

the White House has been playing on this and would put some pressure on the administration to begin to act responsibly in this area.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator we are in morning business and is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### WORDS AND ACTIONS ON CRIME

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, one of the key measures of any government is how well it protects the people from the threat of violent crime. In the preamble to our Constitution, the charter of our Government, we are told the purpose of Government is to "establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility

Only by doing those things and doing them well do we hope to "secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity"

I would like to talk today about the record of the Clinton administration in regard to crime. In doing so, I will contend that mere words are not enough to fulfill that sacred trust between Government and the people. To fulfill its obligation, its obligation to protect people from crime, Government must act.

One of the President's closest advisers said recently, "Words are actions." Words are actions. They really are, Mr. President. The record of this administration gives grave cause for doubt.

For 2 years, 1993 and 1994, President Clinton and his party controlled the White House and both Houses of Congress. One-party control means the party in charge generally gets to set the agenda. It is pretty clear that the fight against crime should be at the top of any sensible national agenda.

Violent crime remains at historic highs. Every year 43 million Americans become victims of crime, and 10 million become victims of violent crime. Juvenile crime is a problem now of historic proportions.

Frankly, Mr. President, there is no reason to believe that this is going to change unless we take some very drastic measures. Here is why. Violent crimes by young people age 18 to 24 have gone up 50 percent since 1986. These young predators are moving coldly, dangerously into a career that will wreak havoc on their communities for years to come. That is bad enough.

But it will get even worse, even scarier, because while crime among 18- to

24-year-olds has gone up 50 percent, crime by even younger offenders, those aged 14 to 17, has gone up 150 percent—150 percent—since 1986. So if we think violent crime is bad now, wait until these 14- to 17-year-olds get into their prime age for crime, the late teens and early twenties. The problem we will have to face is when today's violent teenagers grow up. They are going to be a major social force in this country. To me, that would indicate cause for serious concern about the kind of America we are going to have in the next couple of decades.

Mr. President, the picture is bad in regard to violent crime. But, unfortunately, it does not get any better when we look at the issue of drugs. Since the Reagan-Bush years, marijuana use has tripled—tripled—among those 14 years of age and 15 years of age. In 1992, 1.6 million young people were reported to have used marijuana—1.6. Today that number has risen to 2.9 million.

Mr. President, one good way to find out what our real social problems are is to visit a hospital emergency room. Today cocaine-related episodes have hit their highest level in history. People talk about the 1980's as the cocaine decade. But visit any emergency room and you will see that it is even worse today.

Heroin-related episodes are rising, too. They jumped 66 percent in 1993 and have stayed at that higher level.

In summary, Mr. President, I think any fair observer would characterize this as a very bleak picture. A fair observer would say that violent crime, especially youth violence, is a major challenge to America and very probably the single greatest challenge we face in this country.

Let us talk for a moment about how the U.S. Government has coped with this crisis. Let us examine what the new Clinton administration wanted to do after they took office, what it proposed to do in its first 2 years. Then let us examine what the Clinton administration actually accomplished in its first 2 years. Finally, I would like to examine what was accomplished after the first 2 years.

Let us start first with the new administration's proposals. So I begin with the first phase: The new Clinton administration and its agenda and what they wanted to do.

For 2 years, Mr. President, 1993 and 1994, we had an undivided Government, a Government under the control of a single party. A President with a free hand could create positive change and do what is necessary to protect the American people from the plague of violent crime. What use was made of this opportunity? What did the new administration propose to do about this major national crisis?

Here is the answer. Here, Mr. President, if you can believe it, is what the new administration proposed to do. This is what the President's budget proposed to do. The President wanted to cut 790 agents out of the FBI. The

President wanted to cut 311 agents out of the DEA. The President wanted to cut 123 prosecutors, take them out of the Federal courts. The President wanted to construct zero—zero—new Federal prisons. Finally, the President wanted to cut prison personnel by 1,600. That was the proposed response of the Clinton administration to this major national crisis.

It is true, Mr. President, that much of this agenda did not actually become a reality. It did not happen because, fortunately, congressional approval was required. Again, fortunately, concerned Senators on both sides of the aisle said to the administration, "No. No way. We're not going to do it." Thanks to Senators like ORRIN HATCH, JOE BIDEN, PETE DOMENICI, FRITZ HOLLINGS, much of that misguided agenda was not passed, was defeated.

Let me turn, Mr. President, to the actual Clinton administration record. There is, Mr. President, of course, a lot that the President of the United States can do without congressional approval. The President has a great deal of discretion. Let us look at what the new administration actually did without congressional approval. I think when we look at this we will find that on every front of the war on crime there was a monumental retreat.

First, no new FBI agents were trained. No class. No FBI class.

Second, the White House Office of Drug Policy was absolutely gutted, an 83 percent cut in staff.

Next, the prosecution of gun criminals went down 20 percent. The prosecution in Federal court of those who use a gun in the commission of a felony went down 20 percent.

Prosecution of drug criminals—drug criminals—went down 12.5 percent.

No new FBI agents trained, the White House drug office was gutted, gun prosecutions down 20 percent, drug prosecutions down 12.5 percent. That is what the President did by himself.

Here is what else actually happened under the President's leadership.

Federal spending on drug interdiction went down 14 percent. The Federal drug budget accounts that fund anti-smuggling efforts dropped by 55 percent. In fact, the Clinton administration made a conscious decision to ignore the fact that drugs were coming into this country. They thought it would be enough to focus on the drugs once they were already in the country.

But, Mr. President, we should make no mistake, spending less on interdiction does have consequences. It does make a difference. According to recent Federal law enforcement statistics, the disruption rate, the amount of drugs that are blocked from actually entering the country, dropped 53 percent between 1993 and early 1995. The projection is an additional 84 metric tons of marijuana and cocaine coming into the United States every year.

What was the result of this cut? What was the result of this change in policy by the administration, change in emphasis?

Since 1991, Coast Guard seizures of cocaine are down 45 percent. Coast Guard seizures of marijuana are down 90 percent. The Clinton administration, unfortunately, has ignored a fundamental fact: Spending money on the antidrug effort does make a difference. When we make the antidrug fight a national priority, drug use does drop. Between 1981 and 1992 Federal spending on the drug war effort rose 700 percent. Over roughly the same period, drug use was cut in half.

But, tragically, the opposite has happened under the Clinton administration. Drugs have gotten cheaper. They are more easily available and more pervasive in the lives of our young people. Between 1993 and 1995, the retail price of a gram of cocaine fell during that 2-year period from \$172 to \$137. Over roughly the same period, answering a survey, the number of 8th graders who think it is bad to even try crack once or twice dropped from 61 percent to 51 percent. And overall teenage drug use is up 55 percent.

On measure after measure in the years 1993 and 1994, America's anticrime and antidrug effort lost ground. That was the Clinton administration's record of accomplishment. They faced a tough problem and had to make tough choices. The sad litany I have recited is the best they could do.

Now, moving to the third item I want to talk about, in 1995 there was a major change in the landscape of Federal crime-fighting policy. The new Senate came under new leadership. Over the last 16 months under that new leadership, a dramatically different effort on the issue of crime has emerged. Since January 1995, the majority leader, Senator DOLE, took over the helm of America's anticrime strategy. Here is America's new strategy for fighting crime: FBI agents, up 20 percent; DEA agents, up 15 percent; \$800 million in new funding for Federal prosecutors; \$3 billion in new funding for prisons; \$1 billion in grants to States and local communities so they can fight crime at the grassroots level from neighborhood to neighborhood to neighborhood.

Mr. President, that is a truly remarkable change. I do not believe it is just a coincidence. A pattern of differences as striking as this can lead to only one tenable conclusion. Only one major factor intervened between the dismal record of 1993 and 1994 and the truly remarkable resurgence in the Federal crime-fighting effort that has occurred over the last 16 months.

That one factor, Mr. President, is the new management in the Senate and the House. I suggest Senator Bob DOLE be given the credit he deserves for changing the culture of Washington in this very important way.

Mr. President, politics has been defined as the art of the possible. The best definition of leadership I ever heard is this: "Leadership is the art of changing the limits of what's possible."

Over the last 16 months, Mr. President, we have seen this happen in the

fight against crime. I think it is time that Senator DOLE got the recognition he deserves for a very, very impressive accomplishment. Further, Mr. President, I believe people should be paying more attention to actions and accomplishments than simply to election year conversions and all the rhetoric that they spawn.

The former chairman of the House Committee on Narcotics, a Democrat, once said he had "Never seen a President care less about drugs," referring to the President of the United States. The lackluster war on drugs is just one symptom of an overall abdication on the issue of crime itself.

Mr. President, as we prepare to say goodbye to Majority Leader DOLE, let me say I speak for many when I observe that we will miss his excellent leadership on this very vital and important issue. We owe him our thanks not for his words but, rather, for his actions.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

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

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

#### BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT VOTES

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, we probably all have been guilty at one time or another of getting a little carried away on the Senate floor when we are trying to present our position on an issue. I think we saw a little bit of that yesterday by those of us who want to protect Social Security, and I would like to take a minute to respond to some of those, I think, inflammatory remarks.

I think the junior Senator from Oklahoma was right on the edge when he was talking about the 33 Senators that had previously voted in opposition to a balanced budget which included the use of Social Security. It has been said that to treat your facts with imagination is one thing, but to imagine your facts is another. We saw just how big some people's imaginations were yesterday.

I was 1 of those 33. The junior Senator from Oklahoma accused me of coming to Washington and voting one way and going back to my State and talking another. I am sure he does not know how I talk in Kentucky. I am sure he does not follow me around. I am sure he does not take the paper clips from my newspapers to see how I am quoted in my local paper.

Mr. President, I thought we were beyond the pony express era. I thought that we were on C-SPAN and 60 million people could immediately see how you

vote and what you say and they would know that before you get home. I have represented my State, now, for almost 22 years here in the Senate. I have been fortunate to have been reelected by a large percentage. I think when I vote and I explain my vote to my people some may not like it but they understand the reason for it.

Mr. President, I voted for a balanced budget amendment until this time. Then we were labeled, yesterday, as BBA 6. So I am one of the BBA 6's now. I do not know exactly what that means, except when the leadership on the Republican side sat down in the Democratic Cloakroom, and with a fountain pen wrote how much money they would be taking from Social Security each of the next 7 years, how much they would be taking from Social Security to balance the budget, that is when I reneged. That is when I said if you want my vote, put a firewall in as it relates to Social Security. Now I have that piece of paper, Mr. President. It is in my file and I will keep it. It is the handwriting of some of the leadership on the Republican side, how many billions of dollars, and as I recall the last 2 years, roughly \$147 billion they were going to take out of Social Security trust fund.

Now, when the junior Senator from Oklahoma says those of us who voted "no" last time, the 33, did not want a balanced budget, I just disagree with that. How can he say I do not want a balanced budget amendment? All I say is build a firewall for Social Security. You could have 70-odd votes if you do that. It would be easy to pass. But, no, the Republicans want an issue. They want an issue. They do not want it passed. They lost a vote today for one reason and one reason only. You are talking about star wars, and you have one of the greatest minds as it relates to defense in this country in the Senate in SAM NUNN, the Senator from Georgia, who was vehemently opposed. He said you are mandating that we put it in to spend \$60 billion and you do not know whether it will work. Let us research it for another 3 years. You are not going to get it up any faster. Then in 3 years you will know it will work, and then let us do it. No, we were forced into the vote on the basis that we shall do it whether we know if it will work or not, and at a cost of \$60 billion, and that is right behind that attempted \$700 billion tax break—in one day. And the next day, they holler, "The sky is falling." So you have turned at least one Senator off as it relates to the political tactics being used on the Senate floor.

Now, we have 10 fictitious reasons for voting against the balanced budget amendment. There is only one reason, in my mind. We have heard a lot about a contract. We have heard a lot about a contract now for almost 2 years. Well, we had a contract with the farmers called the Freedom to Farm Act. Signed it, passed it. A contract. Within