

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

as Congressmen SHUSTER and OBERSTAR from the House. All of those Members fought long and hard to ensure transportation would receive substantial increases over the original ISTEA legislation.

I know that the sums in this bill are large, and the press reports sometimes imply we spent too much, but I think we have to put all this into context.

The bill authorizes, indeed, \$218 billion. And I must say, that is a lot of money, as we all recognize. It is over 6 years. As I said, this represents a large increase over ISTEA I of 1991.

However, and I think this is an important point, only about 30 to 40 percent of the total projected spending for highways and transit by all levels of government is encompassed in this legislation. People come up to me and say, well, isn't that a lot of money to be spending on transportation—that is, highways, bridges and transit—over the 6 years? Yes, it is a lot of money, but you have to realize it only represents about 30 to 40 percent of the total projected spending that will be done.

Where does the other spending come from? It comes from counties, it comes from States, it comes from cities that are doing things on their own.

In addition to record authorization levels, this legislation made significant changes to the way we budget for transportation at the Federal level. This legislation changed the budgetary treatment of the highway trust fund following the model set forth in a bill first introduced by Senator BOND, which I was pleased to cosponsor and work on with him, the so-called Bond-Chafee legislation.

This bill ensures that all Federal gas tax revenues deposited into the highway trust fund are spent on transportation programs. In effect, this bill reestablishes the linkage between the highway trust fund taxes and transportation spending that was envisioned when the highway trust fund was created. If future revenues to the highway trust fund increase, then under this legislation the highway spending will increase; and, of course, it works the other way, likewise. If the amount going into the highway trust fund from the various taxes—principally the Federal tax on gasoline—decreases, then highway spending, likewise, will decrease.

Now, using Congressional Budget Office projections, \$198 billion of the total funding for highway and transit programs will be guaranteed under the new budget mechanism we have. Of the \$198 billion, \$162 billion is for highway and highway safety programs and \$36 billion is for transit programs. It is important to note that this historic change which reestablishes the linkage between the trust fund moneys and trust fund spending was all accomplished within the balanced budget framework. We will keep the highway trust fund on budget as part of a unified budget and we will offset the in-

creased spending with spending reductions in other programs.

I want to thank Senator BOND for his tireless work on the so-called Bond-Chafee proposal, which provides the underlying foundation for the budget reforms we implemented in this legislation. I thank the cosponsors of the Bond-Chafee proposal for their input. I also want to thank Senator DOMENICI and his staff for their work throughout the year and for their help in crafting the final budget mechanism that will become law later this afternoon.

I believe the original ISTEA was a landmark piece of legislation. I have said that many, many times. However, it is true that in the 1991 legislation there were some shortcomings, particularly for the so-called donor States. These were the States that put in substantially more into the trust fund than they got back. The original ISTEA established a 90 percent minimum allocation program which was intended to guarantee that each State at least got back 90 percent of what that State put into the trust fund. The problem was that it didn't work. The 90 percent only applied to some of the programs and wasn't structured mathematically to achieve its goals. The old minimum allocation calculation applied to fewer than 80 percent of the programs, leaving some States to receive a percentage share that was equal to 70 to 80 percent of their share of contributions. In other words, a program that was designed to make sure that every State got back at least 90 percent failed. Indeed, some States were left with between 70 plus up to 80 cents back on the dollars as opposed to the 90 cents.

In this legislation, thanks to the leadership of Senator WARNER and others in the Senate, tremendous efforts were made to guarantee that each State would get back—at least originally, we sought 92 percent. We weren't able to achieve that under the formula, but we did come up so that every State got back 90.5 cents for every dollar that State put into the trust fund, at least. So the donor States were put in far better shape than they previously had been under the old former legislation.

Other members of the Environment and Public Works Committee who played a key role in achieving this result were all very, very helpful. In addition, we had Senators who were not on the committee who were very anxious about the program. Senators ABRAHAM, LUGAR, COATS, MACK, GRAHAM, and LEVIN were diligent in their efforts to see that their States got back at least the 90.5 cents.

Another area where ISTEA broke with the past is how priority projects, otherwise known as demonstration projects, are treated. I realize that these projects are viewed by some just like the demonstration projects of the past. However, I think the way we dealt with them in this legislation was somewhat different. First, the special

projects, demonstration projects in this bill, did receive an amount of attention that was far out of proportion to their dollar significance. The high priority projects similar to those in ISTEA I only received 5 percent of the total. If you read the newspapers, you would think they were consuming 40 to 50 percent of the total. Not at all. These special projects received 5 percent of the total. In the original bill, priority projects were treated as mandatory spending, exempt from the appropriations process. In this legislation, priority projects are discretionary spending, subject to the obligation limitations in the appropriation process.

Third, under the former bill, ISTEA I, priority projects were always funded at 100 percent of their authorized level. In other words, priority projects were not reduced when the total authorization went down. However, in this legislation, these projects were treated as the same as the other core projects, taking their share of any reduction caused by a shortfall in final appropriations. If the total amount goes down, the special projects go down, likewise.

We made a sincere commitment to safety in this legislation, recognizing that more than 40,000 Americans die and 3 million are injured in highway crashes every single year in our country. This is a tragic effect for millions of American families. We recognized these statistics and included a variety of initiatives to address this terrible problem. We increased the Federal commitment to improve roadway safety, providing more than \$6.6 billion for highway safety programs; \$3.6 billion of that will be available for safety construction, efforts aimed at eliminating road hazards and improving safety at rail-highway grade crossings. We provided a little over half a billion in incentives to States to promote seatbelt use. Seatbelt usage is by far the most important step that vehicle occupants can take to protect themselves in the event of a crash. We provided half a billion in incentive programs to encourage States to adopt tough .08 blood alcohol concentration standards. This is something that Senators LAUTENBERG and DEWINE worked very, very hard on. I want to recognize their efforts.

Under the category of innovation, we recognized we must maintain the strength of the transportation system we have in place but we have to provide new tools to address new problems and supply new solutions. We have to look at ways to finance our substantial infrastructure needs, evaluating the potential of new methods to design and build infrastructure more efficiently so we have innovative financing provisions, the so-called Transportation Infrastructure Financing and Innovation Act. That is a mouthful. It is also known TIFIA. I want to thank Senators GRAHAM and MOYNIHAN for their leadership on that important provision.

As far as intelligent transportation systems go, this is a forward-looking

initiative. We have to make the most efficient use of our existing highways. We provide new options for transportation planners to address safety and capacity concerns. The objective is to move more vehicles in a safer fashion over the same amount of highway that exists—not expand the highways, just move more vehicles along the existing highways in a safe fashion.

The environment received great attention in our legislation, and, I might say, so did ISTEA I in 1991. But we continued that. Indeed, we increased funding for the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program. In other words, where congestion arises, we took efforts to mitigate those problems and the reflections that that congestion has upon our air quality.

We boosted funding for the Transportation Enhancements Program. We increased that by 38 percent over the prior legislation of 1991. So States can use these funds for what we call transportation enhancements, such as bicycle and pedestrian facilities and historic or environmental preservation projects.

We initiated a wetlands banking system to mitigate transportation's effect on wetlands. When we build new roads, all too often wetlands are affected. We want to promote wetlands restoration. We did that by making wetlands restoration a profitable private enterprise.

We reauthorized and amended the Aquatic Resources Trust Fund, which provides about \$350 million annually to States throughout the Nation for sport fish restoration and boat safety programs.

So these are some of the things that we did. We had environmental streamlining. We held the line on administrative expenses. We added a design-build system for contracting. Current law doesn't allow the use of the so-called design-build concept in highway construction. The design-build concept combines the design and construction phases of a highway project, allowing projects to be built faster and at less cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. President, I will conclude by recognizing the tremendous efforts put forth in this legislation by the staffs and by the Department of Transportation. I want to thank Secretary Slater and Federal Highway Administrator Wykle for their time and effort on this bill and for making the full resources of the Department available to us. From the Department of Transportation, I thank specifically Jack Basso, Nadine Hamilton, Bud Wright and his staff, Tom Weeks, Bruce Swinford, Roger Mingo, Dedra Goodman, Frank Calhoun and his staff, Patricia Doersch, Bryan Grote, and David Seltzer. These individuals, particularly on the formula runs, were tremendously helpful.

I thank Secretary Slater for allowing Cheryle Tucker from the Federal Highway Administration to be detailed to our committee for 16 months to help us

on this. I thank all the conferees from the Environment and Public Works Committee; all 18 were conferees. I think that was very helpful to me, and I believe it worked well. These members took hours from their busy schedules to listen to summaries of what was taking place and offered suggestions. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator WARNER, and the ranking member, Senator BAUCUS, for their efforts in getting this legislation up to the full committee.

Lastly, I would like to recognize the efforts of the Senate staff who worked so long and hard. Of course, I thank every single one of them. Particularly, I recognize the work of Jimmie Powell, who was just tireless, and a series of others who did such a good job. I am going to run over the names of some of those who worked on the reauthorization that I was particularly close with. Chris Hessler; Dan Corbett, of course, who was tireless and always present; Ann Loomis; Tom Sliter; Kathy Ruffalo, with Senator BAUCUS; Chris Russell; Gary Smith; Tracy Henke, with Senator BOND; Jason Rupp; Doug Benevento, with Senator ALLARD; Abigail Kinnison with the Environment and Public Works Committee; Al Dahlberg with the Environment and Public Works Committee; Linda Willard with the Environment and Public Works Committee; Ellen Stein with Senator WARNER; Chad Bradley with Senator INHOFE; Chris Jahn with Senator THOMAS; Gerry Gilligan with Senator SESSIONS; Rick Dearborn with Senator SESSIONS; Arnold Kupferman with Senator MOYNIHAN; Polly Trottenberg with Senator MOYNIHAN; Liz O'Donoghue with Senator LAUTENBERG; Kirsten Beronio with Senator LAUTENBERG; Drew Willison with Senator REID; Melissa White with Senator GRAHAM; Tim Hess with Senator GRAHAM; Joyce Rechtscheffen with Senator LIEBERMAN; Christopher Prins with Senator LIEBERMAN; Rob Alexander with Senator BOXER; Joshua Shenkmen with Senator WYDEN; Howard Menell with the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; Peggy Kuhn with the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; Joe Mondello with the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; Loretta Garrison with the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; Bill Hoagland with the Budget Committee; Brian Riley with the Budget Committee; Austin Smythe with the Budget Committee; Mitch Warren with the Budget Committee; Ann Begeman with the Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee; Charlotte Casey with the Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee; Clyde Hart with the Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee; Bob Greenawalt with Senator CHAFEE; Ashley Miller with Senator ROTH; Keith Hennessey with Senator LOTT; Carl Biersak with Senator LOTT; Janine Johnson with Senate Legislative Counsel; Peter Rogoff with Senator BYRD; Pam Sellers with Senator COATS; Steve

McMilin with Senator GRAMM; and Dave Russell with Senator STEVENS.

They all were tremendous, and I feel bad if I left out the names of any of them. So it goes, Mr. President, without the help of these individuals, we plain could not have gotten this legislation accomplished. So I thank every one of them.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ROBB addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I would like to return to a discussion of the bill that is currently before the Senate. I voted against cloture today, and barring some major shift in the direction of this legislation, which now, regrettably, appears unlikely, I will have no choice but to vote against cloture again tomorrow.

Mr. President, I have a keen interest in the pending legislation. I have three children, all now grown. No member of my family smokes now, and I hope they never do. In the Senate, we represent millions of parents who have the same wish for their children. There are thousands of Virginians who belong to the American Heart Association, the Virginia Cancer Society, the American Lung Association, Virginians who have fought for years against the scourge of smoking-related disease.

There are also, however, thousands of honest, hard-working, God-fearing, law-abiding, taxpaying Virginians whose lives and livelihoods would be dramatically affected solely by the actions this Congress may take on the tobacco issue. For example, there are thousands of Virginians who work to manufacture tobacco-related products, and thousands more who work in associated industries, like the dock-workers at the Ports of Hampton Roads, foil manufacturers, and filter makers. And there are the thousands of Virginia families who work the soil and grow tobacco, who face not only the uncertainty other farmers face regarding the weather and other uncontrollable forces, but must contend with the added uncertainty of what Congress may do to affect their lives.

In short, to an extent not shared by many of my colleagues I represent virtually every interest affected by this legislation. While some would argue that because I'm from a tobacco state I must be biased on this issue. I believe that because I'm from a tobacco state, I'm in a unique position to be objective. I'm willing to listen with an open mind to public health advocates, who want to protect the Commonwealth's children, but I'm also willing to listen with an open mind to tobacco workers and tobacco growers whose very livelihood is under attack. Indeed, I've