

cuts in agriculture and will support them again this year. But a \$14 billion cut has now put the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee and the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee in a position where they cannot write a decent farm bill, and they know it. The chairman of the House Agriculture Committee now comes out with a proposal he calls the Freedom of the Farm Act. It is a white flag of surrender saying we understand we cannot finance a farm program, so let us forget it.

There is a much better way to do this. You can provide a better support price, a decent safety net for family-sized farms, and you can do it at the same time that you save the taxpayers \$5 billion in the coming 7 years by targeting farm program support prices or that safety net for the family farmers, targeting it to family-sized farms. A number of us have been working on that. We have developed some plans which we will be announcing.

But our point is to say to family farmers, at least if there are those who are surrendering on the issue of whether or not they think family farms are important to their country's future, that many of us will not surrender on that. It seems to us that this country is best served by nurturing and protecting a network of family-sized farms in our country to produce Americans' foodstuffs.

We have for many, many years understood that the development and the maintenance of family farms nurture a lot of what is good in this country. Where do you find better family values than on family farms that nurture our small towns and, through migration, nurture our cities? It seems to me that the genesis of all of that starts out on the farm in our country, and we ought to decide that it is worth keeping.

It is worth keeping a farm program that provides some safety net for the only people left in this country who, first of all, do not know when they plant a seed whether they will get a crop. So they risk all that money at the front end. And then they do not know, if they get a crop, whether they will get a price. So you have twin risks which family-size farms simply cannot overcome unless we have some basic support price or some kind of a safety net.

In the coming days, I hope others will become aware as well that you cannot write a farm program that helps and nurtures a future for family farmers with the \$14 billion that is now proposed in reductions. You can do it in a thoughtful way with even better price supports than now exist for the first increment of production and saving the taxpayers somewhere around \$5 billion. That is what I hope the Congress will decide on later this year.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I 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. GRASSLEY. 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. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes as if in morning business.

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

THE NEED TO SUSTAIN U.S. COUNTERNARCOTICS PROGRAMS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have become increasingly concerned about the direction that our drug policy is taking. Not only has the present administration largely retreated on doing something meaningful to deal with illegal drug use, increasingly some in Congress seem to be catching this indifference. The result has been a steady erosion in our efforts to stop the flow of illegal drugs to the United States. Along with the cuts there seems to be an attitude that nothing works. Not only is this belief wrong, it has serious consequences.

According to Justice Department figures, there has been a steep decline in our interdiction of cocaine shipments in the past several years. This has resulted in an increase of at least 70 metric tons of additional cocaine on our streets. We have seen a drop in cocaine prices while purity has gone up. And now, we are seeing a disturbing increase in heroin imports and a rise in addiction. More seriously, we have seen attitude toward drug use shift among the most at-risk population—the Nation's young people. In just the last 3 years, surveys of attitudes of high school kids show a shift away from regarding drug use as bad, reversing a decade of decline in favorable attitudes. Moreover, recent polls indicate that high schoolers increasingly see drug availability and use among their peers as one of the most serious problems that they face.

And now we see yet more disturbing news that confirms the trend. The recent Household Survey released by Health and Human Services shows that drug use is on the rise, especially the use of marijuana, after a decade of decline. This is the consequence of President Clinton's drug strategy, which is to replace "Just Say No" with "Just Say Nothing." What is even more disturbing is that the biggest increases coming among junior high and high school aged children. In those aged 12 to 17, the rate of illegal drug use increased from 6.6 to 9.5 percent. Coupled with reported changes in youth attitudes toward drug use, the trend is a sad reflection of what has happened in just a few short years. This age group is the most vulnerable population for potential drug use, and this has become the forgotten generation in our retreat from the drug issue.

Despite what many critics have argued, our counter-drug efforts were a success. Between 1985 and 1992, overall

drug use declined by 50 percent, cocaine use by more than 70 percent. These are dramatic changes that reflect a major shift in public attitudes and patterns of behavior. Similar shifts in other areas of public concern—a 50 percent reduction in crime, for example—would hardly be regarded as failure. Yet, this is the way our efforts are commonly portrayed. This misinformation is then used to support decreases in the efforts that contributed to this progress. The results of the erosion of our efforts can be seen in increased drug use among the young and disturbing changes in attitudes that bode ill for the future.

This is not a fact lost on the public. While we in Washington seem to have forgotten the issue, the American public has not. A recent poll indicates that more than 80 percent of the public regard stopping the flow of illegal drugs to the United States as the number one foreign policy concern. In addition, more than 70 percent of the public consistently opposes legalization of illegal drugs. We make a great mistake in ignoring our past successes or our present failure to live up to our continuing responsibility that we have to do everything in our power to combat illegal drug trafficking and use.

I have recently become the chairman of the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control. I have accepted this responsibility because I am concerned about the direction, or rather the directionlessness, of our present efforts. We lack both the practical and moral leadership on this issue that are essential to maintaining our past successes. We in Congress have a substantial responsibility to represent the public interest on this issue. We need to insist on accountability. I plan to work with other Members of Congress to oversee the administration's efforts and to insist on consistent, well-conceived programs. I intend to work for adequate funding and attention, and to remind my colleagues of the continuing need to sustain effective counterdrug efforts.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Let me indicate to my colleagues that the reason we are not doing anything on the floor is that we are having some negotiations. It is my understanding—I know we will present to Senator DASCHLE, the Democratic leader, a proposal here in the next few moments.