COMMERCE-JUSTICE-STATE APPROPRIATIONS/FY 2001 Anti-Alcohol Ads

SUBJECT: **Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2000. . . S. 1217. Lautenberg amendment No. 1302.**

ACTION: AMENDMENT REJECTED, 43-54

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 1217, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2000, will provide a total of $35.282 billion in new budget authority, which is $918.2 million less than appropriated for FY 1999 and is $11.592 billion less than requested (largely due to the refusal to include the Administration's request for $8.7 billion in "advance" appropriations; such appropriations have been used in recent years as a bookkeeping means of exceeding the spending caps in effect but not in letter).

The Lautenberg amendment would approve $25 million in fiscal year 2001 "advance" appropriations for a media campaign to discourage alcohol consumption by individuals under the age of 21.

Those favoring the amendment contended:

Earlier this year our colleagues objected to a proposal of ours to pay for a media campaign against underage drinking using funds from the ongoing anti-illegal drug campaign. They said that they supported trying to reduce underage drinking but that they objected to using anti-illegal drug funds. Therefore, we have offered this amendment, which would fund the anti-alcohol campaign without using anti-illegal drug money. Instead, it will use advance funding to pay for the program next year. Unfortunately, our colleagues have said they oppose this amendment as well because they object to advance funding. In response, advance funding is not in any way uncommon. For instance, it has been used regularly to fund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. We see no reason why it should not be used for this anti-alcohol campaign as well. We urge our colleagues to oppose underage drinking by supporting this amendment.

(See other side)

YEAS (43)			NAYS (54)			NOT VOTING (3)	
Republicans (5 or 10%)	**Democrats (38 or 86%)**		**Republicans (48 or 90%)**		**Democrats (6 or 14%)**	**Republicans (2)**	**Democrats (1)**
Grassley	Baucus	Johnson	Abraham	Hagel	Akaka	McCain-[2]	Kennedy-[2]
Hutchison	Biden	Kerrey	Allard	Hatch	Bayh	Shelby-[2]	
Jeffords	Bingaman	Kerry	Ashcroft	Helms	Feingold		
Roth	Boxer	Landrieu	Bennett	Hutchinson	Kohl		
Specter	Breaux	Lautenberg	Bond	Inhofe	Robb		
	Bryan	Leahy	Brownback	Kyl	Torricelli		
	Byrd	Levin	Bunning	Lott			
	Cleland	Lieberman	Burns	Lugar			
	Conrad	Lincoln	Campbell	Mack			
	Daschle	Mikulski	Chafee	McConnell			
	Dodd	Moynihan	Cochran	Murkowski			
	Dorgan	Murray	Collins	Nickles			
	Durbin	Reed	Coverdell	Roberts			
	Edwards	Reid	Craig	Santorum			
	Feinstein	Rockefeller	Crapo	Sessions			
	Graham	Sarbanes	DeWine	Smith, Bob (I)			
	Harkin	Schumer	Domenici	Smith, Gordon			
	Hollings	Wellstone	Enzi	Snowe			
	Inouye	Wyden	Fitzgerald	Stevens			
			Frist	Thomas			
			Gorton	Thompson			
			Gramm	Thurmond			
			Grams	Voinovich			
			Gregg	Warner			

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:
1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:
AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

Those opposing the amendment contended:

Our colleagues seem less intent on getting this program enacted than they are on finding ways to make it so objectionable that we must vote against it. This time they have decided to use advance appropriations as a budget gimmick to get around having to find any way of paying for their idea of a media campaign against underage drinking. Though advance appropriations may be a good idea in some situations, such as when the amount of future year funding needs to be known in order to make accurate, and less costly, long-range plans, there is absolutely no excuse for suggesting advance appropriations in this case. We are considering this year's budget; not next year's. We ought not to be trying to enact next year's budget in a piecemeal fashion. The only reason that this approach has been suggested is so we will not engage in normal budgeting, in which the value of one program for which funding may be provided is balanced against the value of all other programs. In this amendment, one program alone is considered. Next year, this program would have already reduced the available budget by $25 million, and all other programs would have to compete for the remaining funds. If we were to allow this practice to become commonplace, it would totally destroy the budget process. It is true that $25 million is not a very large part of this bill, but that is all the more reason our colleagues should try to find a way to pay for it this year by cutting other spending. Our colleagues have to be willing to set priorities. Surely there must be something in this $35-billion bill they think is of less importance than their proposed anti-alcohol program. They ought to have the courage to identify such spending that they believe is less important and to propose cutting it as an offset. They certainly should not be using advance appropriations as a substitute for showing the needed courage and responsibility. We oppose this amendment in protest over our colleagues' failure to find any means of paying for their new anti-alcohol program.