

the people of the world reach out and hug one another at these moments. So, later on, maybe we can have a leadership resolution or some kind of resolution that all Senators can sign on to, and we can send that to the parents, to the families of Dunblane.

I hope and pray this never happens again.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT, II

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3495 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3466

(Purpose: To provide additional funding for the Office of National Drug Control Policy)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I am going to offer an amendment to increase the drug czar's office. I think it is critical to this country that we start taking the matter of drug control more seriously than we have over the last number of years.

So, I rise to offer an amendment to provide an adequate level of funding for the Office of National Drug Control Policy, better known as the drug czar's office.

This amendment increases ONDCP's budget by a modest \$3.9 million to a total of \$11.4 million for fiscal year 1996. That is still well below ONDCP's funding level during President Bush's administration but higher than the administration has requested. In fiscal year 1992, when George Bush was President, ONDCP was getting \$18.1 million for operating expenses.

We all know why this amendment is necessary. By many accounts, President Clinton has downgraded the war on drugs. One of his first acts upon taking office was to cut the drug czar's staff from 146 down to 25. The President said he was fulfilling a campaign pledge to cut staff, but several of us on both sides of the aisle warned that the new drug czar would not be effective without the tools to do his job. We were right. Indeed, the President's own drug czar conceded in 1993 that drugs were no longer "at the top of the agenda." That was in the Washington Post on July 8, 1993.

For 3 years, President Clinton gave us an imbalanced strategy focusing primarily on the treatment of hardcore users. The strategy left law enforcement and interdiction agencies twisting in the wind. Federal drug prosecutions fell, drug seizures dropped, the ability of U.S. forces to seize or otherwise turn back drug shipments in the

transit zone plummeted by 53 percent. This is just over the first 3 years of President Clinton's administration.

Although the President's stated policy was to focus on hardcore users, President Clinton also presided over record increases in the quality and purity of drugs reaching American streets, as well as staggering increases in the number of drug-related emergency room admissions of hardcore users.

As for supply reduction efforts, there appeared to be none. As recently as 1 month ago, White House staff were arguing that more money for interdiction would be wasted money. This irresponsible talk was coming from people who are supposed to be advocates for the drug war, not advocates against the drug war.

It is indisputable that under President Clinton's leadership, we have been losing ground on this issue. Just look at what has happened since 1992 with our young people. Last year, the number of 12 to 17-year-olds using marijuana hit 2.9 million, almost double the 1992 level, according to the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse in November of 1995.

LSD use is way up among high school seniors. Mr. President, 11.7 percent of the class of 1995 have tried it at least once. That is the highest rate since recordkeeping started in 1975.

A parents' group survey released this November found that one in three high school seniors now smoke marijuana—one in three.

Methamphetamine abuse has become a major problem, particularly in the Western States, including mine. Emergency room cases are up 256 percent over the 1991 level.

After 3 years of inaction, President Clinton now wants to give his drug officials a fighting chance. OMB has requested \$3.4 million to beef up the office. This will allow them to hire 80 additional staff.

Mr. President, in closing, I want to give the President some credit for giving us a new drug czar who, by all accounts, is dynamic and energetic. The unanswered question here is whether the selection of General McCaffrey signals President Clinton's newfound commitment to lead in the drug war or whether it is more simply an election year makeover.

Adopting this amendment is ultimately about helping our children, about helping the 48.4 percent of the class of 1995 that had tried drugs by graduation day. It is about doing something to stem the increasing number of 12 to 17-year olds using marijuana, currently 2.9 million of them. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and give General McCaffrey the tools he needs to do this job.

Mr. President, we have to get serious about this drug problem. It is eating us alive. It is funding most, if not all, of the organized crime in this country. It is debilitating our young people. One in three seniors is trying marijuana, one

in three senior high school students in the senior class happens to be trying marijuana. Think about that. There is an 85 times greater likelihood for them to move on to harder drugs, especially cocaine, if they have tried marijuana.

The vast majority of these kids think, today, both users and nonusers, that marijuana usage is less harmful to them than ordinary tobacco usage, than smoking simple cigarettes. Both, as anyone who knows anything about health will tell you, both are harmful to you. It is terrible to smoke cigarettes because they are going to lead to cancer and heart disease and a whole raft of other problems, but it is even worse to smoke marijuana, which can lead to all kinds of debilitations that deteriorate our society as a whole and make it difficult for people to do what is right and to live up to what is right.

On top of all that, we have those in the administration who are arguing that the only side of the equation that really needs to receive some consideration happens to be the demand side, that means those who are taking drugs. They take the limited resources that we have and put almost all of them toward hard-core drug addicts, of whom the potential of saving is very, very low.

I am not saying we should not help hard-core drug addicts. We should. But we certainly ought to be putting what limited resources we have into helping these first-time offenders and these young kids who have really got caught up in the drug world to come out of it and rehabilitate themselves. It is important to do the demand side of the equation. I am for that.

I think we ought to put money in that, and the drug czar needs to spend some time on it. But unless we are doing the supply side as well, we will never make any headway because we have to interdict and stop the flow of drugs coming into this country and we have to interdict and stop those who are making drugs in this country, especially with the new methamphetamine rise that is inundating the Western States and is moving eastward with rapidity.

We have to start fighting against these things, and we have to have our young people understand the importance of fighting against drug abuse in our society today.

I look at all the drive-by shootings, kids with weapons, the murders in our country's Capital here. I look at all these things, and I know that a lot of this is driven by the drug trade, it is driven by the drug community, it is driven by those who should know a lot better.

Mr. President, there is a second half to this amendment that we are going to file here today. This is an amendment that I am filing on behalf of myself and Senator GRASSLEY. We are adding various funds to the budget, even above what the President has requested for the drug czar, because I believe that this drug czar has to have our support,

and we simply have to do a good job in helping him to get his job done.

Let me just say that, in addition to the drug czar's office, we are including in this amendment that no less than \$20 million shall be for the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department to be used at the discretion of the police chief for law enforcement purposes, conditioned upon appropriate consultation with the chairmen and ranking members of the House-Senate Committees on the Judiciary and Appropriations.

In other words, what we are going to do is we are going to quit mouthing off about the greatest city in the world and how corrupt it is and how drug ridden it is and how murder ridden it is, and we are going to put our money where our mouths are and put \$20 million into helping this police chief to clean up this mess.

I met with Chief Soulsby a week ago. I have to say I have a lot of confidence in him. One of his problems is that he has politicians interfering with the use of these law enforcement moneys from time to time. We are going to stop that by giving these funds directly to him. He will have to consult with both the Judiciary Committees of the House and the Senate and both of the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate as to how he is going to use these funds.

We are going to give him a chance to straighten this out and to start making a turnaround on what is needed here in the District of Columbia. If we find \$20 million is not enough to really make that much of a dent, I will come back and fight for more.

This is the greatest city on Earth, in the sense of governmental action. This is the seat of our Government. It is an absolute crime that people cannot walk down the streets in the District of Columbia without absolute assurance they are not going to be shot by some drug-infested, drug-crazed human being, or that they are safe in their homes, which is what is happening here. Not only are they not safe on the streets, they are not even safe in their homes. The people of this community, the vast majority of whom are law-abiding, decent, honorable, religious citizens, deserve better.

I am convinced that Chief Soulsby will do an excellent job if he is not hindered by some of the politicians in this town. By the way, I think some of the politicians are very good, so I do not mean to lump them all in a category of people who have been part of the problem here. But there are some who are part of the problem as well. There are some in the police department who need to be put in the appropriate positions or drummed out of the department. I am hoping that Chief Soulsby will set a system in motion that will get the very best people to be part of our police department in the metropolitan police department of Washington, DC.

This is the first step of trying to make this a better system. But while

we are making this first step in accordance with what I said I would do, then I think we ought to also consider that we have 37 different Federal law enforcement organizations in this town, 37 different Federal law enforcement agencies. They are not coordinated with the metropolitan police department. We have to use all these agencies to make this the safest and most important capital city in the world.

I think we have to put our money where our mouths are and we have to start now. I am going to rely on Chief Soulsby, and the administration of the city under Mayor Barry. I am going to rely on the help of ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, who is the Representative over in the House of Representatives, who I believe is very eager to do a good job in this area for her constituents and for whom I have the greatest fondness and admiration, and others who, in the best interest of this city, want to do what is right.

So, Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAIG). The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. SHELBY proposes an amendment numbered 3495.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 755 between lines 20 and 21 insert the following:

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE AND
GENERAL GOVERNMENT
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE
PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL
POLICY
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses," \$3,900,000.

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 104-52, \$650,000 are rescinded.

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 104-52, \$650,000 are rescinded.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 104-52, \$500,000 are rescinded.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
FEDERAL BUILDING FUND
LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF
REVENUE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available for installment acquisition payments under this head-

ing in Public Law 104-52, \$1,900,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That the aggregate amounts made available of the Fund shall be \$5,064,249,000.

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 104-52, \$200,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER 12

On page 755, line 22 redesignate the section number, and

On page 756, line 8 redesignate the section number.

D.C. METROPOLITAN POLICE
DEPARTMENT

Page 29, line 18, insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That no less than \$20,000,000 shall be for the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department to be used at the discretion of the police chief for law enforcement purposes, conditioned upon appropriate consultation with the Senate Committees on the Judiciary and Appropriations."

Mr. HATCH. Let me add in closing that this earmark would be applied against the crime control block grant. We think it is about time we do this.

I also mention for the record that the chairman and ranking member of the D.C. Appropriations Committee, Senators JEFFORDS and KOHL, support that part of the amendment granting \$20 million for the District of Columbia Police Force to be utilized by Chief Soulsby, with his consultation, with both Judiciary Committees and both Appropriations Committees.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I support this amendment which will provide \$3,900,000 in supplemental funding to the Office of National Drug Control Policy to permit our new Drug Czar, General McCaffrey to increase staffing by some 80 full-time equivalent positions.

During the debate on fiscal year 1996 funding for this Office, many of us were critical of the administration's dedication to reducing drug use in this country.

Continued surveys show that drug use among our Nation's youth, particularly those aged 12-17, show increases for use across the spectrum of illegal drugs.

The latest National Household Survey, released early this year, found that any drug use, and specifically, crack and cocaine use for 12 to 17-year-olds had increased above the previous year.

In addition, the recent Pulse Check Survey found that the distribution of heroin and cocaine by the same dealers and in the same markets appear in more areas than ever before.

Equally disturbing, Mr. President, is the fact that the number of hard-core drug users remains unchanged despite an investment of over \$100 billion on the so-called "War on Drugs" since 1987. In 1987 we had 2.7 million hard-core drug users; in 1996, we still have 2.7 million hard-core drug users.

The significance of these statistics, Mr. President, is that while hardcore

drug represent less than 1 percent of the population in this country, they consume 66 percent of all illegal drugs and are responsible for 34-36 percent of all violent crime in this country.

It very well could be that this is a given, that no matter what we do to reduce drug use in this country, we will always have 2.7 million hardcore users.

However, I believe we have an obligation to see that we use the latest innovations in both the public and private arenas to reach this group, Mr. President, before we write them off.

We have a new Drug Czar, who I believe, exemplifies the meaning of the word "Czar". He is a decorated war hero and general and someone who brings enormous credibility to this drug war.

I have met with him, Mr. President, and he is very impressive.

General McCaffrey has taken this job, not because he wanted it or sought it out, but because he recognizes the devastating effects drug abuse has on this country and he wants to personally dedicate himself to seeing that we do conduct an all-out effort, on every level, to rid this country for the scourge of drugs for the long term.

He has asked for the resources he believes he needs to put together a strategy that will work. What we've done up to this point clearly is not working.

He has asked for an additional \$3.4 million to increase the number of full-time staff at ONDCP to 125. In addition, he has requested permission to detail 30 planners from the Department of Defense to ONDCP.

Currently, ONDCP has 45 personnel who are responsible for overseeing the proper implementation of an annual \$14.6 billion national drug control budget.

The Office budget is currently \$7.5 million. If this amendment is successful, it will bring the total budget for his office operations up to \$11.4 million or less than 1 percent of the total annual amount spent on Federal drug control programs.

Mr. President, General McCaffrey has the confidence of this Senator and Members on both sides of the aisle, to lead our anti-drug efforts. I think we have an obligation to give him an opportunity to show us what he can do.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I also note for the RECORD that Senator SHELBY, who worked very hard on the Appropriations Committee, would also like to be added as a cosponsor. I hope other Senators will also be cosponsors.

I hope all Senators will vote for this so we can do good for our Nation's Cap-

ital while at the same time adding enough funds now for the drug czar's office.

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. BREAUX. 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. BREAUX. Mr. President, I ask the Chair, what is the pending business and what are the time restraints on it?

WHITEWATER DEVELOPMENT
CORP. AND RELATED MATTERS
—MOTION TO PROCEED

The Senate resumed consideration of the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1:30 p.m. having arrived, there will now be one-half hour of debate, equally divided, prior to voting on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to Senate Resolution 227.

Mr. BREAUX. With that understanding, I yield myself 5 minutes in opposition to the pending motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I was thinking about the Whitewater proceedings and the stalemate we have on the floor of the U.S. Senate with how to proceed. I think the American public really has an interest in this, not just the two political parties, Democrats and Republicans.

When I talk to people back in Louisiana and we talk about this Whitewater investigation, most of my constituents are not really certain or sure what all of this is about. They know there are some accusations that have been presented and that there have been some denials of those. But most people today are very confused about the entire subject that has become known as Whitewater.

I think the American people have an interest in this that is a superior interest, even more superior than the interests of the Democratic Party members on my side and the Republican Party members on that side of the aisle. There is an American interest in this which goes far beyond politics, and I really think that is the solution we should be seeking as we try to resolve this issue on how to handle the so-called Whitewater affair. What do we need to do that puts the American people's interests in the front seat and the political parties' interests in the back seat for a change?

Let me suggest what I think the people in my State and the people in America really would like to see. They would like to see this thing resolved. They would like to see it resolved outside the political arena. They would like to see it resolved. The people's interests are finding out what really hap-

pened, how to resolve it, and, if anything bad happened, that it will not happen again, and it is not who gets the credit or the blame.

What we are doing in this debate is arguing about which party is going to get the proper advantage and the manner in which the Whitewater affair is brought to conclusion. That should not be what determines how we act and what we do.

Let me make a suggestion of some of the things that I have heard from the people in my State. They have told me, "Senator, when politicians investigate politicians, it produces political results, especially in an election year." That is pretty simple and pretty accurate and pretty easy for people to understand. When politicians investigate politicians, it produces political results, especially in a political election year. That is why we had such a difficult time trying to bring this to a resolution that makes sense to the average American, who is less concerned about the politics of all of this, but is far more concerned about just getting it behind us.

If wrong was done, it should be punished. If it was not done, we should go on with the other problems facing the Congress and not spend the time we have been spending debating this issue endlessly while other problems continue to fester.

Let me suggest that the Congress has already spoken about how to get this done outside of the political arena. Does anybody remember what the Congress did and why we did it when we created an independent counsel? I remember the arguments, and I thought they made a lot of sense. The argument for doing that in investigating Whitewater was simple. Let us take the politics out of it and make sure we do not have politicians investigating politicians, producing political results. Therefore, this Senate created the independent counsel, and the independent counsel has been adequately funded. There is no term limit. They could go on forever and always until they bring a conclusion to this whole case.

As we stand here on the floor of the Senate, there is a trial going on, for gosh sakes, in the State of Arkansas on Whitewater. People have been indicted. There is a Federal prosecutor who is presenting the evidence in a court of law, in a Federal court. They are moving to a conclusion of this, and it is being done outside of the political arena.

We have a former Reagan Justice Department official, Kenneth Starr, who was established as the independent counsel. We said we are going to take it out of Congress and out of politics and give it to an independent counsel who does not have any political baggage. He is not a Democratic person, a Democratic chairman, or a Democratic ranking member, or a Republican chairman, or Republican ranking member; he is an independent counsel. What did we do? We have given that person