

see them aggressively marketed by the producers. We are going to have society condone the use of addictive substances. But, we are not going to see a significant increase in use. Such is our understanding of human nature?

We saw what happened with drug use in this country in the 1960s and 1970s when we allowed the de facto legalization of drugs, condoning personal use and not enforcing our laws. That partial legal environment caused a dramatic increase in use. Can anyone doubt the effects if we condoned use outright? We cannot afford this kind of logic.

These are by no means the only myths. Others hold that drug laws are racist—which is another big lie, but even if true it is hardly an argument for making drugs legal; that the health consequences of personal use are exaggerated; or that drug laws lead to locking up lot of innocent people. None of these arguments can sustain serious attention or thought. Nor is there any major public support for drug legalization. The argument is pressed by only a few, some liberal, some conservative. To make the argument requires, however, suspension of judgment, a willingness to accept assertions over facts, and a professional absence of mind that ignores experience.

Unfortunately, while the argument for legalization has little public support, it is a major agenda item of many of our cultural elites. They have a disproportionate influence on our public discourse, on our radios and television, in the movies, in music and the arts. This means they have a disproportionate influence on the most at-risk population for drug users—our young people. By helping to obscure the message of the dangers of drug use, by encouraging it as part of a "liberated" life style, they contribute directly to use. When our political leaders remain silent they aid and abet this. The result in the 1960s made the point. Our recent experience confirms it: When you replace "Just Say No" with "Just Say Nothing" or "I didn't inhale," you are opening the door to trouble.●

#### NO RIGHT WAY TO DO WRONG

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, someone called my attention to an editorial in the Omaha World-Herald on the subject of gambling. I hope before long we will authorize a Commission to look at what we should do about this subject nationally. But the editorial in the Omaha World-Herald, which I ask to be printed in full in the RECORD, may be a cause for some reflection.

The article follows:

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Nov. 19, 1995]

#### NO RIGHT WAY TO DO WRONG

As we were musing recently about the inability of some local officials to say no to the gambling industry, we recalled what Howard Buffett, then a Douglas County commissioner, said when the city-county keno issue came up for a vote in 1991.

"To me, it's clearly wrong," he said. "I don't think there's any right way to do what you think is wrong." Buffett said government shouldn't condone a practice that undermines the work ethic. He was the only county commissioner to oppose the deal.

Regrettably, Buffett is no longer part of county government. He resigned in 1992 and moved to Illinois to take a new job.

Buffett didn't stop being concerned about gambling. In Illinois, he helped campaign against the spread of riverboat gambling. A friend in Massachusetts heard about his efforts and asked him to write down his views

on gambling and government for use in a Massachusetts anti-gambling effort.

The views he set down were again on target.

America was built on hard work, commitment and honesty, he said. Gambling reduces productivity and "cannibalizes existing industry." It spawns political corruption—the bigger it gets, the more government cooperation it requires. When profits drop, some governments have lowered the tax rates the gambling industry pays, thus putting more pressure on other taxpayers.

Gambling doesn't pay its own way. Taxpayers are stuck with social problems. In Illinois, Buffett said, government must spend \$3 to \$6 for public safety, regulation and other gambling-related items for each \$1 it receives in gambling revenue.

Gambling deceives and misleads. Promoters deceptively portray everyone as a winner in advertisements that "help wring billions of dollars from the most vulnerable 'customers' possible—the poor and the addicted." Teen-agers bet up to \$1 billion a year. An estimated 8 percent of the nation's adolescents are problem gamblers.

"The state," Buffett wrote, "should not even allow gambling, much less conduct it."

He's right. His article contains a challenge for government officials. Portraying government-sponsored gambling as a lifelong investment, he asked: "Is it an investment that you will be proud to hand down to the next generation?"

With the exception of Mayor Daub, few officials of Omaha and Douglas County have indicated that they have as clear a view. They should think about Buffett's challenge. Will they indeed be proud of what they are leaving their children and grandchildren?●

#### COMMEMORATING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE GOVERNMENT VS. ROE CASE

<--?@ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ-->

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, January 22, 1996, commemorated the 23d anniversary of the Nation's landmark abortion rights decision *Roe versus Wade*. The Supreme Court's decision in *Roe* established constitutionally based limits on the power of the Government to restrict the right of a woman to choose to terminate a pregnancy.

The right to choose has never been under such fierce attack. In this Congress, the U.S. House of Representatives has waged an all-out attack on a woman's right to choose. They have continuously voted to restrict a woman's fundamental right to choose by:

Attempting to undermine the Accreditation Council on Graduate Medical Education [ACGME] revised requirements for residency training in obstetrics/gynecology with an anti-choice amendment. Currently, in order to address the acute shortage of abortion providers, the revised policy requires OB/GYN programs to provide training in abortion procedures. However, there is a conscience clause for individuals and institutions that have moral or religious objections to abortion. The anti-choice amendment would treat those institutions that qualify under the exemption clause as though they were accredited for purposes of Federal reimbursements, even though they did not provide the training.

Giving States the option to refuse to provide Medicaid funding for abortions in cases of rape and incest.

Attempting to criminalize for the first time the performance of a specific abortion procedure. This measure also passed in the Senate.

Rejecting an amendment by Representative PATRICIA SCHROEDER to allow money from the anticrime block grants to be used for protection at abortion clinics.

Rejecting an amendment by Representative HOKE to allow money from the anticrime block grants to be used for enhancing security in and around schools, religious institutions, medical or health facilities, housing complexes, shelters to other threatened facilities.

Adopting an amendment by Representative CHRIS SMITH which codified the Mexico City Policy, which prohibits U.S. funding of any public or private foreign entity that directly or indirectly performs abortions except in cases of rape, incest, or when the life of the woman is endangered.

Rejecting an amendment by Representative ROSA DELAURO which would strike language in the Defense authorization bill prohibiting military personnel and their dependents from obtaining abortions at overseas military bases using their personal funds to pay for the procedure.

Rejecting a substitute amendment by Representative DELAURO to the Dornan amendment to prohibit abortions at overseas military facilities unless the life of the woman is endangered and if the Government is not able to pay for the abortion.

Rejecting an amendment by Representative HOYER to delete a provision in the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill that would prohibit Federal employees or their families from receiving abortion services through their Federal health insurance policies except when the life of the woman would be endangered. The Senate passed this measure but added an exception for the life of the mother and rape and incest.

Rejecting an amendment by Delegate NORTON to strike from the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill provisions that prevent funds from being used to perform abortions in the Federal prison system except in cases of rape or when the woman's life is endangered. The Senate passed this measure, which was vetoed by President Clinton and its future is uncertain.

Adopting an amendment by Representative GREENWOOD prohibiting funding under title X for abortions or directed pregnancy counseling.

Pro-choice Senators have waged a vigorous effort as have grass-roots activists, but we are outnumbered in too many votes in this anti-choice Congress.

Now H.R. 1833 is on the President's desk. It would make it a criminal offense to perform a rare abortion procedure used to protect women in late term pregnancies. Doctors who have used this procedure have testified these very rare abortions are undertaken

only in the most tragic of circumstances and that the procedure may be the only alternative to save women's lives or to prevent serious, long term health consequences.

President Clinton has indicated his intent to veto this bill, and I urge him to stand firm in his belief that to outlaw a procedure used by physicians out of deep concern for both the mother and the fetus would be wrong and a direct violation of Roe versus Wade, which held that a woman's life and health must always be considered by any governmental entity which regulates abortion.●

---

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY,  
JANUARY 24, 1996

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the joint session of Congress this evening, the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 5 p.m. on Wednesday, January 24; that immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolution come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and there then be a period for morning business until 5:30, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

RECESS

Mr. CRAIG. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order until the hour of 8:40 p.m. this evening, at which time the Senate will proceed as a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the State of the Union Address.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:33 p.m., recessed until 8:38 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. DEWINE).

---

CONSTITUTING MINORITY PARTY'S  
MEMBERSHIP ON THE ETHICS  
COMMITTEE

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 212, the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

So the resolution (S. Res. 212) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 212

*Resolved*, That the following shall constitute the minority party's membership on the Ethics committee for the 104th Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], Vice chairman;

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID]; and

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY].

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO  
HOUSES—MESSAGE OF THE  
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED  
STATES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Thereupon, at 8:38 p.m., the Senate, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Kelly D. Johnston, and the Sergeant at Arms, Howard O. Greene, Jr., proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address by the President of the United States.

(The address by the President of the United States, this day delivered by him to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress, appears in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

---

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 5 P.M.  
TOMORROW

At the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses, and in accordance with the order previously entered into, at 10:15 p.m., the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, January 24, 1996, at 5 p.m.