

senior citizens were met. This was her legacy of compassion, touching the hearts and lives of hundreds of thousands.

Mr. Speaker, for her faithfulness, nobility of character and humbleness of spirit, I ask the Members in this chamber to join me in celebrating the marvelous legacy of Dr. Lucille Banks Robinson Miller.

ISSUES FACING YOUNG PEOPLE TODAY

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 1998

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have printed in the RECORD these statements by high school students from my home State of Vermont, who were speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people today. I am asking that you please insert these statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as I believe that the views of these young people will benefit my colleagues

STATEMENT BY ERICA LEWIS AND DAN JOHNSON REGARDING DRUNK DRIVING

ERICA LEWIS: We would like to express a concern that is becoming a big issue with teen Vermonters today. Our concern is probably the same as many others: Teen driving under the influence of alcohol

Young adults are usually both inexperienced drivers as well as inexperienced drinkers. These two combined is a fatality waiting to happen. Alcohol, when consumed, decreases alertness, causes depression, nausea, unconsciousness, hangovers, and possible overdose, which could lead to death. We, as teenagers, should be aware of the serious risks that are involved when wrong choices are made and lives are at stake. Driving should be considered a privilege, not a right, for we all have the right to be safe while driving, and when alcohol is involved, no one can predict the outcome. Anyone of us here today could be driving down the road next week and, because of a drunk driver, never make it to where we were headed. Because of this increasing problem, there needs to be more awareness of alcohol and its effects. It is up to us, the younger generation, to make an impression on our peers and those that follow, and most of all to prove to our elders that we have what it takes to make the right decisions and follow through.

There is no overall solution to this problem, but we, as mature young adults, should make a strong effort to plan ahead before it gets to a point where it might be too late, whether that be make arrangements for a designated driver or staying until you are capable of driving.

DAN JOHNSON. A suggestion that we have and strongly agree with is a paper called a contract for life. It is an agreement between teenagers and their parents stating, if at any given time that either they feel incapable of driving, there will be transportation provided, and safe transportation for them. This contract was given to us from our drivers ed teachers at the Essex Technical Center. Other suggestions that we agree with is larger penalties for adults in furnishing alcohol for minors at stores to sell this. Teen drinking and driving will always be a problem, but, hopefully, with our help, we can reduce it. Thank you for our time.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS. A very important contribution to this discussion. Thank very much.

STATEMENT BY BILL DOE, NICK BULLARD, MIKE CURRIER AND HEATHER DOLOFF REGARDING TEEN DRINKING AND DRUG USAGE SURVEY

BILL DOE: First of all, we would like to thank you for inviting us to this event today. And we would like to make a minor correction on the program guide. Our presentation is focused mainly on the alcohol abuse and not so much drug abuse.

In preparation for this presentation, we conducted a survey amongst our junior and senior peers. The topic of the survey was underage drinking. Some of our survey questions were as follows:

MIKE CURRIER: It goes: How old are you? Do you drink? If so, how often? Do you ever drink and drive, or ride with somebody who has been drinking? Why do you drink? To be rebellious; tastes good; to get rid of problems; to get wasted; and, a social drinker. The last question was: What do you think about lowering the drinking age?

HEATHER DOLOFF: And our results turned out to be most of the people who drank were age 18, 17, 16, and we had a few who were aged 19, and we did not take surveys from people under 16.

On the average, people drink and they tend to drink once or two times monthly, and a few do drink more than that, and we did have just under 20 people who we surveyed, out of a hundred, who did not drink at all.

And, overall, people don't drive when they have been drinking or don't ride with someone who has been drinking. Only about 30 people we surveyed said that they did, 10 said sometimes, and 60 said not at all, which is encouraging.

And the most common cause for people to drink was that they are a social drinker, which leads me to believe that peer pressure is playing a large role in it.

BILL DOE: We also found that many of the people that we interviewed or surveyed, actually, would have liked the drinking age to be lowered to 16. Now, I tend to think that was more of a case of not being mature, they want to go out and party and have a good time, and wouldn't be young enough to be able to do it legally.

In many countries, you will find the drinking age is very young, perhaps, I think, 16. And it has proven to actually work in many countries, I think only because it has kind of been found as, you know, it is just a given, that is what their society accepts, and they have grown to a certain maturity level that they can live with that.

If we were to, perhaps, lower the drinking age, I think we would have to do it gradually, perhaps like one year at a time, or lower it to like maybe 20 in five years, or 19 the next five years, gradually getting down to maybe 18, perhaps. And maybe then our society will be mature enough to handle it and perhaps be mature about it.

NICK BULLARD: As you can see from our graphs, we have done extensive work with certain questions dealing with underage drinking. In this year alone, the drinking problem in this state has risen greatly, with numerous deaths resulting. This is why the State is cracking down on underage drinking, from the special task force known as START Team to DUI teams. These peoples' only job is to control drinking and driving in Vermont. START concentrates only on underage drinking.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS: Thanks very much.

STATEMENT BY ELIZABETH CARTIER, ANNE MITIGUY, JASON MAGNANI, ERIC MORAN, DANIELLE PEZZIMENTI AND TED DEMULDER REGARDING TEEN DRINKING

ELIZABETH CARTIER: Today we would like to express our concern about alcohol ad-

vertising and the effects it has on youth. Alcohol is the number one drug used among young people. Eight teenagers a day die due to alcohol-related accidents. About two-thirds of teenagers who drink say they can buy their own alcohol. It is said that one out of every 280 babies born today will die in an automobile accident that is alcohol related. Traffic accidents are the single greatest cause of death between the ages of 6 and 28. About 47 percent of these accidents are alcohol-related. 56 percent of students in grades 5 through 12 say that alcohol advertising encourages them to drink.

TED DEMULDER: We have a poster to illustrate underage drinking. There are 10 million underage drinkers in the United States. Of those 10 million, 4.4 million are binge drinkers, which means they have 5 drinks or more, and 1.7 million teens drink heavily on a regular basis.

JASON MAGNANI: Teenagers are known to be more susceptible to alcoholic advertising than adults. This is especially true when it comes to radio and television broadcasting. In June of 1996, the Seagrams America Company began running Crown Royal brand whiskey commercials in Corpus Christi, Texas. It featured a dog labeled Obedience School Graduate who was carrying a newspaper. Another dog labeled Valedictorian was carrying a bottle of Crown Royal. In this ad, Seagrams positioned liquor as an award for achievement.

When liquor ads started to run on television, public health groups and government officials reacted in an alarming way. They said that, by running liquor ads on television, they would be seen by young people and that sometimes they were deliberately targeted at young people. In November of '96, after the liquor ads came out, 26 members of Congress wrote to the Federal Communications Corporation, urging them to further investigate the liquor ads on television. They said that they did not want children to get an image of academic and athletic success, gained through drinking alcohol beverages.

ANNE MITIGUY: Consumer and public health groups scoff at alcohol ads that are aimed at teenagers. They say that beer is heavily advertised during televised sporting events. These are mostly watched by high school and college aged students. The Seagrams ads about the obedience dogs and the Budweiser frogs are designed to catch the eye of young viewers. The alcohol industry critics say that young people decide to sample alcohol because of peer pressure but that advertising reinforces their inner thoughts. The ads are mostly young, attractive and healthy-looking adults. Most of the time, you can't even really tell how old they are. They are drinking beer, and at the end of the commercial, one of them says "It just can't get much better than this." These ads don't show both sides. As they say, it might not get any better, but it can get a whole lot worse. This is a side that should be shown more often, but isn't.

TED DEMULDER: In flipping through two mainstream magazines for our collage, Newsweek and People, we came across various alcohol advertisements. The Barcardi ads shows an unrealistic view of what happens to people when they drink. The Absolut ads have become coffee book material for many teenagers that collect them. The slogan "Forget the rules and enjoy the wine" shows how irresponsible people are, and basically the companies are saying anyone can drink.

ERIC MORIN: Because alcohol ads are very glorified and intensified, more today than ever were before, they can be very harmful to our generation and generations to come. These ads exert constant and powerful pressure on today's youth. With more and more

kids exploring the Internet and the World-wide web there is a growing trend of advertising and promotional material. Oftentimes the corporations use such techniques as up-to-the-minute sports scores, games and contests to promote their type of alcohol. With all the advertising that is going on, there is a growing influence upon youth today. What the corporations have in mind is that, if they gear their ads towards young adults, they will start to drink at a younger age. Once they start to drink, soon the corporation will have a lifelong customer. Our main concern about ads today is that they are giving us an unrealistic view about what alcoholic beverages are and what they can do to you.

Congressman Sanders, after hearing this information, we leave it in your hands to make proposals to remedy this problem, such as placing more responsibility on the alcohol companies to direct their ads at older and more mature audiences, instituting stricter penalties to those who procure alcohol for teens, as well as those teens who try to purchase it, and initiating a stronger community involvement with alternatives to alcohol, such as rec centers, sports leagues, and school-related affairs.

CONGRESSMAN SANDERS: Excellent.

INTRODUCTION OF THE VIDEO
COMPETITION AND CONSUMER
CHOICE ACT OF 1998

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 1998

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join Telecommunications Subcommittee Chairman BILLY TAUZIN (R-LA) in introducing this bill today. The legislation we are proposing today will help to promote competition to our nation's cable monopolies and will help to provide consumer protection.

The legislation will promote greater competition to cable monopolies in a couple of important ways. First, the bill will expand program access rules to reflect the highly-concentrated nature of the current cable programming market and enable competitors to obtain the programming they need to compete effectively. Program access is a key provision that is the lifeblood of many of cable's fledgling competitors. The program access provisions are expanded to include all cable programming, not only programming that is from vertically-integrated programmers and delivered via satellite. Exclusive programming arrangements for incumbent operators may be permitted, but only by obtaining a public interest waiver from the FCC for such channels as locally-produced and locally-originated cable news channels, for example.

Second, the bill will establish a low-cost basic tier so that Direct Broadcast Satellite (DBS) consumers—or potential DBS customers—who today cannot receive local TV channels as part of a DBS service may obtain a lifeline basic tier over the cable wire. This will permit consumers to obtain their local channels in a way that will affordably complement their satellite service. Both the program access and low cost basic tier provisions will help to promote greater competition to cable monopolies. I also want to note at this point that I look forward to working with Chairman Tauzin on legislation that will allow satellite competitors to broadcast local TV sta-

tions back into local markets via satellite. Hopefully Congress can address that issue as well in the near future.

With respect to consumer price protections, the bill seeks to protect consumers by permitting local franchising authorities to certify that an incumbent cable monopoly is not offering consumers an acceptable range of choices and thereby retain FCC consumer price protections for an additional year. This does not mean that the bill is mandating a la carte cable offerings, but rather it means that we'd like to see a greater range of cable programming packages, or "mini-tiers," that cater to particular programming interests of consumers.

This approach also attempts to deal in part with the faulty premise of the FCC's so-called "going forward" rules, which went into effect in 1995 and reversed the good job the Commission had been doing up until that point and which has saved consumers approximately \$3 Billion. The premise of the Commission's rule change was that the cable monopolies needed an incentive to launch new cable programming channels. The new rules allowed for programming costs to be passed on to consumers, plus operators were allowed to charge an extra 20 cents per subscriber per month on top of that for each of up to 6 new channels. Cable operators responded by adding more channels and today claim the high cost of providing those channels as part of the rationale for why cable prices are increasing so drastically.

One obvious result of the FCC's adjustments to its rates is that too many cable consumers are paying excessive monopoly rents to cable operators who blissfully allow their programming units to let costs rise because the cable operator is allowed under the Commission's rules to simply pass these costs along to cable subscribers. No need to ask advertisers to shoulder part of the burden—all of it can go on the cable bills of many working Americans or those on fixed incomes. (Most American companies see their stock prices rise when they are able to announce that they are effectively controlling their costs. Cable companies gleefully see their stocks rise as they fail utterly to hold the line on their programming costs.)

Yet this failure to control programming costs also means that incumbent vertically-integrated programmers cannot only pass these inflated costs on to their customers, but also means that the costs borne by new entrants competing against them get inflated as well. These higher programming rates unnaturally inflate the costs of competitors attempting to take on the entrenched cable club. This is clearly anti-competitive.

In addition, the FCC's "going forward" rules also wound up forcing many consumers to pay more for programming that they have little to no interest of ever watching. The grievance of paying for unwanted programming on a 35-channel cable system is exacerbated when we move to a 60 or 80 or 100 channel universe. A more robust marketplace would help ensure that consumers would not have to pay for all of these unwanted channels and would more adequately reflect the programming demands and desires of different cable consumers.

But we do not have anything remotely close to a competitive cable marketplace today. And the current marketplace is so overwhelmingly concentrated in the hands of monopolies that

the cable club has little interest in catering to consumer choice.

That's why we are introducing this bill today. Chairman Tauzin and I have lived this cable odyssey together for many, many years. We are familiar with the industry—both its promise and its problems. And we are familiar with all of their tired arguments as to why rates keep going up and up even as inflation stays at near record lows. Chairman Tauzin has been driven in his pursuit of promoting cable competition and so have I. The legislation that Chairman Tauzin and I are proposing today will help address pending cable problems. It says that cable systems are deregulated on March 31, 1999 unless a local franchising authority certifies that the incumbent cable company does not offer an acceptable level of choices in the programming offered to consumers. This means that local franchising authorities can help ensure that consumers get additional, smaller programming packages and do not have to take all of the unwanted programming.

Right now, cable rates are rising multiple times the rate of inflation. The massive assault on cable markets that we had expected from the phone companies has not materialized and, except in a few scattered communities across the country, the phone industry has largely pulled back from plans to enter the market in a big way. And we have this deregulation date looming in March of next year. I want to applaud Chairman Tauzin for the leadership he is demonstrating in taking on this vitally important issue for consumers, for the economy and for innovation. And I am happy to be an original cosponsor of this proposal.

IN HONOR OF WILLIAM BOYD
OWEN

HON. CHARLES H. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 1998

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. America is strong because of its millions of citizens who work hard and provide futures for themselves and their families. They build professions, businesses, jobs, and they build strong communities through endless hours of service.

It's my privilege today to recognize one of those individuals who has been a leader in his profession, his community, and a respected and revered father and grandfather, William Boyd Owen.

Born in Dellwood, North Carolina on August 16, 1918, W. Boyd Owen was the youngest of three physician brothers in a medical family which spans several generations and includes his son, William B. Owen Jr., a Haywood County, North Carolina orthopedic surgeon.

Boyd attended Canton, North Carolina public schools before entering Wake Forest College in Wake Forest, North Carolina where he displayed many talents. Young Boyd played basketball, and played the saxophone and clarinet with an orchestra while in college. In 1939, he played for Wake Forest in the very first post season NCAA basketball tournament. After graduation, he entered the Wake Forest Medical School, later transferring to the University of Pennsylvania Medical School where he earned his medical degree at the age of twenty-three.