

should be reserved for only the most important governmental issues, and flag burning just is not such an issue.

I was offended to realize that the television commercial I saw this morning flashed the scene of book burning and a scene of flag burning as if they were the same thing. By my sense of history they are opposite. Book burning denotes the suppression of ideas by government. Flag burning involves the offensive and distasteful expression of protest against government. Nigeria does not tolerate that. But I hope America always will.

I commend you for your courage in taking the position which I suppose is probably contrary to what the opinion polls would tell you to do. Sounds like political courage to me. Wish there were more of us in Washington.

Very truly yours.

It is signed by Chris Wangsgard. I did not know Mr. Wangsgard before he responded to the commercial by sending me this letter.

I can report that a majority of the calls that I have received in response to the commercial have been in support of the position that I have taken. I am grateful to Mr. Wangsgard and those who have so responded.

But I conclude, again as I began, Mr. President, with a sincere statement of respect and admiration for my senior colleague and an assurance to everyone in the State of Utah that, whereas we differ intellectually on this issue, I do not know of two Senators who have worked together better to represent their home State than Senator HATCH and I. I know no senior colleague who has been more supportive or more helpful to his newcomer in the Senate than Senator HATCH has been.

I want, now that the issue is over and settled, to take the opportunity to make sure the people of Utah understand the high regard that I hold for Senator HATCH and the highest esteem that I hold for his scholarship and his leadership.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I will only take a few moments.

I want to thank my colleague for his wonderful remarks. They mean a lot to me, and I have an equally strong feeling toward him and realize that he did this as a matter of principle and conscience. And I could never find fault with people who do that. I naturally differ with him on this particular issue, and I am sure we will have some differences in the future. But by and large we support each other, support our State together in a very, very good way, and I am very proud to serve with him. And I appreciate his service here. He is one of the more articulate, intelligent and hard-working people in this body. I personally feel honored to have him as a partner as we work together in the best interest of Utah and this Nation.

So I want to thank him for his kind remarks here today.

#### A VOTE CAST TO PROTECT OUR FLAG

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, earlier today, I voted to protect the American flag from desecration. In doing so, I chose a statute rather than a constitutional amendment to achieve this important objective.

For me and for most Americans, our Nation's flag is a symbol of the principles and values which hold this country together. We are appalled and deeply offended when someone burns or in some way destroys this national emblem of freedom and justice.

Brave men and women have given their lives to protect the flag, to preserve as well the freedom and democracy for which it stands. We owe it to those soldiers to keep our flag from desecration. And we owe them our solemn pledge to protect the Bill of Rights given to us by history's greatest guardian of American liberty: Thomas Jefferson.

But in defending our flag, we should not alter the Bill of Rights, and we should not tinker with language of our Constitution, if a simple, direct law can get the job done.

I cosponsored and cast my vote for just such a law. It protects our flag by punishing those who damage or destroy it. Flag desecration, like shouting fire in a crowded theater, would not be protected by the first amendment. This law passes every constitutional test, according to scholars at the Congressional Research Service.

Protecting America's cherished Constitution and Bill of Rights is every bit as important as protecting our beloved flag. We must do both, and take care not to jeopardize one while seeking to protect the other.

It is a delicate balance, and I believe the bill for which I voted, achieves that important and critical balance.

#### NATIONAL DRUG POLICY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would to announce that the Office of National Drug Control Policy has just confirmed that Director Brown will make an announcement at 4:15 today regarding his future career plans. It has been widely reported that he will take a sociology professorship at Rice University in Houston. I wish him well. He is a very fine man.

He was a good selection for this position. I believe he has given his heart and soul to it to the extent that he could. He has done a credible job. But I have to say the administration has barely paid any attention to him and his efforts on this issue.

Unfortunately, under this administration drug control policy is in utter disarray. The number of 12- to 17-year-olds using marijuana has increased from 1.6 million in 1992 to 2.2 million in 1994. The category of "recent marijuana use" increased a staggering 200 percent among 14- and 15-year-olds over the same period. One in three high school seniors now smokes marijuana.

I have to say the President has stood up and condemned smoking cigarettes but has not condemned smoking marijuana.

One in three high school students now smoke marijuana. There has been a 53-percent drop in our ability to interdict and push back drug shipments in the transit zone between 1993 and 1995. Drug purity is way up, street prices are down, and the number of drug-related emergency room admissions is at record levels.

Federal law enforcement is under a very severe strain, and at the very time that the technical sophistication of the Cali Mafia is reaching new heights. Frankly, of those one in three high school students that are using marijuana, 30 percent of those who do it will try cocaine in the future of their lives. That is just a matter of fact. It is a statistic we know. And this has gone up so dramatically fast that I am really concerned about it.

The Gallup Poll as released today showed that 94 percent of Americans view illegal drug use as either a crisis or a very serious problem. These people are right. We simply need to do better.

As a start, I urge President Clinton to appoint a replacement director at the earliest possible date. It is vital to our Nation's effectiveness against drugs that we have a coordinated strategy against drug abuse in our executive branch of Government. Almost 3 years into the administration no nominee has been forwarded to the Senate for the purpose of ONDCP Deputy Director for Supply Reduction—in 3 years. This position should be filled immediately as well.

I believe that whoever is appointed ought to use that bully pulpit to let the American people know that we have had it up to here with drug abuse in our country, with this cancer that has been eating away at our children, and which, naturally because of the permissiveness of our society, is resulting in more and more drug use. We have to do something about it.

I wish Director Brown, Lee Brown, well. I like him personally. I know how frustrating it must have been. The first thing they did when he took over the Office of National Drug Control Policy was to cut his staff almost completely. Frankly, it is hard to do this job without the backing of the President of the United States. I really do not believe this administration has backed him in the way that they should have backed him. Despite that, he has done the best he could.

I personally want to acknowledge that on the floor. I want to pay my respects to him. I have admiration for him. I think his heart was always in the right place, and I think he did the best he could under the circumstances.

I just hope in these next few years—especially this next year—we do something about this, that we replace him and get a deputy for the next Director as soon as we can, and that we start fighting this issue with everything we have.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

#### THE BOSNIA ISSUE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be general debate on the Bosnia issue between now and the hour of 6 p.m.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, it is the intention of the majority leader at 6 p.m. pending agreement by the other side to turn to H.R. 2606, which concerns the use of funds for troops in Bosnia.

Mr. President, it is also the intention of the majority leader to have the vote fairly early tomorrow, sometime around noon.

So I urge my colleagues to come to the floor at this time—between now and any time this evening—to debate and discuss this issue. There will be limited time tomorrow. The majority leader asked me to announce that. So I hope that we can get to the bulk of the debate on this issue.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCAIN. Let me just finish if I could, and I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Right now, the tentative plans are to vote on H.R. 2606, which is the use of funds for troops in Bosnia. Following that, a vote on an amendment by, I believe, Senator HUTCHISON and Senator NICKLES, and many others—Senator INHOFE, Senator KYL—on the issue of a resolution concerning Bosnia, and that would be followed, is tentatively scheduled to be followed by a vote on the Dole amendment, the language of which has not been completely worked out.

That is subject to change. There may be amendments, additional amendments from the other side of the aisle on this issue. The Democrat side has reserved the right to propose additional amendments on that side.

I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. The question I had was, is it my understanding there will not be debate time tomorrow before the vote will be taken?

Mr. MCCAIN. I believe there will be debate time, but it will be extremely limited. We would like to have the debate and discussion between now and the hour later this evening. Members wish to stay in to debate the issue.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the intention is to have general debate on Bosnia until 6, but then from then on, if we take up 2606, continue debate on Bosnia as well as that bill. So I am not sure we need to restrain Members as far as time of speaking is concerned.

I wish to emphasize that tomorrow morning there will not be sufficient time for every Member to speak on this issue, so again I strongly urge as much

as possible to have those statements made this afternoon or this evening.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KYL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I would like to begin this debate. I spoke on this floor, I think I was the first Member to speak after the President spoke to the Nation justifying his decision to commit 20,000 ground troops in Bosnia. I indicated my opposition at that time. I wish to reiterate that opposition now and very briefly indicate the reasons why and why I would support at least one and possibly two of the resolutions that will be before us tomorrow.

I was privileged to serve in the House of Representatives during the time that we debated the issue of whether or not to commence the Desert Storm operation. I cannot think of a more serious debate that I participated in while a Member of the House of Representatives. It was an elevated debate in terms of the arguments that were raised on both sides, and I think that everyone felt at the end of that discussion the issue had been thoroughly debated, the good arguments presented on both sides, and I think the right result came from that vote.

This is a similar issue, Mr. President. This is undoubtedly the most serious issue which we have had to debate in this year of the 104th Congress. In the long-term survivability of our country, I suppose one could talk about the balanced budget and those economic issues, but when one considers the possibility of sending young men and women in the Armed Forces into harm's way, all of us I think become very serious about the subject.

On this particular subject, there is no right or wrong in the sense that reasonable people can have differing views. I would like to focus first on what we have agreed on, and I would like to say I know that although my colleague from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN, and I may have some disagreement about the ultimate resolution that should be passed in this body, we agree on what we are for, and I think I would also say that in response to Senator BENNETT, who said that no senior Senator had offered more assistance to a junior Senator than Senator HATCH had to him, I would suggest that Senator MCCAIN has provided that same kind of assistance to me, and I would wish to commend him for all of his efforts in trying to come to grips with what these resolutions should be all about and how we influence the administration in conducting a sound policy with respect to Bosnia.

All of us, undoubtedly I could say all of us, are for peace in Bosnia, for an end to the slaughter. Many of us believe we have made a commitment to that with the American ships that are steaming in the Adriatic, the planes that are flying under the banner of NATO, the other kind of assistance which we have provided in terms of

transport, intelligence, humanitarian assistance, and the monetary assistance that we will be asked to supply in the future.

Second, we are all for the support of our troops. There is no one here who would want to pull the rug out from under our troops once they have been deployed somewhere. Of course, many of us believe the way to support our troops is not to send them in harm's way in the first instance. But once they are there, none of us, obviously, will want to jerk the rug out from under them.

Having said what we are for, peace in Bosnia and support for our troops, I think it is also important for us to say what we oppose. And there are many of us here who oppose what I would characterize as the unreflective and off-handed and premature commitment of troops by the President. Our view is that the President should not have made this commitment, and that is why support for the Hutchison resolution is so important—to express our opposition to that decision.

I would like to discuss why I think this issue arises today. If this were a vital national security interest of the United States, we would not be debating this question. The Senate would have supported it long ago and the American people would be in support of it. But there is no vital national security interest. There is no national security interest of the United States involved. And when there is no national security interest, I think there is a higher threshold that must be met for the commitment of troops into combat situations. Here there is at best what could be characterized as a national interest. Any time there is a moral imperative to stop slaughter, to stop genocide, I think one could say that there is a national interest in seeing that that is stopped.

That does not mean in every case that the United States would send ground troops or we would have ground troops in possibly 20 or 30 or 40 places on the globe today. We do not. There are many situations that cry out for help but we cannot literally be the sheriff of the world. So the mere fact there is a moral imperative in some sense to stop the slaughter, to stop the genocide in different parts of the world, does not automatically mean the United States sends ground troops. We often do other things. There was a moral imperative to send humanitarian assistance to Somalia, and we did that. And there are moral imperatives in other places around the Earth where we have taken action.

This is a moral imperative, but we should not be confused and call it a national security imperative because there is no national security interest of the United States involved here. And because it is only a moral imperative, it seems to me there should have been more debate by the Congress and with the American people about whether or not this is one of those occasions in