

costs out of their own pockets than do those who are under 65. This means the prices of prescription drugs have a greater impact on older Americans than on younger persons.

Four years ago, Families USA found that the prices of prescription drugs commonly used by older Americans were rising faster than the rate of inflation. To determine if this trend of steadily increasing prices for prescription drugs has improved, remained the same, or worsened, Families USA gathered information on the prices of the prescription drugs most heavily used by older Americans over the past five years. Using data from the Pennsylvania Pharmaceutical Assistance Contract for the Elderly (PACE) program, we analyzed the prices of the 50 top-selling prescription drugs most heavily used by older persons.

Our analysis shows that, in each of the past five years, the prices of the 50 prescription drugs most used by older Americans have increased considerably faster than inflation. While senior citizens generally live on fixed incomes that are adjusted to keep up with the rate of inflation, the cost of the prescription drugs they purchase most frequently has risen at approximately two times the rate of inflation over the past five years and more than four times the rate of inflation in the last year.

FINDINGS

The prices of the 50 prescription drugs most frequently used by the elderly rose by more than four times the rate of inflation during calendar year 1998. (The data on average drug price increases used in this report weight drug price increases by sales. This means that the average drug price increases reported take into account the market share of each of the 50 top-selling drugs. This is the methodology often used by industry sources.) On average, the prices of these top 50 drugs increased by 6.6 percent from January 1998 to January 1999, though the general rate of inflation in that period was 1.6 percent.

From January 1998 to January 1999, of the 50 drugs most commonly used by the elderly:

More than two-thirds of these drugs (36 out of 50) rose two or more times faster than the rate of inflation.

Nearly half of these drugs (23 out of 50) rose at more than three times the rate of inflation.

Over one-third of these drugs (17 out of 50) rose at more than four times the rate of inflation.

Among the 50 drugs most frequently used by seniors, the following drugs rose more significantly in price from January 1998 to January 1999:

Lorazepam (manufactured by Mylan and used to treat conditions such as anxiety, convulsions, and Parkinson's), which rose by over 279.4 percent (more than 179 times the rate of inflation);

Furosemide (a diuretic manufactured by Watson that is used to treat conditions such as hypertension and congestive heart failure), which rose by 106.6 percent (more than 68 times the rate of inflation);

Lanoxin (manufactured by Glaxo Wellcome and used to treat congestive heart failure), which rose by 15.4 percent (almost 10 times the rate of inflation);

Xalatan (manufactured by Pharmacia & Upjohn and used to treat glaucoma), which rose by 14.5 percent (more than nine times the rate of inflation); and

Atrovent (manufactured by Boehringer Ingelheim and used as a respiratory agent in the treatment of asthma, bronchitis, and emphysema), which rose by 14.1 percent (more than nine times the rate of inflation.)

Over the five years from January 1994 to January 1999, the prices of the 50 prescrip-

tion drugs most frequently used by older Americans rose twice as fast as the rate of inflation. On average, the prices of these drugs rose by 25.2 percent—twice the rate of inflation, which was 12.8 percent over that period.

Of the 50 drugs most frequently used by older Americans, 39 have been on the market for the five-year period from January 1994 to January 1999.

The prices of 36 of those 39 drugs increased faster than the rate of inflation over the five-year period.

More than two-thirds of those drugs (28 out of 39) rose at least 1.5 times as fast as the rate of inflation over the five-year period.

Nearly half of those drugs (19 out of 39) rose at more than two times the rate of inflation over the five-year period.

More than one-fourth of those drugs (10 out of 39) rose at least three times the rate of inflation over the five-year period.

Of the 39 drugs that were used most frequently by seniors and that were on the market for the period from January 1994 to January 1999, the drugs that rose most significantly in price are:

Lorazepam, which rose by over 385 percent (more than 30 times the rate of inflation);

Imdur (manufactured by Schering and used to treat angina), which rose by 111 percent (almost nine times the rate of inflation);

Furosemide, which rose by 107 percent (more than eight times the rate of inflation); Lanoxin, which rose by 88 percent (almost seven times the rate of inflation); and

Klor-Con 10 (manufactured by Upsher-Smith and used as a potassium replacement), which rose by 84 percent (more than six times the rate of inflation).

Of the 39 drugs that were used most frequently by seniors and that were on the market for the period from January 1994 to January 1999, 31 increased in price on at least five occasions during those five years. During those years, the following drugs increased in price at least seven times:

Imdur, which increased 10 times;

Premarin (manufactured by Wyeth-Ayerst and used as an estrogen replacement), which increased eight times;

Atrovent, which increased eight times;

Pravachol (manufactured by Bristol-Myers Squibb and used to reduce cholesterol), which increased seven times;

Synthroid (manufactured by Knoll and used as a synthetic thyroid agent), which increased seven times; and

K-Dur 20 (manufactured by Schering and used as a potassium replacement), which increased seven times.

During the last two years, there has been an acceleration in price increases of the drugs most commonly used by seniors. From 1995 to 1996 to 1997, those drug prices rose 1.3 and 1.2 times faster, respectively, than the rate of inflation. From 1997 to 1998 and 1998 to 1999, those drug prices rose 1.7 and 4.2 times faster, respectively, than the rate of inflation.

The median net profit for manufacturers of the 50 most prescribed drugs for senior citizens was 20.0 percent in 1998—4.5 times larger than the median net profit of 4.4 percent for all Fortune 500 companies.

AMERICA'S ROLE IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I rise to day to draw your attention to an informative and thought-provoking foreign policy lecture that our colleague and good friend, MIKE DEWINE, recently gave in Oxford, Ohio, at his alma mater—Miami University. His ad-

dress was a part of Miami University's distinguished Hammond Lecture Series, which first began nearly 38 years ago in January 1962. Our esteemed former colleague from Arizona, Barry Goldwater, presented the first lecture in the Series, which, incidentally, Senator DEWINE attended during his first visit to the Miami campus.

I draw your attention to Senator DEWINE's address because it focuses on a fundamental question that the American people, the President, and we here in Congress must consider. That question is this: "What role will the United States play in the world, as we enter the 21st Century? In posing this critical question, Senator DEWINE discusses several of the challenges and concerns that our country faces in forming a foreign policy doctrine for the future. I encourage you to take some time to read this reasoned, well-grounded piece, and consider the questions it raises.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the 1999 Hammond Lecture, given by Senator MIKE DEWINE, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

"AMERICA'S ROLE IN THE WORLD IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Dr. Shriver, thank you very much. It is always a daunting task to follow Dr. Shriver. And, for that kind introduction, I thank you. President Garland and members of the Hammond Lecture Series Committee—thank you for inviting me to be with all of you here tonight.

Dr. Shriver, my wife Fran, and I started at Miami University on the same day. Dr. Shriver started as President in the Fall of 1965, and Fran and I started as freshmen that same day. We all entered Miami together—Dr. Shriver just stayed here a little longer!

Fran and I did spend four very productive years here at Miami. We left with two degrees and two children—two children, by the way, who graduated from Miami and have married Miami graduates. Of our eight children, three—so far—also have graduated from Miami.

I am particularly honored to be giving the Dr. W.A. Hammond Lecture this year. As Dr. Shriver said, Dr. Hammond lived in our home county—in Greene County. He was a chemist, an industrialist, a community leader—a person who cared passionately about our history, about government, about politics, and about America.

His legacy is not just this lecture series. I see his legacy every time that I'm back home. I see it in the long stretch of land that lies along the Little Miami River—still undeveloped and still beautiful. That's just one of his legacies. I also see it when I go to Xenia and see the Galloway log cabin. He was instrumental in preserving it with his own efforts, his own money and his own ingenuity. So, he has left a legacy for us in our home county and a legacy for our state.

As a high school freshman, I came on the Miami University Campus to attend the first W.A. Hammond Lecture. The speaker was then United States Senator Barry Goldwater. It was January 1962. It was a rather interesting day for me, because it was actually not only the first time I saw a United States Senator, but it was also the first time I had seen this wonderful campus.

One of the things that I recall from that speech by Senator Goldwater is that I

thought the question and answer period was a lot more interesting than the speech. I think it's probably typical of most speeches. The speech was fine, but I thought the questions and answers were particularly interesting. So, I hope tonight to spend a significant period of time with you on comment and questions on whatever topics you want to address.

As we approach a new millennium, as well as the next presidential election, I think it is appropriate for us to discuss where the United States is going as we enter the next century. What kind of a country do we expect our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren to live in?

When John F. Kennedy was running for President in 1960, he said that the job of a president is to lay before the American people the unfinished business of the country. That's still the job of the President—a job, I think also, of Senators and other leaders.

So, I'd like to talk tonight about that unfinished business of this country and particularly the unfinished business of this generation and of the next generation.

What are the big challenges and other important things that we have to deal with?

We have a crisis in education, particularly in our inner cities, and particularly in Appalachia.

We must solve—especially in Ohio—the school funding disparity problem and question.

We must, as a country, attract the smartest, the best, and the brightest of our students to the profession of education—the profession of teaching.

And, quite candidly, our schools of education must continue to aggressively reexamine how they prepare our teachers for the future.

We must do a better job of attracting and encouraging professionals and people with real world experiences to make teaching a second career.

The Congress, the President, and the American people must—within the next several years—deal with the Medicare question and deal with the Social Security question. For all of the talk by both the President and the Congress—Democrats and Republicans—about “saving Social Security” and “saving” this surplus for Social Security, the reality is that Social Security and Medicare cannot be “saved” without fundamental reform. All of the surpluses in the world cannot hold back the demographic tidal wave of the baby boom generation as it approaches retirement. Reform—reform, not budget surpluses, will save Social Security.

There are certainly other issues that this generation must tackle: health care, medical research, and a subject near and dear to my heart—the crisis in our country's foster care system.

However, our topic tonight is foreign affairs and what the U.S. role in the world should be in the 21st Century. So, I will now take a stab at that.

When Senator Goldwater addressed Miami in 1961, our nation was in the midst of the Cold War, and certainly no typical American family could go through any day without being touched by that larger, global struggle. It was a time of bomb shelters and of school children crawling under their desks. Young American men and women were sent to all corners of the globe—to places they barely could pronounce, spell, or even find on a map—all in defense against communist expansion. We raced the Soviets to the Moon—and won. The Olympic games were seen as epic struggles to reaffirm the strength of our system.

Senator Goldwater devoted the first Hammond Lecture to a discussion of the ideological struggle between democracy and com-

munist. And, as he said on that January night nearly thirty-eight years ago: “We are fighting an ideology that is dedicated to destroying us. We can win this fight against Communism without firing a shot or dropping a bomb.”

Perhaps, to his own surprise, Senator Goldwater lived to see the fulfillment of that prophecy. Ten years ago this week, the most dramatic symbol of the Cold War—the Berlin Wall—fell, and most significantly, not because of some advancing army. It fell because its foundation—communism—could no longer sustain itself.

In retrospect, the fall of the Soviet Union was neither a complete defeat for totalitarianism, nor really a complete victory for democracy.

The end of the Cold War also did not end the nuclear threat.

The world remains today a dangerous and very uncertain place. Although we are experiencing a period of peace and prosperity really not seen in our country since the 1920s, this “peace” has not been tranquil. American air and ground forces have been dispatched to places such as Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, and Serbia. We've engineered military actions against Iraq and strikes against terrorists in the Sudan and the hills of Afghanistan.

We stand on the brink of a nuclear arms and missile race in South and East Asia and the Middle East. And, nationalism has raised the prospect of war in several regions—from Central Europe to the Asian Subcontinent. And, nations in our own hemisphere face threats that could undermine—if not overwhelm—the progress of our movement toward democracy that we successfully achieved in this hemisphere over a decade ago. In sum, we have moved from a Cold War to a Hot Peace.

The challenges of global stability did not cease with the end of the Cold War. Peace must be protected, enforced, and advanced with the same vigilance and determination we demonstrated to arrive at this point in our history. As Henry Kissinger observed more than ten years ago: “History knows no resting places; what does not advance must sooner or later decline.”

Since the beginning of the so-called American century, when a Canton, Ohio, resident named William McKinley was re-elected to the presidency, our nation's chief executives have faced the challenge of defining America's role in shaping and responding to world events.

The eight Presidents who have led our nation during the Cold War were presented with the opportunity to pronounce, or perhaps characterize, the nature of American foreign policy. During that time, we went from a policy of containment to a policy of detente, and from there to a policy of political containment and military buildup. Now, one may agree or disagree with each of these policies, but there is no dispute that each of these Presidents—from Harry Truman to George Bush—led with a clear vision, or doctrine, if you will, that guided U.S. foreign policy and influenced the shaping of multinational affairs during their terms of office.

Unfortunately, our current Administration never seized the opportunity to articulate a clear, thoughtful doctrine, outlining America's role and place in a post-Cold War world. Sadly, history will not record nor remember the Clinton doctrine.

Instead of a foreign policy geared toward anticipating and shaping events abroad, we have watched events abroad shape our foreign policy.

The future and security of our nation must be—absolutely must be—the dominant theme of the next presidential election. Each candidate has to answer one fundamental ques-

tion: What should be America's role in this post-Cold War world?

The next President—working with Congress, with the American people, and with our global partners—must develop a new bipartisan foreign policy doctrine—a McCain Doctrine, or a Bradley Doctrine, or a Gore Doctrine, or a Hatch Doctrine—a doctrine for this country and for our people—a doctrine to define our role as we move into the next century.

To be sure, there is not one right answer to what role we should play. These are very, very difficult questions. The world is a complicated place. There are no easy, simple solutions to any of the conflicts and challenges our world faces. But, one thing is certain: Protecting our national security and promoting our interests abroad will depend on the kind of vision, the kind of leadership, and the kind of foreign policy doctrine that our next President brings to this task.

As we enter the 21st Century, our next President must—in a bi-partisan manner—engage Congress and the American people in how best to define and how best to articulate a principled and practical approach to U.S. engagements abroad. This means including the American people in an open, foreign policy dialogue. It means getting their support of U.S. involvements in global struggles. And, finally, it means creating a foreign policy doctrine that is neither a Republican nor a Democrat plan, but is rather “the American plan.”

In so doing, I believe that there are certain fundamental principles that should serve as the basis for defining America's role in foreign affairs. So, tonight, I'd like to spend a few minutes sharing some of my thoughts about what those principles are and how they can affect our U.S. role in the 21st Century world. I do not mean for this to be an exhaustive list, but I believe that our foreign policy must include, at the very least, these principles.

And so, I offer them in the spirit of discussion and dialogue—in the spirit of what I expect of the next President. That means that I expect the next President to lead this discussion with the American people, with an understanding that the choices are tough, and many times the choices we are faced with are not good ones. And, while it is tough, unless we start the dialogue—unless we start the discussion—unless we frame it with the sense of where do we go as a country in the post-Cold War era, we are never going to end up where we want to be and where we need to be.

PRINCIPLE NO. 1

The first, and perhaps most obvious, principle is that the United States must lead. We have to lead in foreign affairs. Our country must be an active, engaged player in the world, striving for solutions that look beyond the short-term. Our credibility in the world community depends on it.

Without a clear vision and direction for U.S. foreign policy, our nation will continue on an aimless path. After more than forty years of a bipolar-driven foreign policy, the end of the Cold War put this country at a fundamental foreign policy crossroads. Seven years later, tragically, we are still at that crossroads.

A lack of solid U.S. leadership in the area of foreign affairs has not come without cost. Our military has been deployed around the world to its breaking point. Our credibility in the world community certainly has declined. And, the world is even more dangerous and unstable now than during the Cold War.

I've noted already some examples of exactly how dangerous the world is today. What's troubling is how little U.S. involvement has done to reduce the dangers that we

face. Despite billions in U.S. assistance, Russia's government and economy teeter on the verge of collapse under the weight of rampant crime and rampant corruption. North Korea has become the single largest recipient of U.S. aid in East Asia, but continues to develop nuclear technology and missiles capable of reaching most of the Western United States, and, I might add, also continues to starve its own people. Despite our stern warnings, China and Russia continue to assist rogue nations like Iran and Iraq in their obsessive quests to acquire weapons of mass destruction. All these issues, together, present challenges that require strategic thinking and bi-partisan U.S. leadership.

We, as a nation, must take a lead in exporting our democratic values to our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere and to other areas of the world. When the world looks for leadership, it can look to only one place—and that place is the United States. History has put us where we are. If the United States does not lead, there is no one else who can lead—and frankly, no one else who will lead.

PRINCIPLE NO. 2

The second key principle that I believe should guide our foreign policy in the next century is this: The peace and stability of our own hemisphere must be one of our top priorities. You see, the problems of our hemispheric neighbors are our problems, as well. We, as a nation, stand to lose or gain, depending on the economic health and security of our own neighbors. In other words, a strong, and free, and prosperous hemisphere means a strong, and free, and prosperous United States.

Let's look at the example of our neighbors to the south in Latin America. When I was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1982, Soviet and Cuban influence in Latin America was the dominant issue. Today, the communists have been replaced as a power by the drug dealers. The perverse presence of drug trafficking throughout the region represents a very significant and very real concern—one that puts at risk the stability of our hemisphere.

The disintegrating situation in democratic Colombia really illustrates this.

No democracy in our hemisphere today faces a greater threat to its own survival than does Colombia. That democratically elected government is embroiled in a bloody, complex, three decade-long civil war against two well-financed, heavily-armed guerrilla insurgency groups—the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (otherwise known as the FARC) and the National Liberation Army (or ELN). Also involved is a competing band of about 5,000 ruthless paramilitary operatives.

The real source of violence and instability in Colombia, though, is the drug traffickers. According to the Colombian Finance Ministry, the Colombian drug trade brings in to Colombia up to \$5 billion a year, making it Colombia's top export. To maintain a profitable industry, a significant sum of these drug revenues goes to hire the guerrillas and, increasingly, the paramilitary groups.

Just to give you an idea about how the lives of people in Cincinnati, Ohio, and Bogotá, Colombia, are closely linked, consider this: When a drug user buys cocaine on a street corner in Cincinnati, or Cleveland, or Chicago, that person is funding violent anti-democratic activity that threatens the lives of innocent Colombians. I have walked through the poppy fields in Colombia with the President of Colombia and have seen—first-hand—how the drug trade is fueling the violence and instability in that country and in the region.

The United States has a clear economic interest in the future stability of Colombia.

Last year's two-way legal trade between the United States and Colombia was more than \$11 billion. In fact, the United States is Colombia's number-one trading partner, and Colombia is the fifth largest market for U.S. exports in the region.

I have met with Colombian President Pastrana both in Washington and in Bogotá to discuss how our two countries can work together to resolve this deteriorating situation. One way is to invest more in Colombia's drug fighting capability and improve economic opportunities. I have introduced legislation to provide that additional investment. But, this legislation also strengthens the capability of the Colombian government to enforce the law—the rule of law—and provides assistance for human rights training and alternative crop and economic development—two things that are absolutely essential. With this bill, we are investing in making Colombia a stronger, more stable democracy, and a stronger, capable partner in building a hemisphere free from the violence and the decaying influence of drug traffickers and human rights abusers.

Stopping the drug trade, though, in Colombia and Latin America is only one way that we can preserve democracy. We must move forward to integrate the entire hemisphere economically. The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) is the first and most significant step we've taken in that direction. Recently, the Senate took a positive step toward hemispheric trade liberalization by passing legislation that would extend the benefits of NAFTA to the countries in Central American and the Caribbean.

We have to do even more to pursue a hemispheric free trade initiative. Trade integration will occur in this hemisphere, whether or not we are a part of it. It is in our national interest to bring more Latin American countries into bilateral and multilateral trade agreements with the United States. If we fail, others will fill the void. Right now, Europe, Asia, and Canada are consolidating their economic base throughout Latin America. They certainly are not waiting for the United States. They'd prefer us standing on the sidelines. We must not let this happen. The longer we wait, the more we stand to lose.

PRINCIPLE NO. 3

The third principle that I will offer for discussion tonight is this: Our foreign policy must reinforce and promote our own core values of democracy, free markets, human rights, and the rule of law. I am not at all ashamed to say that our most important export to the international community is our ideals and our ideas. In this country, we are committed to democracy and human rights. We cherish open elections, and we cherish our freedom of speech. We strive to promote free trade and fair trade, so that everyone in our nation has a chance to prosper. We fiercely protect our freedoms, as we should.

I believe passionately that every person in the world should have the same opportunity to enjoy these basic democratic values. We have, over the last twenty years, made significant progress in promoting our democratic values abroad. Let's again look at the example of Latin America.

In 1981, 16 of the 33 countries in our hemisphere were ruled by authoritarian regimes—either of the left or of the right. Today, all but one of those nations—Cuba—have democratically elected heads of government. They're not perfect. Maybe they don't compete exactly with how we see democracy, but they're all moving in the right direction.

The hard, day-to-day work of democracy, however, comes after the elections. It is by no means an easy task to create a democratic society that fosters freedom or expres-

sion, where votes matter and human rights are respected. Democracy-building is a slow, often cumbersome process that evolves over time.

Key to sustaining democracy and nurturing prosperity in Latin America, or in any developing democracy, requires a commitment to the rule of law. That means providing effective responses to current threats, including corruption, criminal activity, drug trafficking and violence. Police and impartial judiciaries must be in place to fight such threats.

If no one enforces the law, no one will uphold the law. And, if that is the case, there will be no jobs, and there will be no economic growth, because there will be no foreign or domestic investment.

I have traveled to a number of these countries and what you see in country after country is a struggle for democracy, as the people move from the election process to the tough work of democracy. This is the daunting challenge they face.

The daunting challenge, quite candidly, is that, many times, there is not rule of law after election day. People and companies won't invest in these countries. They are afraid to invest—they are afraid to invest, because they don't know if their assets will be protected or if they will be stolen. And, if they are stolen, they don't know if there will be any redress. That kind of uncertainty does not encourage investment.

People need to be able to look to the courts, and to the prosecutors, and to the judicial system. When you help that judicial system, you help investment, and you ultimately help create jobs and help people come out of poverty.

The same thing is true for farmers—campesinos—in Guatemala, or Honduras, or Nicaragua, or throughout this hemisphere. If they do not believe that they own land—that they can control their land—they won't invest in their land. They won't put anything back into the soil, as farmers must, if they are to prosper.

So, again, it goes back to the judicial system—to the rule of law—and to the courts. One of the greatest things our country has the ability to do is send abroad our judicial and rule of law expertise. We've been doing that. And, while I think we have been doing a pretty good job, there is still more we can do.

Economies cannot expand and democracies cannot thrive without law enforcement officers and judges committed to law and order. The challenge we face today is that a number of Latin American countries do not have the kind of judiciaries needed to make the rule of law work.

Citizens should not fear the police. Law enforcement should be trained to protect the people and to provide stability and tranquility. Many of the emerging democracies have a long, long history of police abusing human rights and of the military abusing human rights. That has to change. And, it can change through our assistance and through our expertise.

We already are investing time and money to export our principles of law enforcement to train police in Central America through the International Criminal Investigative Training Assistance Program, known as ICTAP. This is an important program, but it's only half of the law enforcement equation. A well-trained police force means little or nothing if corrupt and incompetent prosecutors and judges cannot prosecute and sentence criminals.

It means nothing if a certain elite class of the population—economic, political, ethnic—is above the rule of law and operates in the country with impunity. That has to change in these countries, as well. And, that we can accomplish.

The U.S. government already has worked to help strengthen some aspects of the judiciary systems in Latin America and in other places in the world such as Bosnia, but we have a great deal farther to go. If we fail to focus on this matter, we will miss a great opportunity to build on the foundation we worked so hard to establish. Even worse, we put the very foundation, itself, at risk of collapse. One of the great wonders of a free society is that all of its core values—democracy, free markets, rule of law, and human rights—really reinforce the others. To strengthen one strengthens them all.

CONCLUSION

As we enter the 21st Century and contemplate our nation's role in the world, we must think about past mistakes, learn from them, and move forward toward a more balanced, principled, bi-partisan foreign policy. In doing so, we should consider these principles, which I have outlined tonight:

1. The United States must lead in foreign affairs;
 2. The peace and stability of our own hemisphere must be one of our top priorities; and
 3. Our foreign policy must reinforce and promote our own core values of democracy, free markets, human rights, and rule of law.
- In the global struggle for peace and stability, there is no substitute for strong, effective U.S. leadership. Leadership means foresight. It means thinking ahead. It also means credibility.

This week, ten years ago, the Berlin Wall fell, marking the beginning of the end of the Cold War. During this time of remembrance for this anniversary and as we pause, as Dr. Shriver so appropriately pointed out, to pay honor to our veterans, the following words. I think, have significance:

"Ladies and gentleman, the United States stands at this time at the pinnacle of world power. It is a solemn moment for the American democracy. For with this primacy in power is also joined an awe-inspiring accountability to the future. As you look around you, you must feel not only the sense of duty done, but also you must feel anxiety lest you fall below the level of achievement."

Now these words, while they would be a fitting tribute to the resilience of our nation during the Cold War, actually were spoken by Winston Churchill more than fifty years ago at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri. Although known for its reference to "the iron curtain," Mr. Churchill's now famous speech was actually titled, "The Sinews of Peace." In his typically less than subtle manner, Mr. Churchill was suggesting that times of peace require the same strength of purpose as times of war. He certainly was right.

Winston Churchill saw, before many did, what lay ahead for the world. He saw a difficult, uncertain, and volatile peace. He did advise his American allies to pursue an overall strategic concept and outline the methods and resources needed to enforce this strategy. He was calling on America to define its role in a post-World War II world. President Harry Truman, fortunately for us, had the vision and the resolve to accept this challenge and to redefine America's role in foreign affairs.

No doubt, Mr. Churchill would offer similar advice today. All of us here do have an "awe-inspiring accountability to the future." The challenges are many, but I believe they can be met. Doing so requires one significant first step: We must develop, as a country, a doctrine that will guide and define our role in the world. If our next President does that—if our next President follows the example of John Kennedy, Dwight Eisenhower, or Harry Truman, we will have a doctrine that

will take us into the next century. And, we will have a doctrine that will be consistent with our principles, with our values, and with our vision of the types of world in which we want our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren to grow up.

FLORIDA'S ANTI-TOBACCO YOUTH MOVEMENT: THE SWAT TEAM

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I have been to the floor many times in the past to speak about the expense smoking has cost this great country—both in terms of dollars that the federal and state governments have paid for the care of those afflicted with tobacco-related illnesses and in terms of lives lost from this dreadful addiction.

I have supported state and federal efforts to recoup a portion of these lost dollars from the tobacco industry, as well as their efforts to begin education campaigns that would teach all Americans about tobacco's harmful effects.

And, most importantly, I have worked with my colleagues to ensure that tobacco companies are no longer targeting our youth.

Tobacco companies must stop marketing their wares to our most vulnerable population, be it through magazine ads that depict smoking as the "cool" thing to do or through the strategic placement of billboard advertisements near their schools and play areas.

Mr. President, I am here today to let this distinguished body know that in Florida our message is being heard.

Florida's children are learning about the health hazards that tobacco poses, and they are deciding not to smoke.

This great news is due, in large part, to the successes of our innovative anti-tobacco pilot program—the "Truth" campaign.

Funded with the monies awarded in Florida's 1997 tobacco settlement, the "Truth" campaign has a very simple mission—to counter the misinformation that our youth hear about smoking.

Funded with the monies awarded in Florida's 1997 tobacco settlement, the "Truth" campaign has a very simple mission—to counter the misinformation that our youth hear about smoking.

Much of this truth-telling is done by students working in what are known as SWAT teams.

The Students Working Against Tobacco concept was created in February 1998.

Today, SWAT teams are operating in all 67 counties of Florida, with more than 10,000 members throughout the state.

With a goal of reducing teen smoking through youth empowerment, the SWAT teams have formed partnerships with their communities and developed both marketing and education campaigns to impart the truth about tobacco.

Although SWAT teams have been operational for less than two years,

they are already making progress in the war against tobacco.

Statewide studies are showing that over 95 percent of Florida's youth recognize the "Truth" Campaign and know its message to be anti-tobacco.

Additionally, surveys are showing that teenage smoking has decreased since SWAT's 1998 inception.

Tobacco use among high school students has dropped by 8.5 percent, and middle schools have seen a dramatic 21 percent decline in student tobacco use.

This reduction is particularly significant when compared to national statistics showing that states without an anti-tobacco campaign have seen an approximately eleven percent rise in tobacco use.

Florida's success may be due to SWAT's willingness to employ both education and mass media as means of spreading their message.

Ads that are designed by students are played on local television stations, informing teens of the perils of tobacco use.

Similarly, billboards that the SWAT teams have designed are displayed within the communities.

These are complemented by an education component that is adaptable for all school grades.

Health classes provide an opportunity to discuss the impact smoking has upon the body, from halitosis to lung cancer.

In reading classes, young children learn to read using books that are about how to stay healthy and smoke-free.

Science courses have moved the anti-tobacco campaign into the technology age, employing CD-Rom programs such as "Science, Tobacco and You," an innovative computer program that demonstrates tobacco's effects on the body—from first puff to final drag.

Students scan their photo into the computer, becoming a virtual reality smoker.

As the program progresses, students watch their teeth, skin, bones and lungs begin to deteriorate.

Currently, SWAT teams are strengthening their community outreach and grassroots work.

In their current effort, students are working to get tobacco ads removed from magazines that have either one million youth readers or over ten percent of total readership under age 18.

They are collecting these ads and returning them in bulk to the tobacco companies, with a cover letter stating that Big Tobacco needs to strengthen their commitment to reducing teen smoking.

SWAT teams have offered to meet with industry representatives to share ideas about how this mutual goal might be met.

Once again, the SWAT program has achieved success.

At their next board meeting, they will be joined by representatives from Brown & Williamson Tobacco Company to discuss how to better target tobacco ad campaigns to adults, not youth.