

Take a look at this mailing. It says, in very large print: The judges have decided: Charles M. Sias of Bangor is our \$833,337 winner. And then: We will update our official winners list so that it reads—again, it lists Mr. Sias' name. Urgent: Mail back your prize number within 5 days. In the corner: This is your exclusive prize claim number—giving the appearance that Mr. Sias has already won.

This particular mailing comes from a division of Time, Inc., known as Guaranteed & Bonded. It is very similar to the kinds of deceptive mailings we have seen during the past year.

A representative of Time, Inc., testified at our hearings. She testified that this kind of mailing is fair but assured that they were continuing to evaluate the copy in their mailings and they were trying to improve it so there would be no question.

This is a recent solicitation, and it is just as deceptive as previous ones. I think it is very disappointing to once again see the use of very large, bold headlines declaring that one of my constituents is the winner of more than \$833,000 when obviously his chances of winning are less than his chances of being struck by lightning.

Let me give another example provided to me by one of my constituents. In some ways, this letter from Publishers Clearing House, another one of the major sweepstakes companies, is even more insidious. It was personally addressed to the woman who sent it to me. It says: These are the certified cash winner documents we alerted you to watch for.

The use of the words "certified cash winner" creates the image that my constituent has won a great deal of money. But this goes beyond the other mailing. The \$100,000 figure appears to have been personally crossed out. On the side, it says it is now \$200,000 my constituent is going to win, and it appears a woman named Dorothy, whom we know to be an employee of Publishers Clearing House, has written a personal note to my constituent, to this woman who lives in Portland, ME, and has written: "\$200,000—see enclosed urgent notification for details,"—once again, creating the impression that my constituent is going to win not \$100,000 but now \$200,000. It is her lucky day.

Again, if we look at the small print, we find that, in fact, the vast majority of people responding to this solicitation will receive just \$1. It is extremely misleading.

To add to the deception, Publishers Clearinghouse includes what appears to be a check of some sort. They call it a claim voucher. It is made out to my constituent. I have blocked out her name to protect her privacy. It appears to be personally signed in blue ink by the treasurer and by Dorothy Addeo, and it says: Cash value up to \$100,000—although we know from Dorothy's

helpful little note that it actually may be \$200,000.

My point is that this is clearly intended to deceive the people who are receiving these solicitations. The intent is to part people from their money, to get them to buy merchandise they don't really need or want, in the mistaken belief that somehow making a purchase will either guarantee they will be a winner or at least increase the odds of their winning that great prize, those hundreds of thousands of dollars.

There is another harm that is done beyond the financial waste of senior citizens and others wasting their money buying products they don't really need or want. That is the injury that is done to a senior citizen's dignity when they realize they have been duped by these highly deceptive mailings.

I recently received a letter from one of my constituents which I will share with my colleagues. It shows how tragic some of the results are of these sweepstakes. We found seniors who have wasted \$10,000, \$20,000, \$60,000 on sweepstakes, thinking it would help them win the grand prize. In some cases, they have squandered their Social Security checks and even borrowed money. As I said, there is also the injury to a person's dignity once they realize they have been fooled.

This letter captures that part of the problem. My constituent writes to Reader's Digest in this case:

Several days ago my father received your "announcement" that he had been nominated to fill "your newest position" on the "exclusive Winners Advisory Board." With its official looking certificates and "personal" Internal Selection Record you had him convinced that he was indeed being asked to serve in some official, though honorary capacity. When he realized that this was another sweepstakes gimmick, and that he was no more special to you than the thousands of others who received this same "special" announcement, he was devastated.

My father shared your "announcement" with me because he was proud that he was being recognized by a company he has supported for many, many years. What a cruel game you have played with a man who has truly been a good customer. What a cruel game you play with every person who received this same, or similar letter, and who, like my father, are vulnerable because they believe the best about people.

I think my constituent has described the problem very eloquently. These kinds of deceptive mailings prey on people who believe what they read, who want to trust that they are not being misled.

Mr. President, on August 2, the Senate unanimously approved legislation that I, Senator LEVIN, Senator COCHRAN, Senator EDWARDS, and many others have worked on, which would curtail these kinds of deceptive sweepstakes mailings.

I want to thank the Chairman of the House Subcommittee on the Postal Service, Congressman JOHN MCHUGH,

for his excellent work in securing approval by the House of a strong measure to prevent these types of deceptive sweepstakes mailings. In addition, Congressman FRANK LOBIONDO, who introduced a strong sweepstakes disclosure measure in the House, has made a valuable contribution to the effort to curb deceptive mailings. Congressman JAMES ROGAN and Congressman BILL MCCOLLUM have also introduced legislation to address this problem, and have given their strong support to the effort to reform the current practices. I also appreciate the support and assistance given by Congressman CHAKA FATTAH and Congressman HENRY WAXMAN, who have provided both excellent ideas and leadership during House consideration of legislation to address the problem of deceptive sweepstakes.

The Senate bill was passed, as I said, unanimously, and it is now pending in the House Government Reform Committee. It has been unanimously approved by the Postal Subcommittee of the House Government Reform Committee, and it is my fervent hope that before we adjourn this year we can clear this important legislation and see it signed into law. It is time to put an end to these deceptive and unfair mailings that prey on the hopes and dreams of our senior citizens.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and seeing no one seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### IN HONOR OF SENATOR JOHN CHAFEE

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I have had earlier comments about our good friend, John Chafee, but a line I was trying to say was, more than a balanced budget, what we need in this body is balanced Senators. I don't know anybody better than John. He was the best.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the wonderful column by Mary McGrory entitled, "The Gentleman From Rhode Island."

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 28, 1999]

#### THE GENTLEMAN FROM RHODE ISLAND

Sen. John Chafee of Rhode Island was a hero on the battlefields of two wars: He fought in World War II and in Korea. He was also a hero on the battlefield of the Senate, fighting valiantly, often for lost causes, working behind enemy lines, defying his party on matters of great import. He was an aristocrat who brought to the Senate a sense

of noblesse oblige that is otherwise unknown today. In an institution that calls every male a gentleman, Chafee really was one.

He was of a size difficult for his colleagues to manage. A wrestler in college and a former Marine, he hated violence. He was a high-minded patrician of colonial lineage who came to be idolized by his heavily Democratic and ethnically diverse constituents. He served for 23 years in a body that today is renowned for its pettiness and narrow-mindedness and never to the end lost his zest for coalitions and compromises. He was a most clubbable man, jovial and kind. For many in his caucus, vision consists of imagining bringing Bill Clinton to his knees. Chafee doggedly pursued his goals: clean air, clean water, a nation free of guns, a world where nuclear weapons were under control and people negotiated their differences.

He worried about foster children who at 18 lose government subsidies; he worried about the ABM treaty. The combination of practical and cosmic concerns and a nature that seemed devoid of malice made him an object of wonder. People who eulogized him on the Senate floor, including those who never voted his way, spoke of him with love and tears.

New Hampshire Sen. Robert Smith, now an independent, remembered that in 1991, when the Republican leadership was trying to dump Chafee as conference chairman, Smith, a newcomer, decided against his fellow New Englander. When he told Chafee that he was going to vote for Thad Cochran (Miss.), all Chafee said was "Oh, dear." He lost by one vote.

Sen. Daniel P. Moynihan (D), who served with Chafee on Environment and Public Works, remembers Chafee saying to him the next day, "There is no place for us liberals on our side any more." He was smiling as he said it.

"Liberal" is now a toxic word. "Moderate" is as far as anyone goes to describe someone who is out of step with Trent Lott. Republicans show no mercy to people who, like Chafee, sat down at committee tables and without the slightest nod to partisan sensibilities said, "Let's get at it."

Time was when Chafee's Wednesday group, a weekly lunch for the like-minded, had a dozen members and some influence. At their most recent meeting, last Wednesday, there were just five, counting Chafee. He was gaunt and feeble after August back surgery. He had weeks ago announced his decision to retire from the Senate, but he was using every last minute to make a difference. Susan Collins, a freshman Republican from Maine who, like several others, regarded Chafee as "my best friend in the Senate," told of Chafee's fervent remarks about foster children set loose at 18 and his hope that she could help in helping them.

Chafee, a gentleman of the old school, doubtless deplored what went on in the Oval Office. But he was one of five Republicans who voted against removing Clinton from office. He was one of four Republicans who voted for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Chafee took no part in the pre-debate polemics on the test ban. He and Sen. Richard Lugar (Ind.), a pivotal Republican figure in all arms control efforts, were conspicuously absent. He told me a week before the treaty suffered meltdown on the floor that he was concentrating on the ABM treaty. As usual, he was looking down the road to the day when Senate hawks would tear up the treaty on the Senate floor and remove the last obstacle to building a missile defense system, their ultimate pie in the sky.

Republicans had been sniping at ABM, calling it "null and void" because the Soviet Union, with whom it was negotiated, no longer exists. Clinton will decide next June about going forward with a project about which the only certainty is its astronomical cost. The Russians say they will tolerate no change.

In this Senate the notion of unilateral withdrawal is a live option. So is a return to a full-throttle arms race and the Cold War. Chafee did not press colleagues on the test ban. He said he understood and shared their reservations about verification and our stockpile but on balance thought the country and the world would be better off if we ratified the treaty.

Those looking for consolation—Chafee always did in a dark hour—can find a little in the prospect that his death has greatly improved his son Lincoln's chances of succeeding him. Rhode Island is a small state that sent a great man to the Senate, and sympathy for his family is unbounded. Chafee, a pragmatist, would be pleased.

#### IN HONOR OF SENATOR JOHN CHAFEE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I come to the floor, after many of my colleagues have already said magnificent things, to say a word about a man I revered, worked with, and cherished both in personal and professional terms. That is, of course, John Chafee. There are so many reasons I respected and, in a sense, really loved John Chafee, and do to this minute and always will.

Many of them had to do with what it was that he didn't say and what it was that he didn't find a need to do. There was an interesting article in the Washington Post this morning by Mary McGrory that made me think back to the time I was in the Peace Corps. I served with a man who has since died by the name of Marty Grobli. We were working on the Philippines program together. He was an enormous hero of the Battle of the Bulge in World War II. He had done works of heroism which I never learned about because whenever as a young person in my early twenties I tried to ask him, because I wanted to learn about it, he said he didn't want to talk about it. I think that is the way of many who have been through searing emotional and physical experiences of danger, of patriotism, of great personal risk—they simply keep it to themselves. There isn't a need to tell others. War is not pleasant. War is destructive; war is carried out in the interests of the Nation or of many nations against one or several others.

John Chafee never felt a need. In fact, in all the years I knew him, I never heard him talk about serving in two wars, World War II and the Korean war, or the fact he was a marine. If one looked at John Chafee, particularly in the latter years, one wouldn't necessarily—unless you looked at that chiseled face—say this was a marine in the sense that one thinks about it in classical terms. He was not into look-

ing tough, acting tough, or being tough—he just was tough. But he was tough on behalf of people he loved, whom he represented in Rhode Island, those he didn't directly represent, although he did as a Senator in the form of children and women and the inheritance of whatever quality of environment we will inherit in our country.

He was a steward of all of those things. He was ferocious in the way he fought for them. He never pushed himself forward. It always seemed, watching him on the Finance Committee when he was in a hearing conducting questioning, he was searching for truth, not either to show knowledge, of which he had a deep, deep repository, or to show special seniority. It was always that he was interested in what the witness was saying, reflecting on what the witness was saying, being courteous to the witness, tough on the witness where the witness might be withholding information or not fully disclosing some of the other arguments that might have been brought through that witness' answers.

I loved him for those qualities. I had no idea, I think as no one did, that this was going to be his fate. I didn't look forward to the fact he was going to retire, but since he announced he was going to retire I looked forward to the fact he would go back to Rhode Island, his beloved Northeast, to prowl his State, to be with the people who stood by him in all the years.

As the Senator from South Carolina knows, John Chafee was also a Governor. I was a Governor, and I think Governors bring to this body a particular ability and desire to want to reach a compromise to find a solution. The Presiding Officer was a Governor. And Governors often can't allow themselves to tarry because of an ideology. They can't tarry on simply a petulant feeling about this situation or that person because they are the only person in that State, be they man or woman, who can resolve the situation. Therefore, they have to seek a compromise. They have to seek a solution. I love that quality in a Senator. It is a quality John Chafee had in just an unparalleled amount.

So he never got to go back home. I feel very sad about that. I wanted to think about John Chafee at home, enjoying the fact he was looking back on all of his years of national service and public service and enjoying his grandchildren, his children, Ginny, his beloved State of Rhode Island, and all of the Northeast. He was a remarkable person.

I quote another thing Mary McGrory said which I liked so much:

In an institution that calls every man a gentleman, he really was one.

That kind of puts us in our places. But it also very much says something accurate about John Chafee. I have heard him talk to people sharply. But