

service as public safety officers—that there is a well established support system in place to comfort and assist their families and loved ones in the event that they die in the line of duty.

Mr. President, it is critical that we not only remember, but offer real help to the families of those police officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice to keep our streets and homes safe.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1998

Mr. ALLARD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of calendar 359, S. 1525.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1525) to provide financial assistance for higher education to the dependents of Federal, State, and local public safety officers who are killed or permanently and totally disabled as the result of a traumatic injury sustained in the line of duty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the bill be considered read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill appear at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1525) was deemed read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1525

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Public Safety Officers Educational Assistance Act of 1998”.

SEC. 2. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION TO DEPENDENTS OF PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS KILLED OR PERMANENTLY AND TOTALLY DISABLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY.

Part L of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the heading for subpart 2, by striking “**Civilian Federal Law Enforcement**” and inserting “**Public Safety**”;

(2) in section 1211(1), by striking “civilian Federal law enforcement” and inserting “public safety”;

(3) in section 1212(a)(1)(A), by striking “Federal law enforcement” and inserting “public safety”;

(4) in section 1216(a), by inserting “and each dependent of a public safety officer killed in the line of duty on or after October 1, 1997,” after “1992.”; and

(5) in section 1217—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (6) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate has passed S. 1525, the “Public Safety Officers Educational Assistance Act of 1998.”

Last congress, the Senate passed the “Federal Law Enforcement Dependents Assistance Act”—led by Senators SPECTER and KOHL and co-sponsored by myself and nearly every member of the Judiciary Committee. This law provides for the education of the spouse and dependent children of federal law enforcement officers who die or are totally disabled in the line of duty.

The purpose of the legislation was to remove a significant financial burden from the families of these deceased officers and to allow them to continue on the educational path they would have followed had their parent or spouse not been killed in the line of duty.

Last fall, about 30 young men and women were able to go to college under this program. Unfortunately, this program is only available to the children of federal law enforcement officers.

The Public Safety Officers Educational Assistance Act, which Senator SPECTER and I introduced last year, extends these same educational benefits to the dependents of all public safety officers—in other words, not just federal—but also state, county and local law enforcement officers, and fire and rescue personnel—who have given their lives in the line of duty.

Under this bill, the Attorney General will administer a program which will provide up to \$4,485 per child, per year to attend a 4-year college. This is the same amount of educational assistance the federal government provides to veterans.

The Justice Department estimates the total cost for this year to be about \$300,000. What is more, the Justice Department already has the funds to pay for this \$300,000 within their current budget—so we will not need any additional appropriations.

It is critical that we remember the families of those officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice to keep our streets and homes safe. This bill is intended to allow the dependents of public safety officers to continue with their education as they would have been able to do had their parent not been killed or totally disabled in the line of duty.

PASSAGE OF S. 1605, H.R. 3565, AND S. 1525

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, this week we have been commemorating Peace Officer’s Memorial Week, in honor of those law enforcement and public safety officers who have died in the line of duty. As we remember those who have fallen in defense of the public safety, it is highly fitting that the Senate consider legislation to help save police officers’ lives, and also to do all we can to comfort and assist the families and loved ones they have left behind. Thus, I am gratified by the Senate’s action today in passing three bills to accomplish these goals.

The first of these bills is S. 1605, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act. This bill establishes a matching

program to help States, units of local government, and Indian tribes to purchase armor vests for use by law enforcement officers. The lives of our law enforcement officers will be secured by ensuring that every police officer who needs a bulletproof vest receives one, providing an increased measure of protection to those who protect the public.

The FBI estimates that nearly one third of the 1,182 law enforcement officers killed by a firearm in the line of duty since 1980 would be alive if they had worn a bulletproof vest. The FBI also approximates that the risk of fatality to law enforcement officers while not wearing an armor vest is 14 times higher than for officers wearing an armor vest. In addition, the Department of Justice estimates that nearly 150,000 State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers, roughly 25 percent, are not currently issued body armor. This piece of legislation will save officers’ lives by helping get vests to those who need them.

The second of these bills is the Care for Police Survivors Act of 1998, H.R. 3565. I was proud to introduce the Senate companion to this bill, S. 1985. This bill will strengthen programs available to the families of our slain police officers. For example, groups such as Concerns for Police Officers, more commonly referred to as COPS, will now be allowed to increase and improve their services to these families. Authority will be given to the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance to spend no less than \$150,000 out of the Public Safety Officers’ Benefits program to support and enrich national peer support and counseling programs for families of police officers lost in the line of duty.

This act will also expedite the process of handling cases pending before the Public Safety Officers’ Benefits Office by allowing the expenditure of PSOB program funds on outside hearing officers. Currently, survivors of fallen police officers have to wait entirely too long to obtain an appeal hearing for denial of benefits. By enacting this bill, we will make the process of helping these families less burdensome.

Finally, S. 1525, the Public Safety Officers Educational Assistance Act of 1998, will provide aid to the families of those federal law enforcement officers who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty. By amending the Federal Law Enforcement Dependents Assistance Act, also known as the Degan Law, approximately \$4,500 per year in college assistance will be awarded to participants—the children and spouses of these great officers. Under S. 1525, the current program will be expanded to cover state and local public safety officers as well. I am a proud supporter of this program that will both promote and fund education for the small number of families of those who have given their lives or health while protecting our communities.

The Department of Justice estimates that approximately 55 persons would take advantage of this amendment at an additional cost of \$330,000 per year. Neither the existing scholarship program nor the expansion are an entitlement, and the cost of the scholarships can be covered under the appropriation for the existing Public Safety Officers benefit program. What an incredible service this will provide.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate has chosen Police Officers Memorial Day to pass these three bills. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can acknowledge a small measure of our tremendous gratitude and support for these heroes and their families. I thank my colleagues for their support of these bills.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business.

The able Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. DEWINE. I thank the Chair.

DETERRING TEEN SMOKING: WHAT WORKS

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, this coming Monday, the Senate will begin historic debate on tobacco legislation. This debate represents a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to reduce teenage smoking, a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to save lives.

The window of opportunity opened by last year's tobacco settlement is closing fast, and that means we simply have to keep this process moving. We have to pass a comprehensive bill and we have to pass it now.

A comprehensive bill, Mr. President. That means we have to raise the price of tobacco. But it means much more than that alone. It means a public education campaign. It means limits on tobacco advertising. It means punishing tobacco companies if, in the future, we do not meet the goals we set for reducing teen smoking. Finally, it means enhanced enforcement so a black market does not develop.

There will be a great temptation as we go through this lengthy debate for us to get sidetracked over the coming weeks into debates on countless side issues. It is important that we not give in to that temptation. We need to keep our eyes firmly on a much larger goal, and that goal is saving the lives of America's children from tobacco and from illegal drugs. Frankly, the only way we can achieve this goal is to pass a comprehensive bill, a comprehensive bill that is focused on our one goal, reducing tobacco and drug use among our young people. For the reasons that I will outline in a moment, a piecemeal approach simply will not work. A piecemeal approach will fail.

I commend the majority leader, Senator LOTT, for his leadership in bring-

ing this matter to the Senate floor. Now it is up to all of us to make the most of that opportunity. That is what I want to talk about today.

When a problem generates this much attention, we have to be all the more vigilant to make sure we pay attention to the light rather than to the heat; the facts, not the rhetoric.

Fact: 3,000 children start to smoke every day.

Fact: 1,000 of them are going to die early as a result of that.

Fact: We now have a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to save these lives, a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to do this through comprehensive legislation to reduce teenage smoking.

Fact: The number of legislative days we have left in this session in which to do this is rapidly shrinking.

Fact: If we do not do this now, it may never happen. The opportunity may never come again.

Fact: 1,000 early deaths caused every day by smoking. We need to act and we need to act now.

These are the facts. We cannot allow tobacco companies to lie about these facts or to obscure the fact that tobacco and illegal drugs together pose America's greatest public health challenge to our children. This is a huge challenge to our future. And we need a truly comprehensive approach to meet this challenge of tobacco and of illegal drugs.

What I would like to do over the next few minutes is examine some of the elements of the proposed tobacco legislation in a serious, and maybe even clinical, manner in an effort to try to determine which approaches work best in reducing smoking among our young people.

What works, Mr. President? What works to reduce teenage smoking? That is the key question. In fact, it is the only question that we should focus on as we debate tobacco legislation.

Let me begin by discussing the most controversial element of the various proposed tobacco bills—a tax on cigarettes.

Mr. President, the question of whether tobacco taxes will work in reducing teen smoking comes down to the question of how sensitive teen smokers are to changes in price. The way the economists phrase this question is: How elastic is the demand? How responsive is it? Does it go down when prices go up?

Mr. President, writing tobacco legislation would be a very easy task if the demand were very sensitive and responsive to prices. Then all we would need to do is increase the cost of a pack of cigarettes, and kids would stop smoking and their lives would be saved, and that would be it.

Regrettably, it is not that simple. Reputable individuals and organizations in the field of public health have studied this very question and are certainly far from a consensus.

In 1991, a study published in the Journal of Health Economics concluded that there is no statistically signifi-

cant correlation between cigarette prices and youth smoking. However, a National Cancer Institute expert panel stated in 1993 that "a substantial increase in tobacco excise taxes may be the single most effective measure for decreasing tobacco consumption," and that "an excise tax reduces consumption by children and teenagers at least as much as it reduces consumption by adults."

Mr. President, the confusion continues. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have data indicating that in five of the six States that raised cigarette taxes between 1993 and 1995 that teen smoking actually increased.

Yet, two reports published by the Surgeon General in 1994 and 1998 reached the opposite conclusion—that young people are at least as sensitive to price increases as adults.

Take all of these different findings together and they raise very serious questions about a tobacco-fighting strategy that is anchored solely by tax increases, or by an increase in the cost of cigarettes.

Here is what I think, Mr. President, based on my experience in working over the years against illegal drugs, based on my experience in working against driving under the influence of alcohol, that crusade, that effort: There is no one single remedy. There is no one single solution. I believe that raising tobacco costs will have an impact, but will only have an impact if that is included as part of the comprehensive approach, if the increase in tobacco prices is accompanied by advertising, by counteradvertising, by pulling down the pro-tobacco advertising on TV, by strict law enforcement. All of these things, I believe, have to come together. You cannot succeed in this effort without that kind of comprehensive approach. Raising the cost of tobacco will help, but it is simply not enough. To meet this kind of challenge, we need a comprehensive approach, one that will harness many different elements in the common purpose of saving children's lives.

In addition to raising the price of cigarettes, what else must we include in that comprehensive package? I outlined that a moment ago, but I would like to talk now in a little more detail about some of the other things that I think are necessary to do in addition to increasing the price of cigarettes.

Public education. Let's start with public education. My own experience with public education on health issues, Mr. President, would indicate to me that it does, in fact, work. Let me give you and my other colleagues an example.

Over the last several decades, we in this country have made tremendous progress in making our streets safer from alcohol-impaired drivers. Back when I was in the Ohio State Senate, I wrote legislation toughening our State's law on driving under the influence. But even more important than