

wilderness for her husband and eight children, she wrote poetry despite criticism that she was not devoting enough time to "domestic responsibilities." To that, she replied, "I am obnoxious to each carping tongue who says my hand a better needle fits."

Finally, Louise du Pont Crowninshield of Salem, was a great and knowledgeable collector of antiques and a tireless advocate of historical preservation. Crowninshield's energy and dedication to charity work and historic preservation benefitted and continues to serve the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Peabody-Essex Museum in my hometown of Salem, Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, America would not have flourished were it not for the tireless work of women. They have been, and continue to be, essential to building a country where all citizens, male and female, are free to live to their fullest potential.

THE PROHIBITION AGAINST ALCOHOL TRAFFIC TO MINORS ACT PAAT ACT

HON. JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1998

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to help save our Nation's children: The Prohibition Against Alcohol Traffic to Minors Act. The PAAT Act curbs the problem of underage drinking by prohibiting the "direct shipment" of alcoholic beverages to persons not meeting a State's legal drinking age.

The bill amends Title 18, United States Code by inserting a new section after 1865 that prohibits shippers, their employees, common carriers or agents of common carriers or delivery companies from delivering a package containing an alcoholic beverage or compound, fit for consumption, to any person not meeting the minimum drinking age within a state.

On Friday, December 12, 1997, a local NBC affiliate aired in which an underage youth ordered and received shipment of alcoholic beverages. The youth in question lived in New York, purchased the alcohol via the internet from a retailer in California, paid for the order with a credit card, and accepted delivery of the alcohol from a commercial air-freight carrier. This same story is also the subject of an undercover operation being conducted by the Attorney General of the State of New York. While this particular incident was documented by television cameras, there are numerous others that are not.

According to the Center for Disease Control, 80.4% percent of the nation's high school students have had at least one drink of alcohol during their lifetime; 51.6% have had at least one drink in a 30 day period; and 32.6% qualify as "episodic heavy drinkers" having had five or more drinks on at least one occasion during a 30 day period.

Sixty-nine percent of Americans polled oppose the direct shipment of alcohol to minors; 85% agree that the sale of alcoholic beverages over the Internet would give minors easier access to alcohol and could result in more abuse; and 70% of those polled don't trust delivery drivers to ensure that the recipi-

ent of alcoholic beverages via common carriers is at least 21 years of age.

Direct shippers operate outside of the licensed distribution system. The licensed beverage distribution system is an essential and legal of the alcohol control process and contributes billions in federal and state taxes each year. Direct shipments circumvent these laws and robs states of tax revenues. Florida, Tennessee, Kentucky, Georgia and North Carolina have recently upgraded their laws to make "direct shipment" a felony. At least 26 other states have sent "cease and desist" letters to wineries or retailers urging them to stop illegal shipments.

Every state has set 21 as the minimum drinking age. The passage of "21" laws by states stopped underage drinkers from driving to another state to purchase alcohol. However, Internet and toll-free direct shipment creates a new technological way for underage drinkers to have alcohol shipped directly to the home.

With "shipments" there is no regulatory system to guard against underage access and to collect alcohol beverage taxes. What started many years ago as a cottage industry to sell rare wines and micro brewed beer to connoisseurs has burgeoned into a billion dollar a year business.

According to the Center for Disease Control, 80.4% percent of the nation's high school students have had at least one drink of alcohol during their lifetime; 51.6% have had at least one drink in a 30 day period; and 32.6% qualify as "episodic heavy drinkers" having had five or more drinks on at least one occasion during a 30 day period. This behavior is dangerous, life threatening and must be stopped. I ask that my colleagues support our nation's children and pass this important legislation.

SUMMARY OF THE PROHIBITION AGAINST ALCOHOL TRAFFIC TO MINORS ACT (PAAT ACT)

The PAAT Act curbs the problem of underage drinking by prohibiting the "direct shipment" of alcohol beverages to persons not meeting a State's legal drinking age.

The bill amends Title 18, United States Code by inserting a new section (1866) after 1865 that prohibits shippers, their employees, common carriers or agents of common carriers, delivery companies, or business entities that deliver goods from delivering a package containing an alcoholic beverage or compound, fit for consumption, to any person not meeting the minimum drinking age within a state.

THE FRENCH BROAD RIVER DOESN'T NEED NEW BUREAUCRACY

HON. CHARLES H. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 24, 1998

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I commend to your attention this article written by Will Haynie for the *Asheville Citizen-Times*—a newspaper in North Carolina's 11th Congressional District. It provides a persuasive argument against the American Heritage Rivers Initiative as proposed by President Clinton.

[From the *Asheville Citizen-Times*, March 22, 1998]

OLD MAN RIVER DOESN'T NEED THE FEDS
(By Will Haynie)

The song says that Old Man River, he just keeps rolling along. In today's political envi-

ronment permeated by hype and hysteria, some say that may be easy for an old man, but a French Broad needs federal help.

After the American Heritage Rivers Initiative was announced, the result was a knee-jerk reaction to jump on the federal bandwagon to do something nice for rivers. Not for all of America's rivers, but just for the ten whose communities jump through the federal hoops required for a chance to be personally picked by the president. And with this president, how could ours lose with a name like French-Broad?

The American Heritage Rivers initiative was announced by President Clinton in his State of the Union Address in February 1997. This is an executive branch program, the details of which I viewed at the web site maintained by the federal Environmental Protection Agency (the address is <http://www.epa.gov/rivers>).

The efforts to nominate the French Broad for American Heritage River status sparked a healthy local debate over the role of the federal government and its control over our lives and property. This debate combines the best lessons from history and social studies along with some environmental science topics thrown into the mix.

With such a precious natural resource as the focal point, it's tempting for even the most conservative of us to respond by supporting what looks at face value to be a good intention.

But one thing I learned spending a lot of my youth around water is to look before you leap. Sometimes smooth surfaces hide harmful obstacles.

One obstacle in this initiative is that it comes straight from the executive branch of the federal government and involves the allocation of the funds and assets. When our constitution was framed, the representative branch was given such powers.

One of the initiative's stated goals is to "protect the health of our communities by delivering federal resources more effectively and efficiently."

Two of the most famous lies in the world are "the check's in the mail" and "we're from the federal government and we're here to help you." Add another one to that list: "we will deliver federal resources more effectively and efficiently." Sure, like the speed of the Post Office, the thriftiness of the Pentagon, and the courtesy of the IRS.

Is this to say that paying our federal taxes and acting in a law-abiding manner are not enough reasons to get effective, efficient service from federal agencies? Do we now have to petition the feds and hope for special designations just to get what we are owed?

The third stated requirement for communities whose rivers receive the designation is "the willingness . . . to enter into new, or to continue and expand existing partnership agreements."

The EPA also states "designated rivers and their communities will also receive a commitment from federal agencies to act as 'Good Neighbors' in making decisions that affect communities." That statement raises another question: where does that leave communities who either don't seek or seek but don't achieve American Heritage status? They better not count on the feds to be their good neighbors. They didn't buy an indulgence.

Proponents of The American Heritage Rivers Initiative swear it is not a federal land and power grab. Yet the initiative lists ten contact agencies involved with the program, and the only state agency listed is the North Carolina Historical Preservation Office.

The biggest mystery in this initiative is the statement that federal agencies will support local communities "within existing laws and regulations." Really?