#### TRIBUTE TO DAN GABLE, UNIVERSITY OF IOWA WRESTLING COACH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, too many times in our world today we settle for mediocrity, we settle for just enough to get by. But today, I rise to pay tribute to an Iowan who has never settled for anything less than excellence. I am referring to Dan Gable, head wrestling coach at the University of Iowa. Dan recently announced that he will be taking a year off and turning his coaching duties to others. I think this is the right time to look at the impressive record of Dan Gable.

Many of you may recognize Dan's name because of his legendary accomplishments in the sport of wrestling. Dan reached the very pinnacle of this sport in the late 1960's and has stayed there ever since. As a competitor, Dan compiled a nearly flawless record of 182-1 in his prep and college career. Dan was a three time all-American and three time Big Eight Champion.

After college, Dan went on to win titles at the Pan American Games and world championships. Dan also demonstrated his superiority in wrestling when he won a gold medal at the 1972 Olympics.

His accomplishments as a coach are no less stellar. Teams coached by Dan

have an amazing 355-21-5 record. He has coached 152 all-Americans, 45 national champions, 106 Big Ten champions, and 10 Olympians, including four gold medalists. To say Dan is a living legend in his chosen field is not an overstatement.

But even more admirable is how Dan has handled being at the top of his field for nearly 30 years. We regularly hear about athletes involved in scandal after scandal—so much that we hardly raise an eyebrow when the newest controversy makes headlines. But Dan has always conducted himself with dignity and a refreshing lack of arrogance. Dan has imparted in the wrestlers he has coached an appreciation of hard work, perseverance, graciousness, and calm under pressure. If you believe there are no more role models, then you must not know about Dan Gable. I hope my statement might help correct that misbelief. Dan Gable exemplifies the notion that to be a true winner is not just about scoring the most points; it means carrying the title of winner with integrity and character. Dan Gable has certainly done that.

I thank him for the credit he has brought to his family, his community, his sport, and the State of Iowa, and wish him the very best in all his future plans. I know he will continue to approach whatever he does with the same commitment and hard work he always has in the past.

#### SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to set the record straight.

Defense Week reports that I made inaccurate statements during the recent debate on the Boxer-Grassley-Harkin amendment on executive compensation.

The article was written by Mr. Tony Capaccio and appears in the July 14 issue of his publication.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that portion of the Defense Week article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SENATE REJECTS MAVERICK MEASURE

In endorsing the committee proposal, the Senate in a 83-16 vote rejected an amendment by Sens. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.), Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) and his Democrat counterpart Tom Harkin.

Their amendment would have made permanent a \$200,000 cap applicable to all government contractors and not just the top five in a headquarters or division.

In their floor debate, Boxer and Grassley singled out as an example of the 1995 law's problems the compensation packages of five top McDonnell Douglas Corp. corporate officers, examined by a July 8 report GAO report.

The MDC executives, labeled Nos. 1 through 5, earned a total of \$14.8 million in 1995, according to information contained in a March 31 DCAA report and repeated by GAO. Boxer and Grassley said the GAO indicated that based on the huge compensation packages, the 1995 cap was riddled with loopholes.

Grassley declined to name the executives, saying their identities were "proprietary." Defense Week learned that the unnamed executives, followed by their 1995 compensation packages, are: CEO Harry Stonecipher, \$4 million; Chairman of the Board John F. McDonnell, \$3.9 million; then-McDonnell Douglas Aerospace Co. Executive Vice President & President John Capellupo, \$2.3 million; MDA Deputy President Herbert Lanese, \$2.3 million; and, then-Douglas Aircraft Co. president Robert H. Hood, \$2.2 million.

Grassley was inaccurate when he said during the floor debate that the Pentagon picked up \$9.2 million of the compensation.

That was the amount corporate MDC allocated to the overhead pools of divisions that had DOD contracts, according to government officials. That overhead would then be divided between commercial, general government and defense contracts.

It was not possible to trace how much actually the Pentagon reimbursed.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I think there is a misunderstanding, and I would like to clear it up.

Mr. President, I pride myself on always doing my homework and sticking to the facts.

So when someone accuses me of straying from the facts, I like to address the criticism head on.

I would like to resolve the issue one way or the other.

To do that, I went back to the place where I got the information in the first place.

That's the General Accounting Office [GAO] in St. Louis, MO—near McDonnell Douglas headquarters.

The man with the knowledge there is Mr. Robert D. Spence.

I went back to Mr. Spence to check and recheck the facts to be certain my statements were consistent with the facts.

The disputed information pertains to the amount of money the Department of Defense [DOD] pays out to senior executives at the McDonnell Douglas Corp.

I presented those facts during the debate over executive compensation on July 10.

The facts that Defense Week questions appear on page S7172 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This is what I said.

The DOD paid the top five executives at McDonnell Douglas a total of \$9,273,382.00.

I said the top executive got \$2,713,308.

To back up that statement, I will place a table in the RECORD.

This table was prepared by the GAO but the information came straight from the horse's mouth—the Defense Contract Audit Agency or DCAA.

The table shows how much each of the five top executives at McDonnell Douglas was paid by the Pentagon.

Now, Mr. Capaccio says that information is inaccurate.

He says the top five executives were not paid \$9,273,382.00 by DOD.

He says that is the amount allocated to the overhead pools of the company's many components or subdivisions.

He said that money would then have to be divided between commercial, general government, and defense contracts.

Mr. President, I hate to say it, but Defense Week is flat wrong.

As I said, Mr. President, I went back to the GAO and Mr. Spence to check and recheck my information.

It checks out OK.

My information comes directly from the DCAA.

First, to get the DOD pay figures for the top five executives, DCAA had to query the field offices at each McDonnell Douglas subdivision.

This was done to establish the split between DOD, non-DOD government, and commercial contracts.

This was done to isolate the amounts charged to DOD contracts.

That's what the GAO table does.

It isolates the \$9,273,382.00 as the amount allocated to components with DOD contracts.

DOD contracts—that's the key.

My numbers have absolutely nothing to do with general government or commercial contracts.

So that's a bogus argument.

Second, the dollar totals on the GAO table are not 100-percent accurate.

I will be the first to admit that.

They were not audited in every case.

But they are considered reasonably accurate. They're in the ballpark.

If the GAO and DCAA numbers aren't accurate enough, then Defense Week should produce a better set.

And it admits it can't do that.

Third, Mr. President, I need to clarify one point.

The Pentagon, for example, did not send McDonnell Douglas' top executive a paycheck for \$2,713,308.00.

That's not how it really works.

There are no individual DOD paychecks that go to executives; \$2,713,308.00 is the amount McDonnell Douglas is allowed to bill the taxpayers on DOD contracts for that individual's salary.

That is the amount set aside in DOD contracts for that individual's compensation package.

Once the amount is approved by DCAA, it is then apportioned across hundreds of contract payments.

It's doled out piecemeal in thousands of U.S. Treasury checks.

But it's there in those checks.

McDonnell Douglas got the money.

The money came from DOD.

The money was for executive compensation.

Just because it was a small part of a big payment doesn't make the money any less real.

It doesn't make it play money.

In the end, Mr. President, no matter how you slice it, DOD paid McDonnell Douglas' top five executives \$9.3 million.

I ask unanimous consent that the table I referred to earlier be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MDC ALLOCATION OF COMPENSATION TO COMPONENTS—  
TOP 5 EXECUTIVES

| Executive   | Total compensation for application of compensation cap | Total compensation \$250,000 | Amounts allocated to components with DOD contracts |
|-------------|--|------------------------------|--|
| 1 .....     | \$4,012,833  | \$3,762,833                  | \$2,713,308  |
| 2 .....     | 3,920,559  | 3,670,559                    | 2,646,773  |
| 3 .....     | 2,383,974  | 2,133,974                    | 2,046,481  |
| 4 .....     | 2,303,713  | 2,053,713                    | 1,833,604  |
| 5 .....     | 2,238,966  | 1,988,966                    | 33,216   |
| Total ..... | 14,860,045   | 13,610,045                   | 9,273,382  |

ACCESSING KIDS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, last year, many of my colleagues in the Senate had a great deal to say about the drug use problem in this country. This year, half way through the first term of the 105th Congress, not much has been said. I will not dwell on the reasons. But we need to recall that the reasons for being concerned about drug use in this country have not changed. In fact, all the indicators continue to point to a growing problem.

Just recently, the administration released drug use data in the Pulse Check, a twice-yearly publication on drug use trends and markets.

The information contained in the report is alarming. It confirms the continuing trend we noted last year of growing drug use particularly among young people. I want to share with my colleagues some of the information the Pulse Check shows.

Heroin use in most markets is up or stable, and availability is high.

There appears to be a trend of increased use among younger users, primarily in inner cities.

Cocaine use is stable, but availability remains high.

Marijuana use is growing rapidly and the onset of use is occurring at earlier ages.

Polydrug use, the use of more than one drug in combination, is on the rise. Methamphetamine use is growing and the quality is improving.

Anyone familiar with this country's last drug epidemic, a problem that we are still coping with, should be alarmed at what this information tells us. When you put these facts together with information from other surveys on use, hospital admissions, and trends, the picture is grim. Let me summarize briefly what we are seeing.

More kids at younger ages are starting to use drugs. In our last drug epidemic, use began typically with 16-year-olds. Today's trend is for drug use onset to begin with 12- and 13-year-olds. Along with this, more and more

kids are seeing less danger in using drugs. This fact, of course, leads to more experimentation.

Parents are not talking to their kids about drugs. Many believe that their kids do not listen to them. Many believe that TV and peers have more influence. Further, many of today's parents used drugs when they were young. They now feel ambivalent about talking to their kids about drugs. These parents don't want their kids using drugs, mind you, they just don't know how to talk to their kids. We know, however, that the most important source for kids on how to behave, to judge right and wrong, comes from parents. Not from TV, not from their peers, but from parents. But parents are not speaking up.

Public messages and national leadership on drug use have declined in the past 5 years. As we noted last year, the bully pulpit is empty. In addition, discussion of legalization in one form or another is on the rise. What this means is that kids no longer hear a no-use message. Instead, they hear mixed messages from government leaders and others. They see efforts to legalize marijuana under a thinly disguised claim of medical need. They see increasing normalization of drug use in movies, music, and on TV.

Is it little wonder, then, that we are seeing growing use of drugs among kids? This increase comes after almost a decade of decline. The decline of use among kids in the late 1980's and early 1990's was not an accident.

It came as a result of commitment by this country—by parents, schools, community leaders, politicians, and others—to protect our young people and their future from drugs. In those years, we undertook efforts to discourage drug use. To make it harder to get drugs. To roll back the notion that drug use was simply a lifestyle choice that caused no harm, except maybe occasionally to a user. It worked. But we are now in the process of squandering those gains.

We need to remember something about how we got into our last drug fix. The 1960's and 1970's was a period of collective forgetfulness about the harm that drug use does. It was not our first drug epidemic, it was our worst. It also did not happen by accident.

Neglect of our public responsibility played a part. Glorification of drug use by the popular culture contributed. A collective public amnesia about our experiences of earlier epidemics added to the mix. It was a period of exploring the limits of personal freedom. Unfortunately, it was also a period that