

106TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# S. 1390

To help parents and families reduce drug abuse and drug addiction among adolescents, and for other purposes.

---

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 19, 1999

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. COVERDELL) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

---

## A BILL

To help parents and families reduce drug abuse and drug addiction among adolescents, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3       **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

4       This Act may be cited as the “Drug-Free Families  
5       Act of 1999”.

6       **SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

7       Congress makes the following findings:

8               (1) The National Institute on Drug Abuse esti-  
9       mates that in 1962, less than 1 percent of the na-  
10       tion’s adolescents had ever tried an illicit drug. By

1 1979, drug use among young people had escalated to  
2 the highest levels in history: 34 percent of adoles-  
3 cents (ages 12–17), 65 percent of high school sen-  
4 iors (age 18), and 70 percent of young adults (ages  
5 18–25) had used an illicit drug in their lifetime.

6 (2) Drug use among young people was not con-  
7 fined to initial trials. By 1979, 16 percent of adoles-  
8 cents, 39 percent of high school seniors, and 38 per-  
9 cent of young adults had used an illicit drug in the  
10 past month. Moreover, 1 in 9 high school seniors  
11 used marijuana daily.

12 (3) In 1979, the year the largest number of  
13 seniors used marijuana, their belief that marijuana  
14 could hurt them was at its lowest (35 percent) since  
15 surveys have tracked these measures.

16 (4) Three forces appeared to be driving this es-  
17 calation in drug use among children and young  
18 adults. Between 1972 and 1978, a nationwide polit-  
19 ical campaign conducted by drug legalization advo-  
20 cates persuaded 11 State legislatures to “decrimi-  
21 nalize” marijuana. (Many of those States have sub-  
22 sequently “recriminalized” the drug.) Such legisla-  
23 tive action reinforced advocates’ assertion that mari-  
24 juana was “relatively harmless.”

1           (5) The decriminalization effort gave rise to the  
2 emergence of “head shops” (shops for “heads,” or  
3 drug users—“coke heads,” “pot heads,” “acid  
4 heads,” etc.) which sold drug paraphernalia—an  
5 array of toys, implements, and instructional pam-  
6 phlets and booklets to enhance the use of illicit  
7 drugs. Some 30,000 such shops were estimated to be  
8 doing business throughout the nation by 1978.

9           (6) In the absence of Federal funding for drug  
10 education then, most of the drug education materials  
11 that were available proclaimed that few illicit drugs  
12 were addictive and most were “less harmful” than  
13 alcohol and tobacco and therefore taught young peo-  
14 ple how to use marijuana, cocaine, and other illicit  
15 drugs “responsibly”.

16           (7) Between 1977 and 1980, 3 national parent  
17 drug-prevention organizations—National Families in  
18 Action, PRIDE, and the National Federation of  
19 Parents for Drug-Free Youth (now called the Na-  
20 tional Family Partnership)—emerged to help con-  
21 cerned parents form some 4,000 local parent preven-  
22 tion groups across the nation to reverse all of these  
23 trends in order to prevent children from using  
24 drugs. Their work created what has come to be  
25 known as the parent drug-prevention movement, or

1 more simply, the parent movement. This movement  
2 set 3 goals: to prevent the use of any illegal drug,  
3 to persuade those who had started using drugs to  
4 stop, and to obtain treatment for those who had be-  
5 come addicted so that they could return to drug-free  
6 lives.

7 (8) The parent movement pursued a number of  
8 objectives to achieve these goals. First, it helped par-  
9 ents educate themselves about the harmful effects of  
10 drugs, teach that information to their children, com-  
11 municate that they expected their children not to use  
12 drugs, and establish consequences if children failed  
13 to meet that expectation. Second, it helped parents  
14 form groups with other parents to set common age-  
15 appropriate social and behavioral guidelines to pro-  
16 tect their children from exposure to drugs. Third, it  
17 encouraged parents to insist that their communities  
18 reinforce parents' commitment to protect children  
19 from drug use.

20 (9) The parent movement stopped further ef-  
21 forts to decriminalize marijuana, both in the States  
22 and at the Federal level.

23 (10) The parent movement worked for laws to  
24 ban the sale of drug paraphernalia. If drugs were il-  
25 legal, it made no sense to condone the sale of toys

1 and implements to enhance the use of illegal drugs,  
2 particularly when those products targeted children.  
3 As town, cities, counties, and States passed anti-par-  
4 aphernalia laws, drug legalization organizations chal-  
5 lenged their Constitutionality in Federal courts until  
6 the early 1980's, when the United States Supreme  
7 Court upheld Nebraska's law and established the  
8 right of communities to ban the sale of drug para-  
9 phernalia.

10 (11) The parent movement insisted that drug-  
11 education materials convey a strong no-use message  
12 in compliance with both the law and with medical  
13 and scientific information that demonstrates that  
14 drugs are harmful, particularly to young people.

15 (12) The parent movement encouraged others  
16 in society to join the drug prevention effort and  
17 many did, from First Lady Nancy Reagan to the en-  
18 tertainment industry, the business community, the  
19 media, the medical community, the educational com-  
20 munity, the criminal justice community, the faith  
21 community, and local, State, and national political  
22 leaders.

23 (13) The parent movement helped to cause  
24 drug use among young people to peak in 1979. As  
25 its efforts continued throughout the next decade,

1 and as others joined parents to expand the drug-pre-  
2 vention movement, between 1979 and 1992 these  
3 collaborative prevention efforts contributed to reduc-  
4 ing monthly illicit drug use by two-thirds among  
5 adolescents and young adults and reduced daily  
6 marijuana use among high-school seniors from 10.7  
7 percent to 1.9 percent. Concurrently, both the par-  
8 ent movement and the larger prevention movement  
9 that evolved throughout the 1980's, working to-  
10 gether, increased high school seniors' belief that  
11 marijuana could hurt them, from 35 percent in 1979  
12 to 79 percent in 1991.

13 (14) Unfortunately, as drug use declined, most  
14 of the 4,000 volunteer parents groups that contrib-  
15 uted to the reduction in drug use disbanded, having  
16 accomplished the job they set out to do. But the ab-  
17 sence of active parent groups left a vacuum that was  
18 soon filled by a revitalized drug-legalization move-  
19 ment. Proponents began advocating for the legaliza-  
20 tion of marijuana for medicine, the legalization of all  
21 Schedule I drugs for medicine, the legalization of  
22 hemp for medicinal, industrial and recreational use,  
23 and a variety of other proposals, all designed to ulti-  
24 mately attack, weaken, and eventually repeal the na-  
25 tion's drug laws.

1           (15) Furthermore, legalization proponents are  
2 also beginning to advocate for treatment that main-  
3 tains addicts on the drugs to which they are ad-  
4 dicted (heroin maintenance for heroin addicts, con-  
5 trolled drinking for alcoholics, etc.), for teaching  
6 school children to use drugs “responsibly,” and for  
7 other measures similar to those that produced the  
8 drug epidemic among young people in the 1970’s.

9           (16) During the 1990’s, the message embodied  
10 in all of this activity has once again driven down  
11 young people’s belief that drugs can hurt them. As  
12 a result, the reductions in drug use that occurred  
13 over 13 years reversed in 1992, and adolescent drug  
14 use has more than doubled.

15           (17) Today’s parents are almost universally in  
16 the workplace and do not have time to volunteer.  
17 Many families are headed by single parents. In some  
18 families no parents are available, and grandparents,  
19 aunts, uncles, or foster parents are raising the fam-  
20 ily’s children.

21           (18) Recognizing that these challenges make it  
22 much more difficult to reach parents today, several  
23 national parent and family drug-prevention organi-  
24 zations have formed the Parent Collaboration to ad-  
25 dress these issues in order to build a new parent and

1 family movement to prevent drug use among chil-  
2 dren.

3 (19) Motivating parents and parent groups to  
4 coordinate with local community anti-drug coalitions  
5 is a key goal of the Parent Collaboration, as well as  
6 coordinating parent and family drug-prevention ef-  
7 forts with Federal, State, and local governmental  
8 and private agencies and political, business, medical  
9 and scientific, educational, criminal justice, religious,  
10 and media and entertainment industry leaders.

11 **SEC. 3. PURPOSES.**

12 The purposes of this Act are to—

13 (1) build a movement to help parents and fami-  
14 lies prevent drug use among their children and ado-  
15 lescents;

16 (2) help parents and families reduce drug abuse  
17 and drug addiction among adolescents who are al-  
18 ready using drugs, and return them to drug-free  
19 lives;

20 (3) increase young people's perception that  
21 drugs are harmful to their health, well-being, and  
22 ability to function successfully in life;

23 (4) help parents and families educate society  
24 that the best way to protect children from drug use

1 and all of its related problems is to convey a clear,  
2 consistent, no-use message;

3 (5) strengthen coordination, cooperation, and  
4 collaboration between parents and families and all  
5 others who are interested in protecting children from  
6 drug use and all of its related problems;

7 (6) help parents strengthen their families,  
8 neighborhoods, and school communities to reduce  
9 risk factors and increase protective factors to ensure  
10 the healthy growth of children; and

11 (7) provide resources in the fiscal year 2000  
12 Federal drug control budget for a grant to the Par-  
13 ent Collaboration to conduct a national campaign to  
14 mobilize today's parents and families through the  
15 provision of information, training, technical assist-  
16 ance, and other services to help parents and families  
17 prevent drug use among their children and to build  
18 a new parent and family drug-prevention movement.

19 **SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.**

20 In this Act:

21 (1) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—The term “ad-  
22 ministrative costs” means those costs that the as-  
23 signed Federal agency will incur to administer the  
24 grant to the Parent Collaboration.

1           (2) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Adminis-  
2           trator” means the Administrator of the Drug En-  
3           forcement Administration.

4           (3) NO-USE MESSAGE.—The term “no-use mes-  
5           sage” means no use of any illegal drug and no illegal  
6           use of any legal drug or substance that is sometimes  
7           used illegally, such as prescription drugs, inhalants,  
8           and alcohol and tobacco for children and adolescents  
9           under the legal purchase age.

10          (4) PARENT COLLABORATION.—The term “Par-  
11          ent Collaboration” means the legal entity, which is  
12          exempt from income taxation under section  
13          501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, es-  
14          tablished by National Families in Action, National  
15          Asian Pacific American Families Against Substance  
16          Abuse, African American Parents for Drug Preven-  
17          tion, National Association for Native American Chil-  
18          dren of Alcoholics, and the National Hispano/Latino  
19          Community Prevention Network and other groups,  
20          that—

21                 (A) have a primary mission of helping par-  
22                 ents prevent drug use, drug abuse, and drug  
23                 addiction among their children, their families,  
24                 and their communities;

1 (B) have carried out this mission for a  
2 minimum of 5 consecutive years; and

3 (C) base their drug-prevention missions on  
4 the foundation of a strong, no-use message in  
5 compliance with international, Federal, State,  
6 and local treaties and laws that prohibit the  
7 possession, production, cultivation, distribution,  
8 sale, and trafficking in illegal drugs;

9 in order to build a new parent and family movement  
10 to prevent drug use among children and adolescents.

11 **SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF DRUG-FREE FAMILIES SUP-**  
12 **PORT PROGRAM.**

13 (a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall make a  
14 grant to the Parents Collaboration to conduct a national  
15 campaign to build a new parent and family movement to  
16 help parents and families prevent drug abuse among their  
17 children.

18 (b) TERMINATION.—The period of the grant under  
19 this section shall be 5 years.

20 **SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

21 (a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appro-  
22 priated to carry out this Act, \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal  
23 years 2000 through 2004 for a grant to the Parent Col-  
24 laboration to conduct the national campaign to mobilize  
25 parents and families.

1           (b) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not more than 5 per-  
2 cent of the total amount made available under subsection  
3 (a) in each fiscal year may be used to pay administrative  
4 costs of the Parent Collaboration.

○