

place, but those who do should know this is going to be a rough place to run if you do not decide to bring this issue to a vote.

We brought it to a vote and apparently they got exactly what they demanded—a debate and vote. Before the President blames the Republicans, he ought to take a look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The vote was not a vote against national security. In an attempt to frighten people, the President accused those who opposed it of threatening the national security, that no thinking person could possibly oppose it.

Let me list for the Senate some of the people whom the President dismissed: Henry Kissinger, six former Secretaries of Defense, four former CIA Chiefs, former Federal weapons lab Directors, two former Chiefs of Staff, the President's own head of Strategic Command at the time the treaty was negotiated, three former National Security Advisers. It goes on and on.

This idea of isolationism is ridiculous. The idea of maintaining the U.S. military strength is not. That, in the view of many, gives the best opportunity for security.

Now we are involved, of course, in this question of campaign finance. It is a legitimate issue, a good issue. We have been into it before. We passed bills in the 1970s. We passed bills in the 1980s. It has not changed an awful lot. Some people suggest it has been blown completely out of hand. I suggest it is probably not true. The expenditures in the average congressional district have gone up about 3.6 percent a year since 1986. That is hardly runaway. It amounts to about \$1 per voter in most congressional districts.

But I believe—and, for myself, I think there is some consensus in the Senate—it is an important issue. I have said, and I continue to say, I support some changes. I would like to see more disclosure. It seems to me that is the most important thing. If there is going to be money—and, indeed, there has to be money—if people are to understand the issues and have a chance to speak out, to have the freedom of speech, to have the opportunity to participate, it has to be open. But I think there should be disclosure. There should be disclosure right up until the end of the election, and we can do that. We should enforce the laws already on the books, as is the case with many other matters of enforcement. I think we have to protect the constitutional rights of individuals to participate.

I would support some limit on soft money. I do not know how, constitutionally, that would be accepted by the Supreme Court. Nevertheless, I would set some limit and support that. But I would not support doing away with it. I would not support eliminating it. I would not support the bill as it is proposed now.

We can contribute to the integrity of the process and help return more confidence to it. I have thought about this a lot. People who support Members, or

people who are running, do so because of what they believe. They do not change their beliefs because they received some support. As you look around for whom you are going to support in the election, you support the person whose beliefs are similar to yours. I support things in my State—I suppose some people call them special interests—because they are important to my State. Those are the industries at which most people in my State work. Those are the kinds of industries that we need to have a vibrant economy. Of course I support those, not because of some contribution.

In summary, I wish we were in a little different situation in our relationship on both sides of this aisle and in our relationship with the White House, so we could really look at some issues, come out with what seems best to us as a group, and move forward.

On the other hand, I am very pleased with many of the things we have done. I can tell you, most people in my State, when we talk about doing all these things, have a limit in their minds as to what the Congress ought to be doing, what is the role of the Federal Government. It is not up to the Congress to solve every problem. On the contrary, we are better off to push more and more of that government closer to the people, where they can make the decisions, not the one-size-fits-all kind of thing some people here would like to have.

We are ready to move on and finish up. I look forward to it. I hope we can conclude our work and do the best things for the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The distinguished Senator from Iowa is recognized.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we continue morning business until the hour of 1:05. I think it ends at 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

PARENTS' INFLUENCE IN YOUTHFUL DRUG USE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I greet my colleagues with the often bad news of drug use by young people, and particularly with reference to the very important role of parents in preventing youth drug use. As I do occasionally, in my capacity as chairman of the International Narcotics Control Caucus of the Senate, I come to the floor to report on national surveys that go on in this area, surveys that have been going on for a couple of decades, so we are able to compare the incidence of increasing drug experimentation by young people as well as following trends we had in the last decade in declines in drug use by young people.

I seek the floor today to visit with my colleagues on this very same subject, as I have many times in the past since I have been chairman of this group of our colleagues who spend a great deal of time on drug problems generally and, of course, a lot of time on the issue of drug use by young people.

So, again, as happens at the beginning of every school year, there are these national surveys that are made public. Within the last month or so, several of these have been made public. That is what I want to discuss with my colleagues. There have been three national surveys released that tell the story of drug use in the United States, particularly among teenagers.

On September 8 of this year, the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse—that is called CASA, for short. Let me say it again: It is a National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse. That organization released its annual back-to-school survey on the attitudes of teens and parents regarding substance abuse. The survey stressed how essential it is for parents to get involved in their children's lives. The survey indicates that kids actually do listen to their parents. In fact, 42 percent of the teenagers who have never used marijuana credit their parents with that decision. Unfortunately, too many parents—45 percent—believe that teenagers' use of drugs is inevitable. In addition, 25 percent of the parents said they have little influence over their teen's substance abuse.

I suggest to that 25 percent that they ought to consider that 42 percent of the young people in America have already responded to this survey, saying they do not use marijuana because their parents have influenced them not to. And for the 25 percent of the parents who do not think they can have any influence over their teen's substance abuse, they would probably have considerable and beneficial influence.

CASA stresses how important parental involvement is. A child with a positive relationship with both parents is less likely to get involved with drugs. The survey also suggests that family-oriented activities such as eating dinners together and attending religious services together can reduce the risk of substance abuse.

The second week in September also marked the release of the annual Parents Resource Institute for Drug Education survey. That acronym is PRIDE, P-R-I-D-E. PRIDE's survey on teenage drug use. The survey also indicated the importance of parents' influence in shaping the attitude of teens regarding the harmful effects of drugs, just like the CASA survey.

Unfortunately, this past year the overall attitude among youth towards the harmful effects of drugs remains mostly unchanged. In fact, some attitudes worsened. Sadly, about 27 percent used an illegal drug at least once in the last year, and about 16 percent used drugs monthly or more often.

Moreover, the number of students who regarded cocaine and heroin as harmful has decreased from the previous year. We know that, as perception of risk of use goes down, actual use of cocaine and heroin goes up. The monthly use of cocaine by high school students rose from 3.1 percent to 3.2 percent, hallucinogens went up from 3.9 percent to 4.2 percent, and liquor—and we don't often think enough of a legal product, liquor, being used illegally by young people as being a problem—but it went up from 26.9 percent to 28.1 percent. Worse yet, beer tends to be a gateway for uses of these other drugs that eventually leads, by some young people, to worse drugs. Unfortunately, in this PRIDE survey, the number of students who said drugs cause no harm increased over the previous year.

So that message out there that is strong and hard and definitive and constant that drug use is bad, does work but not if it isn't consistently heard and reinforced.

The PRIDE survey reiterates that parents have the power to change these attitudes. Those young people who say their parents talk with them a lot about drugs show a 37 percent lower drug use than those students who say their parents never talk to them about drugs. Despite this statistic, less than 31 percent of the students say their parents talk with them often or a lot about the problems of drugs.

So we have one-third of the parents shirking their responsibility; and in shirking their responsibility, they are losing an opportunity to make a difference in whether or not their young people will experiment with drugs. Because we have that other survey that shows 42 percent of the young people in America do not use drugs because they have been influenced by their parents not to use drugs.

The last survey I want to refer to is a National Household Survey on drug abuse. It was released 2 months ago. It gives a very clear picture that we still have much work ahead of us when it comes to educating our kids about drugs.

The survey stated that almost 10 percent of our young people, ages 12 to 17, reported current use of illicit drugs. An estimated 8 percent of youths in the same age category reported current use of marijuana fairly regularly.

Unfortunately, this was not a significant change from last year. According to the survey, young people reported great risk of using cigarettes, marijuana, cocaine, and alcohol; and that percentage was unchanged from the previous year.

The disturbing fact is 56 percent of the kids, ages 12 to 17, reported that marijuana was very easy to get. And 14 percent of these young people reported being approached by someone selling drugs within 30 days of their interview for the survey.

Although these statistics seem daunting, we have made some progress in keeping drugs out of children's

hands. The National Household Survey—the last one I referred to—stated that the number of youths using inhalants has decreased significantly from 2 percent in 1997 to 1 percent last year.

The PRIDE survey reported that monthly use of any illegal and illicit drugs fell from 17 percent last year to 16 percent this year. Even more important is the fact that 60 percent of the students say they do not expect to use drugs in the future. And this is a 9-percent increase from the 51 percent last year.

There may be some hope shown in those statistics, then, that finally a message about “just don't do it,” “drugs are bad,” may be making some progress.

But we all know the war on drugs is tough and it is not one that will be won easily, but it is not one from which we in public life or within our families can walk away. Although these numbers and statistics remain exceedingly high, our efforts can make a difference and are not futile. I believe creating a drug-free environment for our youth is an accessible goal that we must work to reach.

Surveys such as these play an important role in measuring our progress and determining the work that lies ahead of us. It is clear that the public is aware of the problem and expects Congress and the administration to do their part in finding ways to make counterdrug programs work.

In a national poll on national drug policy, produced last month by the Mellman Group, the public supports effective drug control programs. As you can see from chart No. 1—if you would look at chart No. 1—the public particularly supports strong interdiction programs and consistent interdiction efforts. The survey shows 92 percent of the people questioned view illegal drugs as a serious problem in this country.

I will now refer to chart No. 2. The majority of individuals think drug use in this country is increasing. Few see it declining, in other words. So it seems obvious to me—and I hope to all of you—that the American people are aware of the problem and are eager for a more assertive national drug policy from Congress and from the administration.

When Americans are more concerned about the availability of drugs than they are about crime, we clearly need to take action. We cannot afford to let drugs devastate our country any further; we cannot afford to let drugs devastate any more young people. We have to be proactive in our efforts if we want to change these disturbing numbers that have come out in the CASA survey, the National Household Survey, and the PRIDE survey.

We do not need a miracle for our young people. We need a strong family life and positive role models to guide our youth in the right direction.

Education of the dangers of drugs starts at home. But it needs to be car-

ried over into all of society. Parents need help in sustaining a clear and consistent “no use” message.

In closing, I refer to an effort I am making in my State called Face It Together, an organization that tries to bring together all elements of our society.

There are two elements of our society—at least in my State—that I do not think have done enough to be supportive of families because the front line in the war against drugs is the home. We cannot, in the home, push it off on the school, off onto law enforcement, off onto substance abuse professions. That front line is the home.

But two institutions of society, in my State, I think, can do a better job. Maybe it is true of the other 49 States as well. Although it is more encompassing than just involving industry and business on the one hand, and the churches on the other hand in supporting families, that is where I want to concentrate my effort. Because most businesses and industries in my State have substance abuse programs, as a matter of necessity, for the health and well-being of their workers and to maintain the productivity of their workforce, we want those businesses that have a drug education and drug awareness program in the workplace to get their workers—men and women alike—to carry that message home and use it in the families, in the home, to support the effort which ought to be in that family already, of telling their children of the dangers of drugs.

The other place where I do not think we have used enough of our resources is in the churches of our State, for messages from the pulpit, and to use the institution of the church to disseminate educational information to, again, be supportive of the family—mom and dad—to keep that message strong back home. This is something we all need to work on.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, may I inquire as to how our time is being controlled? Do we have time limits?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are to return to the pending business, with no time limitations.

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the Chair.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 1999—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to consideration of S. 1593, which the clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A bill (S. 1593) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.