

that their rights, under these new Chinese laws just now going in place, are not being abused. We should encourage the Chinese to allow the establishment of truly independent Chinese non-governmental organizations to monitor and discuss the human rights situation.

I also add to this list the development of a legal system that guarantees an independent judiciary, due process of law, and new civil and criminal codes. This will do more in protecting and advancing human rights than any other single thing the United States can do, and the Chinese have asked for help in this regard.

In releasing the report, Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy and Human Rights, John Shattuck, stated at the press conference on March 6:

There is no question that economic integration enhances human rights.

As Secretary Shattuck also stated, isolating China will not enhance human rights—just the opposite. The continued improvement in the economic well-being of China's citizens is critical to the continued growth of human rights. And continued trade with the United States is critical for the continued development of China's economy.

I do not mean to suggest that the free market by itself will improve human rights records. Assistant Secretary Shattuck once again was so right when he said—and I quote—

Economic growth is not in and of itself the ultimate sufficient condition for the full flowering of human rights.

We must also pursue other forms of engagement with China.

So it is in this context that I urge my colleagues to read in full the State Department's human rights report on China, but to do so not with a jaundiced eye and a focus only on those areas that still require improvement, but with a sense of appreciation for how far in 20 short years China has come, and with continued United States engagement, how much farther China can go in the next 20 years.

That is our challenge today. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, under the previous order I am to be recognized during morning business for a period of 90 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that during this period I be permitted to yield portions of my time to other Members without losing my right to the floor.

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

#### DRUG USE IN AMERICA

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, over the last several months we have heard a growing crescendo, so to speak, about a new national epidemic. And

make no mistake about it, Mr. President, the United States is once again revisiting a drug epidemic.

This epidemic took hold of our Nation in the 1960's and 1970's. By 1979, Mr. President, somewhere in the neighborhood of 55 percent of our youth—importantly here—age 17 to 21, were involved in drugs, an alarming crisis for the Nation. From 1979 to 1992, this usage was cut in half.

For all the naysayers that said you could not do anything about drugs—wrong. This Nation did. It cut drug use in half. It took it down to 24, 26, 27 percent. But in 1992, as I am sure will be alluded to here repeatedly on the floor, something went wrong, something changed. Policies changed, and drug use took off like a rocket. It is now approaching the 40 percent level.

Over the weekend there was a lot of discussion about drug abuse because the President had a much heralded press conference in Miami this morning. But, Mr. President, this is one we cannot win with press conferences. This is one that will be exceedingly difficult to turn into some political gambit for the 1996 Presidential campaign.

Somebody will have to be responsible for what happened between 1992 and 1996. And what happened is a very ugly picture.

Over the various talk shows this quote surfaced. "This President is silent on the matter. He has failed to speak." That was Senator JOSEPH BIDEN, Jr., of Delaware. Or we have Mr. RANGEL, Congressman RANGEL, who has previously said, he has never seen a President care less about drugs. That is Congressman RANGEL. These are Members of the President's own leadership, party.

The point is, that there are ramifications for the policies we have set, Mr. President. In his first 3 years in office, President Clinton abandoned the war on drugs. He slashed the staff of his drug office 83 percent, he decreased the number of Drug Enforcement Agency agents, cut funding for drug interdiction efforts and abandoned the bully pulpit. I will mention this again. But out of 1,680 statements by the President, the word "drugs" was only used 13 times in the first 3 years. We turned away from the message that drugs are very harmful.

You know, Mr. President, President Reagan and President Bush deserve a lot of credit. They engaged this war as the Nation would expect them to, and indeed they contributed to saving millions of lives and harm to millions of families all across the land because they engaged the battle.

Yes, she was made fun of at the time, but Nancy Reagan, our First Lady, when she said, "Just say no," it made a difference. Who knows the number of families that were spared the devastation of drugs just because she led the way. She is going to be remembered very favorably for the role she played in our drug dispute.

I see, Mr. President, I have been joined by the distinguished Senator

from Michigan, who has been a leading advocate in the drug war. I now yield up to 10 minutes of my time.

Is that enough, I ask the Senator?

Mr. ABRAHAM. That would be fine.

Mr. COVERDELL. I yield 10 minutes of my time to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I first thank the Senator from Georgia for having come here today to help lead this discussion. I think the role he is playing in trying to focus public attention on problems in the area of crime and drugs is to be commended. We are grateful to have leadership like that on these issues because we have not had enough of it, either in the Congress or particularly in the administration.

So today I will talk a little bit more specifically about some of the problems we are contending with as a society as they relate to the broadly defined topic of drug use in America.

After steadily declining for a number of years, through the administrations of Presidents Reagan and Bush, drug use has been skyrocketing in recent years. It is increasing at a very alarming rate. According to the 1994 "Monitor of the Future" study, drug use in three separate categories—use over lifetime, use in past year, use in past month—has shown a remarkable surge during the last 2 years, for young people in particular.

Lifetime drug use went from a high in 1981 of about 65 percent to a low of just over 30 percent in 1992. Recently, though, the trend has been in a different direction. In both 1993, and again in 1994, after over a decade of uneven, but steady, decline, drug use has shot up again. It has shot up not just among high school seniors either, Mr. President.

According to the 1995 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, drug use among children from as young as the age of 12 through 17 years of age, went up by 28 percent from 1993 to 1994. That is not just percentages we are talking about. It is human lives, Mr. President.

To make it a little more specific, and to really, I think, dramatize the alarming changes we are talking about, these statistics indicate that in 1994, 1 million more children between the ages of 12 and 17 were using drugs than had been the case in 1993.

Mr. President, I would like to state very clearly that the decisions people make to abuse drugs or any other similarly abused substance of any type is an individual decision. This is not a partisan decision. This is a not a decision that can be blamed on any one individual in Washington.

I think what is critical and what we need to assess is the response that we, as Government leaders, are making to this alarming increase. I think that is where we have to take focus here

today. I think we should specifically look at what this administration has done, because I think in examining it we will get a feel for the different types of priorities that can be established and give the American people a chance to decide which priorities they prefer.

In terms of the Clinton administration, the first thing that we should note is the dramatic drop in drug prosecutions, both in 1993 and again in 1994. Despite the country's increasing drug problem in those years, Federal drug prosecutions fell from a high of over 25,000 prosecutions in 1992 to fewer than 22,000 in 1994. It just 2 years, Federal drug prosecutions dropped 12 percent. In addition, this administration made the decision to dramatically reduce the budget of the drug czar's office. The war on drugs conducted through the drug czar's office, has been cut by approximately 83 percent.

Mr. President, reducing the number of prosecutions and reducing the size of the budget of the drug czar's office, in my mind, at least, is the wrong set of priorities to deal with an increasing rate of drug abuse, particularly when much of the increase can be found among young people.

Third, I think the administration has changed priorities in terms of the message it is sending, particularly the message young people are hearing. The Senator from Georgia has already identified, and I think accurately, and very positively talked about the impact of the "just say no" program. Mr. President, for the better part of a decade, the words "just say no" meant the same thing pretty much to everybody in America, and especially young people. It meant "say no to drugs." With a theme like that resonating whether through the airwaves or in speeches of the public officials and the leadership of the First Lady, Nancy Reagan, young people heard clearly one continuous message. I think that that pervasive message helped to change the direction of drug use in this country. I think that message has been blurred a lot in recent years.

Indeed, unfortunately, I think mixed signals have been sent inadvertently that have at least suggested a certain condoning of the use of drugs. I do not think that those are the kind of signals we want to send. For example, I note the Department of Health and Human Services has sponsored commercials on MTV proclaiming, "If you use drugs, don't share a needle."

Now, I realize that "just say no" may have sounded hackneyed to some, but it works and it is true. In my judgment, sending any kind of signal to our children that suggests that any form of drug use is preferable to other forms, rather than as a society we are opposed to all drug use, will confuse, and I think contribute to their reluctance to follow the message to avoid the use of drugs altogether.

In addition, I think we have sent a mixed message in terms of what the leading messengers of the administra-

tion have been saying about drugs. As we know, Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders talked at length about even going so far as to legalize drug use in this country. It just seems to me, Mr. President, if young people reach the conclusion that an administration or Washington or public officials think that drug legalization is an acceptable alternative, their willingness to begin experimenting or to use drugs will increase. Indeed, Mr. President, those seem to have been the results.

Again, according to the former "drug czar" in my State of Michigan, just a few weeks ago, the Centers for Disease Control jointly sponsored a conference in Atlanta with one of the country's leading pro-drug legalization organizations, the Drug Policy Foundation. The conference agenda was to promote needle exchanges and healthy drug use messages.

These kinds of mixed messages, combined with a drop in prosecutions and a reduction in spending on the drug czar's office, I think, Mr. President, demonstrate the wrong priorities. I think we should have a healthy debate this year over this country's priorities. I happen to think that the investment of funds in the drug czar's office, the increased prosecution of drug offenders, and the sending of one clear unmistakable message that we should say no to drugs is the only way to seriously and effectively deal with the drug abuse problems we face in this country, and particularly with youthful drug offenders. I think to divert resources from that approach is to invite increases in drug use.

I think the American people should understand that there are two very different courses, a course that was followed with great success for over a decade, and a new course that has blurred the message, invested fewer dollars and generated fewer prosecutions. That clear choice, I think, is one that we in Congress now should effectively try to address. I will be working hard to do that in my State, to try to make sure at least in Michigan we send an unequivocal message to just say no to drugs and I will do my best here to support efforts to beef up the forces that will crack down on drug abuse, those in both prosecutorial ranks and providing the drug czar's office and others with the adequate resources they need to combat this on the front lines.

Last year, Mr. President, I was involved in sponsoring a bill which ultimately became law and was signed into law to try to make sure we did not liberalize the sentences that crack cocaine dealers would receive. We have to remain vigilant and tough. I think the sentences for those who use powder cocaine should be tougher as well. We have to make clear that young people in this country, and really to all Americans, that the war on drugs has not been won. Progress that was made in the 1980's can be reversed if we are not vigilant.

I intend to come to the floor often, joining my colleague from Georgia and

others, to make sure those are the messages we send. I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from Michigan. As I said, he has been a stalwart on this kind of work, on crime in general, and the United States and his State are all benefactors of his good work. I appreciate his coming to the floor.

Just to mention again or reinforce a comment I made, when I began in 1993 and 1994, President Clinton made seven addresses to the Nation. None mentioned illegal drugs—none. The President's official 1993 Presidential papers reveal 13 references to illegal drugs as a total, in a total of 1,628 Presidential statements, addresses, and interviews.

Of course, no wonder, Mr. President, if the bully pulpit is not used in whatever form it is chosen, I do not think you have to replicate what First Lady Reagan said, but you do have to use that pulpit. It got turned off.

Mr. President, I yield up to 10 minutes to my colleague from Arizona, also a Senator who has come here with enthusiasm and energy on the topic of making American citizens safer. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his work on this issue and for yielding the time to me relative to the comments that he just made.

I note as recently as yesterday on the "Meet the Press" television program, Senator JOSEPH BIDEN said: "The President is silent on the matter. He has failed to speak." Of course, we are talking about the matter of drug abuse and, more broadly, the war on drugs.

Actually, I am very heartened that the President has rediscovered his enthusiasm to fight this war on drugs. When he campaigned for the Presidency in 1992, candidate Bill Clinton said, "President Bush hasn't fought a real war on crime and drugs. I will." During the first 3 years in office, the President virtually ignored the drug problem. The moving trucks had barely arrived from Little Rock when the President slashed the office, the so-called drug czar's office, by 80 percent. The drug problem received little attention thereafter from his administration.

Whatever the motivation, some might say election year politics, I assume it is an obvious realization that the policy has not worked and has had a disastrous effect. The President has now reversed course and is exercising very needed leadership in our efforts to combat drugs.

During his State of the Union Address, the President announced the appointment of General McCaffrey as the next drug czar, a welcome appointment, because General McCaffrey has a very fine reputation, and, of course, the energy and enthusiasm to deal with this problem.

CLINTON'S ABDICATION ON THE WAR ON DRUGS

A. SLASHING ONDCP'S BUDGET

As mentioned before, one of the first official acts by President Clinton was

to slash the drug czar's staff by more than 80 percent. The number of workers fell from 146 to just 25—half of the size of the White House's communication staff. The President also cut the budget from \$185.8 to \$5.8 million—a 90-percent cut.

After drastically reducing the size of the drug czar's office, the President took nearly a year to select a drug czar, finally settling on Lee Brown.

Lee Brown was not an effective drug czar. Instead of focusing efforts on getting cocaine and other drugs off of our streets, Mr. Brown launched an effort to have "Big League Chew" bubble-gum removed from convenience store chains. The drug czar's office was concerned that the packaging resembled some chewing tobacco products, although its Deputy Director admitted that the agency didn't have any hard data to show look-alikes lead to use of the real thing.

#### B. APPOINTING A SURGEON GENERAL WHO PROPOSED LEGALIZING DRUGS

Lee Brown was not the only Clinton administration official to set back efforts to combat drug use. While serving as the Nation's top health official, Jocelyn Elders commented that, "[I] do feel that we would markedly reduce our crime rate if drugs were legalized."

#### C. DRAMATICALLY REDUCED INTERDICTION EFFORTS

Under President Clinton, interdiction has been dramatically scaled back.

Keeping drugs out of the country was an important and successful element of the Reagan-Bush drug war. Successful interdiction leads to less drugs reaching our streets, and poisoning our children. Interdiction raises the price of drugs, and lowers their purity, which translates into less people using drugs, and those who do, ingesting drugs of lower potency. As a candidate for the Presidency, Clinton recognized the importance of interdiction:

[W]e need an effective, coordinated drug interdiction program that stops the endless flow of drugs entering our schools, our streets, and our communities. A Clinton-Gore Administration will provide cities and states with the help they need.

The President's fiscal year 1996 request represented a 37-percent cut from 1991 interdiction funding levels. And in Clinton's first year in office, the National Security Council downgraded the drug war from one of three top priorities to number 29 on a list of 29.

Between 1993 and the first half of 1995, the transit zone disruption rate—which measures the ability of the United States to seize or turn back drug shipments—dropped 53 percent. The President has cut the interdiction budgets of the U.S. Customs Service, the Department of Defense, and the Coast Guard. Not surprisingly, these agencies are showing a downturn in statistical measures of interdiction.

The administration's cuts to the Customs Service interdiction budget coincided with a 70-percent decline in Customs-supported cocaine seizure in the transit zone.

Between fiscal years 1992 and 1995, the Defense interdiction budgets were reduced by more than half.

The Coast Guard operating budget for drug missions fell from \$449.2 million in fiscal year 1991 to a projected \$314.2 million in fiscal year 1996. Cutter and aircraft resource hours for drug missions are projected to fall 23 and 34 percent, over the same period.

#### D. REDUCED EMPHASIS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT

The President has also reduced the emphasis on law enforcement.

If the President's fiscal year 1995 budget proposal had been passed, the DEA, FBI, INS, U.S. Customs Service, and the U.S. Coast Guard would have lost a total of 621 drug enforcement agents.

While Congress reversed many of the Clinton cuts, the DEA has lost over 200 agents during the President's tenure. No DEA special agents were trained in 1993, nor were any budgeted to be trained in either 1994, or 1995.

Although drug use is going up, the number of individuals prosecuted for Federal drug violations is going down. Between 1992 and 1994 drug prosecutions dropped 12 percent.

#### E. ABANDONED BULLY PULPIT

President Clinton has failed to use the bully pulpit.

Criticism of the President's lack of leadership on the drug issue is bipartisan. Representative CHARLES RANGEL, a Democrat from New York, said: "I've been in Congress for over two decades, and I have never, never, never seen a President who cares less about this issue."

And yesterday on "Meet the Press," Senator BIDEN said: "This President is silent on the matter. He has failed to speak."

#### F. TREATMENT STRATEGY

The de facto strategy of the Clinton administration in fighting drugs was to deemphasize interdiction, law enforcement, and prevention, and concentrate on treatment.

But even though Federal treatment spending was 230 percent greater in 1995 than in 1989, the number of persons served in treatment decreased 144,000.

The President has continued to pursue his treatment strategy, even though reducing hard-core drug use through treatment is generally futile. A 1994 study by the Rand Corp. prepared for the drug czar's office studied the effects of treatment of hard-core cocaine users. The study found that 27 percent of hard-core drug users continued hard core use while undergoing treatment. And 88 percent of hard-core users returned to hard-core use immediately after treatment.

#### RESULTS OF PRESIDENT'S LACK OF LEADERSHIP

##### A. DRUG USE IS UP

As a measure of President Clinton's lack of leadership, drug use is up.

The Clinton administration's abdication of the war on drugs has already had a devastating effect on all Americans—especially our Nation's children.

Last year, the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research

found that, after a decade of steady decline, drug use by students in grades 8, 10, and 12 rose in 1993.

More bad news: In September 1995, the Department of HHS released the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, which showed that marijuana use had increased by an average of 50 percent among young people.

One in three high school seniors now smokes marijuana. We are approaching the point where a student is just as likely to drink a soft drink than use an illicit substance.

The increase in marijuana use among young people is frightening, not only because so many of our young people are using this dangerous narcotic, but also because, according to surveys by the Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, 12- to 17-year-olds who use marijuana are 85 times more likely to graduate to cocaine than those who do not use marijuana.

Hard-core drug use is also up.

The treatment strategy is failing. Far from decreasing the number of hard-core uses as Clinton predicted, the number is increasing.

The Drug Abuse Warning Network [DAWN], which monitors the number and pattern of drug-related emergencies and deaths in 21 major metropolitan areas across the country is used as a bellwether of hard-core use because so many emergency room cases involve hard-core addicts. The most recent DAWN results: Cocaine-related episodes hit their highest level in history in 1995. Marijuana-related episodes increased 39 percent, and methamphetamine cases rose 256 percent over the 1991 level.

Clearly, it makes far more sense to spend resources that will prevent people from using drugs in the first place. Once people are damaged by drugs, at most, treatment can prevent further harm. As some have said, you can't fight a war by focusing only on the treatment of the wounded.

##### B. WHAT THESE STATISTICS MEAN

These statistics show that more kids are becoming hooked on dope. Promising young lives are being derailed.

It is tough to imagine that American children will be equipped to compete with foreign competitors when one-third of high school seniors are smoking pot. The President can talk about education and all of the programs he wants, but if we don't work to keep kids off drugs, all the rhetoric and good intentions will be worthless.

Drug abuse is a major contributing factor to child abuse and homelessness. All Americans bear the costs of the abuse—through increased crime and increased taxes to pay for welfare and other social programs. According to the drug czar's office, the social cost of drug use is \$67 billion annually.

#### WHAT CAN BE DONE TO RETURN TO THE SUCCESSSES ACHIEVED DURING THE REAGAN-BUSH ERA

President Clinton needs to do many things to recapture the advance made during the Reagan-Bush years.

First, it needs to be recognized that the war on drugs can be won. It is not just the President who has waived a white flag—at least before his welcome change of heart—some prominent conservatives have also surrendered.

According to statistics compiled by the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, between 1979 and 1992, overall drug use declined about 50 percent. Between 1985 and 1992, monthly cocaine use dropped by 78 percent.

If we turn from overall narcotics use to the crucial 14- to 18-age bracket, we see that the results of the Reagan-Bush efforts were just as encouraging. According to the monitoring the future study, illicit drug use by high school seniors dropped from 54.2 percent in 1979 to 27.1 percent in 1992, and cocaine use fell from an annual rate of 13.1 percent in 1985 to 3.4 percent in 1992.

I believe that we should return to the strategies that were proven effective during the Reagan-Bush administrations. These include:

**Interdiction:** Renewed efforts by the Federal agencies responsible for fighting drugs to spend greater resources identifying sources, methods, and individuals involved in trafficking.

**Enforcement:** As I mentioned before, drug prosecutions under the Clinton administration have significantly decreased. Those violating our drug laws must be prosecuted. Additionally, we must make sure that those who are profiting from the drug trade are severely punished.

**Bully Pulpit:** the intellectual elite laughed at the Reagan administration's "Just Say No" campaign. But it was clearly an important part of its successful efforts to reduce drug use. The "Just Say Nothing" approach of the Clinton administration has softened the attitudes of students toward marijuana. Peer disapproval of marijuana has dropped from 70 percent in 1992 to 58 percent in 1994.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I would like to say that efforts to fight drugs can and should be bipartisan. For example, earlier this year, Senator FEINSTEIN introduced a bill—which I have cosponsored—to make it more difficult to peddle the ingredients use to make methamphetamine. Senator FEINSTEIN recognized that further controls were necessary to stop a drug which is currently ravaging the Southwest from turning into the next crack epidemic.

I am glad that the President is finally putting some energy into fighting the Nation's drug problem. His recent actions are appreciated, and should be at least somewhat helpful. It is time to resume the drug war. America's future is at stake.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona for his remarks and contribution to this effort.

I yield up to 10 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, first, I thank my colleague, Senator COVERDELL, from Georgia and also Sen-

ator KYL from Arizona. I want to echo the comments of the Senator because they are right on target. I hope the American people have had a chance to listen to what the Senator from Arizona said.

Whatever happened to the war on drugs?

In 1981, Americans were calling the drug epidemic the gravest internal problem facing our society. So Ronald Reagan issued a clarion call. He said, "The United States has taken down the surrender flag and run up the battle flag. And we are going to win the war on drugs." That was in 1982.

In 1992, candidate Clinton sounded out an all-out drug war charge. It is now 1996, an election year.

Today, more than 3 years into his term, President Clinton is announcing his drug policy. Maybe it is better late than never. But to this Senator it sounds a lot like an election conversation.

Under the Clinton administration, drug use amongst teenagers is up sharply, and drugs are more readily available and more cheaply available than at any time in our Nation's history. The surrender flag has been run up the pole once again.

This is not a partisan point of view. Look at what some leading Democrats said about Clinton's lack of leadership in combating drug use.

"The President is silent on the matter. He has failed to speak."

That was not made by DON NICKLES or PAUL COVERDELL. It was made by JOE BIDEN on NBC's "Meet the Press" on the 28th of April, yesterday.

Here is another quote:

"I have never seen a President care less about drugs." Again, not by a partisan Republican but by CHARLES RANGEL, Democrat from New York.

Many Americans, I think, are startled to realize these facts. "What happened to the war on drugs? I thought we were winning." Well, we were.

Between 1979 and 1992 the number of Americans using illicit drugs plunged from 24.7 million to 11.4 million. The so-called casual use of cocaine fell by 79 percent between 1985 and 1992, and monthly cocaine use fell by 55 percent between 1988 and 1992 alone; an enormous decline.

We were winning the war. We were on the way. The war was not over, to be sure, but we had won a lot of battles, and significant progress had been made. So what has happened?

Part of the answer must lie in the fact that the bully pulpit used so often and so forcefully by President Reagan and President Bush, and by their appointee, Bill Bennett, our former drug czar, and Nancy Reagan and Barbara Bush, has been vacated by this administration.

The strategy of "just say no" that Nancy Reagan used was laughed at by many of the persons in this administration. But it has turned into a policy not of "just say no" but "just say nothing" by this administration.

It could be that the administration's silence has been by design created by a need to cover up the backsliding that has resulted from the administration's failed policies.

Whatever happened to the war on drugs?

The Senate Judiciary Committee, led by Chairman ORRIN HATCH, issued a report in December of last year, and it provides several good clues.

Clue No. 1: President Clinton slashes the Office of Drug Control Policy.

President Clinton had been in office almost a year before he finally appointed his drug czar, and that was Lee Brown.

After receiving his appointment, Mr. Brown was not greeted with the support one would expect from a President who is dedicated to an all-out war on drugs.

While reminding America that drug abuse is "as serious a problem as we have in America," President Clinton greeted his Cabinet-level drug czar with a decimated budget and radically reduced staff. Staff size at the Office of Drug Control Policy was reduced from 146 employees to 25 under President Clinton. That is less than one-half the size of the White House communications staff. That is about one-sixth. He did not cut it in half. He did not cut it by a third. He cut from 146 individuals to 25.

He cut the budget from \$185.8 million to only \$5.8 million. It does not even show up. He cut it from \$185 million to less than \$6 million.

That was the President's war on drugs. That looks like a surrender to me. It looks like he gave up.

Clue No. 2: President Clinton downplays the domestic law enforcement efforts.

President Clinton's budgets have resulted in a loss of 227 agents from the Drug Enforcement Administration between September 1992 and September 1995.

The number of individuals prosecuted for Federal drug violations dropped 12 percent over this same period of time; no big surprise. If you cut the number of agents by 227 in 3 years, you are going to have a significant number of individuals prosecuted.

Clue No. 3: President Clinton scales back efforts for drug trafficking prevention.

The overall proportion of the Customs Service budget devoted to drug control fell from 45.5 percent in 1991 to projected 33.9 percent in 1996, again a significant reduction in Custom's budget.

Department of Defense airborne detection and monitoring assets were cut back from 3,400 to 1,850 hours between 1992 and 1995—again almost half.

The use of Navy vessels measured in so-called steaming days was cut from 420 to 170—less than half.

We are doing a lot less interdiction.

The Coast Guard operating expense budget for drug missions fell from \$449 million in fiscal year 1991 to projected \$314 million in 1996.

What is the result of these actions? Between 1993 and the first 6 months of 1995, the transit zone "disruption rate"—which measures the ability of the United States to seize or otherwise turn back drug shipments—dropped 53 percent.

The number of drug trafficking aircraft seized by Customs in the transit zone fell from 37 to 10 between 1993 and 1995.

The Coast Guard cocaine seizures remain 73 percent below the peak of 1991.

Marijuana seizures fell even more drastically—more than 90 percent over the same period.

Mr. President, I look at many of the things that President Clinton has done, and I see a real lack of leadership—almost a surrender on the war on drugs. Maybe this is best exemplified by the some of his appointees.

I think of Dr. Elders, who was President Clinton's first Surgeon General, a candidate whom many of us opposed because of her positions on a lot of issues. After she was confirmed, she made a couple of statements of note. One, she said "I think we should consider legalizing drugs." This was not anybody. This was the Surgeon General, the No. 1 public health officer appointed by this administration who said that we should "consider legalizing drugs."

What did President Clinton do? He said, "Well, I am not sure I agree with her." He asked her not to say it again. A couple of months later she said it again. "I think we should seriously consider legalizing drug use."

This is not a war on drugs. This is a capitulation. This is surrender. This is not using the bully pulpit to combat drug use. This is saying maybe top officials in Government think we should legalize drugs. Maybe drugs are not so bad after all.

She was wrong. Was she removed for those statements? No, she was not. She might have been reprimanded for the first.

The second statement she made was almost ignored, and, frankly, she was removed from office for other statements she made talking about teaching kids things on sexual tendencies and so on in the classroom. She was not removed for her discussion before the press that we should legalize drugs. Again, this is the Nation's No. 1 health officer. Is not drug use unhealthy? Certainly.

Again, what about example? President Clinton's own admission that he has used drugs—and then he came back and said, "Well, I never broke the laws of this country." Well, it was in some other country. But he said he did not inhale. What kind of example is that?

Again, we want to discourage the use of drugs, and when we talk about statistics and we see drug use is up sharply amongst teenagers, what kind of example do we have by the President himself?

Sadly, like so many other things, the war on drugs fell victim to a President

who lacks conviction to back up his promises.

I am glad the President made a speech today talking about we need to stand up and fight the war on drugs. Again, it sounds to this Senator like an election conversion. For 3 years where has his leadership been? It has been actually vacant. It has been silent. It has not existed. It is surrender.

Now we have an election, and I think pollsters informed the President, "Hey, this is an important issue, and drug use is up amongst teenagers." So, finally, we have a speech 6 months before election time.

So what now? On December 13, Majority Leader BOB DOLE and Speaker of the House NEWT GINGRICH convened a bicameral Leadership Task Force on National Drug Policy. The task force was chaired by Senators GRASSLEY and ORRIN HATCH, as well as House Members WILLIAM ZELIFF and HENRY HYDE.

They were asked to develop principles for coherent, national counterdrug policy as well as supporting strategy for future actions. On March 28 of this year, the task force released a five-point national drug strategy.

Sound interdiction strategy. We must stop the enemies' attack by protecting our borders from the pestilence of drugs. On land, air, and sea, our Nation's enforcement officers must have the commitment and the resources from our Nation's leader's so they can do their job.

Serious international commitment to the full range of counter-narcotics activities. We must support renewed efforts by the U.S. Customs Service, Drug Enforcement Administration, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Defense, and Coast Guard to identify sources, methods, and individuals involved in drug trafficking.

Effective enforcement of the Nation's drug laws. The Clinton administration's revolving door justice is making innocent Americans prisoners in their own communities. Our policy must be simply: If you commit the crime, you do the time.

We must also commit to nominating and confirming judges who are tough on crime, unlike President Clinton's judicial nominees—and primarily I think of Judge Baer, who basically said, no, we will not use the evidence of pounds and pounds of cocaine; it was seized illegally. Under pressure, President Clinton pressured the judge and the judge changed his mind. Maybe that is good. But the better aspect of that would have been not to have Judge Baer a Federal judge. He was President Clinton's nominee and, unfortunately, has lifetime tenure.

We need a united commitment toward prevention and education. A key component of any coherent, sustained drug program must be a public education program. This means ensuring that the bully pulpit is not empty and that national leadership is not AWOL.

The antidrug message must be clear, consistent, and repeated often, not just in election years.

Mr. President, we need treatment returning to a proper balance. We must realize that emphasizing treatment alone addresses the wrong end of the problem. Treatment is most effective for those who are motivated and face substantial penalty if they do not achieve and maintain sobriety.

Mr. President, I thank again my colleague, Senator COVERDELL, and Senator GRASSLEY, Senator HATCH, and others for their work on combating drugs. We need to do this every year. It needs to be done by the White House, through the bully pulpit, appointees—appointment of good judges—and we need a consistent effort, not just in an election year. Unfortunately, I think we have not had that from this administration.

I urge my colleagues to be forceful. I urge my colleagues to speak out because the war on drugs needs to be fought, and for the sake of our children the war on drugs needs to be won.

I thank my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank my colleague from Oklahoma for his important remarks and observations made about the situation on the drug war.

Mr. President, I yield up to 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, we are talking basically today about crime, though I heard Senator GORTON speak on another subject, and obviously an important one. He mentioned Pericles of Athens and, I would only add, O that the Lord would send us a Pericles now that we really need one. But we are here today basically talking about crime, and I want to touch on three issues. I want to express frustration about two of them. For the last 6 years, as we have debated crime bills, I have offered two amendments that have passed the Senate with overwhelming votes. They both relate to mandatory minimum sentencing.

The first amendment addresses the same issue the President addressed this morning in Florida, and that is the problem we have with children and drugs. The amendment I have offered recognizes the fact that there is a drug pusher almost literally standing at the doorway of every junior high school in America. In addition, increasingly drug pushers use children to deliver the drug and to take the cash, because it is at that point of transaction, where the exchange between money and drugs actually occurs, that you have the strongest possibility of prosecution. And so, what is increasingly happening in our country is not only are drug pushers exploiting our children by selling drugs outside the doorway—and sometimes inside the doorway—of what would seem to be every junior high school in America, but increasingly our children are being used in drug conspiracies to actually transfer the drug and take the money.

Recognizing this incredible tragedy, I have repeatedly offered an amendment to require 10 years in prison without parole for selling drugs to a minor or for using a minor in drug trafficking or a drug conspiracy. Two years ago I strengthened that amendment to add life imprisonment without parole on a repeat offense.

The thing I think would be most stunning for people to know is that while we have adopted my amendment on minimum mandatory sentencing for selling drugs to children or using our children in drug sales, every time we have debated a crime bill this decade, that amendment has been adopted, and yet it has never become the law of the land. In fact, in President Clinton's so-called crime bill, in 1994, Congress overturned minimum mandatory sentencing for drug felons and, by giving discretion to judges, in essence, guaranteed that the minimum sentencing provisions we had, were largely eliminated.

This spring and summer we are going to debate crime again. I want to put my colleagues on notice. I am going to offer this amendment again: 10 years in prison without parole for selling drugs to a minor or using a minor in drug trafficking; life imprisonment without parole on the second offense. I am not going to stop until, this year, we make that amendment the law of the land.

The second provision, which I have offered now for the better part of a decade—and it normally gets an overwhelming majority in the Senate, but it never becomes law—is 10 years in prison without parole for possessing a firearm during the commission of a violent crime or a drug felony; 20 years for discharging the firearm; life imprisonment without parole for killing somebody, and, in aggravated cases, the death penalty. That provision has consistently been adopted, but what always happens is in the conference committee, where we work out the differences between the Senate bill and the House bill, it ends up being dropped. I do not intend to see that happen this year.

We have proven in the District of Columbia and all over the planet that gun control does not work. But if we add 10 years in prison without parole for simply possessing a firearm during a violent crime or drug felony, in addition to the penalty for the violent crime and drug felony, if we add 20 years for discharging the firearm, if we had the death penalty for killing somebody, we could begin to do something about gun violence in America. I am ready. The Senate has been ready, at least in terms of the public votes we cast. But in the private votes, in conference committee, this provision, year after year after year, has been dropped. It is time for that to stop.

Finally, I want to put prisoners to work in America. It seems that every year somebody offers an amendment—normally, our dear colleague from North Carolina, Senator HELMS—to ban

trade with some country that uses prison labor, and every year I wonder why we cannot use prison labor. We have 1.1 million people in prison in America, yet we have three Federal statutes, all arising out of the Depression era, that criminalize prison labor in America: the Hawes-Cooper Act, the Summers-Ashurst Act, and the Walsh-Healey Public Contracting Act. Each effectively limits our ability to have people work in prison to produce goods for sale.

One bill says it is a felony if you produce something in prison and send it across State lines; another bill limits the transport of such goods; another limits the use of prison labor in regard to Federal contracts. Converted into English, what that says is that it is illegal to make prisoners work. I do not understand that.

I want to repeal these three statutes. I want to turn our prisons into industrial parks. I want to make prisoners work 10 hours a day, 6 days a week, and I want to make them go to school at night. We spent \$22,000 a year last year to keep somebody in the Federal penitentiary. If we stop building prisons like Holiday Inns, if we make prisoners work, I believe we could cut that cost by 50 percent in 5 years, and cut it by three-quarters in 10 years, and I think that ought to be our objective.

So I think it is time to stop talking about the crime problem and start doing something about it.

I remind my colleagues that last year in the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill, the committee adopted an amendment that I authored that would repeal these three laws. But guess what happened? It was not in the final version of the bill. The same thing that has happened on minimum mandatory sentencing for selling drugs to children, the same thing that has happened on minimum mandatory sentencing for gun violence. We cast votes in the Senate—in public everybody says, "Great," they are really serious about this problem—and then some of our most senior Members meet in the dark, dingy corners of some room here in this magnificent building and these great proposals die.

I believe the time has come for that to stop. I think these are three changes that need to be made, and I intend to continue to fight for them. It is our Republican agenda. I want to make it happen.

I thank our colleague from Georgia for his great leadership, and I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Texas, and I wish him well on the efforts to secure the adoption of his amendments.

We have been joined by the Senator from New Mexico. I yield, if he is prepared, up to 10 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAIG). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first, I want to thank the distinguished jun-

ior Senator from Georgia, a Republican, for arranging this floor time, to give us an opportunity to talk to the issue of drugs and crime.

The remarks that the President made in Miami today concerning the administration's new drug control strategy—and I underline the word "new"—come as a great surprise to me. Accompanying the President was the new drug czar, General McCaffrey. He has been a rather outstanding American general, and while he has only been on this job a little more than a month, he is already having an impact on the policies of this administration.

But in the past 3 years, since the President took office, drug use by children between the ages of 12 and 17 has increased 50 percent. Cocaine used by high school students has increased 36 percent during that same period of time. Juvenile crimes have increased dramatically during this same period, and studies show that drug use is closely linked to juvenile crime. According to the Justice Department, in 1994, one out of three juvenile offenders was under the influence of drugs at the time of their arrest.

There are several aspects to the drug and crime problem that I would like to touch upon today. They include drug use, interdiction, and juvenile crime as it relates to drugs.

As you know, Mr. President, my home State is in the southwestern part of America. In fact, New Mexico and Mexico share 175 miles of common border. I say that looking directly at the Senator from Georgia, because some Olympic organizers got confused and did not think there was a border. They thought New Mexico was Mexico. We have straightened that out, at least temporarily.

But to show that, seriously, we understand this issue, we have 175 miles of common border, and without an effective drug control interdiction strategy involving help from the Mexican Government, that 175 miles can and, I might say does, serve as a huge segment of the pipeline through which illegal drugs flow to these United States.

It is not uncommon for contrabandistas to cross the border at El Paso or Santa Teresa into New Mexico. Incidentally, some of these individuals are human mules. Others are actually accompanied by donkeys or other animals that have been fit with packets of illegal drugs and, in many cases, have been fed the illegal drugs—literally ingested them.

Mexican drug gangs also are responsible for large quantities of methamphetamine, or speed, as we commonly know it, as well as other drugs which have begun to pose particularly difficult problems in the Western States.

When the FBI and the DEA appeared before the Senate Banking Committee in March, their prepared statements included the following information:

Of three dominant Mexican drug gangs, one is located in Juarez, just an hour by car

from a city in New Mexico called Las Cruces. This Juarez cartel is headed by Amado Carrillo Fuentes, the most powerful figure in the Mexican drug trade. He is known as "the lord of the skies" because he owns several airplanes and, indeed, several airline companies which enable him to fly 727 jet airplanes from Colombia into Juarez.

We used to wonder about interdicting twin engine Piper Cubs and Cessnas and single engines. We cannot catch this fellow, this "lord of the skies," because he is so big, strong and rich that he has his own airlines. His group is directly associated with the Rodriguez Orejuela drug mafia in Cali, Colombia, and through a cousin to the Ochoa brothers of the Medellin cartel as well.

This Juarez cartel acts as the transportation agent for the Colombia-based distribution organizations, and the cartel's operations include the use of 18-wheelers to transport money. Murders in Juarez have increased and have been associated with Carrillo Fuentes. For instance, in July of 1995, the leader of the juvenile gang Carrillo Fuentes used to smuggle drugs across the border, was found shot 23 times in the head.

These Mexican transportation organizations are full partners with the Colombians in the drug trade. They are full and total partners—it is customary for them to split 50-50 the drug profits.

I was shocked by this information, but it is accurate. As I said, it was excerpted from the testimony of the FBI and the DEA before the Senate Banking Committee on Mexican-American cooperation with reference to stopping the flow of drugs into this country.

My State, because of its proximity, has been particularly affected by the inability of the Republic of Mexico to deal with the illegal trade. A group, which I helped establish, called New Mexico First, recently published a report on crime in New Mexico. The results of the report show that there is a direct link between drug use and crime in my State. The report notes, and I quote, "A common and reoccurring characteristic [of those committing crime in New Mexico] is substance abuse."

According to the report, 75 percent of those arrested in 1994 and 1995 admitted to using illegal drugs. Sixty percent of the criminals in New Mexico tested positive for at least one illegal drug at the time of their arrest, and 18 percent of females arrested were under the influence of three or more illegal substances.

New Mexico first, in its report, also notes that the use of cocaine by criminals has doubled from 1992 to 1994. Amphetamine use was up fourfold during the same period.

In his speech today, the President asked Congress to increase funding for the drug war by 9.3 percent to give schools, hospitals, and communities the tools they need to fight the war on drugs, however, he offered few specific details on how this money was to be used.

The President is correct to emphasize the methamphetamine threat, which is growing every day. Nationwide that threat has risen 256 percent over the 1991 level. We are seeing it as a growing problem in New Mexico schools, and much of it is manufactured in Mexico.

Not too long ago 700 pounds of speed was intercepted in Las Cruces, NM. I just told you that is 1 hour from the Juarez headquarters of the very major gang that I described. That drug, which causes hallucinations, paranoia, and wrecks a lot of lives, is in abundance in my State. And it is becoming more abundant in America, not just in the border States.

In the city of Albuquerque, we saw a group of young girls aged 10 to 13 breaking into homes to steal jewelry, that they would sell to kids doing drugs. The kids doing drugs would sell the stolen property to pay for their drug habits. Several of the young girls have been charged with as many as 30 felonies. It is a real problem.

But, actions speak louder than words. The day after taking office the Clinton administration cut the Office of National Drug Policy staff by more than 80 percent. Soon after taking office the Attorney General announced that she wanted to reduce the mandatory sentences for drug trafficking and related Federal crimes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has spoken for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask the Senator, can I have 3 additional minutes?

Mr. COVERDELL. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Consequently, Federal drug prosecutions dropped 12 percent in the first 2 years of the Clinton administration. From 1992 to 1995, 227 agent positions were eliminated from the DEA. And President Clinton's 1995 budget proposed cutting 621 enforcement positions for DEA, FBI, INS, and Customs.

Fortunately, in the Subcommittee of Appropriations which I was privileged to serve on, we restored most of these positions. The Clinton administration also has shifted funding priorities away from drug interdiction to treatment of hardcore users.

The President asked for an increase, but gave no specifics about what to do with the money. I have some specifics. Reintroduce the drug education program for our youth that was developed in the 1980's. Programs like "just say no" had a visible impact on reducing drug use.

Adopt a policy of treating violent juvenile offenders in the same manner as we treat violent adult offenders. The current system fosters a lack of respect for law and the courts and encourages the commission of more crimes by more juveniles. We are reluctant to hold them accountable. As a matter of fact, we wait until they have been arrested innumerable times, incarcerated innumerable times, before we decide that they must truly be held accountable.

A survey of judges showed that 93 percent thought that juvenile offenders should be fingerprinted, which they are not. And 85 percent said that juvenile arrest records should be available to adult authorities. They are not. I believe both should become a part of

common practice. While the State's business is the State's business, I believe that if we are going to supply more and more aid to fight crime, we ought to begin to ask States to do these kinds of things.

The judges want to fingerprint juveniles so we have permanent records of their criminal acts. They want the arrest records to be available, just as adult records. Perhaps there should be a time limit, maybe not 13 years of age, but starting maybe at 12. But essentially we must act and act quickly in this regard.

So I come to the floor of the Senate to say that the President's speech today was long past due. It is almost too late for the President to have credibility on this issue. Actually, if the distinguished general that recently was hired after the drug policy office was rendered a nullity, if the office would have been funded and had somebody like the general in charge 3 years ago, just look at the results we might be expecting today. For he has already taken charge and is doing some very positive things.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia, I welcome the opportunity to speak on this subject and again thank him for arranging the time. I hope it is educational. I hope the people of our country learn from it, as the Senator expects them to. Most of all, I hope we do some very constructive things with reference to this issue. I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I would remind him, as he spoke of what has not happened over the past 3 years, that there are consequences of that, the most specific of which is that where we had 1.5 million teenagers caught up in this vicious cycle, we now have 3 years later 3 million. So 1.5 million teenagers have been steered to this problem because of our lack of attention, each one of those a personal tragedy in and of itself.

I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his eloquent remarks on this subject. I now yield up to 10 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. Thank you, Mr. President.

I come to the floor to echo the words of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, as well as Georgia. We just heard the statistics on teenagers and drug abuse, misuse. I had the pleasure this morning of sitting around the breakfast table with my youngest son, who is now 9 years of age, and had the opportunity to wish him happy birthday. And across the table at breakfast this morning, I was thinking about what to say and how to express it, and I looked in the eyes of my 12-year-old son, whose birthday is in 8 days, and he will be 13 years of age.

We just heard the statistics. But the backdrop of what I had to say, as I looked at my children, who are a part of that generation, sitting around the breakfast table, was that survey done by the Department of Health and



Human Services, where drug use among teenagers rose from 2.4 million 4 years ago to 3.8 million in 1994. Marijuana use increased 137 percent among 12- to 13-year-olds—the exact age of my son—since 1992. Marijuana use increased 200 percent among 14- to 15-year-olds during this same period.

This, I might add, sharply contrasts with the Reagan-Bush record where between 1979 and 1992, overall drug use declined more than 50 percent.

So that is the backdrop. It is the concern for the current young generation, the generation of our children.

President Clinton referred to action over the last 3 years, as we heard his words this morning, but the action has not been there. Ever since the start of 1996, President Clinton has been shouting about law and order. He capped his efforts today by unveiling in Miami a new drug strategy. But what you are seeing now, I am afraid, is no more than yet another demonstration of President Clinton's lack of candor with the American people. And all you have to do is go back and look at what has happened over the last 3 years.

President Clinton, in spite of his rhetoric, has been soft on crime. He has appointed judges who favor the rights of criminals over law-abiding citizens. He abandoned, as we have heard, the war on drugs. Only now in this election year does he rediscover the crime and drug issue.

As the old saying goes, "Shame on you for fooling me once, but shame on me for being fooled twice." So, before we are fooled once again by President Clinton's law and order rhetoric, we should take a closer look at the actual—I call it "dismal"—record of law enforcement and drug policy over the past 3 years.

Going back to 1992, when Clinton claimed, in an effort to win the war on drugs, he would put a premium on drug interdiction, at that time he stated: "We need an effective, coordinated drug interdiction program that stops the endless flow of drugs entering our schools, our streets, and our communities." He further stated he would provide cities and States with the help they need. It sounds good. Who could possibly disagree with this strategy?

If you look at the actual record of President Clinton, once he was elected, not only did he not pursue new efforts to stop drugs from entering this country, he gutted existing drug interdiction efforts.

First, the newly elected President Clinton cut—cut—his drug policy office staff by 83 percent. He cut the staff from 146 employees to 25 employees. Then he had his National Security Council drop the drug war from one of its top three priorities to No. 29, and there were only 29 priorities on the list.

In 1993, President Clinton stopped the training of new DEA agents. What a contrast this was to the drug interdiction record of President Bush, who trained 347 DEA agents in 1992 alone.

Does President Clinton's commitment to fighting drugs sound bad? Unfortunately, there is more when we look at the record. President Clinton cut Federal spending on drug interdiction by 14 percent during his first 2 years as President. Now, in the fiscal year 1996 budget request, he wants to cut drug interdiction spending by 37 percent from 1991 levels. His misguided efforts to gut drug interdiction programs have resulted in America losing its war on drugs.

With fewer DEA agents, there have been fewer drug prosecutions and fewer convictions. Between 1992 and 1994, Federal drug prosecutions dropped by 12.5 percent. Furthermore, fewer drugs are being stopped at the border. From 1993 to the 6 months of 1995, the transit zone so-called "disruption rate"—that is the ability of U.S. forces to seize or turn back drug shipments—dropped 53 percent from 435 kilograms per day to 205 kilograms. This means that in all probability, approximately 84 metric tons of additional illegal drugs may be arriving on the streets of America.

With fewer drugs being stopped at the border, drugs are more readily available. Under President Clinton, the supply of drugs has increased so much that between February 1993 and February 1995, the price of cocaine fell by 20 percent and the price of heroin fell by 37 percent.

Clinton's soft-on-crime approach to drug interdiction has paralleled the increase that I opened with, drug abuse among our children, with those children who, at the age of my 12- to 13-year-old Harrison, marijuana use has increased 137 percent.

We should resume, not desert, the war on drugs. So, face it, we have to look at the actions. The actions do speak louder than words. I commend President Clinton for coming forward today, but we should look at what he has done those last 3 years. While President Clinton plays lip service to the rights of law-abiding citizens, his abandonment of drug interdiction efforts has left children all over America vulnerable to drug-dealing thugs. To make matters worse, President Clinton has sprinkled his judicial appointments with judges who go out of their way to put criminals back on the streets.

Mr. President, in closing, after looking at President Clinton's crime record over the past 3 years, there is only one conclusion that anyone with common sense can have about it: President Clinton has been soft on crime and drugs, and he is trying to conceal this fact through rhetoric during this election year. It is time to be tough on crime for the future of our children.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Tennessee. I will ask unanimous consent—we negotiated with the other side—for an additional 5 minutes on our time, and then I will yield up to 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Let me thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding and in assuming the Chair so I could speak for a few moments on this very important issue.

I want to thank the Senator from Tennessee for relating, I think, the kind of concerns that all of us have today about the future of our young people and the kind of environment in which they live and survive in. I use the word "survive" because I think when the Presiding Officer and I were growing up, the kinds of stresses in the communities, the kind of peer pressure we had, was so significantly different than it is today. There is no doubt that access to drugs, the availability of drugs, the kind of statistics that we have heard quoted here in the last little while prey heavily upon young people and provide them not only with unique opportunities, but with tremendous courses toward disaster if they choose to make themselves available to these drugs.

I must say that when I look at the statistics today, when I see there was an effort begun in this country in 1979 and early 1980 and throughout the 1980's by Members of the Senate and Members of the House, the administrations of that time, to focus Federal law enforcement and dollars to the interdiction of drugs coming into our communities and into our economy, and in doing so, we found out that it was working. We found out that illicit drugs plummeted in their usage from 24 million in 1979 to about 11.4 million by 1992. The so-called casual use of cocaine fell by 79 percent between 1985 and 1990, while monthly cocaine use fell 55 percent between 1988 and 1992.

It was not by accident, Mr. President, that that was happening. It was happening because this country, its Government and its law enforcement community, was focused. We recognized the crisis in urban America and the crisis on the streets that was dragging our young people into it. It was a drug crisis. That is why Americans told us, "Something has to be done. We are concerned about the future of our country and the future of our young people."

As recently as December of this past year, in a Gallup poll, an issue that had begun to slide on the polling of Americans as to a No. 1 issue was up again, to show that 94 percent of Americans viewed illegal drug use, again, as a crisis and a very serious problem for our society, and that something must be done about it.

That is what was going on out there. Of course, you have heard speakers here on the floor today speak of the President's initiatives announced today in a backdrop of something or nothing having been done for the first 3 years of his administration—or, I should say, a great deal being done, but none of it right: a near collapse of the drug program in this Government, the laying off of employees and personnel in the area of drug enforcement, and



the focus of this administration largely disappearing from a high priority to a very low priority, showing very clearly that when you focus and when you direct resources on a problem of this nature, you can have a substantial impact. We were beginning to show the real results of the availability of these drugs on the streets, and, of course, if they are on the streets, then there is an opportunity for our young people to have access to them.

Perhaps 820,000 of the new crop of youthful marijuana smokers will eventually try cocaine. That is a statistic that has just come from a study done by the Senate Judiciary Committee, published by the chairman, ORRIN HATCH—a horrible statistic, in light of the fact that we are now being told by the criminologists of our country, "Get braced, America, for the greatest juvenile crime wave in the history of our country." What is it driven by? In part, it is driven by drugs, or the desire to have access to them and, therefore, the willingness to commit crimes to have the resources to pay for them. These are horrible statistics that we must become aware of.

I am so pleased today that the Senator from Georgia has taken this special order to speak to this issue. I say, Mr. President, thank you for waking up. But shame on you for turning your back, in the last 3 years, on an initiative that was working well and removing drugs from our streets and was creating a better environment for our youth.

Better late than never? I hope so, because I think the American people want it, and I certainly hope this President will focus the resources of our Government, once again, toward aggressive interdiction and a program worthy of this country in getting drugs off of our streets and making the environment in which our children live a safer place. I yield the remainder of my time.

(Mr. CRAIG assumed the chair.)

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. COVERDELL. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the Senator from Idaho for his remarks on this terribly important issue. If we can just step back for a moment and try to put this situation into perspective, it began with the inauguration of President Clinton. The first sign from the White House was the suspension of the preemployment drug testing program at the White House of the United States. From that moment on, the message became clearer and clearer. We have heard all the statistics that have emanated since—a shutting down of the policy of interdiction, law enforcement, and education saying to America's youth that drugs are harmful.

The result of these changed policies are these: America's youth today no longer think drugs are dangerous. That

statistic has plummeted. So it should come as no surprise to any of us that usage has skyrocketed. They no longer are afraid because of signals like no more drug testing or, "Let us legalize drugs," or, "Let us shut the drug czar's office down," or do not mention drugs at all in 3 years. So that pulpit is shut off, the resources are shut off, our youngsters no longer think it is a problem, and they start exploring drugs. The result is that we have gone from just under 2 million using them to almost 4 million. So that means that 2 million American families and 2 million teenagers' lives are stunted or put at risk as a result of these policies that have been changed.

Mr. President, in closing, the ripple effect of this is stunning. I was with President Zedillo of Mexico a couple of weeks ago, and he said that the drug lords' attack on his country is the single greatest threat of national security to that nation. I say, further, Mr. President, that drugs in the narco operations are the single greatest threat to the security of the democracies in our hemisphere.

Mr. President, in closing, I say that this is the first time a war has ever been declared on children age 8 to 12 years old. What a disgusting, evil force we stand against. This is a war we cannot afford to lose.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk continued calling the roll.

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

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

#### MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR—S. 1708

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill due for its second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1708) to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify the remedial jurisdiction of inferior Federal courts.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I object to further proceedings on this matter at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed on the calendar under rule XIV.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as I understand the floor situation, we will

now return for a continued discussion on the immigration bill, and then at 5 o'clock, the time has been designated for a vote on cloture relating to a matter on that immigration bill. Am I correct?

#### IMMIGRATION CONTROL FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1664, and under a previous order, at the hour of 5 p.m., the clerk will report a motion to invoke cloture.

The clerk will state the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1664) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase control over immigration to the United States by increasing border patrol and investigative personnel and detention facilities, improving the system used by employers to verify citizenship or work-authorized alien status, increasing penalties for alien smuggling and document fraud, and reforming asylum, exclusion, and deportation law and procedures; to reduce the use of welfare by aliens; and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Dole (for Simpson) amendment No. 3743, of a perfecting nature.

Dole (for Simpson) amendment No. 3744 (to amendment No. 3743), of a perfecting nature.

Dole motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report back forthwith.

Lott amendment No. 3745 (to the instructions of the motion to recommit), to require the report to Congress on detention space to state the amount of detention space available in each of the preceding 10 years.

Dole modified Amendment No. 3746 (to amendment No. 3745), to authorize the use of volunteers to assist in the administration of naturalization programs, port of entry adjudications, and criminal alien removal.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I was wondering if we could ask my friend from Arizona if we could divide the time between now and then between the two parties. I do not know how many other speakers we are going to have, but there may be some at the end. Just as a way of proceeding, maybe we can do that. If there is a reservation about it, I will continue to inquire of the Senator about some evenness in time. We might not approach that as an issue, but, more often than not, just before we get to the debate, a number of Senators would like to speak. I would like to see if we can reach some kind of way of allocating the time fairly and perhaps permitting Senators on both sides to make increasingly brief comments as we get closer to the time.

Mr. KYL. I do not have any objection to that. I know the Senator from Nevada wants to speak on unrelated matters now. Perhaps as we get further into that, the precise nature in which we can proceed may be more apparent to us later than it is now. I have no objection.