

Day. Yet, some of those people are serving in the White House today. I believe it is acknowledged by the White House, 21 current employees, top-level officials in the White House are currently undergoing a drug program, a drug rehab program and surveillance.

What kind of example is that? What kind of leadership is that? And what about some of the appointments that President Clinton has made?

I remember we had a big battle over Dr. Joycelyn Elders to be Surgeon General. A lot of us, mostly Republicans, said, no, she would not be the proper person to be the Surgeon General, to be the No. 1 health officer appointed by the President, to be the person in the bully pulpit, because she had views that were more than liberal, they were off the radar screen to the left.

Many of us opposed her nomination, but she was confirmed. We opposed her nomination because she made a lot of statements that we felt should not be made by the Surgeon General.

After Dr. Elders was appointed, it wasn't too long before she said something about, "Well, maybe we should legalize drugs, maybe we should study legalizing drugs." Did President Clinton fire her for that statement? No. I think I heard somebody say, "Well, the President doesn't agree with her on that issue."

It wasn't a month later and she said the same thing. I think before the National Press Club. She thought maybe we should consider legalizing drugs. Was she fired for making it a second time? The answer is no. She was fired later for making some other comments that were, again, very irresponsible in what we should be teaching our kids in school, but the point being is he didn't fire her. She made several comments about legalizing drugs, and she was still the Surgeon General, she was still President Clinton's appointee to a very important prestigious position. Again, he was aware of her background, he was aware of her philosophy, and yet that was his recommendation to the country for that position.

My point being, the war on drugs needs to be fought. It was fought under Ronald Reagan, it was fought under George Bush, and, basically, it was abandoned under the Clinton administration. The net result is, we have a lot of young people today who are experimenting with drugs, thinking, "Well, maybe it's OK." So we see drug use way up, we see the number of young people who will be addicts, who will see their lives ruined, we will see those numbers go up as well.

So we need to fight the war on crime, we need to fight the war on drugs, but, unfortunately, this administration has been AWOL on both. Mr. President, I regret to say that, I hate to say that.

Mr. President, I am going to make a couple more comments. I looked at Senator Dole's announcement. He said he had a stated goal that he wants to reduce drug use by 50 percent during his first term. It can be done. It was

done under Reagan and Bush. It can be done again. You see the current upsurge in drug use due to a very cavalier attitude by this administration, the current administration, on the war on drugs. It will be nice to have a change in the White House and have an individual and a team that is very committed, that is very dedicated, very sincere in saying, "We want to let everyone know that drugs are hazardous to your health."

I find it interesting to see that President Clinton is attacking tobacco and has been silent about other drugs, such as crack and cocaine, marijuana use. I almost think that he made the announcement on tobacco maybe to kind of get this release of information talking about drug use doubling under his term off the front pages. I don't know.

Mr. President, this war has to be fought. We need energetic leadership coming from the White House. I believe we will have that from Senator Dole and his team.

Also, I want to comment on the interdiction efforts. I remember shortly after President Clinton took office, he cut the office of the drug czar by 83 percent. He reduced it from, I believe, 140 employees to 15, and cut the funding way back. That tells you something about his priorities.

Senator Dole said, if elected, he would reestablish the drug czar office. He would redouble and rekindle our efforts on drug interdiction so we can stop drugs before they come into the United States. He said he would increase penalties on those people who have been involved in drug trafficking, particularly amongst people who have been involved in drug trafficking to our young people.

So, Mr. President, it is vitally important that we have a leader who will make change, and make change appropriately, to protect our kids for the future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, our control of time is nearing an end, but I would like to just draw a contrast here.

The former majority leader has embraced a very focused attack on crime in our country, and he begins—and I think it is appropriate—with the first pledge to cut teen drug use in half. I can't think of a grander thing to achieve that would do more good, reduce pain and anxiety and trouble in millions of American families.

Sometimes these numbers get out of whack. We are talking about a sister, a brother, somebody in the neighborhood, and we are talking about 2 million of them who are now experimenting with drugs who did not 3 years ago. That is a city the size of my hometown, Atlanta, GA—every person in it. Every one of those is a family and is in a personal crisis. So by focusing that as No. 1 is right on target.

No. 2, an end to revolving-door-justice, which Americans have been so concerned about. One in every three persons arrested for a violent crime is on parole. Sometimes people say, "Well, it costs too much to keep them in prison, \$25,000, \$30,000 a year." It costs \$450,000 for them to be out of prison, in property damage and personal damage.

No. 3, holding violent juveniles accountable for their actions. We all know we have a juvenile crime wave and it is tied to the drug wave.

No. 4, making prisoners work. Only one-third of the prisoners work full time. We heard the Senator from Michigan addressing that.

No. 5, keeping guns out of the hands of criminals.

On target, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Conversely, this administration suffers from a lack of commitment in this arena. Shortly after arriving at her job, Attorney General Janet Reno repealed the Department of Justice policy requiring prosecutors to seek the most serious criminal charge they could prove in court. We all heard from the Senator from Oklahoma about the former Surgeon General suggesting that maybe we should legalize drugs and the effect that has had, with children no longer thinking that drugs are serious.

This administration's chief prosecutor in San Diego has released hundreds of captured drug smugglers and sent them back to Mexico without prosecuting. This administration's prosecutors across the country have cut back prosecutions of felons for possessing guns by 13 percent and have reduced prosecution for crimes involving guns 20 to 25 percent.

Many of this administration's judges have embraced the criminal as a victim-of-society philosophy. The Senator from Montana talked about that earlier this afternoon and how wrong that is. We heard the statistics of getting these people back out on the street and the price society pays when we do that.

His appointees to the Supreme Court have been among the most willing to use technicalities to overturn death sentences for brutal murders.

The list goes on, Mr. President. Here we have a focused, energetic, committed Senator Dole targeting crime as a No. 1 issue in America and going after it, and over here we have a record of conciliation and a drug war and a drug epidemic.

We need to do this not only for the stability of our country, but for the compassion of our children.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, last week the Senate passed the so-called Defense of Marriage Act. I voted against this bill for three reasons.

First, there is no need for this legislation. Not one State in this Nation has legalized marriages between gay

men or lesbians. Until one does, there is absolutely no need for Congress to consider whether other States are, or should be, obligated to recognize such marriages.

Second, it is clear to me that this legislation is politically motivated. By making this unnecessary bill a priority of this Congress, while failing to act on numerous other measures of much more immediate importance, the Republican leadership has made clear its desire to try to embarrass those who have traditionally supported equal rights for all Americans, including gays and lesbians.

Third, I do not believe that most Rhode Islanders or most Americans think that this a matter of urgent national importance requiring congressional action. Prior to the introduction of this legislation, I had not received one letter or phone call expressing concern about gay or lesbian marriages. And since the introduction of this legislation, I have received only limited correspondence from Rhode Islanders expressing support for it. Whoever has this bill high on their agenda has not consulted with many of my constituents or with many of the people from across the Nation who write to me.

Mr. President, I know that people of good will and strong faith can differ on this sensitive subject. And I knew that the Senate's vote would be a lopsided one. But if we truly believe in family values, we should remember that the gay men and lesbians whom this legislation will affect are our sons and daughters, our sisters and brothers, our friends and colleagues. Before we enact legislation that further isolates them from the mainstream of society, we should consider carefully whether this legislation is needed, desired, or desirable. I do not believe that it is.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, September 13, the Federal debt stood at \$5,217,304,758,895.91.

One year ago, September 13, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,967,411,000,000.

Five years ago, September 13, 1991, the Federal debt stood at \$3,623,683,000,000.

Twenty-five years ago, September 13, 1971, the Federal debt stood at \$416,135,000,000. This reflects an increase of more than \$4 trillion during the 25 years from 1971 to 1996.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3662) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, if the managers would agree, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the committee amendment to offer an amendment at this point. And perhaps it could be dealt with later, if the managers of the bill would agree. It is an amendment that addresses concerns confronting cattle producers in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5351

(Purpose: To promote the livestock industry)

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] proposes an amendment numbered 5351.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President this amendment attempts to address many of the concerns confronting cattle producers in the United States today. The issues of packer concentration, lack of price discovery, retail price spreads and low prices have been foremost on the minds of cattle producers and consumers throughout South Dakota and the Nation.

To say these are concerns of my fellow South Dakotans is a gross understatement. Thousands of South Dakotans have written, called, or visited with me on this issue. This is an issue that strikes at the heart of their ability to run their farms and businesses and provide for their families. The time has come for Congress to take action.

For the past 2 years, I have been pressing the Clinton administration to address meatpacker concentration and utilize existing antitrust laws to make sure that cattle are sold in an open and competitive market. Though the administration has taken some steps over the past several months, I believe these measures are marginal at best. Stronger action is needed.

What is of great concern to producers is the fact that while cattle prices have been at or near record lows, retail prices have not shown any significant drop. In fact, just the opposite is happening.

In 1995, at Eich's Meat Market, in Salem, SD, the price of a choice yield grade 2 hind quarter was \$1.65 per pound—that is the highest price paid at this locker since it was opened. This past summer it was \$1.60 per pound. The same hind quarter was selling for \$1.57 per pound in 1993. In contrast, in 1993 live cattle prices were \$80 or higher. Yet, in 1995, live prices have been as low as \$51.50.

This represents a combination punch to South Dakota ranchers—as producers, they are getting fewer dollars for their livestock; yet, as consumers, ranchers—armed with fewer dollars—are forced to pay more both in terms of real dollars and as a portion of their budget to put their own product on the dinner table.

The influence of packer concentration on the market cannot be overlooked or dismissed. Fifteen years ago, the top four packers held about 40 percent of the market. Today market share is over 85 percent.

Economic studies have shown that this kind of market concentration provides these firms with the kind of power needed to control prices.

At a recent Senate Commerce Committee hearing that I chaired on this subject, it was made abundantly clear that all too often cattle producers do not have free, open, or competitive markets in which to sell their cattle. The Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, [GIPSA] is charged with insuring a free and open marketplace. GIPSA must be more vigilant in assuring this.

Only through enforcement of existing antitrust will we be able to ensure the long-term economic viability of the U.S. cattle industry. South Dakota ranchers agree.

I have held two Senate hearings on this subject over the past year. I also have introduced several bills to address concerns that cattle producers have told me must be addressed. Other Senators have offered their own proposals. Some are controversial. What I have done with this amendment is incorporate those measures that I believe we can pass this year. Our cattlemen need relief now, not a promise of future action at some point next year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of my amendment be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PRESSLER. I do not believe this is a partisan issue. Nor should this amendment be treated as one. Both Republicans and Democrats from cattle-producing States I expect will embrace this amendment. Some may say tougher action is needed. They're right. The goal here is to do what we can now. This amendment I believe is a strong step in the right direction.

Again, while my amendment does not include everything I think is needed I believe it is a measure that can pass