

on behalf of our country and its needs and its sectors that the Senator from Pennsylvania has talked about.

I just didn't want the moment to pass without expressing my support for this very fine individual, whom I have come to know and respect immensely over the last number of years. He has worked with Rubin in Treasury.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, just one further comment. Some of our most worthwhile floor discussions is when there is an exchange of ideas. So often comments go from protection of speech out into a vacuum. Like the old saying about college lectures in classes, it goes from the notes of the professor to the notes of the student without passing through the head of either. But when you have a discussion, it may be a little more informative. The executive branch is where it ought to start. But if there is not relief from the executive branch, then I look to the judicial branch.

The one conclusive item that I will note, because I don't want to take more than another 45 seconds, is in the enforcement of the civil rights laws. We could never have gotten desegregation in America if it was left up to the Congress or to the State legislatures or to the Presidents and the Governors nibbling at the edges a little bit. But when the case went to court, justice was done.

Mr. DODD. The Senator from Pennsylvania is absolutely correct. We need to have that judicial branch if we are going to really make the laws work ultimately. I appreciate that point. It is one well taken.

I agree with his point as well that if you are going to have antidumping laws on the books, enforcing them is the only way to live up to our obligations.

I appreciate his comments.

(The remarks of Mr. DODD pertaining to the introduction of legislation are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—RESUMED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1282) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Dorgan (for Moynihan) amendment No. 1189, to ensure the expeditious construction of a new United States Mission to the United Nations.

Dorgan (for Moynihan) amendment No. 1190, to ensure that the General Services Administration has adequate funds available for programmatic needs.

Dorgan (for Moynihan) amendment No. 1191, to ensure that health and safety con-

cerns at the Federal Courthouse at 40 Centre Street in New York, New York are alleviated.

Campbell/Dorgan amendment No. 1192, to provide for an increase in certain Federal buildings funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, pursuant to the consent agreement of last night, I send the following amendments to the desk for consideration and ask they be set aside.

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

AMENDMENTS NO. 1194 THROUGH NO. 1204

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like at least to give the names of the amendments: Senator WARNER, amendment on professional liability insurance for Federal employees; for Senator KYL, \$50 million for Customs Service; another one for Senator KYL, sense of the Senate for funding for the Customs Service; one for Senator JEFFORDS on child care centers in Federal facilities; one for Senator ENZI, the high-intensity drug trafficking areas; Senator GRASSLEY, funding for the Customs Service; Senator DEWINE, abortion services in Federal health plans; Senators LOTT and DASCHLE, conveyance of the land to Columbia Hospital for Women; Senator COLLINS, Veterans of Foreign Wars Stamp; Senator DEWINE, funding for the Customs Service; and Senator HUTCHISON of Texas, \$50 million for the Customs Service.

With that, I yield to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be numbered and set aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 1191, WITHDRAWN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. On behalf of Senator MOYNIHAN, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to withdraw amendment 1191.

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

AMENDMENTS NO. 1189 THROUGH NO. 1214

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I send a group of amendments to the desk pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement to have them offered by 12 o'clock. I will read their names: an amendment by Senator REID; amendment by Senator BAUCUS, amendments by Senators SCHUMER, MOYNIHAN, HARKIN; another from Senators SCHUMER, LANDRIEU, WELLSTONE, TORRICELLI, and LAUTENBERG.

I ask they be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments are set aside.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I now yield to my colleague, Senator COLLINS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1202

(Purpose: To request the United States Postal Service to issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States)

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS], for herself, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DORGAN and Mr. GREGG, proposes an amendment numbered 1202.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 98, insert between lines 4 and 5 the following:

SEC. 636. (a) Congress finds that—

(1) the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States (in this section referred to as the "VFW"), which was formed by veterans of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection to help secure rights and benefits for their service, will be celebrating its 100th anniversary in 1999;

(2) members of the VFW have fought, bled, and died in every war, conflict, police action, and military intervention in which the United States has engaged during this century;

(3) over its history, the VFW has ably represented the interests of veterans in Congress and State Legislatures across the Nation and established a network of trained service officers who, at no charge, have helped millions of veterans and their dependents to secure the education, disability compensation, pension, and health care benefits they are rightfully entitled to receive as a result of the military service performed by those veterans;

(4) the VFW has also been deeply involved in national education projects, awarding nearly \$2,700,000 in scholarships annually, as well as countless community projects initiated by its 10,000 posts; and

(5) the United States Postal Service has issued commemorative postage stamps honoring the VFW's 50th and 75th anniversaries, respectively.

(b) Therefore, it is the sense of the Senate that the United States Postal Service is encouraged to issue a commemorative postage stamp in honor of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Ms. COLLINS. On behalf of Senators CAMPBELL, DORGAN, GREGG, and myself, I am pleased to offer a sense-of-the-Senate amendment urging the U.S. Postal Service to issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The VFW will be celebrating its centennial in September of this year. This sense-of-the-Senate resolution is similar to legislation I introduced earlier this year which had been cosponsored by 59 of our colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that list of cosponsors be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the 71st was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. CON. RES. #12—COSPONSORS (59)

Senator Inouye, Daniel K.—02/22/99.
 Senator Roth, William V., Jr.—02/22/99.
 Senator Jeffords, James M.—02/22/99.
 Senator Torricelli, Robert G.—02/22/99.
 Senator DeWine, Michael—02/22/99.
 Senator Voinovich, George V.—02/22/99.
 Senator Helms, Jesse—02/22/99.
 Senator Cleland, Max—02/22/99.
 Senator Daschle, Thomas A.—02/22/99.
 Senator Abramham, Spencer—02/22/99.
 Senator Allard, Wayne—02/22/99.
 Senator Brownback, Sam—02/22/99.
 Senator Chafee, John H.—02/22/99.
 Senator Dodd, Christopher J.—02/22/99.
 Senator Enzi, Michael B.—02/22/99.
 Senator Fitzgerald, Peter G.—02/22/99.
 Senator Gramm, Phil—02/22/99.
 Senator Landrieu, Mary L.—02/22/99.
 Senator Thurmond, Strom—02/22/99.
 Senator Specter, Arlen—02/22/99.
 Senator Durbin, Richard J.—02/22/99.
 Senator Hagel, Chuck—02/22/99.
 Senator Inhofe, James M.—02/22/99.
 Senator Biden, Joseph R., Jr.—02/22/99.
 Senator Lott, Trent—02/22/99.
 Senator Sessions, Jeff—02/22/99.
 Senator Snowe, Olympia J.—02/22/99.
 Senator Hatch, Orrin G.—02/22/99.
 Senator Lincoln, Blanche—02/22/99.
 Senator Lugar, Richard G.—04/14/99.
 Senator Nickles, Don—02/22/99.
 Senator Frist, Bill—02/22/99.
 Senator Rockefeller, John D., IV—02/22/99.
 Senator Kerry, John F.—02/22/99.
 Senator Coverdell, Paul—02/22/99.
 Senator Shelby, Richard C.—02/22/99.
 Senator Robb, Charles S.—02/22/99.
 Senator Conrad, Kent—02/22/99.
 Senator Grassley, Charles E.—02/22/99.
 Senator Akaka, Daniel K.—02/22/99.
 Senator Baucus, Max—02/22/99.
 Senator Bryan, Richard H.—02/22/99.
 Senator Craig, Larry E.—02/22/99.
 Senator Domenici, Pete V.—02/22/99.
 Senator Feingold, Russell, D.—02/22/99.
 Senator Gorton, Slade—02/22/99.
 Senator Gregg, Judd—02/22/99.
 Senator Stevens, Ted—02/22/99.
 Senator Wellstone, Paul D.—02/22/99.
 Senator Ashcroft, John—02/22/99.
 Senator Warner, John W.—02/22/99.
 Senator Reid, Harry M.—02/22/99.
 Senator Boxer, Barbara—02/22/99.
 Senator Grams, Rod—02/22/99.
 Senator Kennedy, Edward M.—02/22/99.
 Senator Lautenberg, Frank R.—02/22/99.
 Senator Wyden, Ron—02/22/99.
 Senator Crapo, Michael D.—02/22/99.
 Senator Murray, Patty—04/14/99.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, as a member of the VFW Ladies Auxiliary post in Caribou, ME, and as the daughter of a World War II veteran who was wounded twice in combat, I am honored to lead the charge for this worthwhile legislation.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars traces its roots back to 1899, when veterans of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection returned home and banded together to establish a handful of local organizations intended to help secure medical care and pensions for their military service. These original foreign service organizations gradually grew in number and influence and in 1914 came to be known collectively as the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Mr. President, it was several years later, on June 24, 1921, when the VFW's chapter in my home State of Maine was chartered. Today, there are 84

VFW posts in Maine to which over 16,000 veterans belong.

Those small groups of veterans who organized in 1899 have today grown to over 2 million strong. During that time, VFW members have fought in every war, conflict, and military intervention in which the United States has been engaged during this century.

As we near the start of a new millennium, the VFW's members continue to live by the organization's creed of "Honor the dead by helping the living." They do so by representing the interests of veterans across the nation through an established network of trained service officers who, at no charge, help millions of veterans and their dependents secure the educational benefits, disability compensation, pension, and health care services to which they are rightfully entitled as a result of their distinguished service to our country.

This service also extends beyond veterans. The VFW's Community Service Program, through members in its 10,000 posts, serves communities, states, and the nation. During the past program year, for example, the VFW, working side by side with its Ladies Auxiliary, contributed nearly 13 million hours of volunteer service and donated nearly \$55 million to a variety of community projects. In addition, the VFW helps young men and women attend college by providing more than \$2.6 million in scholarships annually.

Mr. President, this Sunday, on the Fourth of July, we will celebrate the 223rd anniversary of the founding of the United States of America. I can think of no more appropriate time to honor the brave men and women who, while far from home, sacrificed so much that the dreams of our founding fathers might become, and remain, a reality. By urging the U.S. Postal Service to issue a commemorative stamp honoring the VFW's 100th anniversary, as was done for its 50th and 75th anniversaries, the Senate can take a small step toward remembering their service and showing our deep appreciation for their unwavering commitment to our country, both in peacetime and in times of conflict.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for working with me on this amendment. It is my understanding the amendment has been cleared and that it is acceptable to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. As a life member of the VFW myself, and a sponsor of this amendment, I think it is an important statement to make, as my friend said, as we move to the Fourth of July weekend. I am happy to accept this amendment.

I yield to Senator DORGAN.

Mr. DORGAN. I think it is a good amendment. I have asked consent to be added as a cosponsor. I am happy to support the efforts of the Senator from Maine, and we have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1202) was agreed to.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank my colleagues for their support and cooperation.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, seeing no other Senators on the floor, I announce we would like to have them come down and offer their amendments. We will be happily expecting them.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. 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. DORGAN. Mr. President, I will ask that a letter from Barry McCaffrey, Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, be printed in the RECORD. General McCaffrey has written to me and, I am sure, the chairman of the subcommittee because he is concerned about the funding level for the National Youth Antidrug Media Campaign.

As we indicated yesterday, that campaign will be funded in the subcommittee mark at \$145.5 million. That is about \$49 million below the administration's request.

General McCaffrey has a number of observations about that and makes the point in his letter that he hopes, in this process between the Senate and the House, somehow those funds might be restored to full funding at the President's request.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY,

Washington, DC, June 30, 1999.

Hon. BYRON L. DORGAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DORGAN The purpose of this letter is to bring to your attention a precarious funding recommendation for the FY 2000 appropriation for the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. This drug-prevention initiative is the centerpiece of the national effort to educate America's sixty-eight million children and adolescents about the risks associated with illegal drugs. Thanks to the Congress' full support of the campaign over the past two years, we have succeeded in harnessing the full power of modern media—from television to the Internet to sports marketing—to provide accurate and effective anti-drug information to children, adolescents, parents, and other adult influences.

We are pleased with the results obtained since the campaign was launched eighteen months ago.

The campaign's messages are being heard. 95 percent of our youth target audience is receiving an average of 6.8 messages a week. Among African American youth, we are doing even better—reaching 95 percent of the young people 7.8 times per week, 94 percent

of Hispanic youth are receiving messages in Spanish 4.8 times per week.

Our children are becoming more aware of the risks and dangers of drugs. Teens are indicating in response to surveys that campaign ads are providing them new information, increasing their awareness of the dangers associated with drugs, and making them less likely to try or use drugs. Parents state that the ads are providing new information and making them aware of the effects of drugs on their children.

The private sector is matching the federal government's investment. Over the past year, corporate America has provided \$217 million in pro-bono advertising and in-kind contributions. In the past twelve months, the campaign has generated 47,000 public service announcements and resulted in thirty-two network television shows including anti-drug messages.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended that the media campaign be funded at 25 percent below our request in FY 2000—\$145.5 million, \$49.5 million below the administration's request. This funding level would not allow the campaign to reach adolescents and parents with the message frequency required to fundamentally change attitudes towards illegal drugs and, eventually, reduce drug use by vulnerable adolescents and teens. The Committee's additional recommendation that \$49 million of proposed FY 2000 funds not be available to the Campaign until the final day of the fiscal year would result in a de facto 48 percent cut in campaign funds.

Now is not the time to make cuts in the Media Campaign. We are at a critical juncture in time. Drug use by our teens skyrocketed between 1992 and 1996 as risk perception declined. In the past two years, the Monitoring the Future survey and the National Household Survey of Drug Abuse suggest that our children are becoming more aware of the risks posed by illegal drugs and that adolescent drug use rates are declining. This campaign can be a catalyst for lower drug use rates by our children.

We need your leadership to ensure that the full Senate restores funding to the requested amount of \$195 million in FY 2000 for the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. This is a sound investment in the well being of our sixty-eight million young people.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, also, to add to the comments made by Senator CAMPBELL, I believe we had something in the neighborhood of 20 amendments that were filed. The unanimous consent agreement required that amendments be filed by noon today. This subcommittee on appropriations has now, I believe, close to 20 amendments, perhaps 21 amendments, that have been filed. It is, I know, the intention and the interest of the leadership—the majority leader and Senator DASCHLE as well—to move ahead and finish this bill and finish some other business today.

My hope is that Members who have offered amendments—in fact, all the amendments have been filed on behalf of other Senators by Senator CAMPBELL and myself. I hope very much that those who asked us to file an amendment on their behalf will come now to the floor and offer those amendments so we can proceed to get through this piece of legislation.

Of the 20 amendments, some likely will be worked out, some will perhaps need votes. Senator CAMPBELL is absolutely correct, this is the right time for

people on whose behalf we have offered these amendments to come to the floor and begin debating them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1201

Purpose: To authorize the conveyance to the Columbia Hospital for Women of a certain parcel of land in the District of Columbia

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I call up the Lott-Daschle amendment No. 1201, the conveyance of land to the Columbia Hospital for Women, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] for Mr. LOTT, for himself and Mr. DASCHLE, proposes an amendment numbered 1201.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN.

(a) **ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES.**—Subject to subsection (f) and such terms and conditions as the Administrator of General Services (in this section referred to as the "Administrator") shall require in accordance with this section, the Administrator shall convey to the Columbia Hospital for Women (formerly Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-In Asylum; in this section referred to as "Columbia Hospital"), located in Washington, District of Columbia, for \$14,000,000 plus accrued interest to be paid in accordance with the terms set forth in subsection (d), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those pieces or parcels of land in the District of Columbia, described in subsection (b), together with all improvements thereon and appurtenances thereto. The purpose of this conveyance is to enable the expansion by Columbia Hospital of its Ambulatory Care Center, Betty Ford Breast Center, and the Columbia Hospital Center for Teen Health and Reproductive Toxicology Center.

(b) **PROPERTY DESCRIPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The land referred to in subsection (a) was conveyed to the United States of America by deed dated May 2, 1888, from David Fergusson, widower, recorded in liber 1314, folio 102, of the land records of the District of Columbia, and is that portion of square numbered 25 in the city of Washington in the District of Columbia which was not previously conveyed to such hospital by the Act of June 28, 1952 (66 Stat. 287; chapter 486).

(2) **PARTICULAR DESCRIPTION.**—The property is more particularly described as square 25, lot 803, or as follows: all that piece or parcel of land situated and lying in the city of Washington in the District of Columbia and

known as part of square numbered 25, as laid down and distinguished on the plat or plan of said city as follows: beginning for the same at the northeast corner of the square being the corner formed by the intersection of the west line of Twenty-fourth Street Northwest, with the south line of north M Street Northwest and running thence south with the line of said Twenty-fourth Street Northwest for the distance of two hundred and thirty-one feet ten inches, thence running west and parallel with said M Street Northwest for the distance of two hundred and thirty feet six inches and running thence north and parallel with the line of said Twenty-fourth Street Northwest for the distance of two hundred and thirty-one feet ten inches to the line of said M Street Northwest and running thence east with the line of said M Street Northwest to the place of beginning two hundred and thirty feet and six inches together with all the improvements, ways, easements, rights, privileges, and appurtenances to the same belonging or in anywise appertaining.

(c) **DATE OF CONVEYANCE.**—

(1) **DATE.**—The date of the conveyance of property required under subsection (a) shall be the date upon which the Administrator receives from Columbia Hospital written notice of its exercise of the purchase option granted by this section, which notice shall be accompanied by the first of 30 equal installment payments of \$869,000 toward the total purchase price of \$14,000,000, plus accrued interest.

(2) **DEADLINE FOR CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY.**—Written notification and payment of the first installment payment from Columbia Hospital under paragraph (1) shall be ineffective, and the purchase option granted Columbia Hospital under this section shall lapse, if that written notification and installment payment are not received by the Administrator before the date which is 1 year after the date of enactment of this section.

(3) **QUITCLAIM DEED.**—Any conveyance of property to Columbia Hospital under this section shall be by quitclaim deed.

(d) **CONVEYANCE TERMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The conveyance of property required under subsection (a) shall be consistent with the terms and conditions set forth in this section and such other terms and conditions as the Administrator deems to be in the interest of the United States, including—

(A) the provision for the prepayment of the full purchase price if mutually acceptable to the parties;

(B) restrictions on the use of the described land for use of the purposes set out in subsection (a);

(C) the conditions under which the described land or interests therein may be sold, assigned, or otherwise conveyed in order to facilitate financing to fulfill its intended use; and

(D) the consequences in the event of default by Columbia Hospital for failing to pay all installments payments toward the total purchase price when due, including revision of the described property to the United States.

(2) **PAYMENT OF PURCHASE PRICE.**—Columbia Hospital shall pay the total purchase price of \$14,000,000, plus accrued interest over the term at a rate of 4.5 percent annually, in equal installments of \$869,000, for 29 years following the date of conveyance of the property and receipt of the initial installment of \$869,000 by the Administrator under subsection (c)(1). Unless the full purchase price, plus accrued interest, is prepaid, the total amount paid for the property after 30 years will be \$26,070,000.

(e) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Amounts received by the United States as payments under this section shall be paid into the fund established by section 210(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(f)), and may be expended by the Administrator for real property management and related activities not otherwise provided for, without further authorization.

(f) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The property conveyed under subsection (a) shall revert to the United States, together with any improvements thereon—

(A) 1 year from the date on which Columbia Hospital defaults in paying to the United States an annual installment payment of \$869,000, when due; or

(B) immediately upon any attempt by Columbia Hospital to assign, sell, or convey the described property before the United States has received full purchase price, plus accrued interest.

The Columbia Hospital shall execute and provide to the Administrator such written instruments and assurances as the Administrator may reasonably request to protect the interests of the United States under this subsection.

(2) RELEASE OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—The Administrator may release, upon request, any restriction imposed on the use of described property for the purposes of paragraph (1), and release any reversionary interest of the United States in the property conveyed under this subsection only upon receipt by the United States of full payment of the purchase price specified under subsection (d)(2).

(3) PROPERTY RETURNED TO THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.—Any property that reverts to the United States under this subsection shall be under the jurisdiction, custody and control of the General Services Administration shall be available for use or disposition by the Administrator in accordance with applicable Federal law.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This amendment has been cleared on both sides of the aisle, and we are ready to adopt it. I ask unanimous consent the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1201) was agreed to.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1215, 1216, AND 1217

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have three amendments, two of which were to be offered by Senator GRAHAM and one to be offered by Senator COCHRAN. The amendments were left in the Cloakrooms on a timely basis but were not part of the submissions that Senator CAMPBELL and I offered before the 12 noon deadline. Senator CAMPBELL and I ask consent that these three amendments be considered timely filed and offered.

I send the amendments to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments will be numbered and laid aside.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1193

(Purpose: To enable the State of Rhode Island to meet the criteria for recommendation as an Area of Application to the Boston-Worcester-Lawrence; Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Maine, and Connecticut Federal locality pay area)

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment to the bill be called up at this time. It has already been laid down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], for himself and Mr. CHAFEE, proposes an amendment numbered 1193.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 98, insert between lines 4 and 5 the following:

SEC. 636. Section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(j) For purposes of this section, the 5 counties of the State of Rhode Island (including Providence, Bristol, Newport, Kent, and Washington counties) shall be considered as 1 county, adjacent to the Boston-Worcester-Lawrence; Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Maine, and Connecticut locality pay area and the Hartford, Connecticut locality pay area."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this amendment I am offering, on behalf of myself and Senator CHAFEE, deals with a problem that is particular to Rhode Island. The problem involves what is known as locality pay. That is the differential pay that Federal employees are given because of higher costs in the area in which they live and work. Essentially it is a comparison between the labor cost in the private sector and the Federal sector. If there are higher private labor costs, there is a differential added to the paycheck of the Federal employee in the particular area.

The problem with Rhode Island is, because of the complicated rules of allocation, my entire State is excluded from locality pay. So Federal workers who work in Rhode Island do not receive locality pay, even though their fellow workers, in some cases just a few miles away, in Massachusetts or Connecticut, receive this differential locality pay.

Now, the reason the rules disadvantage Rhode Island is, essentially, to

qualify for locality pay, you have to have at least 2,000 workers in a county and that county has to be contiguous to another locality area. This is a map of New England and parts of New York. Because of the high cost of labor in Boston and in these major areas, such as New York City and Hartford, CT, because of the concentration of workers, these areas in blue represent locality pay areas. However, Rhode Island has been, in a sense, discriminated against because, for one thing, the managers of this program have stopped the locality line about 4½ miles from the border, in some cases. In a county in which we have 3,500 workers—we have enough workers in Newport County, but we are not contiguous to a locality pay area. In northern Rhode Island, we don't have 2,000 people in a certain county, but we are contiguous to another area. So the combination of these rules of numbers of Federal employees and being contiguous to a high locality pay area works to the detriment of Rhode Island.

Let me suggest something else that also I think is unique in the situation of Rhode Island. We, I think unlike every other State in the U.S., do not have county governments. We don't operate anything on a county basis. Rhode Island is the smallest State in the Union, roughly 70 miles long and 35 miles wide. The concept of county is something that really is not apropos. When you look at some of the larger States in the country where counties are of sufficient size, where they easily accommodate several thousand workers, then it makes a difference but not in Rhode Island.

The proposal that Senator CHAFEE and I have developed is quite simple; that is, to consider the entire State of Rhode Island as a county. Frankly, in the context of the United States, it is about the size of many counties. If we had that change in the law, we would have a situation where our workers in Rhode Island—we have approximately 6,000 Federal employees —would, in fact, be in an area contiguous to locality pay zones and would qualify for the extra pay. What does this mean in the paychecks of our workers? Essentially, what they are seeing is 3.45 percent less in their 1999 paychecks than people doing the same jobs in New London, CT, and in Boston, MA. In fact, Boston is about 40 miles from Providence. So we have this awkward situation. In fact, we have people who live in Rhode Island and work in Boston for the Federal Government and get paid higher than their neighbors who live in Rhode Island and work in Providence, RI. So this situation is both unfair and, I think, unfortunate.

Our amendment would correct that situation and it would do so in a way which, I think, would not do great damage to the overall structure of locality pay throughout the United States. After all, we are talking really about a unique situation—the smallest State in the country, which has no effective counties in it as a measure of

any governmental type of activity. So I suggest very strongly that we approach this with a legislative solution.

I must thank both the subcommittee chairman, Senator CAMPBELL of Colorado, and also the chairman of the authorizing committee, Senator THOMPSON. We have been talking with both individuals and they have been most helpful, as have their staffs. They have suggested that we can probably, with their assistance, make more progress by simply today discussing and describing the issue and then relying upon our mutual efforts to try to derive some type of administrative solution to this issue.

Let me say one other thing that makes this a very compelling problem to us. This is not simply going out and saying I want to have my workers treated the same way their brethren and sisters are treated just 30 miles away; there is something else here. We find it, in certain cases, difficult to recruit Federal workers to come into the Rhode Island area because if they have a choice between going to Boston or to parts of Connecticut, or parts of Long Island, NY, in the same region, they will choose these other regions because they will automatically get a 3, 4, 5 percent pay increase, simply by choosing to work in Boston rather than working in Providence.

We have, in the past, tried to recruit individuals to come into our FBI and our Secret Service office, and many, many qualified people have said: I would love to work there. The challenges are there, the career potential is there, but the problem is, how can I turn to my family and say I am going to take a 3, 4, 5 percent pay cut?

This really affects our ability to recruit those individuals that we need—as anyplace needs—to effectively run our Federal agencies. So both Senator CHAFEE and I are concerned about and committed to this issue. First, we recognize that this is something that, with the cooperation and the help of the Appropriations Committee and Senator CAMPBELL, and the authorizing committee with Senator THOMPSON, and their ranking members, we hope we can make progress on the administrative front.

At this time, unless the Senator from Colorado has comments, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The Senator has that right.

The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business for up to 8 minutes.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dan Alpert, a

fellow in my office, be permitted floor privileges during the pendency of this bill and during the morning business time.

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

(The remarks of Mr. BINGAMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1315 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the time provided by the managers.

I yield the floor, and I 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. CAMPBELL. 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. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, while we are waiting for Senators to come to the floor with amendments, I would like to speak to two sections of the Treasury and general government appropriations bill that are, I believe, of great importance.

The first is called the GREAT Program—the Gang Resistance Education and Training, or GREAT Program. This is a program that is administered by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, in partnership with State and local law enforcement.

Unfortunately, gang activity has increased in our country in recent years, as the Chair well knows.

ATF has developed a program to give our children the tools they need to be able to resist the temptation to belong to a gang.

The GREAT program is only seven years old, but has already grown from a pilot program in Arizona to classrooms all over the United States—and in Puerto Rico, Canada, and overseas military bases. ATF estimates that about 1.7 million students have received GREAT training.

GREAT was designed to provide gang prevention and anti-violence instruction to children in a classroom setting. ATF trains local law enforcement officers to teach these classes, and provides grants to their offices to help pay for their time.

Needless to say, working policemen in classrooms do a lot to dispel the sometimes erroneous myths that children have about working policemen.

This program is having a positive effect on student activities and behaviors, and is deterring them from involvement in gangs. A side benefit is that the graduates seem to be doing a better job of communicating with their parents and teachers, and getting better grades.

Last year the Subcommittee on Treasury and General Government held a hearing on the GREAT Program. The highlight of the morning was listening to the students from Colorado, Wis-

consin, Arizona and a number of other States as they told about what they learned when they took the classes. It was very encouraging to hear how some of these kids actually turned their lives around because of this training.

For the second year in a row, the administration is requesting only \$10 million for grants for the GREAT program. Last year, Congress felt that wasn't enough to fund the many requests for help from State and local law enforcement and provided \$13 million for GREAT grants. \$10 million still isn't enough.

We are asking again in this bill to provide \$13 million. I urge my colleagues to support the effort of the committee to again provide \$13 million for grants to State and local law enforcement for this worthwhile and effective program.

The other section of the bill I would like to mention for the knowledge of my colleagues is what is called the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

This center was created in 1984, and is dedicated to finding every missing child and helping to prevent the abduction and sexual exploitation of all children.

Sadly, we are not 100 percent successful. Every year thousands of children are put at risk. In fact, every day in the United States 2,300 children are reported missing to different law enforcement agencies.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children works closely with three entities under the jurisdiction of this bill—the Customs Service, the Postal Inspection Service, and the Secret Service. I think it is important for my colleagues to be aware of the contributions of these different agencies.

In 1987, the Customs Service was the first Federal law enforcement agency to agree to be the contact point for tips and leads from the toll-free Child Pornography Tipline. Under direction provided by the committee, support for the Tipline will continue in the fiscal year 2000. This funding will be used for promotional brochures, public service announcements, and a campaign to educate teenage girls about the risks they may encounter and the ways to stay safer from crime.

In March of last year, the Customs Service and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children launched the new CyberTipline to allow parents to report incidents of suspicious or illegal internet activity. For the benefit of my computer literate friends, that internet address is "www.missingkids.com/cybertip."

The U.S. Postal Inspection Service and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children have a long-standing relationship in combating child pornography and sexual exploitation of children. For over ten years, information developed from the Child Pornography Tipline has been provided to the Postal Inspection Service for investigative purposes. In addition, the

Center has provided technical assistance when needed for specific investigations. The Postal Inspection Service has provided continuing assistance to the Center through training, development of publications, and outreach programs.

In late 1996, a cooperative agreement with the Secret Service Forensic Services Division resulted in the creation of the Exploited Child Unit. This unit focuses on combating child molestation, pornography, and prostitution. They raise public awareness about the problem of pedophilia and focus educational efforts on child safety on the internet.

This bill today gives ample opportunity to provide funding for both of these programs. This particular program will provide \$2 million for forensic support of investigations and \$1.996 million for the exploited child unit. This money will be well spent.

I know my colleagues will be willing to support this.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. 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. KYL. Mr. President, I ask of you, or the distinguished chairman of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee, what the process is to call up one of the amendments that has been laid down, specifically No. 1195? Do I need to ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending business? What is appropriate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to call up his amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1195

(Purpose: To increase by \$50,000,000 funding for United States Customs Service for salaries and expenses to hire 500 new inspectors to stop the flow of illegal drugs into the United States and facilitate legitimate cross-border trade and commerce)

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1195, dealing with the appropriation of additional funding for 617 Customs inspectors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL], for himself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. GRAMM, proposes an amendment numbered 1195.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 13, line 24, strike "\$1,670,747,000" and insert "\$1,720,747,000".

On page 15, line 6, before the period, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That \$50,000,000 shall be available until expended to hire, train, provide equipment for, and deploy 500 new Customs inspectors."

On page 49, line 13, strike "\$38,175,000" and insert "\$36,500,000".

On page 50, line 1, strike "\$23,681,000" and insert "\$22,586,000".

On page 53, line 3, strike "\$624,896,000" and insert "\$590,100,000".

On page 58, line 8, strike "\$120,198,000" and insert "\$109,344,000".

On page 62, line 26, strike "\$27,422,000" and insert "\$25,805,000".

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, this is one of the amendments which was offered during the subcommittee markup but which we did not pursue because we had not identified offsets for the additional \$50 million being requested, and we wanted an opportunity to try to work it out before the bill came before the Senate.

We have not really worked out all of the details of this. Therefore, I am informed by the chairman of the subcommittee he may not be able to support this amendment at this time.

It is my intention to at least begin the process on behalf of myself and Senator HUTCHISON, who hopefully will be present shortly, so we can begin the discussion as to how to find a way to fund some additional Customs inspectors, particularly to be deployed on the southwest border.

Before I describe the problem and the reason for this, I commend the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for a really heroic effort to save existing Customs inspectors.

What had happened is, the way the administration's budget had been prepared, it was going to fund existing agents out of a fee structure that never had any chance of being passed by the Congress or implemented into law. Had not the chairman and ranking member acted quickly to find other sources of funding, we would have lost 617 existing Customs inspectors, but they were able to find that money elsewhere.

As a result, those positions have been saved at least for now. Where that leaves us is exactly even, with no increase in Customs officers, despite the huge increases in the number of people and the amount of commercial traffic crossing our border, particularly in the Southwest.

What that means is we are just literally dead in the water despite the efforts of the subcommittee chairman, Senator CAMPBELL.

That is why we wanted to find an additional \$50 million to hire 500 agents—only 500 agents—for next year to help with this problem.

Let me describe a little bit the problem on the Southwest border. As you know, we passed NAFTA. NAFTA has enabled us to dramatically increase commercial traffic between Mexico and the border, our four border States of the United States. But even without NAFTA, we would still have an increase in commercial traffic as well as the daily traffic between the communities south of the border and the American cities on our side.

I was somewhat amused that my colleague from Michigan, Senator ABRAHAM, was very concerned about the situation on the Canadian border near Detroit. He was lamenting the fact we could end up with a situation where

there was a 2-minute delay for every car going through the border checkpoint—a 2-minute delay. Just think what that would mean with the large number of people who wanted to cross into the United States from Canada each day.

The reason I had to chuckle a little bit is, if we are successful, if we do get some additional agents, and the chairman of the subcommittee is successful in protecting what we have, our goal, stated by the Finance Committee, is to get to the point where we will only have a 20-minute delay per car at the Arizona border or at the Mexican-United States border.

A 20-minute delay every time you want to cross the border becomes onerous, particularly to people who live in the border communities and who every day cross the border for business or for family or pleasure reasons. There are literally hundreds and thousands of people who do that every day. This does not speak of the commercial traffic, which I will talk about in just a moment.

The point is, we are trying to get to a point where it only takes you 20 minutes to come into the United States or to go into Mexico. But we are talking specifically about coming into the United States. That is a very onerous situation when you are trying to promote commerce as well as more tourists coming to the United States, as well as families. So this is not something that is a luxury but something I think everyone would recognize is very important.

I will talk about some of the numbers because I think it is very instructive.

The traffic congestion at any of our border crossing points into Mexico—you just have to be there to see it. The number of commercial trucks, for example, that cross the border annually in my State of Arizona increased from 287,000 in 1994 to 347,000 in 1998. We do not have the personnel to keep up with that congestion.

For example, in San Luis, AZ, which depends very heavily on cross-border trade, you can easily wait 3 hours to cross. That is not unheard of at all, to sit there for 3 hours waiting to cross into the United States. This is during times when it is very critical, particularly for produce. Much of the commercial traffic that comes from Mexico to the United States is produce. It does not do any good for that produce to be sitting out there for 3 hours in the very warm sun south of Yuma, AZ, waiting to come in through the border crossing.

I ask my colleagues, if they had to wait 3 hours every time they wanted to get someplace on Capitol Hill, how long they would stand for it. Obviously, not very long.

We just don't have enough Customs inspectors, however, to staff that San Luis port even to stay open during some key hours. I point out, the commercial point is closed on Saturdays. So we are only talking about general business hours.

In effect, what ends up happening is, you get cancellations or reroutes hundreds of miles away to other ports when you have these kinds of long delays. The number of inspectors at this particular port of San Luis has increased. Do you want to know by how much it has increased? One inspector over the last 5 years. That is all. It went from 51 to 52. Obviously, we are not keeping up with the traffic.

The same is true of the port of Nogales, which is the largest port in Arizona. There the fresh produce industry is very big, both import and export. It is over \$1.5 billion a year. It is now the fifth busiest port on our Southwest border. But the Nogales port does not have enough inspectors. The number of inspectors there actually decreased last year by seven.

According to the Fresh Produce Association of America, there have been occasions, even during the low-produce season, where 6-mile truck backups have occurred down in Mexico. Just think about that for a moment—6 miles of trucks waiting to clear Customs. It is not at all uncommon for the truckers to come to the border and literally have to wait overnight before they can find a slot the next day to cross into the United States. And we are trying to encourage trade?

We understand that trade benefits people on both sides of the border. Obviously, we are not doing our part when the produce from Mexico cannot come into the United States because we do not have enough inspectors.

The lack of personnel on our borders is also a very serious problem with respect to the interdiction of illegal drugs and other contraband. As we all know, the Customs inspectors are really our first line of defense there. I have been on the border where you have these huge, long lines of traffic. Everybody is anxious to get through, and you just have a few ports with a few inspectors there struggling mightily to determine whether or not there may be some illegal drugs or contraband. We have given them some good high-tech equipment they can use, but it still requires manpower. Every week, they are able to stop some kind of traffic in which smuggling is going on, but they do not begin to catch even a fairly significant percentage of it.

Just to give you an idea what they have been able to accomplish, between 1994 and 1998 heroin seizures have gone up by 2,078 percent, marijuana seizures up 80 percent. It is clear that more Customs inspectors are needed to keep up with these increasing percentages of attempts to smuggle drugs and other contraband into our country.

As I mentioned a moment ago, the Finance Committee marked up its version of the Customs reauthorization bill not too long ago. In it, they approved legislation that Senators DOMENICI, GRAMM, HUTCHISON, and McCAIN, and I and other border Senators introduced, to increase the Customs personnel in order to reduce the

wait times there to better fight the war on drugs and to enhance commerce to 20 minutes per vehicle.

When we can't even provide the funding to get the wait times down to 20 minutes per vehicle, we are derelict in our duty; we are failing in our responsibility; and the responsibility is on the Congress of the United States.

That is why Senator HUTCHISON and I have introduced this amendment to add \$50 million for 500 inspectors. We may take one item out to make it \$49 million so that the offsets we have provided would be more easily supportable by our colleagues, but this is an increase of merely 500 agents with this \$50 million. That is what it costs to get the equipment and the training and get this number of Customs inspectors actually on line at one of our ports of entry.

The amendment, as I said, will actually permit the deployment of these agents during the next year to one of these points of entry where they are needed for the Southwest border.

Just to focus a little bit more on the specific need with respect to commerce there, should my colleagues be interested, the number of trucks crossing the U.S. border annually has increased from 7.5 million in 1994 to over 10 million in 1998. That is a 40-percent increase. More than 372 million people crossed either the United States-Mexico or United States-Canadian border in the last fiscal year.

But even with this huge increase in the crossings, of both individuals and commercial traffic, the number of Customs inspectors and the canine enforcement officers—that is an important part of this, too—has only increased by 540 people between 1994 and 1998. That is simply not enough to keep up with the commercial traffic, let alone the missing of opportunities to seize illegal drugs.

Of the 3,400-plus pounds of illegal heroin seized last year, Customs seized 2,700 pounds. Of the 1.76 million pounds of marijuana seized, Customs seized just under 1 million pounds. And of the roughly 265,000 pounds of cocaine seized last year, Customs seized 148,000 pounds.

Clearly, this is where the first line of defense is in our war on drugs. I know my colleagues and I love to stand here and talk about how we need to get tougher in the war on drugs. This is our chance. The first line of defense in the war on drugs in the United States is at the point of entry where people attempt to bring this illegal contraband into our country and, because we are unwilling to fund the number of customs inspectors required, we don't have enough people on the border to check every vehicle and, therefore, to find and to stop these kinds of illegal drugs coming into our country.

I know the chairman of the subcommittee has talked a lot about the need to meet this need. I don't think there are any of us who don't appreciate what we have to try to do. It is

very difficult in a tough budget environment to find the money to do it.

What I have tried to point out is that we have to set priorities. If you look at all of the other parts of the budget, I can't find hardly any area in this particular budget that, in my view, has a higher priority than protecting our kids from drugs, than protecting our border from people who are literally invading our country with illegal substances to do detriment to our citizens. What is more important in this budget than that?

I, literally, challenge my colleagues who will oppose our amendment, defending appropriations that are in this mark for their particular area of interest, because we have had to provide \$50 million in offsets in order to fund this \$50 million for increased Customs agents, I challenge my colleagues to come to the floor and be willing to explain why what they are trying to protect in this budget is of a higher priority than stopping drugs at our border. I will be very curious to see how many of our colleagues are willing to come and vote against our amendment because it is taking funding out of something that is important to them, to explain to us why that is more important than this.

I am sorry to present that challenge as directly as I am. I think if we are going to be serious about this problem, rather than just talk about it, we have to address this in a very serious way that makes tough choices, that prioritizes. We can't just say, well, it is hard to do, and, therefore, we will try to do it next year. That is why we are so insistent on trying to accomplish this now.

There is much more I could say about this particular problem at this time. Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON is going to speak to this amendment as well. Perhaps the chairman of the subcommittee would like to address the issue now; I am not certain. Perhaps I could make that opportunity available, should the subcommittee chairman wish to avail himself of it.

If not, I am happy to speak to the issue more.

Let me stop at this point and see if Members might have any other conversation on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Arizona for bringing this to the attention of the Senate. I certainly understand and sympathize with him. My State borders his, and I spend a good deal of time in Arizona. I am fully aware of the problem we have with our borders. They are like a sieve, very frankly.

I wish we could have found the additional \$50 million he asked for, but, as he has already mentioned, we did have some budget constraints. We simply could not find it.

Let me tell my colleagues from where the Senator from Arizona would take the money to offset the \$50 million additional money he would like to

put in this account. He would take \$1,675,000 from the Federal Election Commission. He would take \$1,095,000 from the Federal Labor Relations Authority. He would take \$34,786,000 from the GSA. These are repairs and alterations that are badly needed for Federal buildings across the country. He would take \$10,854,000 from the GSA policy and operations account, and \$1,617,000 from the Merit Systems Protection Board.

I will talk for a few minutes about what we have done. First of all, in this bill the committee has provided \$1.67 billion in funding for fiscal year 2000 for the Customs Service. This level is \$263 million more than was requested by the administration and provides for maintaining current levels of funding and other related costs as well as non-related labor issues associated with the increase of inflation, with the exception of the fiscal year 1999 pay raise component.

The committee has provided new funding for the Customs integrity awareness effort, totaling \$4.3 million. In addition, the committee provided an additional \$2.5 million for the establishment of an assistant commissioner for training, which will provide in-service training and professional development of Customs personnel. There have been news reports about the breaches of integrity within the Customs Service. These programs are in response to those issues. This funding will assist the Customs Service in improving their hiring methodologies, ensuring that applicants are of the highest quality. In addition, the funding will improve the recruitment and redesign of the hiring process as well as support existing personnel.

The committee has continued level funding for the Customs Service child pornography efforts. The committee has been very pleased by the Customs Service's efforts, given the limited resources dedicated to that program. The committee has also provided \$19 million in funding for items associated with technology and staffing along the Southwest border, to which the Senator alluded.

Last year, as part of the fiscal year 1999 emergency drug supplemental funding, this committee provided an additional \$80 million for nonintrusive inspection equipment on top of the \$40.6 million for a variety of technologies for the Southwest border. This funding provided for the purchase of a mobile truck X-ray system, railcar inspection systems, gamma ray inspection systems, and higher energy, heavy pallet X-ray systems. Of the \$276 million of funds provided in that emergency supplemental, the Customs Service has not yet obligated all those funds. In fact, as of today, there is \$143 million that has not been spent in the account.

In addition, there is sufficient funding to cover the costs of the annualization of Operation Hardline and GATEWAY, as well as equipment

annualization for fiscal year 1999. This will allow Treasury to annualize the cost of these border-related positions.

In addition, there is \$1.29 million included to cover the cost for the mandatory workload increases during peak processing hours for the new crossings, including staffing and the dedicated commuter lane in El Paso, TX.

The committee has also included new funding for the Customs Integrity Awareness Program at \$4.3 million, so the total cost of the effort is now \$18 million. That is \$6 million in the base and \$4.3 million for this year for polygraphs and \$8 million for agent inspector relocations.

I wish we could have done more. Very simply, as everybody in this body knows, we were up against budget constraints. We simply did not have the money to fund all the things that we would like to.

I yield the floor.

Senator REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Texas is here to debate the Kyl-Hutchison amendment. I think that is appropriate. I want to respond briefly to Senator KYL's statement.

We are working under some very difficult budget constraints. There is a budget that is affecting the work we do on the floor that I didn't support. It was a budget that was given to us and passed by the majority. There are all kinds of problems we have with domestic discretionary spending, including more Customs agents. I would love to have more Customs agents. We need them very badly in Las Vegas, the most rapidly growing area in the whole country.

Remember, we, on this side of the aisle, did not vote for that budget. The budget we are working under is the budget that was given to us by the majority. With all of our domestic discretionary programs, we have a lot of problems, not the least of which is Customs agents.

I hope the American public is aware of the fact that veterans' benefits, as a result of the budget we have, are being stripped significantly. I hope there will be an effort made to have more money placed in the allocations to allow more appropriate and fair spending for domestic discretionary programs in all of our appropriations bills.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I hope we will be able to allocate the \$50 million in the Kyl-Hutchison amendment for the hiring of new Customs agents.

We have a terrible situation. I understand the position of Senator CAMPBELL and Senator REID in having to allocate this money. I think they have done a yeoman's job working within the budget constraints.

The fact of the matter is, in any budget, any family has to set prior-

ities. This administration has refused to set a priority of protecting our borders from illegal immigration and illegal drugs coming in. The fact is, they asked for no new Border Patrol agents this year, even though Congress has allocated 1,000 new Border Patrol agents every year for 5 years starting 2 years ago.

They didn't even hire the allocation in this year's budget. We authorized and paid for 1,000 Border Patrol agents in this year's budget, and this administration has only been able to hire 200 to 400 agents. Since we lose so many, we are worse off than we were when we started this fiscal year.

Now we come to Customs agents who are, once again, on the front line, particularly for illegal drugs because they are the ones responsible for searching trucks and cars that come in through the border. Once again, we have a request from the President for zero new Customs agents. The Customs Office itself asked for 617 new Customs agents. Look at what these Customs agents are doing. More than \$10 billion in drugs flow across the U.S.-Mexico border each year. Last year, the Customs Service seized 995,000 pounds of marijuana, 148,000 pounds of cocaine, and 3,500 pounds of heroin.

We are talking about not fully funding new agents, to not give these people on the front line the help they need in stopping the flow of illegal drugs into our country. In Laredo, TX, the biggest commercial port of entry on our southern border, there were over 1 million truck crossings last year. There are routine waits of 4 to 6 hours. At El Paso's Bridge of the Americas, the hours of operation are from 6 a.m. to 5 p.m., but because the Customs Service can't afford to pay overtime, they have to close at 4 so that they will be able to actually finish the people in the pipeline by 5. Trucks entering an import lot after 4 have to wait until 6 the next morning just to have their documentation cleared. This is hurting not only our ability to curb illegal traffic, but it is also hurting trade and free trade and ratcheting up the cost of goods coming in from the border. So it is very important that we look at Customs agents as the front line for getting illegal drugs stopped at our country's borders.

DEA Administrator, Tom Constantine, was before the Commerce, State, Justice Subcommittee this past March, and he said:

The vast majority of drugs available in the United States originate overseas. The international drug trade is controlled by a small number of high echelon drug lords, who reside in Colombia and Mexico. Most Americans are unaware of the vast damage that has been caused to their communities by international drug trafficking syndicates, most recently by organized crime groups headquartered in Mexico. At the current time, these traffickers pose the greatest threat to communities around the United States. Their impact is no longer limited to cities and towns along the Southwest border; traffickers from Mexico are now routinely

operating in the Midwest, the Southeast, the Northwest, and, increasingly, in the northeastern portion of the United States.

We need to have as a priority stopping illegal drugs coming through our borders. And if the administration continues to ask for zero new border patrol agents and zero new Customs agents, we are not going to be able to win the war on drugs. We cannot do it.

Senator KYL and I didn't choose to go in and take from other parts of the budget; that was our only option. When the President comes in with a budget that asks for no new Customs agents, we could do nothing but try to find offsets in order to maintain the integrity of the budget. So we went for administrative costs that were increases in spending over last year. It wasn't our choice to do this, but the difference between having increases in the GSA budget or increases in Customs agents who are going to be on the front line stopping illegal drugs from coming into our country, and to ease the flow of trade into our country, it seems to me, is pretty clear.

So I hope that we can make this a priority. I look forward to working with Senator CAMPBELL and Senator REID in the conference committee to try to mitigate the impact of any cuts that would be made in other budgets. I understand their position and having to defend this bill. They had hard choices to make. But we can't choose to walk away from law enforcement on our borders. This is a Federal responsibility. We can't fill in with local law enforcement officers. They don't have the capability to stem the flow of illegal drugs into our country.

So I hope our colleagues will support the Kyl-Hutchison amendment. We will do everything we can to mitigate the cuts that we are making in other areas, but it has to be our priority to get control of our sovereign borders, to keep illegal drugs from going into Cleveland, OH, or from going into Tacoma, WA, or Wilmington, DE, because that is where these drugs end up; they don't stay on the border. They infiltrate our country, and we must stop it. This is one of the ways we are going to try to do that.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CAMPBELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I have to tell you, I have no quarrel with my colleagues from Texas and Arizona in my efforts and interests in reducing the use of drugs in America, since I helped write this bill and I have been on the forefront of trying to reduce drugs and putting money where it is most needed. But I remind my friend from Texas that, in fact, in this bill we put in \$263 million over the administration's request. In addition, as I have already said, of the \$276 million of funds provided in the emergency supplement, which was signed into law on May 31 of this year, Customs has still not spent \$143 million of that money. I know

some of it is for equipment, but certainly some of that could be transferred within the Department to areas that need it. We have done the best we can.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. If the Senator will yield, I was thinking as we were talking about this, and as the Senator was making his point, perhaps we could look for offsets within Customs' budget, as well as some of these other areas. We would like to pass the amendment, but we also would like to maybe look for other ways that Senator KYL and I could set priorities within the Customs Department budget and maybe work something out that would not hurt another agency as much but we reprioritize within the budget.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We will be happy to work with the Senator from Texas and Senator KYL. If we can find the offsets within Customs' budget, we would be delighted to work with the Senator.

Mr. KYL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I just wanted to address a comment to the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator CAMPBELL. I made the point when I first began to speak that without his efforts, we would not have been able to save existing Customs inspectors. I misspoke and understated the nature of the problem and, therefore, the significance of what Senator CAMPBELL was able to accomplish. I think in the way I stated it, I said there were 617 additional inspectors that were at risk. Actually, I think the number is closer to 5,000.

Had Senator CAMPBELL and the other leadership of the subcommittee not gotten to the problem to find an additional \$312 million, as he pointed out, all 5,000 of those existing inspectors would have been at risk because they were being funded by a source which was not ever going to materialize and, in fact, which has not materialized. So in announcing the chairman's successes, I actually understated the nature of what he was able to accomplish. Senator HUTCHISON and I, therefore, take nothing away from the chairman of the committee, who has had to scramble very hard to try to help find a solution to this problem of Customs agents at our borders.

We have expressed, I think, in the strongest terms that we can, our appreciation for that. The chairman doesn't have to remind us of the hard work that he has put into that. We simply are of the view that we have to find a way to do more than tread water to stay even because, as both of us have pointed out, the traffic at the border is not staying even. The drug smugglers' efforts to bring more contraband into the country is not staying even. We have to try to keep up. The modest increase we are talking about is an effort to try to keep up with the nature of the problem that we have.

Point No. 1, the chairman is absolutely correct. They fought very hard

to get additional money just to save the status quo.

But I think the second point we are making is also valid; that is, preserving the status quo isn't good enough. We need to try to find a source to at least find another \$50 million for these additional Customs inspectors to at least try to keep pace with what is going on at our borders.

I ask the chairman, if there is no further discussion, we could simply defer a vote on this until afterwards. It is my understanding there will be a vote on the Lautenberg amendment in roughly 90 minutes or so. Perhaps we can simply conclude this conversation now and schedule any vote immediately after that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I move to table the Kyl amendment and ask for the yeas and nays. I further ask that the vote on the Kyl amendment take place immediately after the vote on the Lautenberg amendment, No. 1214, which we expect to take place later this afternoon.

However, I will be happy to work with my colleague, and if we can find a solution or a way to offset the money in the Customs' budget, at that time I will ask to vitiate this motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request. I ask unanimous consent that the time prior to the motion to table amendment No. 1214, the Lautenberg amendment, be limited to 90 minutes to be equally divided in the usual form, and that no other amendments be in order to the amendment prior to the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I thank the manager of the bill for allowing me to do this.

I ask unanimous consent to speak for about 6 minutes to introduce a bill.

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

The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. AKAKA. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. AKAKA pertaining to the introduction of S. 1317 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, we have an agreement worked out on two amendments dealing with child care centers and Federal activities.

AMENDMENT NO. 1197

(Purpose: To ensure the safety and availability of child care centers in Federal facilities)

Mr. CAMPBELL. I ask the Jeffords amendment No. 1197 be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], for Mr. JEFFORDS and Ms. LANDRIEU, proposes an amendment numbered 1197.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I'm pleased to join Senators JEFFORDS and LANDRIEU as a cosponsor of this amendment that helps address an issue affecting many lower pay-grade federal employees with young children: affordable child care. Often there are facilities available to fill this need, but the costs puts this option beyond the reach of these families. This amendment addresses this concern by allowing the use of appropriated funds to help these families. Though I am concerned that the House may be uncomfortable with the overall scope of this amendment, I look forward to working with Senators JEFFORDS and LANDRIEU to make sure this measure or a reasonable compromise is acceptable to both the House and the Senate.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise to reiterate the importance of an amendment that we agreed to earlier today by unanimous consent. This amendment offered by Senator JEFFORDS and myself will increase the availability, safety, and quality of Federal child care.

I firmly believe that the Federal Government should serve as a model for other employers to implement child care services in this country. These services must be affordable, safe, and be provided in an atmosphere that supports healthy development and growth of children. We have already made much progress within the Department of Defense with the enactment of legislation that ensures quality, safe and affordable child care to defense employees. The DoD program is now considered one of the finest in the world. It is now time to take this exemplary model and expand it to all Federal agencies.

The executive branch of Government has responsibility for over 1,000 child care centers—788 through the military, 109 through the General Services Administration, and 127 through other Federal departments. Over 215,000 children are being provided child care through these various Federal programs.

Unfortunately, almost 1/3 of Federal employees with young children may not have access to any Federal child care services. We need to ensure all children of Federal employees, not just those under the Department of Defense, have access to high quality and affordable child care.

Every parent should know that when they drop their children off at a Fed-

eral day care facility that their child is safe—because we have enacted uniform safety standards for these child care facilities.

We also must make efforts to ensure that child care is made available to every Federal employee regardless of their income. Now, more than ever, Federal employees are struggling to balance work and family obligations. They are also struggling to pay for the cost of child care. Currently, the cost of quality child care services ranges from \$3,000 to more than \$10,000, depending on where a person lives. In my State, this care ranges from \$3,000 to \$6,000. Unfortunately, many families in Louisiana cannot afford this cost. In fact, there are over 500,000 children throughout Louisiana whose families earn under \$27,000.

One of the first steps that the Federal Government can and should take is to provide a model for other employers to follow, so more individuals will have greater access to affordable and quality child care. Moreover, if the Federal Government is to remain a credible provider of child care services, Congress must enact this important amendment. I look forward to working my colleagues in the House and Senate to ensure adoption of this legislation in the conference report.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, this amendment will go a long way toward ensuring the safety and healthy development of children of federal employees who are cared for in federally sponsored or operated child care centers. The Senate passed this amendment last year on the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill by unanimous consent. Unfortunately, it was dropped during the last few hours of the conference. So I am back again this year.

In 1987, Congress passed the Trible amendment which permitted executive, legislative, and judicial branch agencies to utilize a portion of federally owned or leased space for the provision of child care services for federal employees. The General Services Administration (GSA) was given the authority to provide guidance, assistance, and oversight to federal agencies for the development of child care centers. In the decade since the Trible amendment was passed, hundreds of federal facilities throughout the nation have established onsite child care centers which are a tremendous help to our employees.

As you know, Federal property is exempt from state and local laws, regulations, and oversight. What this means for child care centers on that property are not subject to even the most minimal health and safety standards. Even the most basic state and local health and safety requirements do not apply to child care centers Federal facilities.

I find this very troubling, and I think we sell our federal employees a bill of goods when federally owned leased child care cannot guarantee that their children are in safe facilities. The Federal Government should set the exam-

ple when it comes to providing safe child care. It should not be turn an apathetic shoulder from meeting such standards simply because state and local regulations do not apply to them.

As Congress and the administration turn their spotlight on our nation's child care system, we must first get our own house in order. We must safeguard and protect the children receiving services in child care centers housed in federal facilities. Our employees should not be denied some assurance that the centers in which they place their children are accountable for meeting basic health and safety standards.

This amendment will require all child care services located in federal facilities to meet, at the very least, the same level of health and safety standards required of other child care centers in the same geographical area. That sounds like common sense, but as we all know too well, common sense is not always reflected in the law.

It should also be made clear that state and local standards should be a floor for basic health and safety, and not a ceiling. The role of the Federal Government—and, I believe, of the United States Congress in particular—is to constantly strive to do better and to lead by example. Federal facilities should always try to provide the highest quality of care. The GSA has required national accreditation in GSA-owned and leased facilities for years, and the majority of child care centers in GSA facilities are either in compliance with those accreditation standards or are strenuously working to get there. This is high quality of care towards which we should strive for in all of our Federal child care facilities.

Federal child care should mean something more than simply location on a Federal facility. The Federal Government has an obligation to provide safe care for its employees, and it has a responsibility for making sure that those standards are monitored and enforced. Some Federal employees receive this guarantee. Many do not. We can and must do better.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I ask the amendment be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1197) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1211 WITHDRAWN

Mr. CAMPBELL. I call up amendment No. 1211 by Ms. LANDRIEU, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 1211) was withdrawn.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent immediately following the

vote in relation to the Kyl-Hutchison amendment on the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill, the Senate immediately proceed to a vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Lawrence Summers to be Secretary of the Treasury, Executive Calendar No. 95.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. I now ask unanimous consent it be in order to ask for the yeas and nays on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1214

(Purpose: To provide for the inclusion of alcohol abuse by minors in the national anti-drug media campaign for youth)

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1214, which has been sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], for himself, and Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. JOHNSON, proposes an amendment numbered 1214.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ INCLUSION OF ALCOHOL ABUSE BY MINORS IN NATIONAL ANTI-DRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277) is amended—

(1) in section 101(h) of division A (the Treasury Department Appropriations Act, 1999), in title III under the heading “FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS—SPECIAL FORFEITURE FUND (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)”, by inserting “(including the use of alcohol by individuals who have not attained 21 years of age)” after “drug use among young Americans”;

(b) OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1998.—Section 704(b) of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (title VII of division C of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (14), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (15), by striking the period and inserting “; and”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(16) shall conduct a national media campaign in accordance with the Drug-Free Media Campaign Act of 1998 (including with respect to the use of alcohol by individuals who have not attained 21 years of age).”.

(c) DRUG-FREE MEDIA CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1998.—The Drug-Free Media Campaign Act of 1998 (subtitle A of title I of division D of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-277)) is amended—

(1) in section 102(a), by inserting before the period the following: “, and use of alcohol by individuals in the United States who have not attained 21 years of age”; and

(2) in section 103(a)(1)(H), by inserting after “antidrug messages” the following: “and messages discouraging underage alcohol consumption.”.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. This amendment is being offered on behalf of myself, Senator BYRD, Senator HUTCHISON, Senator HOLLINGS, Senator JOHNSON, and Senator HARKIN. This amendment would require the drug czar’s office to include messages in his current media campaign to discourage children from engaging in underage alcohol consumption.

Running ads on national TV espousing the evil of drug use without even mentioning alcohol sends the wrong message to America’s children. It is the equivalent of telling kids, “Say ‘no’ to drugs, but this Bud’s for you.”

The fact is, consuming alcohol is illegal in all 50 States if you are under the age of 21. Among America’s youth, underage alcohol consumption is just as big of a problem as drug use.

The facts are revealing. For those who are not aware of the danger, alcohol kills six times more children ages 12-20 than all other illegal drugs combined. It was a surprise to me, and I suspect it is a surprise to millions of other Americans.

Underage alcohol consumption and its devastating effects on children paint a daunting picture. According to the Department of Health and Human Services, the average age at which children start drinking is 13. Even worse, the research shows that children who drink at the age of 13 have a 47-percent chance of becoming alcohol-dependent; if they wait until they are 21 to begin drinking, they have only a 10-percent chance of becoming dependent.

In all, there are nearly 4 million young people in this country who suffer from alcohol dependence. They account for one-fifth of all alcohol-dependent Americans.

The bottom line is that we dare not turn a blind eye when an opportunity comes along to address this problem. The drug czar’s media campaign is that opportunity.

Drug czar Gen. Barry McCaffrey has said:

[T]he most dangerous drug in America today is still alcohol.

Gen. McCaffrey has also said:

[Alcohol is] the biggest drug abuse problem for adolescents, and it’s linked to the use of other, illegal drugs.

Statistics support what General McCaffrey has been saying. According to the Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, young people who drink alcohol are 7.5 times more likely to use any illegal drug and 50 times more likely to use cocaine than young people who never drink alcohol. In other words, alcohol is a gateway drug. Too often it leads to the use of marijuana, cocaine, and heroin by children. Since that is true, including ads addressing underage alcohol consumption in the media campaign would benefit the campaign and increase its overall effectiveness.

In advocating for this amendment, our voices are not alone. Surgeon General David Satcher recently wrote a letter to General McCaffrey:

I want to recommend that you include advertisements addressing underage drinking in the paid portion of ONDCP’s media campaign.

Surgeon General Satcher also stated:

It is time to more effectively address the drug that children and teens tell us is their greatest concern and the drug we know is most likely to result in their injury or death.

In addition to support from the Surgeon General, we have bipartisan support in the House. This same amendment was already added to the House version of the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill by Congresswoman ROYBAL-ALLARD from California and Congressman WOLF from Virginia.

Editorials have also been written across this country supporting our position. Editorials have appeared in the Washington Post, the New York Times, Christian Science Monitor, and the Los Angeles Times, among other newspapers.

This effort on behalf of our children is further supported by more than 80 organizations, including Mothers Against Drunk Driving, the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Public Health Association, the Center for Science in the Public Interest, and the Crime Prevention Council.

The Senate has not been silent on the issue of underage drinking in the past, and we should not stand mute now. We have made clear on at least three occasions that it is the law of the land to prohibit the use of alcohol by those under the age of 21.

I am proud to have been the author of the 1984 law that made 21 the drinking age in all 50 States. As a matter of fact, I had an argument with a couple of my children who were less than 21 at the time. We had a long discussion. They said it might cut into their fun, their proms.

But I looked at the statistics and saw how many lives we could save. In the almost 16 years that law has been on the books, we have saved 15,000 kids from dying on the highways.

Later, in 1995, Senator BYRD led the charge on “zero tolerance” for underage alcohol consumption by writing the law that says if you are under 21, a .02 blood-alcohol level is legally drunk.

Our amendment is not prescriptive. It would not tell the drug czar which types of alcohol ads or precisely how many alcohol ads would be run. But it would require the drug czar to include the underage alcohol consumption message in its media campaign. And it would give General McCaffrey the authority to do so, authority he has claimed he currently lacks.

We want to send a strong message to America’s youth that neither underage alcohol consumption nor drug use is acceptable. We do not want to say there is a preference of one over the

other. We do not want to do that by being silent on alcohol.

Mr. President, the only successful path to winning the war on drugs is the one paved by preventing underage drinking. If we cannot muster the political will to tell our children that underage drinking is wrong, we will never win the war on drugs.

We must not accept underage drinking as a so-called rite of passage because it is a passage directly to illegal drugs such as marijuana, cocaine, and heroin; and it is a passage to a life of alcohol dependency.

What we have heard from colleagues who are not supporting us is that drugs are illegal. But so is drinking under the age of 21.

Tobacco is a legal product, but we have worked hard to try to stop young people from starting to smoke because we know eventually it often leads to respiratory failure, lung cancer, and other diseases, as well as premature death.

So I hope our colleagues will support this amendment. It is time to make young people aware of the facts. Underage drinking is not acceptable. It leads to addiction, and nothing is more painful to a parent than to see an addicted child.

We ought not to be deterred by any arguments that suggest that adding alcohol to the media campaign might detract from the message about drugs. What is the difference? Addiction is addiction is addiction. We do not want to lose our kids. We do not want them to lose control, and we do not want them to lose their lives.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, before I speak to the Lautenberg amendment, I ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD. On several occasions in earlier debate I referred to the Kyl amendment No. 1195 as the Kyl amendment. I ask unanimous consent to correct that title to the Kyl-Hutchison amendment.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of my friend from New Jersey. I came from an alcoholic family. Believe me, I know firsthand the devastating effects of what it does in a family. I have had over a dozen relatives, uncles, cousins and so on, including a sister, who have died from some form of alcohol-related abuse. I know the devastating effects on a whole community; on society as a whole. I know the cost and I do not think anybody detests it more than I do.

As my colleague, Senator DORGAN, knows, coming from a State in which there are many Indian reservations, fetal alcohol syndrome, which is an effect on children from mothers drinking too much, is literally hundreds of times worse on those reservations. On one reservation in America, 1 out of 4

children is born with some degree of fetal alcohol syndrome as opposed to the national average of 1 out of 500.

I am concerned, but the question for this body is not whether we want to reduce the use of alcohol by youngsters. Of course all of us want to do that. The question here is whether the ONDCP is the right vehicle or not. My view is it is the wrong vehicle.

I have been the chairman of this committee since the inception of this media campaign, when Senator KOHL was the ranking minority, and this project is something the committee originally had a great deal of difficulty in doing, because we wanted to make sure we got the best use of taxpayers' money when we set this up. I believe this amendment would simply dilute that mission. The committee did not provide as much as we would want this year. In fact, we are putting in \$50 million less this year than we did for the ONDCP last year. I believe the inclusion of an anti-alcohol campaign would simply decrease the funds available for the antidrug campaign more than we want to. The House, in my opinion, made a mistake when they pursued this action.

I also tell you we are, in my view, increasing the jurisdiction of the Office of National Drug Control Policy without legislative authority to do so. This is the wrong vehicle, as I mentioned, and I am seriously concerned that the precedent it would set would cause us a great deal of controversy, maybe open a Pandora's box of other amendments to broaden the ONDCP into areas it should not be.

This amendment expands ONDCP's jurisdiction into alcohol prevention. As I mentioned, they do not have a statutory mandate to do that. There are other agencies, such as the Center of Substance Abuse Prevention, that are better equipped to handle this kind of campaign. When we originally put the money into this campaign a few years ago, we wanted to make sure we could measure the effects. So there was a GAO study authorized, a 5-year study to review the media campaign and give the results to our committee about the ongoing effects, to see if we, in fact, were reducing the use of alcohol consumption by youngsters as a result of the campaign.

That study is only halfway through. It still has several years to go. I think if we dilute this message, if we start expanding the role, we are simply going to completely throw out the validity of that study the GAO is doing.

So, although I do appreciate the efforts of the Senator from New Jersey, and I look forward to working with him on other ways we can reduce alcohol use by youngsters, I, at this time, oppose the amendment. I will move to table after my colleague speaks.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I require to respond to my friend from Colorado.

He talks, as he said, with experience, having seen alcohol addiction and the

devastation it inflicts. But I want to respond specifically to the question the Senator from Colorado raises about dilution of message. We think that when a campaign is directed toward young people and it says "Say no to drugs," the omission of alcohol sends the wrong message. That's like saying, "Drugs are bad for you, but alcohol is not so bad."

So when we look at the statistics, and we see alcohol kills six times as many young people ages 12 to 20 than all of the illegal drugs combined, that tells us that the media campaign cannot deliver a thorough message unless it includes alcohol. Without including alcohol, the media campaign is a mere wink at underage drinking.

The drug czar is going to have \$1 billion, we hope, over the next 5 years to deliver a message. Mr. President, \$1 billion is a lot of money. So if the media campaign says "Say no to drugs," and it also says "Say no to alcohol," I see nothing wrong with that. And if there are ads portraying the horrific things that illegal drugs can do to kids, there should be ads portraying the same horrific things that alcohol can do to kids.

With the budget surpluses we have, we will keep on looking for additional funding for this campaign. One of the things that touches everybody in this Chamber, regardless of party, is interest in children, interest in protecting them from violence, interest in protecting them from disease, and interest in protecting them from addiction. So I think it is quite appropriate we combine the message on addiction to include all of the products that would be addictive, including alcohol.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the very distinguished Senator from New Jersey, Mr. LAUTENBERG. I compliment him on the battle he has been waging, and successfully, might I add. I am sorry he has elected not to return to this body. I wish he would change his mind on that score.

Let me just say at this point, I am pleased to join Senator LAUTENBERG in offering this amendment to the fiscal year 2000 Treasury and general government appropriations bill. The amendment would require that the Office of National Drug Control Policy's Anti-drug Youth Media Campaign include ads regarding illegal underage drinking. It is absurd to me that our federally funded media campaign fails to include the No. 1 drug choice amongst children; namely, alcohol. I do not know how that could escape anyone's attention. I cannot understand why that is not included.

Large numbers of young people are drinking. According to the 1997 Monitoring the Future Study conducted by

the University of Michigan, approximately 34 percent of high school seniors, 22 percent of tenth graders, and 8 percent of eighth graders, report being drunk at least once in a given month.

Yes, Mr. President, drunk. I know that is a shocking statistic. It is also one that we should not tolerate. Alcohol is a gateway drug. Young people who consume alcohol are more likely to use other drugs.

Statistics compiled by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University show that 37.5 percent of young people who have consumed alcohol have used some illicit drug versus only 5 percent of young people who have never consumed alcohol.

Early alcohol use results in alcohol problems in life. A report by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism indicates that when young people begin drinking before the age of 15, they are four times more likely to develop alcohol dependence than when drinking begins at age 21.

I noted in I believe it was either Roll Call or the Hill earlier this week there was a story about interns who are visiting the "watering holes"—visiting the watering holes. We all know what that means. These are not watering holes. These are places where these young interns are going to drink some form of alcohol, and many of them will end up getting drunk.

Most tragically, alcohol kills. It is deadly. Deadly! It takes the lives of more children than all other drugs put together. Yet, for some reason, this particularly lethal drug is left out of the media campaign. This administration has been leading a great campaign, a great crusade against tobacco, against smoking, and that is all right. That is well and good. But why doesn't the administration put its stamp on a crusade, on a great campaign against alcohol for youngsters? Why doesn't the administration lead in that crusade?

Let me repeat a story I have told many times. Russell Conwell, one of the great chautauqua speakers, told the story "Acres of Diamonds" 5,000 times. I have not told this story 5,000 times, but I have told it a number of times.

In 1951, when I was a member of the West Virginia Senate, I asked the warden of the State penitentiary in Moundsville to let me be a witness to the scheduled execution of a young man by the name of James Hewlett.

Under the laws of West Virginia at that time, a certain number of witnesses were required to be at an execution. The warden acceded to my request.

Why did I want to witness an execution? I often have the opportunity to speak to young people. I often speak to these pages who are sitting right now on both sides of the aisle looking at me. I speak with them out in the halls. I try to tell them wholesome stories from Tolstoy or from other great au-

thors. I try to give them good stories. I try to teach them good lessons so they will leave here having heard someone—and I am sure there are other Senators who do the same thing—talk with them about values.

It was for that reason that I wanted to see this execution. I often speak to young people in 4-H groups, Boy Scout groups, Girl Scout groups, and other groups, and I wanted to be able to tell them something that would help them in later life.

I went down and talked with the man who was to be executed. He had hired a cab driver to take him from Huntington, WV, over to Logan. On the way, he pulled a revolver and shot the cab driver in the back, robbed him, dumped him by the side of the road, and left him there to die.

Later, Jim Hewlett was apprehended in a theater in Montgomery. He was brought to trial, convicted, and sentenced to die in the electric chair.

He was asked if he would like a chaplain in his cell. He scoffed at the idea of having a chaplain in his cell. He did not want any part of it. But when the Governor declined to commute his sentence, then the young man became serious about a chaplain. He wanted a chaplain in his cell.

On this occasion, the warden permitted me to go down to the cell of the young man, and I talked with him. I told him I had the opportunity to talk with young people on many occasions, and I asked if he had something that he could tell me that would help these young people, some advice that I could pass on to them that might assist them in avoiding trouble in later life.

Jim Hewlett said yes. He said: "Tell them to go to Sunday school and church." He said: "If I had gone to Sunday school and church, I wouldn't be here tonight."

Our conversation was very short. The hour of 9 was rapidly approaching, and he was to step into the electric chair at 9 o'clock. As I started to go, after thanking him, he said, "Wait a minute. Tell them one more thing. Tell them not to drink the stuff that I drank." Those are his exact words. I have spoken them hundreds of times: "Tell them not to drink the stuff that I drank."

I said: "What do you mean by that?"

The chaplain spoke up and said: "Senator"—I was a State senator at that time—"Senator, you see that little crack on the wall up there? If he were to have a couple of drinks, he would try to go through that crack in the wall. That is what it does to him. He was drinking when he shot the cab driver."

I went back to the warden's office.

The rest of the story, of course, is obvious. The young man was executed, and I have been passing these words of Jim Hewlett from Fayette County, WV, on to young people during these almost 50 years since: "Tell them not to drink the stuff that I drank."

Why do we have to tippy-toe around it? Why does the administration have

to tippy-toe around it? Why do the people in the administration who have responsibilities along this line have to tippy-toe around it? Alcohol kills! Not only does it sometimes kill the person who imbibes but it also kills others—wives, children, old people who are trying to go to the grocery store or to a child-care center. These are people who are innocent. They are not doing the drinking. But the person who drank and then got behind the wheel, that person has killed others.

Every year at commencement time, when high schools are holding their commencements all over the country, we read stories in the newspapers. They are the same year after year: a group of youngsters, having just graduated, have a big party, and they get drunk and they crash their automobile that is going at a speed of 100 miles per hour into a tree. The automobile wraps itself around the tree and there are the mangled, bleeding, dead bodies in the twisted wreckage. And in the car is also found some alcohol.

It is time this country awakens. It is time the churches of this country awaken and tell our young people: Don't do it.

When I give a Christmas message, I do not say: Don't drink and drive. I simply say: Don't drink. I am not expecting everybody to feel as I do or to do as I do, but at least we ought to do what we can to educate the young people of this country as to the evils, the dangers, and the sorrows that will come from the use of alcohol—alcohol.

There are some young people right now listening to me on the television somewhere who have heard me pass along the advice of the condemned man, Jim Hewlett: "Tell them not to drink the stuff that I drank." I hope those young people will listen. I hope they will take it to heart and not drink alcohol.

This amendment is a commonsense amendment—a commonsense amendment—to address the staggering statistics regarding youth alcohol use. We need to send a strong message to the nation's youth that drinking has serious consequences, and all too often they are deadly consequences.

I thank Mr. LAUTENBERG for his statesmanship, for his courage, and for his common sense. I appreciate very much his allowing me to cosponsor this amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, on our time, I thank the Senator from West Virginia. He shows an interest in this subject that calls up our knowledge of experience with alcohol that none of us should ever have—the loss of a family member.

When you see the devastation of alcohol, you do not understand why it is a different class addiction than that which is drugs. It is easier to get into. It is less stigmatized. People do not say: Oh, look, he's an alcoholic.

A friend of mine has a granddaughter, 14 years old—14 years old—who started sniffing glue, drank alcohol. Now it is drugs. She is in an institution. It is the most heartbreaking thing one can imagine.

Mr. President, how much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes 34 seconds.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. I will use time allocated by Senator CAMPBELL.

Mr. President, it is a rare occasion when I rise to oppose an amendment on alcohol offered by my colleague from New Jersey. I just heard the moving comments by the Senator from West Virginia. On almost every other occasion on the Senate floor, I have supported their initiatives. The .08 national standard on drunk driving, I have supported it. You name it, I have supported it.

My mother was killed by a drunk driver. I have been in an accident caused by a drunk driver in which the car I was driving was totaled.

Senator BYRD described graduation parties. My cousin's son Jesse was at a graduation party one night—the night before he was to graduate from high school—a wonderful young boy, great golfer, slight of build, a handsome young man—and at midnight got in the wrong car, a car driven by a young man who had had too much to drink. They drove across a railroad track and were hit by a train, and that young boy lost his life.

I know about the scourges of alcohol. I know about drunk driving. I know about the disease of alcoholism. I also know about the issue of illegal drugs in this country and want to tell a story about that, if I might.

I visited Oak Hill Detention Center recently, within the last matter of weeks. Oak Hill Detention Center is not too far from this building. It is a half-hour drive. It houses some of the toughest young criminals who have committed crimes on the streets of the District of Columbia. These are kids, in many cases tough, hardened criminals but still kids.

I met a young man who at age 12 was dealing drugs and was addicted to hard drugs on the streets of the District of Columbia. He was shot a number of times, picked up, and convicted of armed robbery. At age 12, he was selling and addicted to hard drugs.

Across the table from him sat another young man who, at age 12, was also dealing drugs and convicted of armed robbery. Across the table was a young girl who, at age 13, was on hard drugs and selling drugs and had a baby—all in the first year of her teenage life.

The security fellow in one of the areas of the Oak Hill Detention Center

said to me—and I could tell he liked these kids; he cared about these kids; he knew them, knew them well—said: You know, these are tough kids. These are kids who have done wrong, in most cases have had a tough life, but they are still kids. He said: What I regret most about this job is going to their funerals. There are too many funerals. After they serve their time at the Oak Hill Detention Center and they are back on the streets—too often relapsing back on hard drugs—I go to their funerals.

The common element to the discussions I had at that Oak Hill Youth Detention Center was hard drugs—addicted to drugs at a very young age and then followed a life of crime, and in most cases violent crime as well.

This country has a problem with drugs. One approach to addressing this problem was recommended by the administration and some in Congress to say: We know that television has an influence on people's lives. Television advertising, hundreds of billions of dollars of television advertising has an influence on what people buy, what they wear, how they look, and what they sing. If it has that kind of influence, can we use television in a way that can influence people with respect to drugs and how they view drugs?

So the proposal was to put together a \$1 billion program over 5 years to do intensive drug education television advertising. I support that.

This year, this subcommittee cut the funding for that by \$50 million. In other words, there will be \$50 million less than was requested for it and \$50 million less than was spent last year on this program.

This program ought to be allowed to work so we can determine with what effectiveness we can change people's vision and view about drugs, especially young people. We are in the third year. We need to allow this to work.

Cutting this program by \$50 million was the last thing we wanted to do, but the budget allocations would not allow us to fully fund it.

Now we are told by our colleagues, we want to add other things to it. I will support in an instant a proposal brought to the floor of the Senate that says let us do something of exactly the same scale on alcohol. I will support that in an instant. A \$1 billion program over 5 years to educate young people about alcohol, we ought to do that. But I don't think, having cut this program by \$50 million this year—understanding that when you talk to young people anywhere in this country who have been involved in violent crime, you will find out that the origin of that and the genesis of much of that behavior comes from addiction to drugs—now is the time to both cut this program by \$50 million, which is what has happened in this subcommittee, and then also add other responsibilities to that program.

I indicated that my family was visited by the horror of the phone call late at night saying that my mother

had been killed. Others in my family have been victims of drunk driving accidents. I understand all that. But the subject here is about drugs.

I have spoken on the floor about six times of a person I am going to speak about just briefly again, Leo Gonzales Wright. A young attorney with, I am sure, great hope and stars in her eyes moves to Washington, DC, to practice environmental law. In her early twenties, her name was Bettina Pruckmayr. Bettina Pruckmayr ended her life in this town with the kind of horror that is not visited upon many. She stopped at an ATM machine, was abducted by a man named Leo Gonzales Wright, and stabbed over 30 times by this violent felon.

Who was Leo Gonzales Wright? A man addicted to drugs, a man high on drugs, a man who had been convicted of murder before, let out of prison on parole, tested positive for drugs but not put back in prison.

What do drugs mean? What do drugs do? It means that people on our streets, who are addicted to drugs and are willing to commit violent acts, murder innocent people like young Bettina Pruckmayr.

The origin of this is the problem of drugs. It is a very significant problem. The attempt was to decide whether we could alter behavior, educate young children with \$1 billion in a 5-year program of advertising dealing with drugs. I happen to think that makes sense. We have tried a lot of different things. It makes sense to try this.

Does it make sense to do a lot more on alcohol? Absolutely. I am willing to support that and do that. I don't think, however, it ought to be used to dilute this effort. This effort is an effort that is in its third year. We have already had to dilute it by reducing funding \$50 million.

I say to my colleague, with whom I voted on every occasion on this issue, let us find another way to fund this program and I will be with you. I understand the scourge of alcohol and alcohol addiction, the carnage it causes on American roads, and the devastation it causes to American families. I also think those who spoke about that with such gripping emotion today probably could tell us stories that they understand the carnage caused by drug addiction in this country to hard drugs and the number of families whose hearts ache tonight because their loved one was killed by someone high on drugs, addicted to drugs for a number of years in a circumstance where perhaps, had we done things differently, had we done things better, had we had more influence on those lives, we might have avoided having that person addicted to drugs and, therefore, committed to a life of crime.

That is what this effort is about. It is what General McCaffrey and the Office of Drug Control Policy, it is what we are trying to do in a 5-year period. I think we ought to continue to do that.

One final point: One of my regrets, standing as I am today, is a woman

named Karolyn Nunnallee, whom I consider a good friend. She is the national president of the Mothers Against Drunk Driving. She and her organization very strongly support the Lautenberg amendment. I almost never have disagreed with Mothers Against Drug Driving. I think they have done more in this country than most any other organization I know to influence and alter behavior dealing with the issue of drunk driving. I regret very much not supporting them on this issue.

For reasons I have already stated, I think we ought to stay the course on this question of drug addiction and education dealing with drug addiction among America's youth. At the same time, I want to join in and support in any way possible the efforts of Senator LAUTENBERG and Senator BYRD and others to add money to transportation bills on drunk driving issues, to add money to health bills on drunk driving. I will support a billion-dollar program in 5 years. Sign me up. But don't dilute this program. Let us let this program work to see, at the end of 5 years, whether we have altered the behavior and substantially changed the determination by some young people in this country to understand more about drugs.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CAMPBELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has 30 minutes, 25 seconds; the Senator from New Jersey has 15 minutes 20 seconds.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky and 10 minutes to Senator McCONNELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Lautenberg amendment.

We all want to do what we can to fight underage drinking. At first glance this amendment might look like a good idea. Putting the office of national drug control policy and the drug czar on the case sounds like we are really taking action in the fight against underage drinking.

I believe that this amendment would actually hurt both the fight against underage drinking as well as our Nation's struggle with illegal drugs.

First of all, we're not even sure if the drug czar, General McCaffrey, really wants this amendment. We are hearing rumblings that the administration is against it, but no one seems to know for sure. Until we know, it doesn't make sense to pass the amendment.

If General McCaffrey, the man the President has asked to lead the charge in our anti-drug efforts, isn't sure about it, I think we need to be very careful.

In addition, we know that the bipartisan coalition for a drug-free America—headed up by Bill Bennett and

Mario Cuomo—the group that coordinates efforts with the drug czar and produces most of the Government's antidrug ads, does not support this amendment.

Bill Bennett and Mario Cuomo don't agree on much, and when they do we should take notice and listen.

Second, passing the amendment and adding underage drinking to the problems the drug czar has to tackle will just distract him from his principal focus—as Senator DORGAN said—the war on illegal drugs.

As Senator DORGAN, the ranking member on the subcommittee, pointed out last night, the drug czar's resources are already stretched to the limit.

Adding underage drinking to the drug czar's portfolio would only stretch his resources even further, and force him to take on another tough fight. I don't think that's what we want.

In fact, we know the Federal Government is already spending hundreds of millions of dollars through the various agencies to fight underage drinking, and the evidence shows we are making progress.

Over the past 10 years, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration reports that excessive drinking by underage kids has dropped significantly.

The Centers for Disease Control agrees. They report that underage drinking has dropped by more than 50 percent over the past two decades. A study by the National Institute on Drug Abuse on drinking among high school students reports similar progress.

Unfortunately, the evidence from the war on drugs is not as good. Over the past 5 years, the Department of Health and Human Services reports that illegal drug use has increased for high school kids.

We are turning the tide against underage drinking. What now is the compelling reason to involve the drug czar's office? He already has his hands full with the war on illegal drugs.

As I said earlier, it's an idea that sounds good at first, but I don't think anyone has laid out a compelling justification for it.

Mr. President, I applaud Senator LAUTENBERG for his fight against underage drinking. It is a fight, as is the war on illegal drugs, that we have to win. But I think he has taken the wrong approach on this amendment. It sounds like a solution in search of a problem. Let's keep fighting underage drinking with the tools we now have in place. They are working. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Lautenberg amendment.

I yield back my time.

Mr. McCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, others have said it probably better than I can, but what is really at stake

is whether we are going to dramatically diminish, if not gut, the war on drugs.

The junior Senator from Kentucky has outlined the progress made on the teenage drinking front in the last 20 years, and it is, indeed, significant. No one argues with any of the observations that have been made by Senator BYRD and Senator LAUTENBERG, and others, about the devastating nature of the problem of teenage drinking, although it is encouraging that progress is being made.

The industry itself advertises against underage drinking extensively. The alcohol industry has spent \$100 million over the last 8 years, and the beer industry has spent \$250 million over the last 10 years, for a total of \$350 million, in their own financed effort to get at the problem of teenage drinking, which is a horrendous problem. But as Senator BUNNING has pointed out, it is a problem upon which we have made significant progress.

What is before us today with the Lautenberg amendment is whether we are going to gut the war on drugs. Regrettably, since President Clinton came to office, teenage drug use in this country has gone up 46 percent. We are going backwards in the war on drugs. While it may be an unintended consequence of what Senator LAUTENBERG is seeking to achieve today, the practical effect of this amendment is to gut the advertising campaign designed to go after teenage drug use, as Senator DORGAN has pointed out.

Let's have no misunderstandings; nobody is in favor of teenage drinking. Nobody thinks that we should not do more about this problem. However, the issue before us is: Are we going to gut the advertising effort in the war on drugs?

The National Youth Antidrug Media campaign is underway. This amendment, according to drug czar Barry McCaffrey, would undermine that. The Partnership for a Drug Free America, which is the nonprofit group that works with General McCaffrey to run this antidrug campaign, opposes this amendment.

General McCaffrey said just 3 weeks ago that proposals such as this amendment "could dilute the focus of the successful media campaign advertising effort to change attitudes of youth and parents toward illegal drug use." He also said, "An anti-underage drinking message to youth is largely a separate and distinct message from the anti-drug message, requiring a significantly different strategic approach based on scientific and behavioral knowledge."

So what we are doing is mixing up apples and oranges. A campaign, designed, properly researched, and underway, to deal with youth drug abuse would be diverted in an entirely different direction by the Lautenberg amendment.

Others have referred to the letters from Mario Cuomo, Bill Bennett, and Jim Burke, the cochairs of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America. They

oppose the Lautenberg amendment. Obviously, it is not because they are in favor of teenage drinking, but they don't want to gut the effort to have an effective antidrug campaign among America's young people.

Chairman Burke, of the Partnership for a Drug-free America, said: "We don't believe . . . an effective campaign targeting underage drinking can be carved out of the current appropriation for the National Youth Antidrug Media Campaign.

He went on:

I can tell you that forcing the campaign to address underage drinking (something it was not originally designed to do) will seriously jeopardize the success of this effort.

He is referring to their effort to deal with teenage drug use, which, remember, is going up while teenage drinking is going down.

Cochairman Mario Cuomo, former Governor of New York, said this amendment "threatens the success of one media campaign by creating another that simply cannot and will not work given the current limitations."

Governor Cuomo also said that "this type of program will require hundreds of millions more dollars—if not billions—to be effective."

Governor Cuomo's cochairman, Bill Bennett, said:

Advocates are wrong to suggest that this enormous problem of teenage drinking can be addressed effectively within the current appropriation for the antidrug campaign. We read this amendment as the beginning of the end of the antidrug campaign.

Mr. President, we don't need to end the antidrug campaign. Drug use is going up; drug use among high school seniors has gone up 46 percent since 1992. It needs to be addressed. That is what this appropriation is for. Certainly, a program to address underage drinking, which all three of the men I have just quoted would tell us, would have to be of a tremendous size. That is an activity Congress would need to analyze carefully before embarking on.

I know that there are probably many Senators who are thinking that if they oppose the Lautenberg amendment, it is going to be very difficult to explain in a campaign contest. Let me say this. What would be even more difficult to explain, it seems to me, is a vote that would gut the effort to combat drug use in this country—teenage drug use in particular—which is on the increase. That is what this appropriation is designed to try to impact.

So if we are going to address teenage drinking, let's not do it at the expense of the war on drugs. The war on drugs has not been very effectively fought in the last few years. I am not here to cast any particular aspersions against anybody for that, but it is a cold, hard reality that teenage drug use has gone up 46 percent since 1992 in this country. It was previously tracking down. We need to get back on track and address this youth drug use. That is what the original appropriation was designed to do.

I hope we will resist the temptation to gut the war on drugs so that we can pursue it effectively. As evidence, we have the testimony of Jim Burke, Mario Cuomo, and Bill Bennett.

I ask that the record include copies of a letter from Bill Bennett of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, opposing the Lautenberg amendment; a letter from Mario Cuomo of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, opposing the Lautenberg amendment; and a statement of Richard D. Bonnette, President and CEO of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, opposing the amendment, along with a press release from the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

I ask unanimous consent that those be printed in the RECORD.

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

PARTNERSHIP FOR A
DRUG-FREE AMERICA,
Washington, DC, June 24, 1999.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: An amendment has been introduced in the House of Representatives that threatens the success of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, currently being coordinated by the Office of National Drug-Control Policy and the Partnership for a Drug-Free America. This amendment, now part of the Treasury & General Government Appropriations Bill, mandates the inclusion of alcohol-related messages in the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. As former Director of ONCDP in the Bush administration and as co-chairman of the Partnership, I write to urge you to oppose any similar provision that may be offered in your Appropriations Committee markup of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Bill.

Representative Royal-Allard and Representative Wolf, who introduced this amendment in the House are correct in their convictions about underage drinking. But advocates are wrong to suggest that this enormous problem can be addressed effectively within the current appropriation for the anti-drug campaign. Advocates of the amendment say it is simply designed to give Gen. McCaffrey statutory jurisdiction to address alcohol within the context of this campaign. We read this amendment as the beginning of the end of the anti-drug campaign.

If you wish to combat underage drinking, I urge you to support the development of a mass media campaign specifically targeting this issue through a separate appropriation. The marketing experts who comprise the Partnership believe it will take hundreds of millions of dollars to conduct a campaign designed to dissuade teenagers from drinking. The Partnership offers its assistance in this pursuit. But many things need to fall into place first—research, market-testing, and hundreds of millions in funding to do this correctly.

Should a version of the Roybal-Allard/Wolf amendment surface in the Senate, please help us keep the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign on track and focused. Please oppose any effort to require this campaign to do more than it was originally designed to do. As you may know, the Partnership receives no part of the federal money dedicated to the anti-drug campaign. The Partnership donates all its advertising to this federally-backed effort for free.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. BENNETT.

PARTNERSHIP FOR A
DRUG-FREE AMERICA,
New York, NY, June 23, 1999.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: An amendment has been introduced in the House of Representatives that threatens the success of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, currently being coordinated by the Office of National Drug-Control Policy and the Partnership for a Drug-Free America. This amendment, now part of the Treasury & General Government Appropriations Bill, mandates the inclusion of alcohol-related messages in the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.

If Congress wishes to support developing a national advertising campaign targeting underage drinking, we stand ready to support you by offering the assistance of our entire organization. We do not believe, however, an effective campaign targeting underage drinking can be carved out of the current appropriation for the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.

As the former chairman and CEO of Johnson & Johnson and someone who has spent his entire career in marketing, I can tell you that forcing the campaign to address underage drinking (something that it was not originally designed to do) will seriously jeopardize the success of this effort. To undertake such an effort, extensive consumer-based research would be needed to determine effective advertising strategies. No such research exists. Additionally, to really change attitudes about alcohol, this type of effort would have to compete head-to-head with the billions spent to market alcohol products and, therefore, require significantly more funding.

Shaving money out of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign will not accomplish this. We do not question the rightness of addressing underage drinking. Our concerns focus on what we can and cannot accomplish with the current appropriation. We question the wisdom of seriously risking—and perhaps killing—the effectiveness of one media campaign to create another that simply cannot and will not work, given current limitations. Should a similar amendment be proposed in the Senate, I respectfully ask you to keep the anti-drug campaign focused on what it was designed to target: illegal, illicit drugs.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. BURKE.

PARTNERSHIP FOR A
DRUG-FREE AMERICA,
New York, NY, June 23, 1999.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: As you may know, the Partnership for a Drug-Free America—a non-profit coalition of professionals from the communications industry—has for the past 12 years demonstrated a remarkable expertise in the production of anti-drug advertising and the execution of a national anti-drug media campaign. The Partnership is currently donating all of its advertising to the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, being coordinated by the Office of National Drug Control Policy. The Partnership also provides ongoing strategic advice to the campaign, and receives no federal funds as part of this program.

The House Appropriations Committee will soon mark up its Treasury & General Government Appropriations Bill. An amendment has been added to this bill authorizing the inclusion of alcohol-related messages in the anti-drug campaign. As the Partnership has

demonstrated, advertising can be used to address teenage drug use. Backed by the proper research, advertising could also be used to address underage drinking. But please understand this: We cannot target both effectively within the current appropriation.

The alcohol industry spends billions each year on marketing and promotion. As it stands, \$185 million is authorized to fund the anti-drug campaign. Of this less than \$150 million is actually being spent on the purchase of media exposure for the campaign. If the Congress is interested in developing an effective campaign to address underage drinking, the Partnership stands ready to work with any and all concerned organizations and government agencies to see it through. But please understand that this type of program will require hundreds of millions more dollars—if not billions—to be effective.

Unless the House plans to increase funding significantly for the anti-drug campaign, the Partnership has urged members to vote to strip the Roybal-Allard/Wolf Amendment from the anti-drug media campaign appropriation. The amendment threatens the success of one media campaign by creating another that simply cannot and will not work, given current limitations. A fact sheet on the Partnership and our position on this amendment are attached for your convenience. If any similar provision is offered in your Appropriations Committee markup of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Bill, I encourage you keep the anti-drug campaign focused by opposing any such measure, unless significantly more funds are appropriated.

Sincerely yours,

MARIO M. CUOMO.

PARTNERSHIP FOR A DRUG-FREE AMERICA
CO-CHAIRMAN

Mr. James E. Burke, Chairman Emeritus, Johnson & Johnson, Chairman, Partnership for a Drug-Free America, 405 Lexington Avenue, 16th Floor, New York, NY 10174, 212/973-3514, 212/697-1031 (Fax).

Governor Mario M. Cuomo, Former Governor, New York, Partner, Wilkie, Farr & Gallagher, 787 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY 10019-6099, 212/728-8260, 212/728-8111 (Fax).

Dr. William J. Bennett, Former Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy (Bush administration), Former Secretary of Education, US Department of Education (Reagan administration), Co-Director, Empower America, 1776 I Street, N.W., Suite 890, Washington, DC 20036, 202/452-8200, 202/833-0556 (fax).

STATEMENT OF RICHARD D. BONNETTE, PRESIDENT & CEO, PARTNERSHIP FOR A DRUG-FREE AMERICA ON THE ROYBAL-ALLARD/WOLF AMENDMENT

NEW YORK, June 7th—We whole-heartedly support the concept of developing a national advertising campaign targeting underage drinking. Alcohol abuse is a huge problem in America, and plays an undeniable role in substance abuse among children and teenagers. As the Partnership has demonstrated, advertising can be used to address teenage drug use. Backed by the proper research, advertising could also be used to address underage drinking. But it is simply not possible to target both effectively within the current appropriation for the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.

I base this perspective on more than 30 years in the advertising business, and 10 years of experience with the Partnership for a Drug-Free America. The Partnership is a coalition of communications professionals from advertising, marketing, public relations and related disciplines. This judgment

does not question the relevance of targeting underage drinking. It questions the wisdom of seriously risking—and perhaps killing—the effectiveness of one media campaign to create another that simply cannot and will not work, given current limitations.

Our overriding concern about the Roybal-Allard/Wolf amendment is that it will reduce the overall media exposure for the anti-drug campaign. The alcohol industry spends at least \$1 billion each year on marketing and promotion; the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign is funded at \$195 million. Of this, less than \$150 million is backing the advertising campaign. Clearly, an alcohol-abuse advertising campaign would require significantly more money to compete with the marketing muscle of the alcohol industry. From a sheer marketing perspective, the chances of such a campaign having an impact within the context of the current appropriation are very, very slim.

The Partnership stands ready to support the development of a national advertising campaign on underage drinking. We have more than a decade's worth of experience in running a consumer-focused media campaign designed to change attitudes on drugs. We will help any and all groups interested in this type of campaign in every way we can. This type of campaign, however, must be done correctly.

The first step of any solid marketing effort is thorough research. We have 11 years of experience in the marketplace and 12 years of research on consumer attitudes about illegal drugs. While one could assume this model could work for alcohol abuse, extensive consumer-focused research would be needed to guide the development and execution of such a program. Currently, this type of research does not exist. The development and literature review backing the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign took more than 18 months. To insert an amendment requiring alcohol abuse be addressed, without the same thorough approach taken in the development of the anti-drug media campaign, ignores the fundamental need for research.

Children and teenagers have different attitudes about different drugs—marijuana, cocaine, inhalants, methamphetamine, heroin and other illegal drugs. Kids of different ages, races and genders view these drugs differently. Attitudes about certain drugs also vary by region in the country. We have no similar consumer insights into what kids think about alcohol—beer, liquor, malt liquor, etc.—and how these attitudes may differ by alcohol brand, by age of kids, race, etc.

Marketing to reduce alcohol abuse would be more difficult than marketing against illegal drugs. Alcohol, unlike illicit drugs, is legal. While not impossible to accomplish, changing attitudes about alcohol would be very challenging, given its widespread cultural acceptance and use (responsible and otherwise) of alcohol products. Alcohol use is widely glamorized in movies, television and music. Alcohol use is deeply ingrained in our culture—ritualized and commonplace.

We respect the opinions and passion of our colleagues working to reduce alcohol abuse. We do not have any ties with the beer and/or alcohol trade organizations opposing this amendment; we do not accept funding from the alcohol and/or tobacco industries. We are concerned about this amendment solely because it could significantly diminish the impact of the anti-drug campaign.

The National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign is being coordinated by the Office of National Drug Control Policy in cooperation with the Partnership for a Drug-Free America (PDFA). PDFA provides advertising to the campaign pro bono and receives no federal funding for its role in this effort. The amendment seeks inclusion of anti-alcohol

ads in this campaign, which is using federal funds to purchase media exposure for anti-drug advertising.

FACT SHEET

The Partnership for a Drug-Free America is a non-profit coalition of professionals from the communications industry, whose mission is to reduce demand for illegal drugs in America. Through its national anti-drug advertising campaign and other forms of media communication, the Partnership works to decrease demand for drugs by changing societal attitudes which support, tolerate, or condone drug use.

The Partnership is comprised of a small staff and hundreds of volunteers from the communications industry, who create and disseminate the Partnership's work. Advertising agencies create Partnership messages pro bono; research firms donate information services; talent unions permit their members to work for free; production professionals bring Partnership messages to life; a network of advertising professionals distribute the group's work to national and local media; public relations firms lend services to various Partnership projects; and media companies donate valuable broadcast time and print space to deliver Partnership messages to millions of Americans.

To date, more than 500 anti-drug ads have been created by our volunteers. From March 1987 through the end of 1998, the total value of broadcast time and print space donated to Partnership messages topped \$3 billion, making this the largest public service media campaign in history. The Partnership receives major funding from The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and support from more than 200 corporations and companies. PDFA accepts no funding from manufacturers of alcohol and/or tobacco products. The organization began in 1986 with seed money provided by the American Association of Advertising Agencies.

Research demonstrates that the Partnership's national advertising campaign has played a contributing role in reducing overall drug use in America. Independent studies and expert interpretation of drug trends support its effectiveness. The New York Times has described the Partnership as "one of the most effective drug education groups in the U.S."

Drastic changes in the media industry over the past decade have led to an overall decline in media exposure of public service advertising. This is one factor contributing to the Partnership's decision to participate in the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, coordinated by the Office of National Drug Control Policy in cooperation with PDFA. Through the leadership of Gen. Barry McCaffrey, director of the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy, and the commitment of numerous, outstanding members of Congress, a total of \$380 million has been appropriated by Congress for this effort to date (\$195 million in FY '98, \$185 million in FY '99). The bulk of this money is being used to pay for the one thing that has eluded our campaign in recent years—consistent, optimal, national media exposure. PDFA receives no funding for its role in this campaign. The organization donates all advertising to the effort pro bono and serves as a primary strategic consultant (unpaid).

In addition to its work on a national level, the Partnership has helped create 54 state-and city-based versions of its national advertising campaign through its State/City Alliance Program. Working with state/city governments and locally-based drug prevention organizations, the Partnership provides at no cost—the guidance, on-site technical assistance and creative materials necessary to shape a multimedia campaign tailored to the

needs and activities within the state or city. Several additional alliances are targeted for launch, which will expand the program's reach to 98 percent of the U.S.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY,

Washington, DC.

ASSESSMENT OF THE POTENTIAL INCLUSION OF ANTI-UNDERAGE-DRINKING ADVERTISING IN THE ONDCP CAMPAIGN

An anti-underage drinking message to youth is largely a separate and distinct message from the anti-drug message, requiring a significantly different strategic approach based on scientific and behavioral knowledge. If we were to be asked to communicate an additional anti-underage-drinking message platform with the current media budget, we would fall below effective reach and frequency levels for all message platforms, thus risking the success of the entire campaign.

An anti-underage drinking message to youth would also require separate production, and this would incur a considerable investment (\$3-\$4 million).

An anti-underage drinking message to adults might more easily be incorporated in a strategic message focusing on encouraging good parenting, and the important role of youth influencers, in shaping positive behavior among youth. Ideally, of course, a separate effort targeting adults would be more effective.

While incremental advertising funds would absolutely be required to successfully mount an anti-underage drinking campaign, it would not be necessary to double the overall ONDCP advertising budget if the adult efforts are combined. Since the youth campaign represents about half of the campaign, the ideal incremental budget would be approximately \$100 million. This would include some funds for such needed expenditures as additional production, new behavior change expertise, and limited copy testing, tracking and evaluation. We would seek every possible efficiency between the anti-drug and anti-underage-drinking campaigns from a creative and media perspective (e.g., limiting the target to older teens).

If incremental funds are unavailable at this time, please be aware that the current campaign already includes a substantial percentage of anti-underage-drinking messages (e.g., MADD, DOT, OSAP, etc.). This proportion could be augmented, though this would obviously diminish other PSA efforts. The "match" airtime devoted to this advertising is every bit as good as that secured for the paid anti-drug units.

ISSUE PAPER

Inclusion of alcohol in the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign

Using appropriated funds to include an alcohol or tobacco component in the paid portion of the ONDCP National Youth Anti-drug Media Campaign, within existing budgets, would significantly dilute the campaign's emphasis on illicit drugs, the primary intent of Congress and the Clinton Administration in establishing this program.

The Media Campaign already addresses alcohol in several key areas.

When ONDCP purchases time on network or local television and/or radio stations, a condition of the media buy is a dollar-for-dollar contribution to ONDCP from the media outlet in the form of public service. Most comes in the form of donated public service slots in similar time periods, which ONDCP shares with other organizations that have drug-related messages (PSAs). The Media campaign is already using underage-

drinking and drunk driving public service announcements in its pro bono component. From July 1998 through January 1999 (the period for which data is available), about 15% of the television public service time given to the Media Campaign has been shared with four organizations involved with underage drinking and drunk driving (They are: National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence, Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD), Recording Artists, Athletes and Actors Against Drunk Driving, and the Dept. of Transportation). These 20 PSAs were electronically coded and reports are generated to identify and track when and where each message is played. Computerized tracking reports indicate these messages have played over 7,000 times on local and network television, which is conservatively valued at \$8,000,000 in media time. ONDCP does not count any time donated in the middle of the night (1 a.m. to 5 a.m.) All of these PSAs were aired during appropriate time slots.

In addition, the Partnership for a Drug Free America has 53 State and local alliances 15 of which support programs that include alcohol messages as public service announcements. These messages include underaged drinking, binge drinking, prenatal alcohol use, parental modeling, and other subjects that appear on television, radio, on billboards, on posters, and in print. PDFA estimates that the total value of media time donated for these messages is approximately \$7,000,000.

ONDCP's media match also comes in the form of television programming. At least four national network television programs have focused on youth-alcohol related issues. For example, on May 16, the entire episode of WB's Smart Guy will concentrate on underage drinking. ONDCP's behavioral change experts have worked closely with the writers and producers of this program to ensure key message strategies were incorporated.

Much of the campaign's communications strategy to reach parents regarding youth drug are appropriate to reaching parents regarding underage drinking (knowing where your children are, who their friends are, establishing rules and values, etc.).

Substantial and costly changes in the communications strategy would be required. The existing campaign strategy was developed over an eight-month period in an expert driven process. The strategy emphasizes specific message platforms, techniques, and activities to address illicit drugs. Adding alcohol to the strategy would mean a substantial departure from current strategy, and would require additional time and research for development. For example, ads would need to be developed to address laws on underage drinking, issues of access to alcohol (point of sale), etc. This would dilute and delay the overall impact of the anti-drug ads by reducing their reach and frequency. Professional advertising and research staff have already alerted ONDCP that we may have too many strategic messages for the level of funds available. The addition of alcohol ads would further complicate efforts and delay the campaign from reaching its planned potential and strength.

Development of alcohol messages would place new, unanticipated requirements on our existing partners, require substantial time for production (behavioral briefs, focus groups and testing) and create additional expense. The Campaign was developed based on the Congressional expectation that all the messages used would be produced on a pro bono basis, primarily through the Partnership for a Drug Free America, whose agencies provide their creative work free of charge. PDFA does not produce national messages on alcohol use/abuse; thus, we would be required to pay for development costs

through an advertising agency (and no funding allocation exists for this). The costs and contractual effort required to undertake this would be substantial. Further it would undermine a principle upon which the campaign was based—the pro bono development of advertising messages.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY,

Washington, DC, June 7, 1999.

MCCAFFREY SAYS INCLUSION OF UNRESEARCHED AND UNDER FUNDED ALCOHOL ADS IN YOUTH ANTI-DRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN WOULD BE ILL-ADVISED

WASHINGTON, DC.—White House National Policy Director Barry McCaffrey today said that proposals to include alcohol prevention in the paid portion of the ongoing National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign "could dilute the focus of the successful media campaign advertising effort to change attitudes of youth and parents toward illegal drug abuse."

McCaffrey stated, "We share a concern about the terribly serious problem of underage alcohol use. We do not disagree with the desirability of a media campaign targeted against underage drinking. However, it would be a serious mistake to simply add alcohol messages to the ONDCP paid media campaign without significantly increasing the funding level. Behavioral scientists and youth and advertising experts advise us that our campaign will only be effective if we purchase a sufficient level of media exposure for each of our messages. The addition of paid alcohol ads—without new funds, staff and research—would only hamper the effectiveness of our campaign."

A commercial advertiser would not add a new product line to an advertising plan without increasing the advertising budget. We cannot simply add new alcohol messages without seriously endangering the effectiveness of the anti-drug youth campaign. There are several challenges that would make an anti-alcohol campaign an expensive proposition. Although at the initiation of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign there was a stockpile of illicit drug ads, there are very few ads currently available on underage drinking. We would need to develop and produce expensive new ads. Additionally, since alcohol is legal for adults, an effective anti-alcohol campaign would need an entirely different strategy than our existing media campaign, which has as its focus illegal substances.

When ONDCP purchases time on national or local media, we negotiate to achieve a dollar-for-dollar matching contribution. Most of this contribution comes in the form of donated public service announcement slots in similar time periods. ONDCP then passes these PSA opportunities to organizations that have anti-drug messages. From July 1998 through January 1999, roughly 15% of television public service time given to the ONDCP Media Campaign was shared with four organizations confronting underage drinking and drunk driving (National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, Recording Artists, Athletes and Actors Against Drunk Driving, and the Department of Transportation). These messages have played over 7000 times on local and network television, which is conservatively valued at \$8 million. In this concrete way, we have already generated the largest youth anti-alcohol media campaign in history. ONDCP has also used the match part of the campaign to urge networks to include anti-alcohol messages in entertainment programming. For example, the entire episode of WB's Smart Guy that

aired on May 16 concentrated on underage drinking."

We are now entering the second year of an increasingly successful youth anti-drug media campaign. Alcohol and tobacco use are clearly a major threat to the health and safety of our children. However, now is not the time to lose focus on the start of a massive, well designed and successful effort to reverse the disastrous increase in illegal drug use by American adolescents."

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let us get on about the business of fighting teenage drug abuse. I urge my colleagues to support the motion to table.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, my colleague from Ohio is going to speak. I will give him 4 minutes to make his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. I thank my friend.

Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Lautenberg amendment.

This is a commonsense amendment.

What are the essential facts? The essential facts are that underage drinking is a huge problem in this country. If you are worried about your child dying, this is a good place to start.

Statistics are absolutely unbelievable. The life expectancy of those between the age of 16 and 24 or 25 is not good. One of the main reasons it is not good is underage drinking. Most of the fatalities are connected with underage drinking.

Let me also state some other essential facts.

Advertising works. We all know it works. We know it works on campaigns. Where does the majority of the money that we raise for our campaigns go? It goes to advertising. Advertising is how we communicate with people. We know it works.

If we are serious about dealing with this problem, then we need to spend the money and we need to do the advertising.

One of the statistics that has been cited on this floor is very telling. It goes back to my question. If you are serious about this problem, if you are serious about protecting your kids, what do you do?

Here is one statistic. One study indicates that underage abuse of alcohol certainly has serious consequences. According to the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, underage drinking killed an estimated 6,350 young people between the age of 12 to 20. That was for the year 1994. All other illicit drugs killed 980 youth.

If these statistics are true—based on my experience as county prosecutor and someone who has been involved in this issue for many years, I think it is true—alcohol kills six times as many children than all other illicit drugs combined.

This is a very modest proposal because it does not compel the drug czar to spend money. What it simply says is that the drug czar spend some of the

money that they have that has been set aside for advertising. They can, in fact, spend it on this horrendous problem.

All you have to do to see this problem is to go to the hospital and talk to an emergency room physician. Ask an emergency room physician how often alcohol is related to what they see. They will tell you that on any Friday night, or any Saturday night, it dominates the emergencies; that the vast majority of the emergencies they see, particularly the serious ones, are alcohol related.

This is a leading killer of our young people. To say that we are not going to use this money that is available for advertising, which we know is effective, for this horrendous problem, frankly, makes absolutely no sense.

I appeal to my colleagues. While reasonable minds can differ—and I think my colleagues on the other side of this issue have made some very interesting and some good arguments—I believe that the statistics clearly indicate that alcohol is the drug of choice among young people.

For those who are underage, alcohol is the drug of choice. It is the most serious drug in this country, and it is also a gateway drug, which simply means it is the drug that most young people start with, and then they "advance" to other drugs.

To be able to mount a successful and a good advertising campaign—to take the words from the amendment, the message of "discouraging underage alcohol consumption," that is what this amendment would allow.

I urge my colleagues to allow this permissive use of the money. I believe it will save lives. I believe it is the right thing to do.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, what time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has 11 minutes 1 second. The Senator from Colorado has 15 minutes 39 seconds.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I think we have no further speakers on the issue on our side. We are prepared to yield back the time, unless someone shows up in the next minute or two.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I think that we can move to conclude this debate. I will take just a couple of minutes. Unless there are further Members who want to speak, I will then yield back the time.

This is one of those debates that I really do not enjoy because the friends who are opposing this are not people who are against what we want to do. They are not against eliminating underage drinking—not at all. What we are arguing about is somewhat about process.

Frankly, though, we are on the same side of the issue. But I see them as having an argument that I can't buy, and I don't think the American people will buy. We are saying let's preserve as much of the \$1 billion that we have to fight drugs through the media campaign, plus all of the other money

spent on fighting drugs, even though we are not doing it quite successfully.

But we ought to be looking more critically at how we deal with the drug problem. We are building more jails. We are penalizing those in institutions and jails, or in other facilities of incarceration, who are not drug addicts. We are spending billions of dollars. And we don't put alcoholics in jail. We don't punish them. We don't stigmatize them the same way we do drug users.

But I point out that alcohol kills six times more children ages 12 to 20 than all other illegal drugs combined.

What does that say? Does that say that the children who die from alcohol are worth less to us as a society than those who die from illegal drugs? I don't think that is the message that we want to convey.

There is a \$1 billion anti-drug media campaign. That \$1 billion, in light of this surplus, could grow. But because the drug czar does not even have the authority, he cannot issue messages about underage drinking. There is something wrong with that. Why can't an ad that shows a picture of a degenerated adult brain from drug use say that also happens from alcohol?

In many cases, we see violence from alcohol that does not always kill. But it enrages people and causes fights. Alcohol is the product largely responsible for spousal abuse and internal family fights. Alcohol does it every time.

We have 4 million alcoholics between the ages of 13 and 20—4 million. That is a lot of young people. Yet, we are not waging the same war against alcohol as we are against drugs.

By the way, in the message that we heard from the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky, he mentioned outstanding citizens, Jim Burke and Mario Cuomo, as people who are on the other side. But that doesn't mean that they are right in this fight. I disagree with them and have great respect for both of them. I know them personally.

The fact of the matter is, when we don't mention that alcohol is a scourge, as are illegal drugs, then it is assumed to be by young people something not so bad. We know it is terrible: Six times more fatal to young people than all of the illegal drugs combined.

What keeps the message from getting out there? I don't know that there is anybody lobbying for illegal drugs. But I know that there are people lobbying to keep this anti-alcohol message away from children. When I see the Budweiser lizards talking on television, it is a pretty attractive picture. But it is not a lot different from Joe Camel attracting kids to smoking. Young people laugh. They like those commercials. I know it goes right from the television into young people's minds.

Those commercials make people think, "Beer is cool." But it is not cool when it is a 13-, 14-, or 15-year-old kid. As they say, a child who starts drinking at age 13 has a 47-percent chance of becoming an alcoholic. Those who wait

until age 21 have only a 10-percent chance.

Why don't we respond to this epidemic? We can talk about programs that can make a difference, but we are not. But we are spending \$1 billion on an anti-drug campaign. Yes, there has been a cutback, but I see that being restored. If those funds grow, the drug czar can't add alcohol to the campaign, because he doesn't have the authority. This amendment gives him the authority. It doesn't tell him how to do it. It says tell young people out there, you hurt your brain, you hurt your family, you hurt your society, and you hurt yourself if you use alcohol.

The law is age 21. I wrote that law against terrific opposition in 1984. It was a Republican President. President Reagan was President, and Elizabeth Dole was the then-Secretary of Transportation. We worked together to get it done because they saw alcohol as a scourge.

I hope we are not put off by the argument that you can't do two things at the same time: "No to drugs" on one side of the screen; "no to alcohol" on the other side of the screen. I don't think that hurts anybody, and it could help somebody. That is the issue.

I hate to disagree with some of my friends who have taken the other side. I know they feel the problem deeply. I think they have chosen to dismiss an opportunity that I think is the only one that exists for us. We will not have an anti-alcohol program. Can you see trying to get that through this place with all of the friends of the alcohol industry? There is not a chance.

This is the time to do it. We ought to step up and vote the right way. Give the drug czar an opportunity to say no to alcohol, as well as to drugs.

I ask unanimous consent that a series of editorials be printed in the RECORD, including one from the New York Times, as well as a list of over 80 responsible organizations—many of them religious, a lot of them social—who are on our side of the issue, as well as the Surgeon General's letter.

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

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1999]

THE ANTI-DRUG CAMPAIGN'S MISSING LINK

Gen. Barry McCaffrey, President Clinton's director of national drug policy, has declared flatly that under-age drinking is the single biggest drug problem among adolescents, and is intimately linked to the use of illegal drugs. But as things stand now, the \$195 million national media campaign that General McCaffrey is running this year to dissuade youngsters from using illicit drugs will not spend a penny in Federal funds to warn teenagers about the dangers of drinking.

The White House's Office of National Drug Control Policy offers two reasons for not including alcohol in the anti-drug campaign: the first is that it would dilute the basic message, which is that kids should avoid illegal drugs. That is strange reasoning, given the solid evidence showing that teen-age drinking is often a gateway to illicit drug use. Indeed, the first goal of the White House's national drug strategy is to "edu-

cate and enable America's youth to reject illegal drugs as well as alcohol and tobacco." It also notes that adults who started drinking as children are nearly eight times more likely to use cocaine than adults who did not do so.

The second reason is that Mr. McCaffrey believes that the statute granting his office authority to combat controlled substances leaves him no room to target alcohol. That rigid interpretation is open to question. In any case, the statutory problem can be quickly remedied by legislations. Representatives Lucille Roybal-Allard, Democrat of California, and Frank Wolf, Republican of Virginia, have introduced a measure that would explicitly give General McCaffrey the authority to include under-age drinking among the campaign's targets.

Ms. Allard and Mr. Wolf have lined up powerful support from groups like the American Medical Association. The National Beer Wholesalers' Association opposes the measure, as does the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, a nonprofit coalition of advertising firms that has been working on the campaign. The Partnership argues that an anti-alcohol message would dilute the anti-drug message, but some of the Partnership's members earn lucrative fees for promoting alcohol products.

The measure, an amendment to an appropriations bill, deserves support. If warning about the dangers of excessive drinking is not statutorily part of General McCaffrey's job, it ought to be.

[From The Washington Post, June 18, 1999]

BEER LOBBY AT WORK

If beer lobbyists have their way in Congress, an expensive taxpayer-funded campaign against youth drug use—\$1 billion over five years for a prime-time advertising blitz—will go through Congress without a penny to combat the No. 1 drug choice among young people. In the eyes of the National Beer Wholesalers Association—the group responsible for killing legislation last year to toughen drunk-driving standards—alcohol doesn't count when it comes to warning kids about illegal drug use.

Karalyn Nunnallee, national president of Mothers Against Drunk Driving, points out that alcohol kills six times more young people in this country than all illicit drugs combined "and is the primary gateway drug for other illicit drug use." Yet the campaign conducted by Gen. Barry McCaffrey, President Clinton's director of national drug policy, in cooperation with the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, has excluded any references to alcohol. The partnership, a non-profit, non-federally funded, non-industry-supported coalition of advertising firms, favors a separate campaign against drinking by kids. It argues that anti-alcohol messages would inevitably dilute the focus on "culturally" very different drugs.

Still, an anti-drug campaign that can't mention alcohol—or binge drinking, a serious problem across America—is flawed. Reps. Lucille Roybal-Allard of California and Frank Wolf of Virginia are sponsoring an amendment before the House Appropriations Committee that would free Gen. McCaffrey of this restriction. Their point is not to detract from anti-drug messages but to add to their effectiveness by reflecting reality. Taxpayer dollars ought not be spent by the hundreds of millions to talk about drugs but to remain mute on the danger of illegal alcohol use by kids.

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 4, 1999]

SAY 'NO' TO UNDERAGE DRINKING, TOO

States uniformly ban the sale of alcoholic beverages to minors because they are not

considered mature enough to drink responsibly and safely.

That bit of wisdom seems to have been lost on Congress, which by sleight of hand banned the federal government from mentioning alcohol in a \$195 million anti-drug media blitz aimed at kids.

A two-word phrase deep in the legislation establishing the White House's Office of National Drug Control Policy—the so-called "drug czar"—limits its activities to "controlled substances." Liquor is not one, and so the federal government can't spend a nickel to warn kids about alcohol's potential dangers.

A bill introduced this month by U.S. Rep. Lucille Roybal-Allard (D-Calif.) would correct that and allow the drug czar to include alcohol warnings in anti-drug messages to children. It's a sensible amendment, reflecting national concerns about underage drinking, and it ought to be approved.

Leading the crusade against the Roybal-Allard bill is the National Beer Wholesalers' Association, whose tiresome refrain is that liquor is a legal product and the federal government has no business criticizing it in any forum.

Nonsense. Alcohol sales to minors are not legal, and the dangers of alcohol abuse by adolescents are universally recognized. "It's the biggest drug abuse problem for adolescents, and it's linked to the use of other, illegal drugs," said drug czar Barry McCaffrey at a Feb. 8 news conference.

Among other research, a 1998 University of Michigan study reported that 74 percent of high school seniors had already tried alcohol—about twice as many as had smoked marijuana—and nearly a third admitted getting drunk during the previous month.

Still, a spokesman for the drug czar's office argues that adding ". . . and alcohol" to the federal ad campaign for kids would muddle its anti-drug message.

That's an inane distinction. Alcohol, in the hands of children or teens, is a dangerous drug they should be warned about. It's sufficiently dangerous in fact, that if more money is needed to broaden the federal media blitz, Congress should provide it.

Honesty has to be the trademark of a campaign against substance abuse, particularly one aimed at kids. Playing phony games with the definition of "dangerous substance" undermines the credibility of the effort and also its effectiveness.

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 16, 1999]

BOOZE AND ITS BACKERS

Federal drug czar Barry R. McCaffrey has launched a \$1-billion media campaign to dissuade youngsters from substance abuse. Not a penny, however, will address the substance that today's teenagers are abusing the most: alcohol.

With youth consumption on the rise since the early 1990s, even McCaffrey acknowledges that alcohol leads to more teenage deaths than other drugs combined. Nevertheless, he insists that including alcohol in the campaign would only dilute its basic message, that kids should avoid illegal drugs.

That's hard to swallow, given federal studies showing that 67% of children who start drinking alcohol before age 15 end up using illicit drugs. And that adults who started drinking as children are nearly eight times more likely to use cocaine than those who did not.

That's why the House Appropriations Committee should pass an amendment by Rep. Lucille Roybal-Allard (D-Los Angeles), requiring McCaffrey to include underage drinking in his campaign's targets.

Ideally, the government would not be spending any money at all to reach the

American people on TV and radio: Broadcasters promised in 1996 to offer more free public-service spots, just before Congress gave them, without cost, a portion of the supposedly public airwaves that would have fetched \$70 billion on the open market. Given that McCaffrey's money has already been allocated, however, Congress' focus should be on how he can spend it wisely.

The people scrambling to defeat Roybal-Allard's amendment are unable to offer any sound reason why alcohol should be excluded from McCaffrey's campaign. But they do have a clear stake in opposing the amendment. Leading the charge against it is Rep. Anne M. Northrup (R-Ky.). She received nearly twice as much campaign money from the alcoholic beverage industry in 1997 and 1998 as any of her colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee. At her side is a coalition of advertising firms, called the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, that have benefited handsomely from the \$1 billion the alcohol industry spent last year on promotions.

On Thursday, the executives of those firms will meet at the annual American Advertising Conference in Washington. In a valid illustration of the capital's incestuous world, the opening speaker will be Gen. Barry McCaffrey.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 4, 1999]

THE MONITOR'S VIEW—DON'T SOFT-PEDAL ALCOHOL

The United States government will spend \$195 million this year to persuade young Americans to avoid addictive drugs. Is there any good reason why some of that money should not be used to point out the dangers of the substance most abused by the young—alcohol?

A couple of members of Congress thought not. That's why they put forward legislation to give the country's chief antidrug official, Barry McCaffrey, the authority to use some of the advertising money available to the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy to steer kids away from beer, wine, and liquor.

But these matters are not so clear-cut as they seem—or as they ought to be. No sooner has Reps. Lucille Roybal-Allard (D) of California and Frank Wolf (R) of Virginia offered their amendment than a political-defense mechanism lurched into action. Alcoholic beverages have a powerful lobby on Capitol Hill, and their producers and distributors contribute faithfully to campaign war chests.

Opposition to the amendment is coalescing in Congress around the argument that including alcohol would dilute or distort the antidrug message. How so, since alcohol destroys more young lives than any other drug, and people who use "hard" drugs typically have tried alcohol first? Binge drinking, threatening order and individual lives, has become an increasing problem on college campuses.

No, what's kicking in is "Big Alcohol's" political clout and America's ambivalence about its most popular over-the-counter addictive drug, which is relentlessly pitched to the young via TV beer ads. Sadly, McCaffrey's office is ambivalent, hardly leaping to support the amendment. Leaving alcohol out of the antidrug campaign creates a gap in common sense and effectiveness. Representatives Roybal-Allard and Wolf get high marks for working to fill it.

[From the Record, June 7, 1999]

OVERLOOKED TYPE OF ABUSE—FAR MORE YOUNGSTERS DRINK THAN USE DRUGS

Common sense doesn't always win in Congress. How else can you explain some of the

reactions to an amendment directing the Federal Government to spend some of its anti-drug advertising dollars to discourage underage drinking? Unless, of course, campaign contributions are a factor.

Many people believe that underage drinking is a far more serious problem than drug use by youngsters. And there's evidence to support their view. For example, nearly three-quarters of the high school seniors surveyed by the University of Michigan last year said they had consumed alcohol in the previous year, compared with the 38 percent who reported smoking marijuana. A third admitted to being drunk in the previous month.

Gen. Barry McCaffrey, director of federal drug policy, has called underage drinking the "biggest drug abuse problem for adolescents." He has said it is "linked to the use of other, illegal drugs."

Yet while the federal government this year plans to spend \$195 million on a national media campaign to fight the use of illicit drugs, no money has been set aside for an advertising campaign to combat underage drinking.

Earlier this month, Lucille Roybal-Allard, a California Democrat, introduced legislation to make underage drinking a target of the federal anti-drug media campaign. Her measure is supported by the American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Society of Addictive Medicine, and Mothers against Drunk Driving.

But several members of Congress and the beer wholesalers oppose it. Even the White House's Office of National Drug Control Policy has questioned it.

Why? The beer industry says it already spends hundreds of thousands of dollars to combat the problem. It says the drug czar should focus only on illicit drugs. Rep. Anne Northrup, R-KY, agrees and has promised to fight the measure when it comes up for a vote. Ms. Northup says her opposition has nothing to do with the nearly \$40,000 in contributions she has gotten from liquor and beer interests in the past two years.

The Partnership for a Drug-Free America, the coalition that coordinates the anti-drug media campaign, says it supports the concept of targeting underage drinking. But it says federal efforts would be dwarfed by the \$3 billion a year the beer industry spends promoting its products. The Partnership says \$195 million is not enough to do two effective campaigns, and that one good campaign is preferable to two weak ones.

Maybe, but it's hard to see how targeting underage drinking would dilute the message against drugs. If the two are connected—as Mr. McCaffrey says—discouraging youths from drinking might also prevent some from using drugs.

[From The Boston Globe, June 22, 1999]

BEER PRESSURE

The same lobby that killed a proposal last year to standardize blood alcohol levels for drunken driving is now trying to keep underage drinking out of a youth education campaign sponsored by the nation's drug czar, General Barry McCaffrey.

The National Beer Wholesalers Association opposes the inclusion of underage drinking in the \$195 million media campaign, claiming that alcohol is a legal substance and should not be lumped with marijuana, cocaine, and other illegal drugs. But drinking under age 21 is illegal in every state, and alcohol abuse is far more common than any other drug among young people.

General McCaffrey himself has said alcohol is "the biggest drug abuse problem for adolescents." But his office has been strangely

circumspect about adding underage drinking to the campaign, saying the drug czar's charter limits his mandate to fighting controlled substances. This is why Congress should favor an amendment sponsored by Representatives Frank Wolf of Virginia, a Republican, and Lucille Roybal-Allard of California, a Democrat, that authorizes McCaffrey to include underage drinking in the education campaign.

The alcohol lobby is terrified of being regulated like that other legal killer, cigarettes, with warning labels on beer cans and limits on marketing to teenagers. It points to its voluntary public service ads that urge responsible drinking. But the alcohol industry spends nearly \$3 billion a year on marketing and promotion. Against that backdrop, "responsibility" needs all the help it can get.

The facts about underage drinking are sobering. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration reports 16,100 alcohol-related fatalities in 1997—one person killed every 32 minutes. Intoxication rates were highest for the youngest drivers. Although the universal drinking age of 21 has helped reduce fatalities, motor vehicle crashes remain the number one cause of death for teenagers.

June—prom season—is the month when most of these tragic deaths occur. It would be a good month for Congress to do something about it.

STATEMENT OF ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING INCLUSION OF ANTI-UNDERAGE DRINKING MESSAGES IN THE YOUTH ANTI-DRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN

An effective antidrug prevention program directed at America's young people must include a significant effort to discourage underage drinking. Alcohol is the leading drug problem among young people in America, and a "gateway" to the use of other drugs.

We therefore call on Members of Congress and the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDPC) to work together to insure that a series of underage drinking prevention messages is included as a substantial part of the federally paid portion of the "Anti-Drug Youth Media Campaign."

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

- Adventist Health Network
- American Academy of Addiction Psychiatry
- American Academy of Pediatrics
- American College of Nurse-Midwives
- American College of Preventive Medicine
- American Dance Therapy Association
- American Health and Temperance Association
- American Medical Association
- American Medical Student Association
- American Medical Women's Association
- American Public Health Association
- American School Health Association
- American Society of Addiction Medicine
- Center for Science in the Public Interest
- Child Welfare League of America
- Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints
- Consumer Coalition for Health and Safety
- Consumer Federation of America
- Face Truth and Clarity on Alcohol
- Join Together
- Latino Coalition on Alcohol and Tobacco
- The Marin Institute
- Mothers Against Drunk Driving
- National Alliance of Pupil Service Organizations
- National Association of Addiction Treatment Providers
- National Association of Evangelicals
- National Association for Public Health Policy
- National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselors

National Association on Alcohol, Drugs, and Disability
 National Crime Prevention Council
 National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence
 National Drug Prevention League
 National Families in Action
 The National Road Safety Foundation
 National Woman's Christian Temperance Union
 Partnership for Recovery:
 The Betty Ford Center
 Caron Foundation
 Hazelden Foundation
 Valley Hope Association
 Security on Campus
 Service Employees International Union (AFL-CIO)
 Seventh-day Adventist Church of North America
 Southern Baptist Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission
 United Methodist Church, Board of Church & Society
 Youth Power (formerly: Just Say No, International)

STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

AGC/United Learning (Evanston, ILL)
 Alabama Council on Substance Abuse
 Alcohol Research Information Service (MI)
 Alcohol Services, Inc. (Syracuse, NY)
 Break Free Outpatient, Inc. (Hollywood, FL)
 'Cause Children Count Coalition (Washington, DC)
 Charlotte-Mecklenburg [NC] Drug and Alcohol Fighting Back Project
 Christian Citizens of Arkansas
 Communities that Care—Somerset County (PA)
 Dauphin County Regional Alcohol/Drug Awareness Resources (PA)
 Florida Association of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselors
 Georgia Alcohol Policy Partnership (GAPP)
 Hillsborough County Community Anti-Drug Coalition (Tampa, FL)
 Indiana Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking
 Institute for Health Advocacy (San Diego, CA)
 Illinois Churches in Action
 Lake County (FLA) Citizens Committee for Alcohol Health Warnings
 Lancaster County Drug and Alcohol Commission (PA)
 Lebanon County Drug & Alcohol Prevention Program (PA)
 Los Angeles County Commission on Alcoholism
 Maryland Underage Drinking Prevention Coalition
 National Capitol Area Coalition to Prevent Underage Drinking (DC)
 Network of Alabama Prevention Professionals
 New Haven Fighting Back
 Newark Fighting Back Partnership, Inc.
 New Visitors/Mercy Hall Chemical Dependency Program (Johnstown, PA)
 PAR, Inc. (Pinellas Park, Florida)
 Pennsylvanians Against Underage Drinking
 Pennsylvania Council on Alcohol Problems
 Pennsylvania Prevention Director's Association
 Perry (County) Human Services (PA)
 Phase: Piggy Back, Inc. (New York)
 PRIDE—Omaha
 Somerset County Department of Human Services (PA)
 St. Vincent College Prevention Projects (Latrobe, PA)
 TODAY, Inc. (Vensalem, PA)
 Vallejo Fighting Back Partnership (CA)
 The Village (Miami, FL)

Youth As Resources (Somerset County, PA)

—
 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND SURGEON GENERAL,

Washington, DC, June 11, 1999.

Hon. BARRY F. McCAFFREY,
*Director Office of National Drug Control Policy,
 Executive Office of the President, Washington, DC.*

DEAR GENERAL McCAFFREY: I congratulate you for your excellent work in developing the national anti-drug media campaign and demonstrating such strong leadership in support of our nation's youth. I am confident that the effectiveness of this program as a means of educating and motivating children and their families will be enhanced by a greater commitment to the problem of underage drinking. Thus, I want to recommend that you include advertisements addressing underage drinking in the paid portion of ONDCP's media campaign.

Alcohol is the drug most frequently used by American teenagers. It is consumed more frequently than all other illicit drugs combined and is the drug most likely to be associated with injury or death. Alcohol is a drug that can affect judgement, coordination and long-term health. It is involved in teen automobile crashes, homicides, and suicides; the three leading causes of teen deaths. No comprehensive drug control strategy for youth can be complete without the full inclusion of underage alcohol use and abuse.

The National Household Survey on Drug Abuse reports that there are 11 million drinkers between the ages of 12 and 20. Over fifty percent of high school seniors report having been drunk in the past year. Among 12-17 year olds, less than half perceive great harm in consuming five or more drinks once or twice a week. In light of the prevalence of underage drinking, it is little surprise that alcohol consumption by youth so often results in risky behaviors which lead to unplanned pregnancies, sexually transmitted diseases, involvement with law enforcement, and worst of all, death and the death of others. These are the immediate impacts on society and do not include the even more costly, long term impact of alcohol abuse or dependence on individual health and the state of families.

A recent study from the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism sheds even greater light on the implications of these figures. Youth who begin drinking before the age of 15 are four times as likely to become alcoholic as those who wait until age 21 or later to begin drinking. This research also indicates that every year of delayed drinking onset will result in a significant reduction in risk for alcohol abuse or alcoholism. Underage drinking is a shadow that threatens the health, safety and adolescence of our nation's youth.

We should utilize a public health media campaign to send youth and their families messages which will educate them about the health and social consequences of underage drinking. Through the ONDCP strategy, we can utilize this effective medium for altering youth attitudes about underage drinking and for supporting community-based prevention activities that will help young people adopt lifestyles that eschew the use of alcohol and other drugs. The evidence of need is overwhelming.

I stand ready to work with you to develop a powerful media campaign that will effectively deglamourize underage drinking. I have established a Surgeon General's Staff Working Group to bring together the resources of the Department to create an effective campaign to curtail the incidence of un-

derage and binge drinking. This campaign will be successful only if it can receive the national dissemination available through a paid media campaign. It is time to more effectively address the drug that children and teens tell us is their greatest concern and the drug we know is most likely to result in their injury or death.

Sincerely yours,
 DAVID SATCHER, M.D., PH.D.
*Assistant Secretary for Health
 and Surgeon General.*

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I want to explain my opposition to the Lautenberg amendment giving ONDCP's National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign jurisdiction to include underage alcohol consumption for the purposes of the media campaign. Like all my colleagues, I have seen the results of underage drinking, and I deplore them. Young lives should not be wasted, and I challenge the White House and my colleagues to continue to take action to curb this problem.

However, I do not believe this amendment is the correct way to solve the underage drinking crisis. The Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign is not the right vehicle for anti-alcohol messages. The Office of National Drug Control Policy fights the war on drugs, not alcohol. I agree with Drug Czar Barry McCaffrey that there is an important distinction between illegal drugs and alcohol, which is a legal substance. Additionally, simply adding anti-alcohol messages to the ONDCP's Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign without appropriating more funds for this purpose will dilute the anti-drug efforts. Resources which are badly needed to fight drugs will be rerouted to fight underage drinking. I cannot support a bill which chooses to fight alcohol at the expense of illegal drugs.

I have supported in the past, and will continue to support, programs that discourage underage drinking. In fact, I want to applaud the efforts of alcohol distributors, who have initiated many of these important programs.

Let us find a different way to take action against underage alcohol consumption that does not compromise our actions against the use of illegal drugs.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield the remaining 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor this amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. I compliment him on his foresight for bringing this amendment up.

We will have a 5-year media campaign, with \$1 billion targeted at youth so they don't get into drugs and start taking drugs. The drug czar himself, General McCaffrey, said that alcohol is the gateway drug. Mr. President, 42 percent of Iowa teens seeking substance abuse treatment in 1998 were being treated for alcohol addiction; three out of five teens have had an alcoholic drink in the last month.

We have a 5-year, \$1 billion ad campaign to tell teens don't take cocaine, don't take meth, don't smoke marijuana, and we are not going to say anything about beer and alcohol? These are the first drugs these kids take.

That is what the Senator from New Jersey is saying. Let's require in this package of ads over 5 years that they also target drinking by kids.

I understand that the amendment is supported by Mothers Against Drunk Driving, the National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselors, and the National Association of Alcohol, Drugs, and Disability.

It is time we took teen drinking seriously. I heard that the National Beer Wholesalers Association is opposed to the amendment. If I am wrong, someone please correct me. It is this association that has always said they are against teen drinking. If they are against teen drinking, why would they be opposed to this amendment to put ads out showing teens what happens if they drink?

Eight young people every day die in alcohol-related car crashes. It is time to stop this epidemic.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes 33 seconds.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Let me reiterate that the practical effect of the Lautenberg amendment is to gut the effort to reduce teenage drug use.

I wouldn't argue with a single thing that any of our colleagues has said about the importance of combating teenage drinking. Everybody thinks it is important to combat teenage drinking. Fortunately, over the past 20 years teenager drinking has gone down. However, according to a highly respected University of Michigan study, teenage drug use has gone up 46 percent since 1992.

We should let this effort to combat teenage drug use, which is dramatically on the increase, go forward. On another day in another contest, let's pursue an effort to deal with teenage drinking.

This amendment, regrettably, would gut a very important campaign to combat teenage drug use. That is not me speaking. That is Mario Cuomo and Bill Bennett, chairman of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, who oppose this amendment, which is not to say that either one of those men is in favor of teenage drinking.

Let's keep this antidrug effort intact and let what we hope will be an effective advertising campaign go forward.

I thank Senator CAMPBELL for yielding time to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me make just a couple of concluding comments, again reiterating I am really quite uncomfortable in the position of opposing Senator LAUTENBERG. But I

do not think this is a forced choice of the type he suggests we make; I do not think this is a choice that we ought to be required to make. One might at some point put together a program, which I would fully support, to say let us do \$1 billion advertising in 5 years, targeted to Americans, especially America's kids, dealing with alcohol abuse. I would support that. Then one would say, perhaps, coming to the floor of the Senate: This program you have dealing with alcohol abuse, why doesn't it include drugs? Or, Why doesn't it include addiction to smoking cigarettes? I would support that as well.

But we ought to do them as programs we can measure and evaluate. The program we are talking about now is a program dealing with drugs. It is 3 years into the program. People say: Why doesn't it include alcohol? Let's do a program on alcohol. I will support that.

The story I told earlier, about going to the Oak Hill Detention Center and seeing these young children, kids on drugs who were convicted of violent crimes, do you know the other thing about their stories? In every case, they were 12 or 13 years old and they were addicted to drugs, selling drugs, shooting people, committing armed robbery, being involved in violent crimes; and the other common denominator in every single case was they had parents addicted to drugs. They came from homes, often with only a single parent, in which that parent was addicted to drugs, died at a young age, and was an abusive parent because of being addicted to drugs. There is a common denominator.

This program is a program designed to say to America's youth, through drug education by television commercials: Don't do drugs. We know television advertising works. We all use it. Hundreds of billions of dollars a year are spent on television ads to convince people to listen to certain kinds of music, wear certain kinds of jeans, to buy certain kinds of food. We know it works. I think it will work with respect to this issue of drugs as well.

We are 3 years into the program. I will support gladly, and with great excitement, a program on alcohol. I have supported every initiative dealing with alcohol abuse and drunk driving in this Senate. I will support it as well dealing with the addiction to cigarettes. The targeting of alcohol and cigarettes, both legal products, to this country's youth, is unforgivable.

But this is a separate issue. We have a campaign underway. It is 3 years in progress. It is designed very deliberately to change the understanding and the culture dealing with drugs. I think it has a chance of working. So let us do that. We had to cut it \$50 million this year alone just on this issue. Let us allow this to work. At another time I will be happy to join my colleague from New Jersey and others in designing an identical program dealing with alcohol abuse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Senator DORGAN and I find ourselves in a strange debate indeed, because I think we as much as anyone in this body want to reduce teenage drinking. All of us have had personal tragedies in our families. As I say, as a former deputy sheriff and as a volunteer prison counselor, I know all the horror stories. We know a lot of them today. I don't deny any of them. I am sure they have created terrible problems in families and in society, too. But I think we are missing the point I tried to make a while ago. It is not whether we want to reduce teenage drinking. We all do. It is whether this is the right vehicle; and it is not.

I mentioned a while ago that ONDCP does not have statutory authority. If we are going to add statutory authority and just bypass the legislative part of this body, why don't we do away with the legislative part of this body and just do all legislation in appropriations bills?

I would join my friend from New Jersey if he wanted to introduce a bill to add alcohol to the ONDCP's agenda. That would be fine with me, to add more money to it, too. I would be a co-sponsor. I will be more than willing to fight the battle with him to make sure we reduce teenage drinking in any kind of ad campaign that would be effective. I hope we will do that, too. But I believe this is the wrong vehicle for it. We ought to do it through the authorizing committees.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will yield, let me make one final observation. He mentions the issue of alcohol. He comes from a particular perspective, being a Native American.

I want to tell him just about two people, and I will do it in 30 seconds. I toured a hospital one day. He talks about fetal alcohol syndrome. A young Native American woman had just given birth to a baby. The woman was an alcoholic. The baby was born with a .21 blood-alcohol content, a young baby born dead drunk. This woman, having had a third baby, wanted nothing to do with that child, didn't want to see that child. That child will probably have fetal alcohol syndrome.

But I was down at a hospital not far from this building and I saw babies born from crack-addicted mothers, and I saw babies born drug addicted, addicted to hard drugs. The doctors told me what those babies are like as they try to shed this addiction, being born of mothers who had taken drugs during this pregnancy.

We have problems in all of these areas. I do not deny that. But this program deals with drugs. I think it has a chance of working. I hope we can allow that to happen with this vote.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the Senator for those eloquent comments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the first vote, there be 2 minutes equally divided in the usual form between the remaining votes.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I see no further speakers. I yield the remaining time, and I move to table the Lautenberg amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 1214. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCAIN (when his name was called). Present.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 194 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Abraham	Dorgan	Mack
Allard	Enzi	McConnell
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	Murkowski
Baucus	Frist	Nickles
Bennett	Gorton	Robb
Bond	Graham	Roberts
Breaux	Gramm	Santorum
Brownback	Grams	Sessions
Bunning	Grassley	Shelby
Burns	Gregg	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Hagel	Smith (OR)
Chafee	Hatch	Snowe
Cochran	Hutchinson	Thomas
Collins	Inhofe	Thompson
Conrad	Jeffords	Thurmond
Coverdell	Kerrey	Torricelli
Craig	Kyl	Voinovich
Crapo	Lincoln	Warner
Daschle	Lott	Wellstone
Domenici	Lugar	Wyden

NAYS—40

Akaka	Harkin	Moynihan
Bayh	Helms	Murray
Biden	Hollings	Reed
Bingaman	Hutchison	Reid
Boxer	Johnson	Rockefeller
Bryan	Kennedy	Roth
Byrd	Kerry	Sarbanes
Cleland	Kohl	Schumer
DeWine	Landrieu	Specter
Dodd	Lautenberg	Stevens
Durbin	Leahy	Thomas
Edwards	Levin	Thompson
Feingold	Lieberman	Thurmond
Feinstein	Mikulski	Torricelli

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

McCain

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Under the previous order, there are 2 minutes of debate before a motion to table the amendment of the Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL. Who yields time?

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to vitiate my motion to table the Kyl-Hutchison amendment No. 1195. During the break we were able to finalize some language for the amendment.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time prior

to the motion to table amendment No. 1200 by Senator DEWINE be limited to 45 minutes, to be equally divided in the usual form, and no other amendments be in order to the amendment prior to the motion to table the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is agreed to.

The question is on the amendment by the Senator from Colorado, Mr. KYL.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We have reached agreement, but we don't have the modification printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask that the amendment be laid aside?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, I make that request, Mr. President.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

[Rollcall Vote No. 195 Ex.]

YEAS—97

Abraham	Feingold	Mack
Akaka	Feinstein	McCain
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Baucus	Frist	Mikulski
Bayh	Gorton	Moynihan
Bennett	Graham	Murkowski
Biden	Gramm	Murray
Bingaman	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Reed
Boxer	Gregg	Reid
Breaux	Hagel	Robb
Brownback	Harkin	Roberts
Bryan	Hatch	Rockefeller
Bunning	Helms	Roth
Burns	Hollings	Santorum
Byrd	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Campbell	Hutchison	Schumer
Chafee	Inhofe	Sessions
Cleland	Jeffords	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kennedy	Snowe
Conrad	Kerrey	Specter
Coverdell	Kerry	Stevens
Craig	Kohl	Thomas
Crapo	Kyl	Thompson
Daschle	Landrieu	Thurmond
DeWine	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dodd	Leahy	Voinovich
Domenici	Levin	Warner
Dorgan	Lieberman	Wellstone
Durbin	Lincoln	Wyden
Edwards	Lott	
Enzi	Lugar	

NAYS—2

Allard Smith (NH)

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will return to legislative session.

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 2000—Continued

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, is there going to be a modification to the Kyl amendment before we go to the Y2K liability?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, we have an agreement on that, if Senator KYL is ready.

AMENDMENT NO. 1195, AS MODIFIED

Mr. KYL. I have a modification of amendment No. 1195. I note for the record that this modification is cosponsored by Senators FEINSTEIN, McCANN, ABRAHAM, GRAHAM, GRAMM, DOMENICI, and GRASSLEY, along with Senator HUTCHISON and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), for himself, and Senators HUTCHISON, FEINSTEIN, McCANN, ABRAHAM, GRAHAM, GRAMM, DOMENICI, and GRASSLEY, proposes an amendment numbered 1195, as modified.

The amendment (No. 1195), as modified, is as follows:

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows: