

schemes used by these States and others nearly single handedly created double-digit increases in Federal Medicaid spending in the early 1990's. Congress shut down these schemes in 1991 and 1993 by creating State-specific and hospital-specific limits on DSH payments. However, through Republican maneuvering under this omnibus bill, two States that relied on these schemes will once again disproportionately benefit from the Federal Treasury.

First, New Hampshire will receive Federal matching payments for the disproportionate share hospital payments it made last year to a State-owned psychiatric hospital, even though these payments violate the hospital-specific limits enacted in 1993. The Department of Health and Human Services has deferred making Federal matching payments because these DSH payments normally would not be allowable under Medicaid matching rules. The omnibus appropriations bill would allow New Hampshire to receive matching payments up to \$54 million, whether these payments are allowable or not.

In addition, although the majority intended to provide a fix only for New Hampshire, other States may also qualify under this provision.

Second, Louisiana will receive a guaranteed Federal payment of \$2.6 billion—even though it will not be putting up the State dollars necessary to claim these matching payments. This provision, in essence, provides Louisiana with a higher Federal matching rate than allowed under current law, simply because Louisiana is unwilling or unable to commit sufficient State funds to support its existing Medicaid Program. Louisiana also used DSH scams to draw enormous Federal Medicaid payments and is now facing a budget shortfall under current, tighter rules. CBO initially estimated that this fix will cost the Federal Government an additional \$900 million through 1999. Late-breaking negotiations have shortened the time-frame and lessened the Federal cost in the out-years. However, increased spending still will not be offset because the increase occurs later than fiscal year 1996.

In 1991 and 1993 Congress chose to close down some States' creative book-keeping schemes and construct reasonable limits to the disproportionate share hospital program. These appropriations provisions will undermine those important protections for the Federal Treasury. If congressional Republicans were serious about limiting Federal spending, they would have refused to include these give-aways in this appropriations agreement. Instead, Congress will provide additional funding with no additional gain to American taxpayers.

The Republican Governors say that they can control Medicaid spending themselves—and they have clamored for Federal block grants to do so. Yet the Republican Governors in these two States sought these exceptions to Medicaid law. These legislative fixes signal

that the Republican Governors in these States cannot even live within existing limits that control only one aspect of the Medicaid Program. If Medicaid block grants were to be enacted, we should expect a deluge of formula fixes in the future.●

#### RELIEF OF NATHAN C. VANCE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Further, for our leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 383, S. 966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 966) for the relief of Nathan C. Vance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be deemed read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

So the bill (S. 966) was deemed to have been read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 966

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. PAYMENT TO NATHAN C. VANCE.

(a) PAYMENT.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary of Agriculture shall pay \$4,850.00 to Nathan C. Vance of Wyoming for fire loss arising out of the Mink Area Fire in and around Yellowstone National Park in 1988.

(b) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the amount specified in subsection (a) from amounts made available under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) CONDITION OF PAYMENT.—The payment made pursuant to subsection (a) shall be in full satisfaction of the claim of Nathan C. Vance against the United States, for fire loss arising out of the Mink Area Fire, that was received by the Forest Service in August 1990.

#### AMERICAN FOREIGN SERVICE DAY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Also, for our leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 381, Senate Resolution 217.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 217) to designate the first Friday in May, 1996 as "American Foreign Service Day."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

So the resolution (S. Res. 217) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution with its preamble is as follows:

#### S. RES. 217

Whereas the American Foreign Service was established in 1924 and some 11,600 men and women now serve with the foreign affairs agencies of the United States at home and abroad;

Whereas the diplomatic, consular, communications, trade, development, and numerous other functions these men and women perform constitute the first and most cost-effective line of defense of our Nation by protecting and promoting United States interests abroad;

Whereas the men and women of the American Foreign Service are increasingly exposed to risks and danger to themselves and their families, even in times of peace, and many have died in the service of their country;

Whereas in this uncertain post-Cold War era, an ever-vigilant American Foreign Service remains essential to the strategic, political, and economic well-being of this Nation by strengthening the United States' relations with other countries and promoting a safer, more peaceful world.

Whereas the United States Government's foreign affairs agencies and the American Foreign Service Association have observed Foreign Service Day on the first Friday in May for many years; and

Whereas it is both appropriate and just for the country as a whole to recognize the dedication of the men and women of the American Foreign Service and to honor those who have given their lives in the loyal pursuit of their duties and responsibilities representing the interests of the United States of America and of its citizens: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) commend the men and women who have served or are presently serving in the American Foreign Service for their dedicated and important service to country;

(2) honor those in the American Foreign Service who have given their lives in the line of duty; and

(3) designate the first Friday in May 1996 as "American Foreign Service Day".

The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States and the Federal, State, and local administrators to observe the day with the appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

#### ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 1996

Mr. GRASSLEY. Also, Mr. President, for our leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 9 a.m. on Wednesday, May 1; further, that immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed of, the morning hour be deemed

to have expired, and there then be a period for morning business with Senator LUGAR to be recognized for up to 45 minutes. I further ask that immediately following Senator LUGAR's statement the Senate resume consideration of the immigration bill.

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

#### PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the Senate will tomorrow resume consideration of S. 1664. That is the immigration bill. That will be tomorrow morning. Senators should be reminded that there will be a cloture vote on the bill immediately following the vote on the Simpson amendment.

It is the hope of the majority leader that we will complete action on the immigration bill during Wednesday's session. All Senators can therefore be expected to have rollcall votes throughout tomorrow's session.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following my remarks.

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

#### THE NATION'S DRUG STRATEGY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, yesterday I did not have an opportunity to participate in a very important series of speeches on the subject of the national drug strategy that were spoken by several of my colleagues, particularly on this side of the aisle. I am sorry I was not able to do that. That was under the leadership of Senator COVERDELL, and I compliment Senator COVERDELL for his leadership in that area. So, it is at this point, albeit 1 day later, that I would like to comment on our Nation's drug strategy.

Mr. President, when I returned to Washington after the Easter recess, I returned with a lot on my mind. During the last week of Easter recess I held a series of meetings across Iowa to brainstorm with parents, educators, law enforcement officers, country attorneys, probation officers, juvenile court officials, social service and youth specialists, and high school students. I wanted to hear their views on juvenile delinquency, violence, and drug use. I held these meetings to follow up on a town meeting I held in February. I did this, in part, as preparation for the reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Act. We need to take a hard look at what works and where the act needs to be updated in order to meet today's requirements.

The meetings highlighted the deep concern of the public over the growing problem of violence and drug use among the Nation's young people. One

of the causes of difficulties is the ease of availability of illegal drugs to today's young people. Not only do illegal drugs destroy families and ruin the lives of individuals; they exact a heavy cost on society as a whole. Whether it is in rising health care costs, losses at work, or greater risks on our highways and streets, drugs exact a heavy toll. Conservative estimates put the costs at over \$67 billion a year. That does not include the costs of the drugs themselves. Nor is it a measure of human misery, which cannot be reduced to dollars and cents. When linked to rising crime and violence among our young people, the problems become even more disturbing.

Juvenile crime is not new but it is rising nationwide. What is worse, experts say kids commit more violent crimes today and show less remorse. In the last decade, murders committed by teens increased by 150 percent. Just recently, three children, one 6-year-old and two twins, aged 8, invaded the house of a neighbor to steal a tricycle. The 6-year-old, the ring leader, used the occasion to savagely attack an infant in its crib. The infant, beat and kicked by the 6-year-old, is not expected to live, and if he does live, he is likely to have brain damage. The crime was premeditated and vicious. Unfortunately, this tale of children killing children is becoming increasingly common. As is drug use among teenagers and even elementary school kids.

What is unfortunate about this rise in drug use is that it comes after years of declines. It comes after we had made considerable progress. After years in which "Just Say No" helped lift a generation of kids past the most vulnerable years—ages 12 to 20. Not only is use returning, but kids see less danger in using drugs than just a few years ago. Somewhere we put a foot wrong, and now we face the prospect of a new generation of addicts.

We cannot let this happen. Recently, I cochaired a congressional task force to lay the groundwork for fighting back. Last week I held a hearing on the domestic consequences of drug trafficking and use. Last month the Task Force on National Drug Policy, convened by Senator DOLE and Speaker GINGRICH, released "Setting the Course: A National Drug Strategy". In that report, we set out many of the prevention, treatment, law enforcement, and interdiction initiatives that we need to undertake to respond to the growing challenge of returning drug use. Senator HATCH, Congressman ZELIFF and I, along with others, have been working to put the drug issue back on the national agenda after years of neglect and virtual silence from the administration.

Yesterday, the administration, belatedly, issued its own strategy on how to fight back. While I welcome General McCaffrey, the new drug czar, to the fray, I am concerned that the strategy released by the administration is long on platitudes and shy on substance.

While I do not doubt the General's sincerity, I am not all that confident in the administration's commitment to supporting him. Indeed, the General's first task is imply to recover much of the ground lost in the last 3 years. His effort is aimed at damage control. The strategy, unfortunately, is a prisoner to that effort. And it shows. It outlines fine sentiments, but it is skimpy on any measurable standards. It is hard to fault such language as the strategy contains. But it says little other than it is against drugs. It offers little in concrete measures to determine whether intent will be backed up by deeds. And it fights shy of providing any criteria to measure success.

I know that General McCaffrey intends to do all in his power to fight this problem, but when it comes to serious effort, my response is, "Show me, don't tell me." It is important that we get action not more words.

This administration has been more than invisible on the drug issue in the past 3 years. It has tried to bury the drug issue. The first official act on drugs of this administration was to gut the drug czar's office. To cut its staff by 80 percent. It was this administration's first Surgeon General that called for the legalization of drugs. It was this administration that replaced "Just Say No" with "Just Say Nothing." It was this administration that replaced a strategy that was working with one that has presided over one of the largest increases in use in the last 30 years. Furthermore, in the past 3 years under this administration's approach, the movement to legalize drugs has gained momentum.

It is *deja vu* all over again. Music, movies, and the media have begun to glamorize drug use. To normalize it in print and song. Meanwhile the response from the administration to rising teenage drug use or the effort to legalize dangerous drugs has been like pulling teeth to monitor, difficult to explain, and hard to spot with the naked eye.

It is only after growing criticism from Congress and from the public that the administration has begun, at long last, to at least talk about the drug issue. The President has had more to say about the drug issue in the past 2 months than in the past 3 years. It is about time. It is only after efforts by Congress to force a more serious strategy on the administration, and to insist upon accountability in programs, that the administration has begun to speak about meaningful efforts.

The administration is now talking about the need for a bipartisan effort. I, for one, welcome such an effort. But let us not mistake criticism of failed policies as partisanship. It is, after all, criticisms of the past few years of effort that have led to the present, election-year reversals. It is breaking the silence on poor performance and neglect that have led to renewed attention to drug policy. To the appointment of a new drug czar. To a rediscovered interest by the President in drug policy.