Accordingly, the Tribe, the State of New Mexico, and the Administration support an extension of the 1992 Act's deadline in order to preserve the benefits of the settlement to all parties.

The second new section extends until June 30, 1997, the deadline for completion of all requirements necessary to effect the San Carlos Apache Tribe Water Rights Settlement Act of 1992. This extension is intended to provide the Tribe and the Phelps Dodge Corporation, and the Tribe and the city of Globe, Arizona, additional time to reach bilateral agreements that would be included as part of the overall Settlement Agreement that the Congress ratified in the 1992 Act. The relatively short time period is intended to ensure that the parties remain diligent in pursuing a final resolution of the issues between them. The Tribe, Phelps Dodge, Globe, and all other parties to the settlement, including the Administration, support this extension. The Committee recognizes that, in the event agreements are reached within the time provided by the amendment, an additional extension of time will be needed for the Arizona courts to consider the settlement in the context of the ongoing general stream adjudication of the waters of the Gila River basin.

Mr. President, by accepting the request of the Prairie Island Indian Community regarding its charter, H.R. 3068 demonstrates the Congress' respect for tribal self-government and tribal sovereignty. The amendments to the bill that provide extensions of time for completing two complex water settlements already approved and funded by Congress must be enacted if we are to preserve the benefits of those settlements for all parties involved, including the United States.

Mr. President, H.R. 3068 is extremely important legislation that is without controversy or opposition. The Congressional Budget Office reports that enactment of the bill will not effect direct spending nor create any pay-as-you-go problems. Accordingly, I strongly urge the Senate to pass H.R. 3068 and send it to the President.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the committee amendment be agreed to, the bill be deemed read for a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table and any statements relating to the bill be placed at an appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill (H.R. 3068), as amended, was deemed read for a third time and passed.

WITNESS RETALIATION, WITNESS TAMPERING AND JURY TAMPERING AMENDMENTS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar 430, H.R. 3120.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3120) to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to witness retaliation, witness tampering and jury tampering.

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. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the bill be deemed read for a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and any statements relating to the bill appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 3120) was deemed read for a third time and passed.

CRAWFORD NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Environment and Public Works Committee be discharged of H.R. 3287, and further that the Senate proceed now to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3287) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Crawford National Fish Hatchery to the city of Crawford, Nebraska.

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. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the bill be deemed read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 3287) was deemed read for a third time and passed.

CARBON HILL NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 462, H.R. 2982.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2982) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Carbon Hill National Fish Hatchery to the State of Alabama.

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. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent the bill be deemed read for a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill appear at this point in the RECORD.

The bill (H.R. 2982) was deemed read for a third time and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—H.R. 3539

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order of the Senate on September 18, 1996, the Chair appoints the following conferees to H.R. 3539.

The Presiding Officer appointed Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. FORD conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1996

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Friday, September 20; further, that immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day and the Senate immediately resume consideration of H.R. 1350, the pending legislation, the maritime bill.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the time between 9:30 a.m. and 10 a.m. be equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the motion to table the Grassley amendment to occur at 10 a.m.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, tomorrow morning at 10 a.m., the Senate will vote on or in relation to the Grassley amendment to the maritime bill. Other rollcall votes are possible on the remaining amendments to the maritime bill. It is hoped that a unanimous-consent agreement regarding the maritime bill can be reached tomorrow morning which would allow Members to know the voting schedule for the remainder of Friday's session. The Senate may also be asked to turn to consideration of any other items cleared for action.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment, in accordance with the previous order, following the remarks of Senator GRASSLEY.

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

The Senator from Iowa.

THE NEED FOR COHERENT DRUG POLICY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, for my colleagues who may have missed the information during the August break, or the news since, the latest household survey numbers on drug use are out. For anyone concerned about drug use in this country, those numbers tell a depressing story. The story is quite simply this: more kids are using more drugs. Put what gloss you want on the numbers, the depressing fact is, we are in the midst of a new drug crisis.

There are five major surveys of drug use in this country. These include the Drug Abuse Warning Network, or DAWN, which surveys hospital emergency room admission rates. The high school survey, which studies use among seniors and others in high school. The Parents' Resource Institute for Drug Education, or PRIDE survey of high school substance abuse. The Drug Use Forecasting, or DUF, survey that tests for substance abuse among arrestees.

And the household survey, which samples over 17,000 households to look at drug use trends in the population age 12 and older. These surveys are our early warning network. And the alarm bells are ringing. The emergency lights are flashing. We need to heed the warning.

To understand the warning in its fullness, we need a little perspective. Today's growing problem does not occur in isolation. It is not the result of ignorance of the dangers of drug use.

The 1960's and 1970's taught us a bitter lesson about that. They taught us about the risks individuals and communities run in dealing, or failing to deal, with the drug problem. Since 1981, when we began to fight back seriously, we have spent $128 billion at the Federal level to combat illegal drug use. We have spent a like amount at the State and local levels. In addition, we have spent in the neighborhood of $1 trillion on the indirect costs of drug use and an additional $1 trillion, out of individual pockets, to buy illegal drugs.

This is only the fiscal summary. It does not begin to tote up the human toll. These numbers do not account for the tens of thousands of deaths or the millions of addicts. They do not make plain the toll of drug-addicted babies. Mere numbers do not convey the suffering, the loss of life, the damaged lives, the ruined prospects and shattered dreams that are all part of the legacy of this country's flirtation with dangerous drugs. In a generation, we went from a nation with no drug problem to a country in which one-fifth of the population has tried drugs and over 6 million people who are addicts.

There is not a single, major social pathology today that is not in some way linked to drugs. From family violence to drive-by shootings, from drug-addicted babies to devastated inner-city neighborhoods, the legacy of drugs is written in bold print across the face of this country.

We got ourselves into this mess because we allowed our cultural elite and others to persuade us, against our understanding, that drugs were really OK. That using drugs was merely a form of personal expression that did not hurt anyone, not even the user.

We bought into that idea and lived it through the 1960's and 1970's. We came dangerously close to legalizing drug use. And we delegitimized the notion of enforcing our laws against drug use. We are living with the consequences. Today's billions spent on the war on drugs are a direct result of the choices that we made yesterday. Our drug problem was no accident. Movies and music glorified drugs. Politicians publicly questioned the usefulness of preventing individual drug use.

Our cultural elite talked of legalization. In virtually all our means for communicating what we think is proper and appropriate, we sent the signal that drugs were OK. And who were we talking to? Who was listening? who got the message? It was our kids. And it was our kids who ended up as the principal casualties of this so-called enlightened policy. What were we thinking?

In the 1980's, however, we realized our mistake. We began to fight back. It was not that we just spent money on the problem. Parents and communities, schools and businesses, civic and political leaders came together to stop the nonsense. They formed coalitions, lobbied their public officials, and organized public and private efforts to fight back, to save the kids. And it was working. Between 1985 and 1992 drug use in this country went down. More important, attitudes among kids about drugs improved.

More and more kids came to see drugs as dangerous. More kids stayed away from using. That was no accident. Everywhere they looked the message they got was the drugs were bad. The message was, just say no. And they listened.

That did not mean that our difficulties were past. We still had a large addict population that was using more and more. We had enriched powerful drug organizations that had extensive networks for drug smuggling and money laundering.

We still had to deal with a lingering notion that somehow, despite the evidence before our eyes, drugs were OK. Nevertheless, we were on the right track. In recent years, however, we have gone off the rails. In some areas, we have been pulling up the tracks and shooting the engineers and conductors.

This is what the most recent household survey makes clear. It shows that marijuana use among young people is up over 100 percent since 1992.

It went up 37 percent last year alone. Overall drug use has risen 78 percent since 1992, 33 percent last year. Fully 10.9 percent of young people aged 12 to 17 reported using marijuana monthly last year. That is up from 8.2 percent the year before. At this rate, we will have lost all the ground that we won in the late 1980's and early 1990's. And the people who are at risk, once again, are kids and teenagers and young adults. If this trend continues, and it is showing no signs of changing under present policies, in the next few years we will have wiped out all the gains made in the 1980's.

Now, if you do not believe that legalization is a rational policy, then you cannot welcome the recent news. And if you do not think 10, 11, and 12 year olds ought to be making their own decisions about using heroin or cocaine, then you have to conclude that the present trend is a disaster in the making. As I suggested earlier, the warning lights are flashing.

When the oil light goes on in your car, it is time to check the engine. If you decide to ignore the light you risk making an expensive mistake.

Well, the Nation's warning light is on. And what do you find when you open the hood and check on the reasons? As it turns out, we've been trying to run our programs without the right stuff.

Despite what some of my colleagues have argued on this floor, this administration simply has not taken the drug issue seriously. Not from day one, and not, so far as I can see, yet. In fact, its policy, where one can be disconcerned, has downplayed the issue and distanced the President from any involvement.

Now, having said this, I know that one of my colleagues is likely to be down here any minute accusing me of playing politics. That seems to be the administration's line any time someone criticizes them. Indeed, Secretary Shalala and the Attorney General have been going around saying this. They have blamed Congress for lack of funding. They have pointed to increases of drug use in Europe. They have also taken to blaming the Bush administration for the present problem. When they do that, reaching back 4 years to try to blame someone else, that is not playing politics, of course.

That is not dodging. That's not blowing smoke. That is what passes for policy in this administration. But serious policy is more than artful dodging.

Let me remind you, that this administration came into office saying that the Bush administration had not fought a real drug war—that claim was made despite the fact of steady declines in teen use. The present occupant of the White House promised to do better. At the least, then, we should expect to see the trend of teen use continuing to decline.

We should expect that teenage attitudes about drug use would remain negative. But that is not the case. In fact, it is exactly the reverse. And it was not the Bush administration that presided over these recent increases. It