

reported in any three of these reports—even if it is mentioned. It means all you have to do is go file in the future, file a cookie-cutter lawsuit, and the tobacco company must disprove that your ailment or your disease or your condition came from smoking.

This afternoon, or when I get the floor again, I will go through a list of what that is going to mean. I mean, if ever—if ever—there was a lawyers' relief bill, beyond that which we have been discussing in terms of their recompense for the settlements, it is here.

We have been looking around for tort reform. And here we have exactly the wrong kind of tort reform. I do not believe very many Senators know that this provision is in this bill. I do not know whether I will try to take it out. I would just like to make sure it is well known.

I do not want to leave the impression, and never have, that tobacco companies should not pay for what they have wrought on this society in terms of misleading advertising and the effects of smoking. But to say that three reports that compile the research of every ailment or disease that has been researched to try and find a causal relationship between that ailment and cigarette smoking should be incorporated by reference in this bill is not a good way to legislate. Under this provision a plaintiff would not have to worry about proving it anymore, just allege it, sue for it, and the tobacco company must then prove that they did not cause it.

That provision has been researched of late, and we will talk about it in a little more detail—how many thousands and thousands of lawsuits that would precipitate from people with diseases and ailments who never even gave a thought until now that they might find somebody who would pay for that; namely, the tobacco companies.

So I say to those who are very, very well-intentioned, who support this measure, I have said before—and the bill was redone—I said before that it was far too cumbersome, had way too many agencies and bureaus and bureaucratic innovations in it that nobody should really support. It was fixed somewhat. And I still seriously question how it got put together, how these kinds of provisions could find themselves in there with no discussion.

To me, this is one bill that I am very glad is taking a long time to get through the Senate. We normally say discussion on the Senate floor is good because it lets everybody understand what is going on and what the issues are. Frankly, I do not think we would have found out about all the things in this bill if we had not been down here for a couple weeks. It is just a very difficult job, very hard to do.

So let me summarize. I believe the amendment ought to pass, because if we are going to raise significant money, as purported in this bill, we ought to go after more than just the problems that teenage tobacco smok-

ing brings to our country. We ought to try our best, in a very reasonable and well directed way, to spend money trying to get a better handle on illicit and illegal drug use by our children and, in fact, by the American population. So I hope that passes. I hope cloture is not invoked.

But I say that I believe it is beginning to come to the surface that a bill could be put together. It surely cannot be the bill that is before us. As a matter of fact, I think probably it ought to just get redrafted, if people want to put a bill together. Essentially, it ought to take care of the States in some way, not necessarily 40 percent. It ought to have a very significant tax cut, especially for those American families who are going to pay the tobacco tax—pay most of the tobacco tax. If we do that, it ought to be directed at the marriage penalty, perhaps some health related tax provisions, but that ought to take the lead. And we ought to put a major program together in trying to really declare war through advertising and other initiatives to aid in the prevention of smoking among kids. And, as I indicated, it is corollary with reference to illegal drugs.

Another component could be research at NIH on cancer and related kinds of research. And that is probably doable in this country. And if you are going to spend some additional money, you can probably justify it there as well as anywhere else, although I would suggest that if you have a big bill like this with a lot of resources, we can bring amendments to the floor, one after another, showing areas where the U.S. Government is not doing what it ought to do in certain areas of endeavor that are our responsibility as a nation. And if it is needed, and doing a better job, we could have a myriad of amendments that we could let people vote on and decide what to do.

For instance, I give you one. It is totally unrelated, but some provisions in this bill are also. When will the U.S. Government pay for Indian schools in America?—which are falling down around the kids, totally ill-equipped, are way beyond anything we would have non-Indian kids in in the United States. And the only entity that is supposed to pay for it is the Federal Government. It is not a school board, not a State; it is the Federal Government. There is a backlog of over \$750 million. And we are leaving those kids out there, watching the suicide rates go up, watching the illegal drug rate go up, watching all the social problems they have, and every year we take care of one or two schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator should be reminded we have an agreement to recess at 12:30.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am sorry I went over. I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, first, I thank the Senator from New

Mexico for the enlightened remarks we just heard on this very important subject. I always enjoy the opportunity to hear his analysis. I hope he will return later this afternoon and continue with it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I make an inquiry. I know we have the agreement to recess at 12:30. Is there not a vote at 2:15 when we return?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. We have a cloture vote at 2:15.

Mr. DURBIN. I was looking for an opportunity to speak for 5 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that, after that vote, I have that chance in general debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you, Mr. President.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:37 p.m., recessed until 2:14 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).

#### NATIONAL TOBACCO POLICY AND YOUTH SMOKING REDUCTION ACT

The Senate continued with consideration of the bill.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the modified committee substitute to S. 1415, tobacco legislation:

Senators John Kerry of Massachusetts, Robert Kerrey of Nebraska, Kent Conrad, Harry Reid of Nevada, Paul Wellstone, Richard Durbin, Patty Murray, Richard Bryan, Tom Harkin, Carl Levin, Joe Biden, Joseph Lieberman, John Glenn, Jeff Bingaman, Ron Wyden, and Max Baucus.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate be brought to a close on the committee substitute?

The yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) is absent because of illness.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 150 Leg.]

## YEAS—42

Akaka	Durbin	Leahy
Baucus	Feingold	Levin
Biden	Feinstein	Lieberman
Bingaman	Glenn	Mikulski
Boxer	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Breaux	Harkin	Moynihan
Bryan	Hollings	Murray
Bumpers	Johnson	Reed
Byrd	Kennedy	Reid
Cleland	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Torricelli
Dodd	Landrieu	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wyden

## NAYS—56

Abraham	Ford	McCain
Allard	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Robb
Brownback	Gregg	Roberts
Burns	Hagel	Roth
Campbell	Hatch	Santorum
Chafee	Helms	Sessions
Coats	Hutchinson	Shelby
Cochran	Smith (NH)	
Collins	Smith (OR)	
Coverdell	Inhofe	Snowe
Craig	Jeffords	Stevens
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thomas
DeWine	Kyl	Thompson
Domenici	Lott	Thurmond
Enzi	Lugar	Warner
Faircloth	Mack	

## NOT VOTING—2

Inouye	Specter
--------	---------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 42, the nays are 56. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized, under the previous order, for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend that to 10 minutes, if there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized to speak for 10 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for those who have counted out the tobacco lobby, for those who said the tobacco giants are now flat on their backs and have no strength left on Capitol Hill, I am afraid the last vote is an indication that there is still life in that tobacco lobby. This vote of 42 to 56 on a motion to bring to a halt the debate and bring to a vote the tobacco bill is a sad commentary on where we are today.

This legislation, S. 1415, which is the product of the Senate Commerce Committee and the hard work of both Republican and Democratic Senators, deserves a vote, not just because it is on the floor today but because what this bill sets out to do is so important for this Nation. Instead, what we have seen are the opponents of this legislation come to this floor over the last 3 weeks, producing amendments to grind

us down, mire us down in debate, sink us in this morass of technicalities and procedures so we never get to this bill.

Many of my colleagues, Senators, have come to this floor and offered very important amendments, interesting amendments. They are not related to tobacco and children though. An amendment comes to the floor from one of the Senators, "Let's talk about reforming the Internal Revenue Code." That is a good idea. We should do that on a regular basis. But on this bill? Why on this bill? This bill, which is designed to stop the addiction of our children to tobacco products, why should it be a forum for this debate on reforming the Internal Revenue Code?

Another Senator comes to the floor and says, "Let's talk about the problem of narcotics in America." It is a terrible problem. It is a terrible problem. Everyone agrees with that. Every parent agrees with that. Yet, to raise that as an issue on this bill? To suggest, as part of this debate, we ought to talk about school vouchers? School vouchers, that is an important debate, too. But why in this bill? Why in this legislation, this historic piece of legislation that gives us a chance, for the first time in this Nation's history, to do something meaningful about tobacco, are we being diverted by so many amendments?

Do you know what the order of business before the Senate is at this moment? I can tell you what it is. You may want to write this down. For those with scorecards at home, be prepared with your pencils ready. We are currently debating the Coverdell amendment to the Durbin amendment to the Gramm motion to recommit with two underlying Gregg amendments still pending.

Hard to follow? It is designed to be hard to follow. It is designed to tangle us up in procedure so we never get to vote on this bill and never vote on this issue.

The tobacco companies have to be cheering after that last vote, 42 to 56, so we continue to mire ourselves in this procedural mess and never get to the bottom line. What is the bottom line? Let me show you in this graph. This is the bottom line. The smoking rates among high school seniors in America are at a 17-year high. As I speak today, in the Senate gallery we have many visitors and friends and a lot of youngsters who are here from schools. You know what I am talking about. You know what is happening in your grade schools and in your junior high schools and in your high schools—more and more children are starting to smoke. I have never in my life ever met a parent who has come to me and said: "Great news, I just got the best news. My daughter just called, she started smoking." Have you ever heard that? I never heard that from any parent. It is a troubling piece of information which every parent dreads.

More and more kids, now over half the high school seniors in America, are

taking up this deadly habit. Since we started this mindless debate, 66,000 children in America have started smoking for the first time. Tobacco companies have a big smile on their face: More and more kids addicted to their products, kids who will spend a fortune over their lifetimes on this addiction and ultimately a third of them to be victims of an early grave, because of this tobacco addiction. Yet here we are on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Here we are with this historic opportunity, with bipartisan legislation, to do what is right, to pass legislation and say to the tobacco companies, "The game is over. We are no longer going to allow you to appeal to and addict our children. We are going to ask you be held accountable, accountable for reducing the percentage of children who are smoking." And, by overwhelming votes, Senators on both sides of the aisle supported my amendment last week to hold the tobacco companies specifically liable if kids continue to be lured into this addiction. Yet, over the weekend one of the leaders here in the Senate says the tobacco bill is all but dead—all but dead, after all this work.

Keep in mind, we are not just talking about another piece of legislation in the Senate. We are talking about the No. 1 preventable cause of death in America today. Members of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, who missed this opportunity, will, frankly, have to answer for it—perhaps not in the next election, but maybe at a later time—as to why at this moment in history, when we had the chance to seize the opportunity and do something to help our children, we failed to do so.

I continue to believe we have a chance to pass this legislation. We have Democrats and Republicans alike who believe it is not only right but timely. But if we allow this procedural morass to continue, if we do not bring to a vote the critical amendments necessary so we can bring this bill to final passage, then the clock runs out.

As I said once before, I guess time is on the side of those who want to stop this legislation. But history is not on their side. History will judge them harshly. Having been given this opportunity to pass an important bill, they missed it. They missed it, to the detriment not of their own political careers but of their children. And the money to be raised from this bill, the money that comes from a tobacco tax—that is right, t-a-x, tobacco tax; call it a fee or what you like, I call it a tobacco tax—that money is going in for specific purposes to help children: Smoking cessation clinics, antismoking advertising, and medical research.

I will stand in the State of Illinois, or wherever I am called on, to defend that vote. I think asking smokers to pay more for their product to reduce the sales to children and put money in the Treasury for those purposes is a defensible thing to do and not something we should shrink away from. I have heard

all this argument on the other side about this bill: Senator MCCAIN's bill is going to create some massive Federal bureaucracy. Not so. Not so. This bill basically does, in self-executing ways, what we sought to achieve in the beginning, when 42 State attorneys general filed lawsuits across the United States saying to tobacco companies: Your day is over. You are going to be held accountable. This came to a basic agreement about a year ago. We are building on that agreement.

I salute them for their initiative in allowing us to reach this point. But, will this Senate miss this opportunity, as we missed the opportunity to pass campaign finance reform? Will we miss this opportunity to pass comprehensive tobacco legislation? This last vote, 42 to 56, is an indication we have a long way to go. Cooler heads have to prevail. Senators on both sides of the aisle have to understand, this is more than gamesmanship on some amendment tree; this is fundamentally a question about the public health of America and the public health of our children.

What we and the American people are waiting for is leadership, leadership here in the Senate to bring action to a close on this legislation. While we wait for that leadership, the advertising industry is waiting, too, pens poised, ready to write the next generation of ads for cigarettes to hook children. That will happen if this bill fails.

The lawyers are waiting, too. The lawyers are waiting with their legal briefs in hand to continue the next round of State litigation, and that will continue, month after month and year after year, if this bill fails.

The parents are waiting. The parents of America are waiting to see whether or not their children will be able to escape this addiction to tobacco while they go to school and while they grow up. Passing this bill will help those parents.

And, yes, the tobacco companies are waiting, too. They are waiting to see whether the Senate will drop the ball and give them another year of obscene profits at the expense of our children.

The President of the United States and this administration have shown extraordinary leadership on this issue. No President in history has ever stuck his neck out as far as President Clinton in fighting the tobacco lobby. He has taken a lot of grief for it. There have been a lot of people who invested a lot of money in opposition to folks who supported it. But he was right to do it. Those of us on the floor of the Senate who have been fighting this tobacco battle for over a decade have dreamed of this day and this opportunity.

And that is why it is so sad that we find ourselves in this gridlock, this procedural gridlock. I am sorry that the motion to close down debate and limit the amendments to those germane to the bill did not prevail. A similar motion will be offered tomorrow, and I hope that motion will prevail. In the meantime, I hope Demo-

crats and Republicans will join Senator MCCAIN and Senator KERRY of Massachusetts in a bipartisan effort to pass this landmark legislation.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, let me say to my colleague from Illinois, I understand his frustration. I understand the goals that he is attempting to reach, and I agree with him, but I am one of those who voted against cloture. In his 15-minute speech, he did not mention the farmer, the farmer who could wake up in the morning if we pass this bill with some amendments in it and be out of business in 36 months. The Senator from Illinois wouldn't mind that, but I certainly do.

I don't object to smoke-free schools. Ninety percent and better in my State, a tobacco State, are opposed to underage smoking. We have no problems with that. But be fair to those and help those who have a life in front of them based on a legal product. They have had no part in all these problems of lies and documents and court cases, but are down there living by the sweat of their brow. And we are not talking about the farmer.

Look at this bill that is before us and the amendments that have been adopted or that are pending, and you want cloture to be invoked on that bill and be the bill that goes out of here? I cannot allow that. I cannot in good conscience allow cloture to be voted on that bill and my farmers not be taken care of.

I agree with the Senator from Illinois—of course I do—we have lost the target. We have lost the target. Someone figured up the other day that if everything that has been introduced and is in this bill is taken care of, we will spend 169 percent of the estimated amount of money that is going to be raised in the next 5 years.

Mr. President, I am one of those—and I admit it, it is on the record—but I want people to know why I voted against cloture and will continue to vote against cloture until we can get some consensus as it relates to my farmers.

The Senator from Illinois said he wants leadership. I think our leader is doing one heck of a job. I think he is pushing the point. I think he is doing the right thing for the position he is in, and I think the leadership on the other side is making one mistake after the other after the other after the other, because of what they are trying to do—to make a lifesaving piece of legislation into a tax cut bill. We need to understand that, and I think the American people will.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that before we have too many cloture votes and are criticized for voting no on cloture that we can have something that is palatable or even reasonable—even

reasonable—that we can vote on to do the right thing for those we represent. I represent 65,000 small farm families, and I intend to see that, to the best of my ability, every one of those are treated fairly. Up to now, the answer has been no, and the answer will continue to be no on cloture until such time that we can see some daylight as it relates to those families that are struggling down in my State of Kentucky. I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

AMENDMENT NO. 2451

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I, of course, am aware of the long-standing concern of the Senator from Illinois about tobacco, but I think to suggest that some of the amendments that are being discussed have some meaning other than their stated purpose is not appropriate. The amendment before the Senate is an effort to make sure that any legislation that deals with teenage addiction embrace all the components of teenage addiction. Yes, smoking, but, yes, drug abuse and the smoking of marijuana which, I point out, is five times more dangerous than smoking a cigarette—five times.

The principal drug abuse and addiction on behalf of teenagers is smoking, not cigarettes, but marijuana. I have long felt that for us to come to the Senate and talk about the dangers of tobacco and the addiction of tobacco and be absolutely silent on the question of teenage addiction to drugs is unconscionable policy.

Mr. President, just yesterday on June 8, the President of the United States at the United Nations in New York said:

Ten years ago, the United Nations adopted a path-breaking convention to spur cooperation against drug trafficking. Today the potential for that kind of cooperation has never been greater or more needed. As divisive blocks and barriers have been dismantled around the world, as technology has advanced and democracy has spread, our people benefit more and more from nations working and learning together. Yet the very openness that enriches our lives is also exploited by criminals, especially drug traffickers. Today we come here to say no nation is so large and powerful that it can conquer drugs alone; none is too small to make a difference. All share a responsibility to take up the battle. Therefore, we will stand as one against this threat to our security and our future. The stakes are high, for the drug empires erode the foundations of democracy, corrupt the integrity of market economies, menace the lives, the hopes and future of families on every continent. Let there be no doubt that this is ultimately a struggle for human freedom.

Those are pretty lofty remarks, but where is the administration in support of our attempts to confront these drug cartels, to confront the fact that the target of these cartels are kids age 8 to 14 years old—8 to 14? Yes, tobacco is hazardous, and it has been abusive to health and it is increasing. Over the last 6 years, it has increased about 40 percent.

What about drug abuse? What about these points the President made to the world? It has increased 135 percent in the last 6½ years—135 percent. And his team, the President's team the day following these remarks is blocking votes on trying to make a component of teenage addiction embrace and confront drugs. It is OK to talk the talk, but you have to walk the walk.

Mr. President, this administration does not have a good record on the issue of teenage drug addiction. It does not have a good record. It came into office—if we are talking about the troubles of drug abuse—it came into office, and it closed down the drug office, for all practical purposes. It came into office and it massively reduced interdiction efforts in the Caribbean and on the border. As a result, Mr. President, massive amounts of new drugs are flowing into the country almost unfettered.

As a result of that, the price of these drugs has collapsed, utterly collapsed, and for some of these drugs, the price has dropped 70, 80, 100 percent—not 100—70 percent. So no message—more kids are unaware of the fact that drugs are dangerous. In fact, several years ago—2 years ago—that number was at the lowest ever. The number of children who perceived drugs to be dangerous to them was at an all-time low. So why are we surprised, if they do not think it is dangerous, that suddenly the use of it would just skyrocket and go up 135 percent?

Mr. President, framing what has happened here is important: Quit talking about it; dismantled interdiction; closed the drug czar office; massive amounts of new drugs in the country; no message to kids or parents about the dangers of drugs—boom, a new epidemic, a new epidemic. One million-plus new teenagers caught up in drugs.

Mr. President, there are 1.1 million prisoners in America today. Over 800,000 of them, 800,000 out of 1.1 million, are there on drug-related charges—indirect or direct. And \$67 billion a year it is costing this country.

The No. 1 problem for teenagers, according to teenagers, according to parents, according to all statistics—and not by a slim margin; by an enormous margin, 2, 3, 4 to 1—they have said that is the No. 1 problem our kids face, smoking marijuana, getting in the drug culture, the No. 1 problem. It is accessible everywhere, and it is cheap. The other side says, "Oh, this is not appropriate to be talking about this on the tobacco bill." What in the world does it take to be appropriate?

Five times more dangerous to smoke it, mind-altering, 800,000 prisoners, \$67 billion a year, the principal problem of teenage addiction, and we just heard the Senator from Illinois: "This is a poison pill amendment." The logic defies me, absolutely defies me.

He talked about school choice. What he is talking about is three paragraphs in this amendment that says if a child becomes a victim of a crime, including drug-related, that the school system could move the child to another school.

Mr. President, I will give you an example. First of all, we have a letter from the all-knowing NEA, which says, "This amendment"—this is the drug amendment provision—"to allow Federal tax dollars to be used to provide private school vouchers is a cynical attempt to use the recent tragic violence in our schools to advance a political agenda."

What they are talking about is the ability for a local school to take this teenage girl, who was assaulted at her school, sexually assaulted, in an abandoned locker room in De Kalb County—this amendment would allow this school system to move her to another school. That is what the ruckus is about over there. Heaven forbid that we would make it possible for one of these victims of a violent crime to be moved to a safer location. That is what he is talking about when he talks about the nonrelated issue of school choice. He is talking about this girl and the right for a school system to try to protect the victim of a violent crime. "But this is not a serious attempt to make the bill better. There's not any relevance here."

Fourteen thousand teenagers die every year as a result of teenage drug use. Once again, in the drug culture, the chances of rehabilitation are very limited. That is why you have to have massive campaigns to educate. The administration and the Congress have already understood this because they are trying to launch a national campaign now. And I applaud them for it. It is just too little. If we are going to get this drug epidemic under control we have to get serious.

There was an article in the paper June 2, a pretty interesting article, Mr. President. I will just read a few select remarks from it.

As commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard for the last 4 years, Admiral Robert E. Kramek played a key role in the war on drugs, serving as coordinator for U.S. interdiction efforts. But in leaving the post last week, after 41 years in the service, the 58-year-old admiral could not hide a sense of frustration and dismay about what he described as partisan bickering, pork-barrel politics that have hamstrung the United States in its fight against illegal narcotics. He said, "If we want to win the war on drugs, we've got to have the will to win." He said, "While politicians have described the war on drugs as a high priority and a matter of national security, they have failed to fund it adequately, preferring instead to pour billions of dollars into other things." He said, "Funds spent on interdiction represent 10 percent of the antinarcotic budget. Today [this is the admiral] I have two-thirds of the money, half of the ship time, half of the aircraft flight hours I need," the admiral said. "And you can't get there from here. You can't make a 50 percent reduction in demand in the flow of drugs into this country over the next 10 years with what we're committing to the battle."

The amendment that the other side does not want us to vote on, that some on the other side say is not relevant, the amendment responds to the admiral. The Coast Guard appropriation for interdiction would be doubled with this

amendment. In other words, exactly what the admiral said he did not have the amendment gives him. It gives him the ship time to get back in the waters instead of being in mothballs. It gives him the aircraft and the surveillance that he needs to shut down the Caribbean.

The Caribbean got shut down in the 1980s, Mr. President. It got shut down. It was pouring into the United States. The will was put together, and in the 1980s it was locked off. It is not locked off anymore. It is pouring through the Caribbean again, pouring through the Caribbean.

Now the amendment also doubles the interdiction budget of U.S. Customs. It doubles the interdiction budget of the Department of Defense. It strengthens the civil and criminal penalties for custom violations and doubles the number of border agents by the year 2003.

Now, why all the interdiction? Because part of the reason that our teenagers, who are the target of these cartels, are being so affected by these drugs is that they are everywhere and readily accessible and cheap. If these interdictions are successful, the price goes up and the availability goes down. Price goes up. The other side is talking about the fact that price affects purchasing. It works that way in drugs, too. If the floor of the price drops out, you can buy marijuana as cheaply as a pack of cigarettes, what do you think will happen? The price affects not just tobacco, it affects drug use, too. And we have allowed the price to just plummet, too much of it, too accessible, too cheap.

So the admiral is absolutely correct. If we are going to stop this epidemic, it is going to require a nation demonstrating the will. If the President is serious in his statement about our nations of the world coming together to confront the evil empires, then he needs to have a message sent over here to his team and say we want drug addiction to be a part of this effort.

I find it curious, I have to tell you just at the outset, as to how you could have ever gotten into a debate about teenage addiction and been absolutely silent on the No. 1 problem, addictive problem, teenagers are facing. I find it incredulous. Then to make matters even worse, some lame argument that it isn't relative. First of all, the majority of the teenagers using it, smoke it. It is a product that is smoked, just like tobacco. The only difference is it is five times more dangerous. National Institute on Drug Abuse and National Institutes of Health say:

Someone who smokes marijuana regularly may have many of the same respiratory problems that tobacco smokers have. These individuals may have daily cough and phlegm, symptoms of chronic bronchitis, and more frequent chest colds. Continuing to smoke marijuana can lead to abnormal functioning of lung tissue injured or destroyed by marijuana smoke. Regardless of the THC content, the amount of tar inhaled by marijuana smokers and the level of carbon monoxide absorbed are three to five times greater than tobacco smokers. This may be due to

the marijuana users' inhaling more deeply and holding the smoke in the lungs.

But it is not relevant? What a puzzle. I have been trying to figure the logic. Just try to match that paragraph with the suggestion that this amendment is not relevant to this issue. Nonsense. It is the No. 1 issue. No. 1 for parents, for teenagers, for our society, for this country. It is an epidemic.

We had a lot of discussion about the fact that tobacco is focused on youngsters—and that is horrible—but the cartels are totally focused on teenagers, age 8 to 14. It is the first war that has ever been waged against kids that we are in the middle of.

So we suggest an amendment, if this legislation becomes law, that says 20 percent of the resources, 20 percent, are to be focused on the Nation's No. 1 problem. I think that leaves 80 percent to deal with what is, among families and teenagers, the eighth most serious problem.

I see the coauthor of this amendment has arrived on the floor. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Idaho.

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, June 10, between the hours of 3 and 4 p.m., Anson Chan, the chief secretary of Hong Kong special administration regional government, be given floor privileges.

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I am so pleased to be able to stand on the floor today with my colleague from Georgia who is the primary author of the important amendment that is before the Senate. He has done such an excellent job of laying out what everyone in America knows to be the No. 1 issue facing our young people and literally facing the American culture, and that is the drug culture and the impact it is having on the lives of an awful lot of our citizens and especially our young people.

Neither he nor I belittle the concern that 3,000 young Americans start smoking every day. But 3,000 young Americans that start smoking don't die every day. But about 40 of our youngest and sometimes our brightest die every day because of an overdose of drugs or because of a crossfire of a gang shooting that was drug-related. That adds up to about 14,000 young Americans.

Yet this legislation we have before us, S. 1415, 753 pages that our colleagues tell us will cause young citizens in this country to smoke less and live a better life, has not one word in it about illicit drugs, the drug traffic, and what we as a citizenry and those of us as policymakers ought to be doing, where we can, to stop the rapidly increasing flow of illicit drugs into this culture.

My colleague from Georgia, Senator COVERDELL, and I join together. By this amendment we are saying if you are

really sincerely concerned about what goes on amongst our young folks today that may in some way damage them, then you ought to be voting for this legislation because the Senator from Georgia, like myself, and I know like the Presiding Officer at this moment, have on many occasions gone before grade school and high school groups to talk about the state of affairs of our country and the importance to those young people of what goes on in our country, and we have asked the question, Is cigarette smoking a problem. Yes, a few hands go up. They are concerned about it. Others are not because they are smoking. But when you ask about drugs, when you ask about the character of them, the nature of them, the availability of them, all hands go up, or nearly all hands, because young people know better than anyone else what is going on amongst their peer group. They are frighteningly concerned because oftentimes it impacts the life of a friend or it disrupts in a massive way a friend's family.

Yet today this Senate is silent on the issue. This administration has retreated in a dramatic way from the war on drugs that was launched by the administrations of President Reagan and President Bush.

Let me give some very interesting statistics. While there are not as many pot smokers as tobacco smokers at current rates, if the current rate continues, in but a few short years there will be almost as many marijuana, pot, weed smokers amongst our youth as there are tobacco smokers. There has been a 25 percent, 38 percent, and 31 percent increase in the number of children who have smoked a cigarette in the last 30 days, in the month of May. In comparison, there has been 175, 153 and a 99 percent increase, respectively, in the number of children who have tried a joint of marijuana in the last 30 days in the 8th, 10th and 12th grades, respectively.

That is an American tragedy. We know it. Yet, we have allowed this administration and, frankly, we have allowed the Congress to be relatively silent on the issue. That is why the Senator from Georgia and I could be silent no longer. It is critically important that we speak out, that we begin to shape more clearly policy that will work toward interdiction. As the Senator has just spoken to, the Coast Guard, dramatically cut back, with ships in mothballs—they are not out in the Gulf of Mexico, where they were for a good number of years, stopping the flow of illicit drugs moving into the market.

There is a 70 percent flow of drugs coming across our southern borders, and we are silent to it. Well, yes, in all honesty, there has been a limited amount of interdiction. Yes, there was an effort on the part of this administration as it related to the money laundering in Mexican banks. But just the other night, on television, there was attention addressed to three Mexican

brothers operating south of the border, in Tijuana, talking about the multi-hundreds of millions of dollars in cash-flow and the intimidation and the deaths that they can bring down on citizens who get in their way because they are the kings of drugs flowing up the west coast. We know who they are. Their pictures were shown on television. But we do limited amounts of things against them. Are we frightened of them? No. It is just a retreat from the scene. It is the attitude of, well, we will fund a little bit of therapy if somebody gets hooked on drugs. But somehow we don't want to engage in a war to save our children.

I was once a smoker. I am not proud of it, but I was. But I quit, I guess when I matured enough to know that it wasn't good for me and smart enough to know that it wasn't the right thing to do. But you know, if I would have been hooked on a major drug like cocaine, I might not be here today. The great tragedy of young people and drugs is that it kills them. Young people, while smoking cigarettes may be the cool and stylish thing to do amongst their peers, grow up and mature. There is a reverse peer pressure that begins to develop, and in great numbers we see young people quitting in their twenties and early thirties. They can quit because they are not dead. But if they are hooked on cocaine or heroin, which is the follow-up to marijuana, they are dead. That is how they quit. We know it.

We saw the great tragedy out in California of the great humorist a few weeks ago whose wife could not get off cocaine. She finally killed that humorist and then took her own life and left two small children. That is the story of drugs, the tragedy of drugs. The other side is saying that we have a bitter pill here: We are trying to destroy a tobacco bill. Quite the opposite: We are trying to make it a good piece of legislation that truly does something against this phenomenal drug culture in our society. That is what we ought to be debating. Those are the real issues.

Let me give you some fascinating statistics. Young people are young people, and for those of us who are now adults, but, more importantly, for those of us who have raised teenagers, we know a lot more about kids than we used to know, especially if we have raised our own. We know that if you put a challenge against them, oftentimes they will meet the challenge. Well, guess what? The American public knows that, too. And so when they were recently asked, just in the last week, in a nationwide survey—not funded by a tobacco company, funded privately—the question was asked: Which of the following do you believe is the most responsible for young people initially beginning to smoke? Ten percent of the American public said Hollywood, television, popular culture.

You know, it is true. When that handsome or attractive television star or movie star walks out in prime time

with a cigarette in their hand, that is cool; that is something, those viewing say, I ought to do. Yes, when President Clinton said he didn't inhale and then later on MTV he jokingly said he might have on a second try, guess what happened? Marijuana usage amongst teenagers bottomed out and headed up, because the leader, the icon of America's culture, kind of shrugged it off as no big deal. But the tragedy of no big deal is that, step one, marijuana smoking leads to step two, a search for cocaine, which can lead to death. The numbers have dramatically changed during this administration. I am amazed that they aren't out on the front line with us attempting to lead a war against drugs.

Well, back to the question: Who most influences young people to initially start smoking? Thirteen percent say the parent example—in other words, a power figure, an important figure in your life. If your parents smoke, you are likely to smoke.

The tobacco industry and their advertising—if you listened to the debate from the other side on the floor, you would be convinced that they alone caused 3,000 kids a day to start smoking. The American public says that maybe 6 percent of the cause is laid at the feet of the tobacco companies. I am not going to let the tobacco companies off. Yes, we now know that they targeted young people by their advertising, and that is wrong, and we ought to try to stop that. But the public knows that it didn't work that much.

Guess what. No. 1 factor: 59 percent say influence of peers and friends. If you have ever raised a teenager, you know that that is absolutely correct. It is the pressure of those whom they associate with, those whom they go to school with, those whom they play with; that is the real influence. If the friend is smoking, then there is a great pressure for you to smoke. Worst of all, if the friend is using drugs and thinks it is cool, and you are in that group, as a teenager, there is phenomenal pressure on you to go along, to be cool, to be part of the crowd.

Well, the statistics go on. But, most importantly, the American public has not been fooled by the rhetoric on the floor from the other side that somehow this massive tax increase, this massive expansion of Government programs, is somehow going to stop teenagers from smoking and make the world a safer and healthier place, because when they were asked, in this same poll, basically what the impact of this legislation would do and what it really was, 57 percent of them said it was a massive tax increase and a major increase in Government. And then they asked the question about raising the price of a pack of cigarettes by better than double—\$2.50 when everything is added in at the furthest extension of the bill—is that more likely or less likely to stop teenagers from smoking? Sixty-seven percent of Americans said it was less likely. Strangely enough, Mr. Presi-

dent, if you do the math and you raise cigarettes to that amount, all of a sudden marijuana becomes less expensive in a relative sense. Kids are paying three times or four times the price of tobacco for a joint of marijuana. Yet, we are being told that if you just jack up the price somehow they quit smoking. Yet, marijuana usage in a 30-day period in this last month of May was up 157 percent amongst eighth graders. It sounds like a lot of spendable income to me. Yet, that is not taken into consideration.

So my colleague from Georgia and I said that somehow we have to change this. We have to work with our colleagues here in the Senate to change it. How long can we go with these figures and statistics and death rates smacking us in the face and saying it is not a problem, it is not a problem if 14,000 young people die directly or indirectly related to drugs on an annual basis? That is a national crisis by any definition deserving a national effort of magnitude against it. That is what the Coverdell-Craig amendment does.

As my colleague from Georgia was speaking and talked about doubling the interdiction budget for U.S. Customs, doubling the interdiction budget for the Coast Guard—in other words, ships out of mothballs and back in the water—the Department of Defense put some effort there because they have been pulled back. As my colleague from the State of Idaho who is chairing at this moment knows, we have seen a major effort out in our State with drug-free communities and a drug-free neighborhood effort. We help there. While that has been a marvelously successful voluntary effort bringing in business and educators in our State, we help them out by some block grants giving flexibility to do more in the local communities by millions of dollars nationwide to encourage the successes in Idaho and other communities to have those successes across the board everywhere. Does it make a difference if national leaders and local leaders and State leaders are standing up telling their young people not to get involved in drugs? You bet it does. Our First Lady, Nancy Reagan, was oftentimes joked about because she said "just say no." Yet, because she was and is a national leader and a national image of great respect, the young people responded.

There is value in saying no and not shrugging it off and laughing and saying, "Maybe I ought to have tried to inhale." But it is very important that leaders of this country say no.

Our legislation helps leaders at the local level and the State level say no. Why should teenagers convicted of drug crimes or associated with drug purchases have a driver's license? If you are caught drinking at an illegal age in the State of Idaho, you don't have a driver's license. Shouldn't it be the same? Our bill provides for that incentive, and it ought to.

But the real arena is our schools. This legislation makes allowable the

use of Federal funds to provide school choice for grades K through 12 for students who are victims of school violence related to drugs, and includes drug-related crimes, creates incentives for States to provide an annual report card for parents and teachers listing incidents of crime. In other words, it lifts the awareness of drugs in the community and in the school system to get parents involved along with their educators to build a drug-free school environment. That is what we ought to be talking about—and a smoke-free environment. Let me add that. That is important, too, because we want to get kids away from tobacco.

The thing I fear most in all of what we do or may not do is that we are hiding in the myth that has been perpetrated by some, including the former Director of the Food and Drug Administration, that if you just jack up the price of a pack of cigarettes the problem goes away. Yet, every nation that has tried that in the past—and Canada is a perfect example—lost their market because the market went into the black market. When there is a desire in the public arena for something and you restrict the ability of the public to get to it, they will find a way. Thirty percent of the sales in Canada went into the black market. They had to lower the tax to get the sales back to control the product.

My point is very simple. If we do that in this country and 30 to 40 percent of tobacco and cigarette sales move into the black market, then that cool dude on the street that is selling your kids marijuana or cocaine is going to open his coat and say, "Oh, you can have some cigarettes, too. I am your local cigarette vendor, but I also have marijuana and cocaine. What is your choice?" Wouldn't that be a human tragedy if that is what this legislation, S. 1415, results in?

I am not saying that is the intent. I am saying that is how the market reacts. The statistics and facts show that in Canada, in Europe, and in Germany, that is exactly what happened. Yet, we are so naive to think you just jack up the price as high as you can possibly get it. Oh, sure, you are going to get hundreds of billions of dollars from the lower income, 30 percent of the socioeconomic scale of this country, and you are going to spend that in all kinds of programs. The trial lawyers are all going to get billions of dollars. But what about the kids? What about the kids?

You can't tell the tobacco industry to quit advertising without their consent. It is something called the first amendment in our country. They said they would voluntarily do that if we would control this a little bit. This Senate has chosen not to do so. So we will not get their consent. They will not become involved. But the great tragedy is our kids will be the victims still. While it may curb a few of them from smoking, we are silent—deathly silent—to the issue of drugs.



I am extremely proud to stand on the floor today with my colleague from Georgia to offer the most comprehensive anti-teen-drug amendment, to my knowledge, that this Senate has put forward. I don't plead with my colleagues from the other side. I challenge them to get aboard, to quit looking at the dollars and the political game being played, and come with us into good, effective public policy that mans the front lines once again in the war against drugs, that allows national leadership and State and community leadership to unite to say that perpetuating a drug culture among teenagers of our country is an evil we will not tolerate. That is what our amendment does so very clearly.

So to the other side, don't call it a bitter pill. How dare you? I don't blame you for being embarrassed about the President's record. The country ought to be. But we don't have to live with that record. We can walk beyond it. This amendment allows that to happen. This is not a bitter pill, nor is it a placebo. It is the beginning of a major and comprehensive effort to deal with the reality of our time. That is that there is the growth of a drug culture in our society that is killing America's youth in greater numbers than we ever dreamed possible. It is time that we stop it.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRAIG. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. COVERDELL. There are so many numbers that we talk about here. We often talk about how complicated it gets. But when the Senator talks about the magnitude of this issue, I think there are two figures that have been spellbinding to me, and it fits so much with what the Senator is saying.

What all this means is that today one in four—that is 25 percent—of high school students are using drugs now regularly—one in four. Most of them are smoking it. They smoke it. But they say it is not relevant—I in 10 junior high schools students. When the Senator was talking about the number of students that are affected by this, the number of deaths, 25 percent of the high school population in the United States and 10 percent of the junior high population in the United States.

I just wanted to make that point.

Mr. CRAIG. The last 30 days, 8th, 10th, 12th graders, using marijuana, up on the average of 100 percent. That is a dramatic figure that you speak to.

Out in my State of Idaho—rural, big public land State—two major raids last year of huge magnitude, to interdict marijuana, and still it remains, by everybody's figures—and we don't have those figures—the No. 1 cash crop in this country being driven by this huge market in this country. And that is in this country. And we are not getting that, let alone getting the huge flow of cocaine and heroin coming in from the outside along with marijuana, 70 percent of the flow across our southern borders.

The Senator from Georgia dealt with that with greater money for Border Patrol and interdiction. When we look at what is going on in Mexico today and their attitude in relation to this, it is a huge money machine for them, and it permeates down through their system, and it corrupts it. And it will corrupt ours, because there is the constant effort to corrupt. So that those who are of the profiteers can gain access through to the innocent, the children.

I thank my colleague from Georgia for his effort and his energy in this area. He brought my attention to this issue, and it was obvious to me in a very short time that we had to deal with this. We will be back, successful or unsuccessful here. This is something I think neither of us will rest on until we have a much clearer, stronger public policy in this area and we engage our Government in probably one of the most significant wars—against our very culture and our people, our young people, our future—that we have ever seen before.

I thank my colleague, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, working off the remarks of the Senator from Idaho, which I appreciated very much—not only his cooperation in joining in the amendment in the first place but the energy and intellect that he has brought to the discussion since that time—as he was talking, I was reminded of a meeting that occurred, probably, now, some 2 years ago.

I was encouraged to stop by a female youth detention center in the middle of my State. I really didn't expect that much from the meeting, but they gathered about 20 of the inmates. Their ages were 12 to 16. They were each given the assignment to tell about their own experience and what happened. As they walked—I was quite taken with the courage. It is not an easy thing. First all, the circumstances were pretty rough; and then they have to sit there and talk about it. But they did. They walked around the room. They were in the detention center for prostitution, assault and battery, attempted murder, car theft—and you name it—all related to an addiction to drugs. All of it.

It was very moving, the damage and their realization of it. I asked them, in the meeting, if they could say whatever they wanted to say to the rest of the youth of the Nation, what would they say? Really quite remarkable. They all said essentially the same thing in different ways. They said, "Don't use drugs. Do not believe you can control them"—which is the point my colleague was making. "The drugs will control you. And do not use drugs to be anybody's friend, because if somebody is encouraging you to use drugs, they are not your friend." They all had a sense of how dramatically their lives had been changed. One young girl said she was afraid to leave the institution;

she just knew she was going to have difficulty breaking away from it.

Cigarettes are a tough problem. But there isn't anybody in a youth detention center over it.

Mr. President, as has been stated here repeatedly, this amendment is a very bold statement about what this Nation is going to do about drug use. I am not going to name the individual here I was talking with several months ago. Suffice it to say, the individual was the head of one of our Nation's most powerful agencies. I said, "Are we guilty of just taking on this drug epidemic in a kind of day-to-day, you just kind of keep the wheels turning, but have been unable to understand, as in the Persian Gulf, that this Nation needs to be bold and forceful and come down on this with a hammer?" He paused for a moment, and he said, "We are guilty. We are not paying enough attention. We are not getting bold."

That makes all those men and women out there on the front lines—two of whom were killed a couple of weeks ago, overwhelmed at the border, shot and killed. All those people out there—I am not talking about the teenagers for a moment, but the people trying to help them—get the feeling that we don't care. I am sure the debate they have listened to here on this amendment has not encouraged them: "This is not relevant." This is relevant. This is destroying lives as we stand here and talk. The chance of recovery once the addiction occurs, once somebody is on this stuff—getting them off of it is murder. Our best shot is that they don't get on it in the first place.

So, yes, we need advertising to dissuade people from smoking. In fact, we have been doing a lot of that. This Nation has improved the statistics about tobacco. All of you have seen it. You walk outside, in this new culture, and you see a gaggle of people outside the building smoking in front of the building. When you walk into a restaurant, we just take it for granted, but the hostess says, "Smoking or non-smoking?" The flight attendant says, "This is a no-smoking flight." Everywhere we go, in our culture, we are beginning to get a message: Tobacco is not healthy.

We are making progress, and we should continue doing it. And I do not fault the underpinnings of the bill to improve the advertising. But it is flawed thinking, to think we can go to the Nation and say it would really help teenagers, and we would have been silent on the No. 1 addiction problem and the one that is undermining our society, the one that is so difficult to correct, if somebody does get snared on this.

One of the provisions in this amendment gives Customs the authority to, up to 5 percent of their force, be able to move it, irrespective of collective bargaining agreements. There is a flurry of worry on the other side because of that. Why is this language in the

amendment? Because Customs has to have the authority, from time to time, to alter the nature of who is present at a point of entry. They have to mix it up. So, we have this amendment which—as I said, it is limited up to 5 percent, to give them some flexibility to be able to maneuver who is at a given post at a given time.

It is almost as if every NEA, Fraternal Order of Police, lets them dominate this war. For heaven's sake, we don't want a rape victim to be able to be moved or someone who is a victim of a drug crime, we don't want to give a school district the ability to move that student to a safe-haven school.

Mr. President, I am going to take a few minutes and describe in more detail exactly what the amendment does.

No. 1, it stops the flow of drugs at our borders, and it doubles the resources for U.S. Customs, doubles the resources for the U.S. Coast Guard and doubles the resources for the Department of Defense. It also increases the antinarcotic capacity of the FBI by 25 percent and the Drug Enforcement Agency by 25 percent. In other words, I am responding to the gentleman I talked to a moment ago. It is a bold statement. It responds to what the admiral, who I quoted, said, that the Nation doesn't have the will to fight this battle. This says the Nation does have the will and is going to fight it. Then the accountability will be up to the admirals. We are going to give them the materiel to fight the fight, and then they better win it.

It strengthens the civil and criminal penalties for Customs violations and doubles the number of border agents by the year 2003.

It protects our neighborhoods and schools from drugs.

It has a title dealing with drug-free teen drivers, providing \$10 million per year in grants for States that institute voluntary drug testing for teen driver license applicants and for States that enact and enforce laws that crack down on drivers who use drugs. Only five States do that, Mr. President. Only five States have expanded DUI to drug driving. So this legislation encourages an expansion of drug driving.

Drug-free schools: It makes it allowable to use Federal funds to provide compensation and services to K through 12, kindergarten through high school students, who are the victims of school violence, including drug-related crimes. It creates incentives for States to provide an annual report card to parents and teachers listing incidents of school violence, weapons possession or drug activity, and makes voluntary random drug testing programs an allowable use of Federal funds.

The drug-free student loan provision: It restricts loans for students convicted of drug possession, 1 year for first offenders, 2 years for second offenders and indefinitely for third. It restricts loans for students convicted of drug trafficking, 2 years for first offenders and indefinitely for second of-

fenders. It resumes loan eligibility on an expedited basis for students who satisfactorily complete a drug rehabilitation program that includes drug testing.

Drug-free workplace: It authorizes \$10 million per year in SBA demonstration grants for small- and medium-size businesses to implement drug-free workplace programs and provides technical assistance for businesses through SBA.

Drug-free communities: It authorizes \$50 million per year to encourage communities nationwide to establish comprehensible, sustainable and accountable antidrug coalitions through flexible matching grants, and it allows up to \$10 million of these funds to be used each year to encourage the formation of parent-youth drug prevention strategies.

Mr. President, there is data that strongly suggests that if parents talk to children about the drug issue, the chance of their children becoming users are cut in half—cut in half. But if you ask students by survey or in person whether they are talking to their parents about these problems, they are not. Only about 10 percent of the knowledge that students learn about drugs are coming from the parents. That dialog is not occurring, which also explains why what parents think about the drug epidemic is different from what children think, and children are far more knowledgeable, unfortunately, about the drug epidemic than their parents.

The other day I mentioned one statistic of, "Do your children know someone who uses marijuana?" The percentage of parents who think that is the case is 20 percent. When you ask the students, "Do you know someone who smokes marijuana?" Yes, over 70 percent. There is a disconnect out there, and that disconnect is hurting us. That is what this provision is meant to get at. We have to get parents talking to their children.

One of the ads being used now from the drug czar's office shows a little girl sitting at a desk, and she is being talked to by a voice. The voice says: "There is a pack of matches there. Do you use matches?"

The little girl says, "Oh, no, they are dangerous."

"How do you know that?" the voice says.

"My mommy told me so."

Then they say, "Well, are drugs dangerous?"

And the girl just sits there and looks at the camera. Inference: Mommy is not talking to the little girl about drugs.

These provisions begin to highlight this dialog.

Ban free needles from drug addicts. This has been very controversial, a dispute in the administration, the drug czar's office arguing there should be no needle exchange program. It almost came about, but the drug czar caused a change.

I was given this pamphlet earlier this afternoon. It is published by the Bridgeport Needle Exchange Program of Bridgeport, CT. This is the kind of thing that a needle exchange program would move toward.

The brochure says: "Shoot smart; shoot safe. Tips for safer crack injection."

I have to tell you, Mr. President, the Federal Government should have nothing to do with anything associated with this kind of activity.

"Get your stuff ready. Have a cooker, water, syringe, citric or ascorbic acid, cotton or alcohol wipes ready."

It is your ABCs on how to use a needle. It goes through every step.

"Get a vein ready. Tie off a good vein and clean with alcohol wipe. Never share a syringe or cooker."

Just all your tips.

This legislation makes it absolutely clear that there will be no needle exchange program. It would be banned, and it ought to be.

As I mentioned a little earlier, the Drug Enforcement Agency would receive an antinarcotic budget increase of 25 percent. The Federal Bureau of Investigation would receive an increase in the drug enforcement budget by 25 percent. It would require the registration of convicted drug dealers and provides \$5 million per year in incentive grants to States that require convicted drug dealers who target kids to register with local law enforcement.

That is the nuts and bolts of the amendment that we are discussing this afternoon, an amendment that has been criticized as being not relevant to the subject or issue.

From the outset, I have been stunned that this legislation would be silent on teenage drug addiction. Myself, Senator CRAIG and others decided that could no longer be the case.

If we are going to talk about teenage addiction, we have to simply make sure that in the center of this debate is the subject of teenage drug abuse. Why? Because teenage drug abuse is the No. 1 problem—No. 1—because it is costing our society \$67 billion a year; because it has resulted in 800,000 U.S. prisoners in jails, in prisons, State and Federal; because it has caused, and continues to cause on a daily basis, the most violent, hostile attack on our citizenry and its property.

As bad as smoking a cigarette is, it does not cause a mind to pick up a gun and murder someone. But drug abuse does. That is why we have seen this surge of violent crime among our youth that everybody is so alarmed about—drug based. And as we have wondered about the increase in mindless crime, just senseless and brutal—drug based. Drugs alter the mind, and they cause inexplicable activity and hostility that the rest of society bears the brunt of.

Relevant? You bet. And this Senator, for one, any time you talk about teenage addiction, which I am glad we are talking about, we are going to talk



about drug addiction because it is part of it. And it is smoke driven, the only difference being that it is five times as dangerous to smoke this stuff as tobacco.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, at this point in the debate, it is appropriate to ask one very simple question: Why are we here? Why have Members of the Senate spent months of their time focusing on this issue? Why, with a busy schedule, and few legislative days left this year, are we occupying the Senate's time with this bill?

The answer to this question is equally simple—the most important thing the Senate can do this year is to make significant inroads in cutting youth smoking.

If you accept this simple premise—that the goal of a tobacco bill should be about reducing teen smoking, then the decision on how to vote on the Coverdell amendment is clear. The amendment should be opposed.

Mr. President, let me be perfectly clear. I support increased appropriations for drug enforcement and drug interdiction. I represent a State that has experienced major crises related to drug trafficking and drug use. And I know better than most, as a member of the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control, the importance of fighting the scourge of drugs in America.

Last year, I joined my House colleague and fellow Floridian JOHN MICA in establishing a new High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area in Central Florida. I was also an original co-sponsor of the Drug Free Communities Act. I have co-sponsored a bill with Senator GRASSLEY that will establish a national strategy to attack money laundering. I have fought to increase funding for our counternarcotics efforts time and time again.

Just next week I will be holding a field hearing in Miami on the current interdiction efforts in the Caribbean. I know how serious the drug threat is, and I have been and will be committed to doing whatever it takes to keep drugs away from our children.

I support many of the measures in the Coverdell amendment. And if the United States Senate ever gets serious about addressing this issue, perhaps funding these measures through general revenues, I would support them wholeheartedly.

In fact, we will have an opportunity to vote on an alternative which addresses the drug problem by authorizing funds to increase the number of border patrol agents, Coast Guard officers, and money for the Department of Defense to increase interdiction. And we will be able to augment these programs without gutting anti-tobacco efforts.

Mr. President, let's stay focussed, stick to the purpose, and send a message to parents right now that we are serious about reducing teen smoking.

If we adopt the Coverdell amendment, here's what happens: five million

smokers will not receive smoking cessation services. Those who argue that the tobacco taxes are regressive should remember that cessation and other public health programs are targeted toward helping those who will actually pay the tax.

Over 20 million children will not receive the benefits of effective counter advertising to discourage them from taking up the deadly habit of cigarette smoking.

Fifty million children will not participate in school-based prevention programs.

States will not have the funds to develop their own anti-smoking programs which are so vital in protecting our children.

We will not have the benefit of future biomedical advancement through increased funding for NIH research.

In addition, we have solid scientific evidence to suggest that if we stop kids from smoking, they may never take up the use of illicit drugs, such as cocaine and marijuana. This "gateway effect" has been well documented.

Let's look at the findings of the Surgeon General's 1994 report, "Preventing Tobacco Use Among Young People"—ninety-eight percent of all cocaine users smoked cigarettes first.

Among 12 to 17 year olds—those who smoke are 114 times more likely to use marijuana and 32 times more likely to use cocaine.

By contrast, less than one percent of those children who never smoked end up using cocaine or marijuana.

Mr. President, if we are interested in cutting drug use among our children, we should pass this tobacco bill now, and leave the funding to States and public health intact, and then come back and fund the real anti-drug initiatives in the Coverdell proposal and the Democratic alternative amendment. There is simply no reason why we cannot and should not do both. Our kids are worth it.

This is simply the greatest opportunity, and perhaps our only opportunity to take a huge step toward reducing youth smoking. This bill is our best chance to have a significant impact on the Nation's public health. We shouldn't blow it.

Mr. President, those who attempt to gut this bill through funding extraneous programs—are going to be on the wrong side of history. For all of these reasons, I urge the rejection of the Coverdell amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAFEE. 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. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for the next 20 minutes as in morning business.

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

#### THE TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I rise today to say a few words about the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, otherwise known as the ISTEA reauthorization legislation. This was passed by the House and Senate on May 22, and the President will sign this historic legislation into law later this afternoon.

In the rush to finish the conference before the Memorial Day recess—and I know the Chair remembers well the frantic hours that were taking place then—and during our subsequent efforts on the technical corrections bill to this overall legislation, I did not have an opportunity to speak about what was accomplished in this important bill. I also want to take this chance to thank the many people who were involved in the effort.

First, a word about the legislation. It is the result of over 2 years of hard work and careful negotiation. But I think the final product is better for the extra time and effort that was put into it.

This legislation builds upon the landmark achievements of the so-called first ISTEA legislation, which stands for Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act. That was in 1991. Senator MOYNIHAN of New York was chairman of our committee at the time, the Environment and Public Works Committee, and was, I think it is fair to say, the principal author of that landmark legislation in 1991.

Now, how is this bill historic? And how is it different from the 1991 legislation?

First, and most obvious, ISTEA II, or sometimes called the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, authorizes a record amount of funding for surface transportation: almost \$218 billion for highway and transit programs over the next 6 years.

Of this amount, almost \$174 billion will be for highways—that includes bridges, obviously—\$3 billion is for highway safety programs, and \$41 billion is for transit programs.

Now, \$205 billion of these funds are authorized from the highway trust fund, and \$13 billion from the general fund. In total, the funds provided in the conference report represent a 40 percent increase over the last so-called ISTEA legislation—40 percent increase.

We will provide these record funding levels in the funding guarantee within a balanced budget. I think that is terribly important to remember, Mr. President. We are not increasing the Federal deficit, despite some of the statements that have been made in the various news media.

For achieving these record funding levels for the highway program, Senators BYRD, GRAMM, WARNER and BAUCUS deserve special recognition, as well