

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

abandoned notions of personal responsibility. Combined with an active lobby that pushed for drug legalization, those years laid the foundations for an explosion of drug use. Most of the burden of that use fell upon young people. Most of our addicts today, who burden our welfare and health systems, are the casualties of that period. They are paying the personal price but the rest of us are footing the bill. It is also no coincidence that our major crime wave began during the same years and is linked directly to growing drug use.

It was the double whammy of kids on drugs and crime on our streets that led to public demands for a speedy and effective response. It led to "Just Say No" and a concerted effort to reverse the trend and save a generation of young people. It worked. But now we are in danger of forgetting once again what we once knew: That drug use is not a victimless crime. That it is not harmless. That it is simply a matter of personal choice with no social consequences.

In the last several years, we have seen teenage drug use increase at an alarming rate. We have seen drug use messages re-emerge in the popular culture. We have seen major public figures and leading members of government equivocate on drugs or openly advocate legalization.

We have seen major financial figures pour money into pushing drugs-are-good-for-you themes. We have also seen the birth of MTV and the Internet. These media, aimed at kids, purvey in the most direct way drug use themes to kids of all ages. Today, access to kids by people who want to exploit them is unprecedented. Whether we are talking drugs or pornography, there is an open highway into almost every home in the country. Any household that is home to a tv or computer access to the worldwide web is accessible. You cannot lock your doors.

Currently, drug information sources on the Internet are dominated by drug legalizers. Their websites are easily accessed. They specialize in trendy formats and cartoon helpers. We hear a lot about Joe Camel.

Well, take a look at what those who specialize in drug legalization use. As a recent piece in the New York Times shows, drug messages aimed at kids are up to date, stylish, and accessible. High Times, which is one of the major drug legalization publications in the country, operates a site on the net. Their web page is available with only a few clicks from the main page. It is filled with lots of helpful tips. You can learn, for example, how to grow marijuana at home. It offers advice on how to evade or distort drug tests. You can find details on where to find the best drugs. Of course, to access these helpful hints, you have to certify that you are not a minor. But there is no way to check on this, so the certification is meaningless. There are many more, similar sites.

When you link this access to re-emerging drug themes in the music

most listened to by young people, it is not hard to understand that more kids are using. It is not hard to see why more kids believe that drugs are not dangerous.

These messages come at a time of another wave of ambivalence about drugs. They come at a time when leadership is lacking. They come at a time when many parents do not seem to know how to talk to their kids.

Close to 25 percent of the population of this country is under the age of 18. Forty-five million are under the age of 12. It is this population that is most susceptible to drug use messages. It is this audience that is most targeted with those messages.

We have all the ingredients for another drug epidemic. This one, however, will come when we are still coping with the walking wounded for our last fling with drugs. We are also seeing much younger kids starting to use. If we fail to respond, seriously and soberly, then our new drug epidemic will be worse than our last. It will also be the result of a colossal act of irresponsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BINGAMAN. I ask unanimous consent that a fellow in my office, Dan Alpert, be permitted floor privileges during the pendency of the Treasury, Postal appropriations bill.

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

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as if in morning business for up to 12 minutes.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 937 TO S. 1023

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, the amendment Senator MURKOWSKI and I have offered strikes section 630 of the bill. If enacted, section 630 would foreclose all Federal agencies from taking advantage of energy conservation programs offered by their local utility company. I believe section 630 would needlessly restrict an option that helps the Federal Government, the Nation's largest energy user, implement cost-effective energy-savings programs at Federal facilities.

Mr. President, the Energy Policy Act of 1992 set a goal of reducing by 20 percent the average energy consumed by the Federal Government. Federal facilities were given various approaches for reducing energy consumption. For example, an agency can sign an energy savings performance contract with an energy service company, or it can work with the local utility company to take advantage of utility-sponsored energy conservation measures. Under current law, Federal agencies may select the option that is best for their situation.

It is important to have this flexibility because working with the private

sector to reduce a facility's energy use is not an ordinary procurement. Purchasing energy efficiency isn't like buying paper clips or furniture. The Federal Energy Management Program has made substantial progress in streamlining the contracting process for energy management services at Federal facilities. If an agency chooses to work with the local utility company, it may go directly to the utility on a sole-source basis to obtain the energy efficiency and management services that are available to all utility customers. In most cases, the utility teams with energy service companies to maximize cost-effective energy savings for the Government.

Section 630 would eliminate the option of working with the local utility. If section 630 remains in the bill, Federal agencies will not be able to take advantage of the financial incentives, goods, or services generally available to all other customers of the utility. This could represent literally millions of dollars lost to the taxpayers. Section 630 could also prevent payments on existing energy management contracts between Federal agencies and utilities.

Over the years, I have spoken frequently here on the critical need for Federal agencies to make better efforts to reduce their energy use. According to a recent GAO report, the taxpayers' electric bill for Federal facilities is more than \$3.5 billion a year. There is no question we could be saving a substantial portion of this amount through cost-effective energy measures that frequently have payback times less than 10 years. I am pleased to see the substantial progress now being made.

For example, the Government's largest single energy user is the Department of Defense, which accounts for half of all Federal electricity consumption. The Department is now on a track to save up to \$1 billion per year in total energy spending by the year 2005. The Department of Defense believes section 630 would significantly reduce its authority and opportunity to take advantage of private sector energy conservation expertise and capital, and would, in fact, seriously reduce the amount of work offered to all sectors of the energy community.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter from Millard Carr of the Department of Defense be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BINGAMAN. Earlier, I described the options available to Federal agencies to secure energy management services. If I could Mr. President, I'd like to take a moment to give two examples demonstrating that the program is on the right track and illustrating the risks of hasty and ill-considered changes.

The first example is the New Mexico initiative from my home state. The