

English in 1972. In 1975, he received his master's degree from Northwestern University's Kellogg Graduate School of Management with a concentration in finance, marketing, and organizational behavior.

Art was appointed president of Northern Trust Bank in 1987. Since that time he and his wife Peggy, a former vice president of J. Walter Thompson Co., helped raise millions of dollars for philanthropies in the Sarasota area.

Art's continuous involvement in the community has included philanthropies and civic causes of all sizes and scope. He chairs the Van Wezel Foundation and is a former treasurer. He is chairman of New College Foundation; and a member of the Asolo Center's board of directors. He is past chairman of the Sarasota Memorial Hospital Century Foundation and the past president of the United Way of Sarasota. He is chairman of the Out-of-Door Academy and a former board member of Florida West Coast Symphony, the Salvation Army, and the Education Foundation. He was chairman of the 1990-91 United Way Campaign and has served on the advisory boards of Sarasota Ballet and Girl's Inc. He also cochaired the 1991 French Film Festival with his wife Peggy.

In addition to his individual efforts, he has participated in and supported Peggy in her many charitable endeavors, which include, but are not limited to, the following: chair of the 1995 New College Auction, chair of the 1994 Circus Gala at Ringling Museum, chair of the 1994 Sarasota Opera's Youth Festival, chair of the 1992 Memorial Hospital Cartoon Classic, chair of the 1991 New College Library Association Mistletoe Ball, chair of the 1990 Family Counseling Center's benefit, and chair of the 1989 Orchid Ball.

Mr. President, as you can see Art has not limited his benevolence to specific organizations, instead his influence is felt across the entire Sarasota community. He has done more charitable work in 10 years than most of us could hope to do in a lifetime. The great State of Florida is a better place because of Art Wood's commitment to his community. Mr. President, I will conclude by commending the southwest Florida chapter of the American Jewish Committee, especially the committee's president Robert Rosenthal and director Harriet Abraham, for their dedication in recognizing this year's recipient of the 1996 Human Relations Award, Arthur M. Wood, Jr.●

**A CENTURY OF NOBLE SERVICE:
COMMENDATION OF THE ENFIELD
VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT ON THE OCCASION
OF ITS CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY**

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, never has the noble spirit of voluntarism been more important than it is today. And nowhere in the Nation is the spirit of

self-reliance and gritty determination a more integral part of life than it is in New England. Voluntarism and self-reliance came together in 1896, when the citizens of Enfield, CT, formed the volunteer Enfield Fire Department, and they are alive and well in the department's service today. And so it is my pleasure to offer my commendation to the brave men and women of the Enfield Volunteer Fire Department who have served and protected Enfield for 100 years.

At a time when our society is seeking real role models for our children, we can with confidence point to our Nation's volunteer firefighters as true heroes. The galant members of the Enfield Volunteer Fire Department, both past and present, have selflessly devoted themselves, day in and day out, to saving the lives and livelihoods of their neighbors. Without these dedicated individuals, the community of Enfield would be at a tremendous loss.

No matter what is required of them, Enfield's volunteer firefighters stand ready to help. Whether responding to an emergency, or preventing emergencies from happening in the first place, all the department's activities are executed with the highest caliber of professionalism. Indeed, the firefighters make a difference every day, conducting safety lessons in schools and throughout the community to teach kids and others about fire prevention.

Mr. President, the men and women of the Enfield Fire Department have faithfully served and protected Enfield, contributing tens of thousands of hours, for a century. Those who served yesterday, serve today, and will serve tomorrow, are truly a tribute to the State of Connecticut. I am proud of the work done by these fine citizens, and as they celebrate their centennial, wish them another hundred years of valiant duty.●

DRUG LEGALIZATION

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, yesterday the New York Times ran a piece noting that the lead story in the next issue of the National Review is going to call for the legalization of drugs. The rationale for this argument is that the war on drugs has failed and that the only solution is to declare defeat and turn the asylum over to the inmates.

I am not sure just what information the folks at the National Review are using, but the facts are flawed and the argument is dumb and irresponsible.

Mr. Buckley, the author of the piece, is safe in making such arguments because he personally does not plan to use drugs. No one of his immediate acquaintance is likely to start using dangerous drugs. And I doubt that he will encourage any teenage members of his family to use drugs. So the consequences of his advocacy will not be felt personally. Instead, the burden of his ideas will be borne by countless

families whose kids—the most at-risk population—will fall victim to the consequences of drug abuse. The costs will also be borne by the public purse, as we have to treat the walking wounded.

Although there is no public support for the idea of legalization, and none in the Congress, some of our culture elite—left and right—keep raising the idea as if it had some intellectual merit. Nothing could be farther from the truth. I am therefore submitting for the RECORD a longer statement on the common mistakes made in the legalization argument that I hope will help in closing this latest chapter in foolishness.

The statement follows:

**STATEMENT BY CHARLES E. GRASSLEY: DRUG
LEGALIZATION**

I have been increasingly concerned about the tendency in some quarters to promote the legalization of drugs in this country. If there is any idea that is essentially without merit and without public support, it is that this country should entertain seriously the notion that dangerous drugs should be legalized and made widely available. Drug legalization is truly an invitation to the Mad Hatter's Tea Party.

Unfortunately, many in the media and in our cultural elite, who have a disproportionate access to public communication and opinion outlets, have once again started to advocate some form of legalization. While this advocacy is not likely to lead to a major change in public policy, it can and does have an adverse influence on thinking about the dangers of drug. It sends a mixed message about the dangers of use that is particularly harmful when it touches our young people.

As Bill Bennett and Joe Califano noted recently, drugs are illegal because they are dangerous, they are not dangerous because they are illegal. Legalization advocates, however, deploy a variety of arguments on behalf of their position that ignore this essential fact. They all too often resort to scare tactics, misrepresent reality, or skip over inconvenient facts. I think that it is important to set the record straight.

There are a number of misconceptions about our efforts to deal with the drug problem. It is important to understand these and the common arguments used to promote them in order to arrive at a reasoned and reasonable understanding of what the drug problem is about. One of the first points to note is that our last drug epidemic—during the 1960s, 1970s, and early 1980s—was the result of arguments made by some that drugs were really not a problem and that everyone would feel better, live better, and prosper from the self-administration of dangerous drugs.

The claim, made with considerable fervor, was that drugs were liberating and that only a repressive society would prevent people from achieving their true potential. By the late 1980s, we finally came to realize just what a cruel hoax, a big lie, these claims were. We are still trying to cope with an addict population from that era, a period that has left us with a legacy of lives blasted by drug use, a cost that is borne by families and the public purse. We cannot afford to ignore this lesson, to repeat a disaster based on the enthusiasms of a few.

Mistake #1: Prohibition doesn't can't work. Efforts to keep people from using drugs, like alcohol prohibition, only encourages the idea of forbidden fruit, increases crime, and will always fail.

The argument that prohibition doesn't work relies on a collective amnesia about

this country's experience with alcohol prohibition between 1920 and 1934. In the first place, Prohibition did not make the use of alcohol illegal, only its manufacture and sale over a certain strength. It was, in effect, a control regime legalizing personal use. This effort came at the end of a very long history in this country of trying to reduce the consumption of alcohol from dangerous heights. The modern parallel is with the efforts to reduce tobacco use.

Second, Prohibition did not lead to a major increase in violent crime, as is often claimed. The major increase, particularly in violent crime in this country, came between 1900 and 1910, well before the prohibition movement. Violent crime remained fairly stable or declined during Prohibition. While it is true that crime rates decreased after Prohibition this was not the result of ending Prohibition. Nor did Prohibition create organized crime. Major organized crime groups existed well before alcohol prohibition and they prospered after it ended.

Third, major health problems, such as cirrhosis of the liver and alcohol-related psychoses, declined sharply during Prohibition. Alcohol consumption, even though it was not illegal, also declined sharply. It increased in the years following the repeal of Prohibition, as did the associated health problems.

Fourth, it is important to remember also that alcohol, unlike dangerous drugs, had wide social acceptance and a long history of use. Alcohol can also be used by most people without creating impairment, either temporary or long term. Marijuana, cocaine, and heroin have no such long history of popular public use or acceptance, and their use is solely for the purpose of intoxication. In fact, the public has opposed these substances once they learned how dangerous and destructive they were. This is also true historically in this country and internationally. No society today has a legalization regime for dangerous drugs.

In addition, it is clear that control efforts, when reinforced by serious law enforcement, prevention, and education programs do deter use, especially among young people. Our own recent experience illustrates how effective we can be. After decades of increasing use in this country, we reversed the trend of drug use when, beginning in the mid-1980s, we decided to just say no and to get serious about doing something. Overall drug use, apart from addicts, declined by more than 50 percent; cocaine use by 70 percent. Unfortunately, more recently, as we have moved away from these serious programs we have seen a return to use in the most at-risk population—teenagers.

Mistake #2: Legalization will mean less crime because the profit motive is removed and we will lock fewer people up when we make our drug laws more humane

First, most prisoners in state and Federal prisons are not there for drug offenses as their first or major offense. Most offenders are in jail for violent or repeat offenses. Of these, despite the wildly exaggerated numbers often cited, only 10 percent of Federal prisoners and 17 percent of state inmates committed their crimes to obtain drugs. Indeed, research shows that most career criminals came to drug use after starting their criminal activities, not before. Legalization will not greatly reduce the crime rate, especially for violent crimes. Indeed, in so far as the pharmacological effects of drugs, particularly cocaine and other stimulants, exacerbate violent tendencies, legalization will produce far greater violent crime rates as the number of "legal" addicts soars.

Second, the vast majority of prisoners serving time from drug offenses are not there for use but for trafficking—individuals whose

actions destroy lives and menace neighborhoods.

Third, legalization will not end black markets for drugs, unless we are prepared to legalize drug use for all ages down to the age of 6 or 7. Only the most radical legalization advocates want to see kids using drugs. But to leave any population out of a legalization regime means leaving a black market. Crime will not simply disappear nor will the organizations that are currently trafficking in illegal drugs.

Mistake #3: Legalization will mean a healthier climate in which controlled drug use will provide quality control and monitored use

This argument misses or misrepresents the issue. The issue is not whether we make drugs, which are inherently dangerous to use, more pure, but whether we permit their use at all. Britain led the way in trying to treat dangerous drug use as a therapeutic problem, regulating addicts through doctors' care. This was not an open drug policy for anyone to use drugs but a policy just for addicts. The result was a disaster. It did not prevent the spread of drug abuse. It only made doctors complicit in the act of promoting an addiction for which they had no cure. In effect, it reversed the normal doctor-patient relationship, putting doctors in the position of making their patients worse off. As a result, in Britain, addiction soared, addicts got worse not better, and the black market flourished. Similar experiences have visited similar efforts in other countries. Now, it seems that Switzerland is experimenting with a variation of this approach. The results are likely to be a similar disaster, making the government and the medical community complicit in spreading addiction.

It is also important to keep in mind, that dangerous drugs are not synonymous with other controlled pharmaceuticals. The latter are controlled but they also have a therapeutic purpose. Dangerous drugs have no medical purpose. They are addictive and destructive. To argue that these drugs should be self-administered with the only control being over their quality is to argue for a massive increase in the addict population, adding an even greater burden to an overtaxed health-care system. In effect, the legalization argument requires society to endorse a self-destructive behavior and then requires society to provide perpetual care to the victims at public expense.

Mistake #4: Deterrence does not work

When you talk to former addicts or those who have given up use, one of the most important reasons they give for their decision to quit or seek treatment was the threat of criminal prosecution, the difficulty of acquiring drugs, and the cost. When drugs are perceived as expensive, dangerous and wrongful to use, difficult to get, and involve a risk of criminal prosecution, potential users forego use, and many current users quit. This remains true even though most enforcement efforts focus not on users but on violent offenders and drug traffickers.

No program to prohibit drug use can be universally effective. Although we have long-standing laws against child abuse or murder or theft, these have not prevented any of these acts completely. No one doubts their importance, however, or the role they play in discouraging yet more of these actions than if they were not prohibited.

Mistake #5: Legalizing drugs will remove the "Forbidden Fruit" appeal of drugs, which leads most new users, especially the young, into use

If this is a valid argument, then anything that society prohibits for the general good would succumb to the same argument. Forbidding child abuse encourages child abuse.

Prohibiting murder encourages it. This is the logic of the argument. In fact, the reverse is the case. We educate people's understanding of what is rightful or wrongful to do by the laws that we declare and enforce. Even during Prohibition, when use was legal, the simple message sent by society that use was bad caused significant drops in use. Whenever we have enforced our drug laws and backed these up with education and prevention programs endorsed by our civic and cultural leaders, we have seen use decline and young people forego use. When we ignore this simple reality we see kids returning to drug use.

Unless one contemplates making cocaine and heroin routinely available to 12-18 year olds, something even few legalizers argue, then legalization will not remove the so-called "Forbidden Fruit" appeal. It will only add the idea that society condones use while continuing to prohibit access to the most at-risk population. Just the absence of a clear message on drug use in the last few years has seen teens returning to use in disturbing numbers. A legalization message would have devastating results.

Mistake #6: Drug use is a purely personal choice. It is a victimless crime. The state has no right to keep people from using drugs

The idea that an individual who uses drugs does so in some vacuum that affects no one else is another one of those fictions that obscures the facts. In the first place, drug users don't stay home. They go to work and play with the rest of us. They use the highways, they drive the school buses and trains, they fly the planes. They also encourage others to use, thus spreading the problem.

People under the influence of dangerous drugs are more prone to workplace accidents, are more likely to have highway accidents, are more prone to use violence in public and family disputes, and are at greater risk for health care than are non-users. Addicts are far more likely to lose control over their own lives, and are more in need of public intervention. A considerable percentage, perhaps as many as 60 percent, of the homeless are drug and alcohol addicts. Some 2 percent of live births in this country—over 100,000 babies—are born addicted with lifelong disabilities because their mothers used. Conservative estimates of the yearly social costs of drug addiction at current levels run around \$70 billion. These costs are borne by families and the public purse. The number of users and consequently the number of addicts would soar under a legalization regime, compounding all the problems we currently have. There is no such thing as a purely private use of drugs without consequences. There is no known cure for addiction. A choice for legalization would be a self-inflicted disaster.

Mistake #7: Since alcohol and tobacco are legal, and cause far more harm than dangerous drugs, we should make heroin, cocaine, etc., legal to be consistent. Doing so would not increase the number of users significantly

Here is the legalization argument at its most outrageous. What people are asked to accept is the idea that because we have substances generally available that already cause major harm—tobacco and alcohol—we should add dangerous drugs to the occasions for woe for the sake of consistency. What the argument says is that since we have one major problem we should make it worse by adding another. Who are we kidding?

In order to rescue this logic from being completely ludicrous, people are asked to believe a further assertion: that under a legal regime there won't be an increase in users. Really? Let's look at what we are being asked to believe. We are going to make drugs cheaper and freely available. We are going to

see them aggressively marketed by the producers. We are going to have society condone the use of addictive substances. But, we are not going to see a significant increase in use. Such is our understanding of human nature?

We saw what happened with drug use in this country in the 1960s and 1970s when we allowed the de facto legalization of drugs, condoning personal use and not enforcing our laws. That partial legal environment caused a dramatic increase in use. Can anyone doubt the effects if we condoned use outright? We cannot afford this kind of logic.

These are by no means the only myths. Others hold that drug laws are racist—which is another big lie, but even if true it is hardly an argument for making drugs legal; that the health consequences of personal use are exaggerated; or that drug laws lead to locking up lot of innocent people. None of these arguments can sustain serious attention or thought. Nor is there any major public support for drug legalization. The argument is pressed by only a few, some liberal, some conservative. To make the argument requires, however, suspension of judgment, a willingness to accept assertions over facts, and a professional absence of mind that ignores experience.

Unfortunately, while the argument for legalization has little public support, it is a major agenda item of many of our cultural elites. They have a disproportionate influence on our public discourse, on our radios and television, in the movies, in music and the arts. This means they have a disproportionate influence on the most at-risk population for drug users—our young people. By helping to obscure the message of the dangers of drug use, by encouraging it as part of a "liberated" life style, they contribute directly to use. When our political leaders remain silent they aid and abet this. The result in the 1960s made the point. Our recent experience confirms it: When you replace "Just Say No" with "Just Say Nothing" or "I didn't inhale," you are opening the door to trouble.●

NO RIGHT WAY TO DO WRONG

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, someone called my attention to an editorial in the Omaha World-Herald on the subject of gambling. I hope before long we will authorize a Commission to look at what we should do about this subject nationally. But the editorial in the Omaha World-Herald, which I ask to be printed in full in the RECORD, may be a cause for some reflection.

The article follows:

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Nov. 19, 1995]

NO RIGHT WAY TO DO WRONG

As we were musing recently about the inability of some local officials to say no to the gambling industry, we recalled what Howard Buffett, then a Douglas County commissioner, said when the city-county keno issue came up for a vote in 1991.

"To me, it's clearly wrong," he said. "I don't think there's any right way to do what you think is wrong." Buffett said government shouldn't condone a practice that undermines the work ethic. He was the only county commissioner to oppose the deal.

Regrettably, Buffett is no longer part of county government. He resigned in 1992 and moved to Illinois to take a new job.

Buffett didn't stop being concerned about gambling. In Illinois, he helped campaign against the spread of riverboat gambling. A friend in Massachusetts heard about his efforts and asked him to write down his views

on gambling and government for use in a Massachusetts anti-gambling effort.

The views he set down were again on target.

America was built on hard work, commitment and honesty, he said. Gambling reduces productivity and "cannibalizes existing industry." It spawns political corruption—the bigger it gets, the more government cooperation it requires. When profits drop, some governments have lowered the tax rates the gambling industry pays, thus putting more pressure on other taxpayers.

Gambling doesn't pay its own way. Taxpayers are stuck with social problems. In Illinois, Buffett said, government must spend \$3 to \$6 for public safety, regulation and other gambling-related items for each \$1 it receives in gambling revenue.

Gambling deceives and misleads. Promoters deceptively portray everyone as a winner in advertisements that "help wring billions of dollars from the most vulnerable 'customers' possible—the poor and the addicted." Teen-agers bet up to \$1 billion a year. An estimated 8 percent of the nation's adolescents are problem gamblers.

"The state," Buffet wrote, "should not even allow gambling, much less conduct it."

He's right. His article contains a challenge for government officials. Portraying government-sponsored gambling as a lifelong investment, he asked: "Is it an investment that you will be proud to hand down to the next generation?"

With the exception of Mayor Daub, few officials of Omaha and Douglas County have indicated that they have as clear a view. They should think about Buffett's challenge. Will they indeed be proud of what they are leaving their children and grandchildren?●

COMMEMORATING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE GOVERNMENT VERSUS WADE

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, January 22, 1996, commemorated the 23d anniversary of the Nation's landmark abortion rights decision Roe versus Wade. The Supreme Court's decision in Roe established constitutionally based limits on the power of the Government to restrict the right of a woman to choose to terminate a pregnancy.

The right to choose has never been under such fierce attack. In this Congress, the U.S. House of Representatives has waged an all-out attack on a woman's right to choose. They have continuously voted to restrict a woman's fundamental right to choose by:

Attempting to undermine the Accreditation Council on Graduate Medical Education [ACGME] revised requirements for residency training in obstetrics/gynecology with an anti-choice amendment. Currently, in order to address the acute shortage of abortion providers, the revised policy requires OB/GYN programs to provide training in abortion procedures. However, there is a conscience clause for individuals and institutions that have moral or religious objections to abortion. The anti-choice amendment would treat those institutions that qualify under the exemption clause as though they were accredited for purposes of Federal reimbursements, even though they did not provide the training.

Giving States the option to refuse to provide Medicaid funding for abortions in cases of rape and incest.

Attempting to criminalize for the first time the performance of a specific abortion procedure. This measure also passed in the Senate.

Rejecting an amendment by Representative PATRICIA SCHROEDER to allow money from the anticrime block grants to be used for protection at abortion clinics.

Rejecting an amendment by Representative HOKE to allow money from the anticrime block grants to be used for enhancing security in and around schools, religious institutions, medical or health facilities, housing complexes, shelters to other threatened facilities.

Adopting an amendment by Representative CHRIS SMITH which codified the Mexico City Policy, which prohibits U.S. funding of any public or private foreign entity that directly or indirectly performs abortions except in cases of rape, incest, or when the life of the woman is endangered.

Rejecting an amendment by Representative ROSA DELAURO which would strike language in the Defense authorization bill prohibiting military personnel and their dependents from obtaining abortions at overseas military bases using their personal funds to pay for the procedure.

Rejecting a substitute amendment by Representative DELAURO to the Dornan amendment to prohibit abortions at overseas military facilities unless the life of the woman is endangered and if the Government is not reimbursed with private money for any costs associated with the abortion.

Rejecting an amendment by Representative HOYER to delete a provision in the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill that would prohibit Federal employees or their families from receiving abortion services through their Federal health insurance policies except when the life of the woman would be endangered. The Senate passed this measure but added an exception for the life of the mother and rape and incest.

Rejecting an amendment by Delegate NORTON to strike from the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill provisions that prevent funds from being used to perform abortions in the Federal prison system except in cases of rape or when the woman's life is endangered. The Senate passed this measure, which was vetoed by President Clinton and its future is uncertain.

Adopting an amendment by Representative GREENWOOD prohibiting funding under title X for abortions or directed pregnancy counseling.

Pro-choice Senators have waged a vigorous effort as have grass-roots activists, but we are outnumbered in too many votes in this anti-choice Congress.

Now H.R. 1833 is on the President's desk. It would make it a criminal offense to perform a rare abortion procedure used to protect women in late term pregnancies. Doctors who have used this procedure have testified these very rare abortions are undertaken