

“(A) that prohibit occupancy in any such unit by any person—

“(i) who the public housing agency determines is illegally using a controlled substance; or

“(ii) if the public housing agency determines that it has reasonable cause to believe that such person’s illegal use (or pattern of illegal use) of a controlled substance, or abuse (or pattern of abuse) of alcohol, could interfere with the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by the tenants of the public housing project; and

“(B) that allow the public housing agency to terminate the tenancy in any public housing unit of any person—

“(i) if the public housing agency determines that such person is illegally using a controlled substance; or

“(ii) whose illegal use of a controlled substance, or whose abuse of alcohol, is determined by the public housing agency to interfere with the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by the tenants of the public housing project.

“(2) INAPPLICABILITY TO INDIAN HOUSING.—This subsection does not apply to any dwelling unit assisted by an Indian housing authority.”.

SEC. 10. ELIGIBLE HOME EQUITY CONVERSION MORTGAGES.

Section 255(d)(3) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-20(d)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) be secured by a dwelling that is designed principally for a 1- to 4-family residence in which the mortgagor occupies 1 of the units;”.

On page 5, strike line 8, and insert the following:

SEC. 11. APPLICABILITY.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

WAR ON DRUGS

• Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, last night, President Clinton announced his intention to reenlist in the war against drugs. It is an announcement that is long overdue.

For 3 years, the Clinton administration has failed to provide any leadership in this battle. And one of the results has been a dramatic increase in drug use among America’s youth.

One of the most eloquent and effective soldiers in the war against drugs is former First Lady Nancy Reagan. Throughout the 1980’s Mrs. Reagan devoted her tremendous energy to leading the “Just Say No” campaign—a campaign that is credited with dramatically lowering this Nation’s tolerance and use of illegal drugs.

Like countless other concerned citizens, Mrs. Reagan is concerned with the recent increase in drug use. And a column she wrote in yesterday’s Wall Street Journal should be required reading for all Americans.

I salute Mrs. Reagan for her commitment to this most important issue, and I ask that her column be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

JUST SAY “WHOA”

(By Nancy Reagan)

Statistics released last fall from the annual Household Survey of Drug Use and, more recently, from the 21st annual Moni-

toring the Future Survey show that marijuana use among teenagers was up again last year. Where is the public outrage over this finding? When will this country realize that as long as we don’t wake up and adopt a zero tolerance for drug use, we are heading down a path of no return? Most we lose another generation of children to the horrors of crack addiction? Must the statistics soar to all-time highs before we bother to take notice?

Last March I was invited to testify before a congressional committee, at which time I said: “I am not here to criticize or place blame, but after the great strides that we made just a few years back, I’m worried that this nation is forgetting how endangered our children are by drugs. I’m worried that for the first time in many years, tolerance for drugs and the mistaken perception that ‘everyone is doing it’ is creeping back into our national mentality. And I am worried that the psychological momentum we had against drug use has been lost.

“[Y]et it’s more than worry,” I pleaded. “This weakening vigilance against the drug threat can have a tragic effect on this country for many years to come. . . . How could we have forgotten so quickly? Why is it we no longer hear the drumbeat of condemnation against drugs coming from our leaders and our culture? Is it any wonder drug use has started climbing again, and dramatically so?”

Regarding the drug use survey, NBC News reported: “‘Just Say No’ was an effective message in the ‘80s . . . in the ‘90s much more will be needed.” Denver drug counselor Bob Cota emphasized, “Kids have to be shown why they need to learn it early, in the third and fourth grades—and it has to be repeated often.”

Repeated often—like in the ‘80s when the national leadership was vigilant and visible. And yes, we do need even more now. In response to the 1994 Monitoring the Future Survey, Joseph Califano Jr., chairman and president of the Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (CASA), warned: “If historical trends continue, the jump in marijuana use among America’s children (age 12–18) from 1992 to 1994 signals that 820,000 more of these children will try cocaine in their lifetime. Of that number, about 58,000 will become regular cocaine users and addicts.” In a 1995 survey by CASA, adolescents said that drugs were their “number one” problem. Our children are crying out for help.

While drug use is on the rise, the perceived risk of drug use is on decline. The two go hand in hand. Only a few short years ago, the constant message to young people—in the media, in their classrooms, and in their homes—was that drugs lead to destruction. But where are those messages today? Those messages, those lessons, are what change perceptions, change attitudes, change lives. Each of us has a responsibility to bring back those messages—loud and clear.

Before the drug-use increases of the past three years, we really had seen marked progress. As I told the members of the committee: “A decade of effort was beginning to pay off. Attitudes were being changed. I don’t mean to sit here and say that we had won the battle against drugs. I think it’s plain we had not.” However, between 1985 and 1992, monthly cocaine use declined 78%, or to an annual rate of 3.1% from its peak of 13.1% in 1985. It’s the same story with other numbers: Annual use of any illicit drug by high school seniors dropped to 27.1% in 1992 from 54.2% in 1979. “The battle was going forward one child at a time,” I said in March. “There was momentum, unity, intolerance of the exaggeration and glorification of drug use by the media—we were building peer sup-

port for saying ‘no.’ Children were being taught resistance skills—in short, there was progress.”

Now there is silence—and not without consequence. In 1994, twice the number of eighth-graders were experimenting with marijuana as did in 1991, and daily use of marijuana by high school seniors in 1994 was up by half from 1993. The 1995 Monitoring the Future Survey shows that daily use has made another jump.

We should all, as citizens of this great nation, be frightened by the latest drug statistics. We should all question what they mean to our futures and those of our children. We should all resolve not to be silent any longer. By the latest drug statistics and the renewed calls for legalization of marijuana, it is painfully obvious that our “letting up” is going to let down the young people of this country. It’s time to just say “Whoa!” •

STUDENT LOANS AND CORPORATE WELFARE

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, in his State of the Union Address, President Clinton made a reference to the successful effort to streamline the college student loan process and make repayment easier.

Some of my colleagues may be surprised to learn that much of the credit for these improvements should go to a conservative Republican from Wisconsin, Representative TOM PETRI. He developed one of the earliest models for a direct loan program and for income-contingent repayment, and he has been a consistent proponent over the years.

Earlier this month, Congressman PETRI appealed to fellow conservatives to help save the direct loan program, which has come under attack by banks and agencies that do not want to lose their Government-guaranteed income.

I urge my colleagues to read Mr. PETRI’s article which appeared in the Washington Times on January 9. I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

STUDENT LOANS: DIRECT LENDING VS. SPECIAL PLEAS

(By Thomas E. Petri)

How’s this for a switch? The Clinton administration stands firm for private enterprise and competition, against Republican attempts to stomp out a successful competitor and perpetuate an inefficient monopoly.

That’s exactly what’s occurring in the ongoing student loan debate. Administration officials accuse congressional Republicans of caving in to loan-industry lobbyists by eviscerating the Direct Student Loan program. And on this issue, the administration actually occupies the conservative high ground.

The loan industry (banks, secondary markets and guaranty agencies) wants to protect its lucrative, fraud-infested, no-risk student loan program from any meaningful competition. It’s losing in the marketplace; so it mounted a multi-million-dollar lobbying campaign this year to persuade Congress to eliminate direct student loans.

By casting the debate in simple, ideological terms, the loan lobbyists have won some allies. They’ve equated the Department of Education’s Direct Student Loan (DSL) program with Big Government—and they’ve successfully portrayed it as a Clinton initiative. That guarantees enmity from conservative Republicans.