

partying, or Puritanism. They aren't intended to interfere with anyone's right to drink alcohol socially or antisocially, responsibly or irresponsibly, in vast or moderate quantities. The law just asks drinkers not to operate heavy machinery on the States' roads and highways while under the influence of alcohol.

The Baltimore Sun:

You're driving on the beltway. The motorist in the next lane consumed four beers during the past hour. To paraphrase Clint Eastwood, "Do you feel lucky?" Amazingly, that tipsy driver may be within his legal rights.

And they end up:

Four drinks in one State makes you no less drunk than four drinks in another State. The abundant evidence justifies a national response.

The Omaha World-Herald:

Yes to a national drunk driving law. Congress uses the threat of withheld funds too often, in our opinion, to force its will upon the States. In this case, however, the States would merely be required to set an intoxication standard that reflects research on how alcohol affects driving.

That is the Omaha World-Herald, October 29.

The Wall Street Journal said this:

Safe alcohol levels should be set by health experts, not the lobby for Hooters and Harrah's. The Lautenberg-DeWine amendment isn't a drive toward prohibition, but an uphill push toward health consensus.

The Toledo Blade:

Complaints from the beverage industry that the new limits would target social drinkers and not alcoholics are ridiculous and dangerous. All that matters is whether the person behind the wheel has had too much to drink. Whether he or she is a social drinker is irrelevant.

Finally, New York Newsday:

It should be obvious that cracking down on drunk driving is an urgent matter of health and safety. The attack is not against drinking; it's against drinking and driving.

Mr. President, my colleagues have said it very, very well. My colleague from North Dakota a few moments ago said it well. He says it is not complicated. It is not complicated how you reduce auto fatalities. This is an easy way to save lives. And this is a way that will save lives.

At 10:30 tomorrow morning we are going to have a chance to do something very simple. We are going to have the chance to come to this floor and cast a yes vote on this amendment. It is one time when we will know the consequences of our act. And the consequence of that act, if we pass this, if it becomes law, will be simply this: Fewer families will have their families shattered, fewer families will have their lives changed forever. That is what the loss of a child or loss of a mother or father to drunk driving does—it changes your life forever.

We will save some families from that tragedy. We will never know who they are. They will never know. But we can be guaranteed that we will have done that and done that much tomorrow morning. This is a very rational and reasonable proposal. I say that because it sets the standard at .08.

I will repeat something I said a moment ago—and I am going to continue to state it because I think it is so important—and that is: No one, no expert who has looked at this believes that someone who tests .08 has not had their driving ability appreciably impaired. No one who has looked at this thinks that someone who tests .08 should be behind the wheel of a car. If any of my colleagues who might be listening doubt that, tonight or early tomorrow morning—we all know police officers; we all know people who have been in emergency rooms; we all know people who have seen DUIs and who know who they tested—pick up the phone and call one of your police officers.

Pick up the phone and call a member of the highway patrol who may have picked up someone, who has picked up probably dozens of people who have been drinking and driving, and ask them if, in their professional opinion, they think someone who tests .08 or above has any business being behind the wheel of a car. I will guarantee you, the answer will be unanimous.

The fact is, the more someone knows about the subject, the more adamant they will be about that. I became involved in this issue a number of years ago when I was an assistant county prosecuting attorney. One of my jobs was to prosecute DUI—DWI cases we used to call them in those days.

I can tell you from my own experience, someone who tests .08—and I have seen the videotape, as they say. I have seen the replays. I have seen the tapes that are taken right before the person takes the test. And I have compared those videotapes where you can see the person staggering, you can see the person's speech slurred, you can see their coordination impaired. I compared that with the tests. I will tell you from my own experience in observing, a person at .08 absolutely, no doubt about it, should not be behind the wheel.

Look what other countries have done. Senator LAUTENBERG showed the chart. Canada, Great Britain, Australia, Austria, all at .08 or below. This is a rational and reasonable thing to do. It is reasonable, as Ronald Reagan said, to have some minimum national standards that assure highway safety.

We live in a country where we get in a car and we think nothing of crossing one, two, three, four, five State lines, and we do it literally all the time. There ought to be some national standard, some floor, some assurance when you put your child in a car, when you get in the car with your wife and your loved ones, some assurance that whatever State you are in, wherever you are driving, that level is .08. That is a rational floor. It is a rational basis.

Again, despite all the scientific evidence, despite all the arguments, still there are some who would say this bill is an attack against social drinkers; this amendment will mean if I have two beers and a pizza I will not be able to drive. That is simply not true. All

the scientific data, all the tests, all the anecdotal information tells us that is simply not true.

Let me again go back and repeat what the scientific data shows. It shows that when a male weighing 160 pounds has four drinks in an hour—it takes four drinks on an empty stomach in an hour for that adult male at 160 pounds to reach the .08 level. I don't think anyone believes that person should be behind the wheel, and I don't think there is anyone in this Chamber who will turn their child over to that person.

Mr. President, again we will have the opportunity tomorrow to save lives. I urge my colleagues to cast a "yes" vote on the Lautenberg-DeWine amendment. It will, in fact, save lives.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAFEE. Now, Mr. President, we have made valiant efforts to get the opponents of this measure here. We have given them every chance in the world. They have not shown up. Any opponents who want to speak will have half an hour tomorrow to speak.

I therefore propose that we close shop here.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

THE GOVERNMENT SECRECY ACT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the distinguished Minority Leader, the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and with the distinguished Senator from New York, Mr. MOYNIHAN. Both Senator MOYNIHAN and Senator HELMS served with distinction on the Commission on Protecting and Reducing Government Secrecy. They are to be congratulated for their efforts. Senator MOYNIHAN and I have spoken repeatedly about his commitment to declassifying information while protecting legitimate secrets.

S. 712, the Government Secrecy Act of 1997, is a complex piece of legislation. Chairman THOMPSON has already held a hearing in the Governmental Affairs Committee. Other committees have legitimate and appropriate concerns about elements of this legislation, including Foreign Relations, Judiciary, Armed Services and the Select Committee on Intelligence on which I serve as an ex officio member. Their concerns should be addressed as we move through the legislative process.

I also have a number of concerns that I hope are addressed as the committees consider this legislation. I am concerned about allowing judicial review of executive branch classification decisions. I do not think it is wise or necessary to allow judges to second-guess