

prison and everything. Eighty-two percent of the people in our prisons and jails are high school dropouts. You should not have to be an Einstein to figure out that maybe if we invested a little more in education, we would not have to put so many people into prison, and maybe we would be a much better country if we did. That is the kind of thing we ought to do.

This budget takes a step backward in the field of education, rather than a step forward. I am not going to be around here next year, and my good friend from Nebraska is not going to be around here next year. I hope that whoever sits in this body will listen to the Presiding Officer when she stands on this floor and says that we have to do better in the field of education, as she has done many times. And while it is true you are not going to solve problems by just throwing money at them, I do not hear that same argument used in the Defense Department. And while money alone is not going to solve the problem in the field of education, without additional resources, we are not going to solve the problem.

That is the simple reality. We ought to be asking how do we build a better America as we put a budget together. When you ask that question, I think you will come to the conclusion that we ought to be doing more in the field of education.

I yield the balance of my time back to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, I am not sure we have any more speakers. We may have some more. I note that Senator GRASSLEY is waiting. I have talked with him, and he is not going to talk on the budget per se. I simply inquire of the Republican side, are there any other speakers on the budget? Senator GRASSLEY has another subject he would like to address as in morning business. Senator SMITH is on the floor. Is he here to talk about the budget or another matter?

Mr. SMITH. Madam President, I am here to talk about Senator DOLE when the Senator is finished on the budget matter.

Mr. EXON. All right. I will just pose a question to the leadership on that side of the aisle. Since there are other Senators wishing to proceed on other matters, maybe we could close down the debate on the budget and proceed as in morning business.

Mr. GRASSLEY. If the Senator will yield, I had a discussion with Senator DOMENICI on that point. He asked me if I was going to be here. It was his understanding on our side of the aisle that there was no more reason to speak. He spoke of two or three people on your side of the aisle. When that was done, he figured that the debate on the budget was done for today.

Mr. EXON. Well, I have just been handed a note that Senator LAUTENBERG is on the way over. I would like to close off debate on the budget, if I might. I do not want to cut people off. I guess the best thing for me to do to

protect my colleagues is to say that why do we not temporarily go off of the budget to allow the Senator from Iowa and Senator SMITH to proceed as they see fit. If, when they have finished, we do not have any more speakers, we can put the budget debate over until tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent that we temporarily go off the budget matter before us and allow the two Senators on the Republican side, who wish to address other matters, to be able to proceed as in morning business, if that is their request.

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

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

THE ROAD NOT TAKEN: DRUG POLICY AND LEADERSHIP

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I have spoken a number of times, last year and this year, on the need for a sound drug policy. We have entered a time, of course, when more teenagers are using drugs. It is a very serious problem. When more teenagers see no serious harm or wrong in using drugs, it seems to me that we cannot simply accept these facts in silence. We need to ask ourselves if we are prepared to see a repeat of the drug epidemic of the late 1960's and 1970's that claimed so many lives. It was an epidemic that destroyed so many young people and, of course, it brought a cycle of enduring pain to their respective families.

Of course, I do not believe that we can afford to remain silent. It is not a responsible policy to be silent. It certainly is not effective leadership to preside over a repeat of what we know to have been a social disaster of epic proportions. To today's ears, this may sound like exaggeration, but a brief reminder might serve to make the memory fresh in our thinking.

Before the 1960's, we had virtually no major problems in this country with illegal drug use. Then, beginning in the mid 1960's, the notion became current that drug use was not so bad, that drugs were your friend. It became common to hear the refrain that drug use was a personal choice that did no harm to anyone. That drugs could be used responsibly. That making drugs legal would end crime.

Hollywood picked up this theme and replayed it in countless movies. Music and cultural leaders made drugs fashionable and exciting. Even government got into the act. By the mid and late 1970's, a number of States had decriminalized marijuana use and lowered the drinking age to 18. Federal authorities began to talk about responsible drug use. Government experts accepted the notion that cocaine was not addictive. That marijuana use did not lead to so-called harder drugs. As the chorus on the wonders of drugs increased, dissenting voices were drowned out. Contrary opinions were overruled as unenlightened holdovers of a repressive past that had to be dismissed.

As a consequence, we decided to walk down a path that encouraged people, young people especially, to believe that drugs were okay. The result was the de facto legalization of drugs in this country. It was a vast social experiment based on wholly foolish notions about the dangers of large-scale drug use and its anticipated consequences. It relied on creating in the mind's eye some mythical drug user of heroic proportions, an everyman, someone who could use drugs with no ill affects, someone whose mind and consciousness would expand to include new horizons of enlightenment, someone who would be a better citizen. It was a form of a collective delusion. We found that the path we had chosen led to a dead end.

In the space of a few years, we went from having virtually no drug problem to having over 70 million people who had tried drugs and at least 6 million addicts. When you stop to consider that the vast majority of those addicts came from among kids, then the scale of the disaster becomes more apparent. We had an explosion of emergency room admissions and a plague of drug-related deaths and violence. In the very years that we stopped enforcing drug laws we saw a corresponding explosion in violent and property crimes. It is not wholly a coincidence that the explosion in drug use also accompanied the explosion in crime throughout America. It is no coincidence that the devastation of our inner cities, already suffering a host of problems, was a product of crack.

We learned, the hard way, that there was no heroic individual drug user. There were just people. Ordinary people. Most of them kids. We found that they listened to what adults said. We found, to our sorrow, that drugs worked. We discovered that when you make drugs widely appealing in large quantities at affordable prices more people will use drugs. Being a commercial and trading people, this should not have been a surprise, but under the spell of the drug culture, we ignored our experience.

We learned, to our profound regret, that dangerous drugs were illegal for a reason. We learned that they were illegal because they were dangerous, not dangerous because they were illegal. We learned that increased use leads to more addiction and to all of the collective woes that come with it. We learned these lessons because we ignored reality. We disparaged common sense. And we paid the price.

The first people to recognize the true extent of the consequences were parents. It was not some mythical Everyman that was using drugs, it was their kids. In alarming numbers. Parents began to fight back. In doing so, they enlisted the government. Finally, beginning in the early 1980's, we made extraordinary strides in reducing use. That meant we got more kids to just say no to drugs. Remember that phrase? It may have been laughed at by some, but it worked.

We still had the horrible legacy of our misdirected and ill-informed past, but we made real strides in reducing use. By the earlier 1990's, we had a comprehensive strategy that addressed both supply and demand. We had succeeded in persuading rising generations of young people that drug use was both dangerous and wrong. Except for hardcore addicts—our legacy from accepting the lie that drugs are OK—we were winning the struggle against drugs. Then, somewhere, somehow, we lost our way.

Somewhere, the silence set in. We replaced "Just Say No" with "Just Say Nothing." We came to a crossroads and took a wrong turn. We have seen the consequences. In the past several years, drug use among kids is on the rise. More seriously, their attitudes about the dangers of drugs are changing—for the worse. An increasing number of kids no longer see drug use as dangerous or wrong. Moreover, to fill the silence, the tragic chorus of legalization has returned. Once again the airwaves are filled with the sounds of the wonders of drug use. Once again we are assured that drug use is a personal choice that harms no one. Once again we are told that enforcing our laws are the cause of our problems. Once again we hear the refrains of drugs are OK.

The question we ought to be asking ourselves, is how, after all the progress we were making, do we find ourselves back where we began? How is what we are doing today different from just a few years ago? Are we doing anything different? No matter what road you follow to get to the answers to these questions, it seems to me, that you come back to the same crossroads. We need to retrace our steps, to put our feet back on the right road.

Examining recent drug policy and efforts from the 1980's and early 1990's, several major differences emerge. Today's drug strategy funding is quite similar to its immediate predecessor. After the initial major increases in Federal drug funding in the first years of the Bush administration, the budget to fight the drug war has increased on average about 5 to 6 percent per year. This rate of increase holds true for both Democratic- and Republican-controlled Congresses. So, if funding has been fairly consistent, we need to look elsewhere for the changes in policy that might account for the dramatic changes in our domestic drug situation in the past 3 years. When we look at the problem from this perspective, what we see as the major changes come not in money but in emphasis. Emphasis on how the money is spent, and on the public posture of the administration on the drug issue.

Now, we need to ask ourselves if we intend to accomplish anything by the policies we pursue. If we do, then we ought to be able to look at the results and draw some conclusions about whether our efforts are producing the results we want. If they aren't, then we might conclude that something isn't

working. It is important to examine the record of the administration's drug policy and what seems to be happening with the drug problem. We need to remind ourselves of where we were and the road we took to get where we are now. I have been detailing this issue in the past. The last time I did it was just before the Memorial Day recess. At that time, an esteemed colleague of mine asserted that I was using my remarks to play politics in an election year.

I do not want to question my colleague's motives for raising that particular concern. I trust that her remarks on the administration's records were made because she is concerned as well as I am with the issue and not with the circumstances. Certainly, in sponsoring very recently a legislative initiative that addressed a Clinton administration policy of letting drug smugglers go, she herself is aware of some of the shortcomings of that record. Unfortunately, in her remarks after I made my remarks that day 2 weeks ago, she did not address many of the issues that I raised. In addition, she, too, seems to have found it difficult to set the record straight based on the record. Many of her remarks dealt with administration initiatives that are only indirectly concerned with drug policy.

It is, therefore, useful to review the record of both actions and words that took us down the path that we are on today, in other words, the path that changed dramatically from the 1980's up until about 1991 or 1992.

Here we can see three major differences in present policy from our earlier successful efforts. First, at the beginning of the Clinton administration, we saw a decision to lower the profile of the drug czar's office. That was accomplished by firing over 80 percent of the staff in the first weeks of the new administration and by appointing a no-profile drug czar. We should ask ourselves if that decision tells us anything about the intent of a new administration.

Second, we saw a decision by this administration to shift the counter drug efforts away from interdiction and enforcement to treatment. This was, in fact, an upfront announced policy of this administration. It would seem to tell us something about priorities and about desired outcomes. The consequences of that decision have been a steady decline in our interdiction efforts and a decline in prosecutions of major drug offenders. It would seem we are getting what we should have expected.

Third, we saw a decision by the President to absent himself from the drug issue. In this regard, I have noted the need for clear, consistent leadership on this issue, but a number of our colleagues, both Democrat and Republican, have noted a deafening silence in the past, coming from the White House on the issue of drugs. This is in sharp contrast to previous administrations.

You can actually count on your fingers on one hand the number of times the President mentioned drugs in the first 3 years of his administration. We need to ask ourselves if this silence was accidental, was an oversight, or was a matter of deliberate policy. Even a policy defined by an absence of mind, however, is still a policy. And, of course, as we all know, choices have consequences.

Taken together, these decisions represent more than just a minor restructuring of programs that were working. Even though spending on counter drug efforts remained fairly steady, there was a significant shift in emphasis. There was a very significant dropoff in rhetoric about the drug problem, and there was a significant decline in interdiction and enforcement efforts. These have been documented in a number of news reports, a number of congressional studies, and even in information provided by this administration.

Leading Democrats and Republicans in the last several years have also noted the silence from the President on the drug issue. Their conclusion was that the bully pulpit lost its chief representative.

Unfortunately, as this silence progressed, the voices for legalization of drugs gathered steam. Silence at the White House, a maddening echo around the issue for legalization.

Not since the 1970's have we seen this much voice, this much effort about the clamor to make drugs more widely available. And, disturbingly, the renewed call for drug legalization comes first from within the administration itself. It came from no less a person than the Surgeon General of the United States, a position that carries great moral weight and an opportunity to lead.

At the time, the startling remarks of Joycelyn Elders may have received only a minor rebuke from the White House. Whatever might have been said or done to counter the efforts of the Surgeon General's remarks remain unsaid. Oh, yes, I know she was fired, but the rest, as they say, is history.

Now, if choices have consequences and if policies have purposes, we should ask ourselves what we see as a result of these choices and policies of recent years. Here is the current record.

After a decade of decline in drug use, we see startling new figures of returning use of drugs. Every survey, including the most recent hospital emergency room studies released just last week, show a returning drug problem. Teenage use is on the rise. Teenage attitudes about the dangers of drug use have changed for the worse. Emergency room admissions are rising. Calls for drug legalization and efforts to accomplish it abound.

The bottom line is that more kids are starting to use drugs. Presumably, these outcomes were not the intent of the policies stated or left unstated, as I have mentioned. If that is true, then we are drawn to the conclusion that

these efforts are either a failure or, at least, ineffective, and we have some further evidence that this view is shared by the administration.

In the last several months of an election year, the administration has changed its course very dramatically on drug policy. The President has named a new high-profile drug czar. He has agreed to restore the personnel, that 80 percent cut I spoke about that came in 1993 in the drug office, to restore that personnel. We have given the money to do that. He has agreed to beef up spending on interdiction and enforcement, and he has made himself more visible on the drug issue.

These changes may smack of an election-year conversion, but they correspond exactly to the problems in the policies that I noted earlier. They seem to indicate an awareness of a problem. I leave it to others to determine whether this shift is too little, too late. I leave it to others to decide whether the shift is as a result of political convenience in an election year. But what we all need to know and remember is that when it comes to drugs, we find ourselves back in a familiar and dangerous neighborhood. We took a wrong turn and have ended up on a dead-end street. We have been here before, and we cannot afford to stick around a dead-end street.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, if I understand the parliamentary situation, we went, temporarily, off the budget resolution so the Senator could speak as in morning business. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. EXON. I have cleared this on both sides of the aisle. Following the remarks by the Senator from New Hampshire, I ask unanimous consent that we return to the budget resolution, and I yield 15 minutes at that juncture to the Senator from New Jersey.

Following the completion of the 15 minutes of the Senator from New Jersey, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of time on both sides on the budget resolution be retained and set over until tomorrow, and that there be no further action following the remarks to be offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

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

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

TRIBUTE TO MY FRIEND, SENATOR BOB DOLE

Mr. SMITH. Madam President, today I rise to join so many of my colleagues in a tribute to my friend and my lead-

er, Senator Bob DOLE, who, as we all know, is leaving the Senate today, June 11, 1996.

As a former history teacher, I could not help but sense the historical significance of this day. It really was a flashback to the old days of the great oratory that took place on the Senate floor, with the likes of Calhoun and Clay and others, when Bob DOLE took the podium that he so many times has stood at and addressed the U.S. Senate. You could hear a pin drop in the Chamber and in the gallery, not always the case here on the Senate floor, with a lot of hustling and bustling and talking and people not paying attention.

That was not the case today. Senator BOB DOLE took that podium, addressed the country, the Chair, his colleagues and friends, many, many staff in the galleries, and the Chamber was hushed and quiet and everybody was listening—as well they should, Madam President, because when the history books are written, they will write about the great Senators who have occupied this Chamber: Henry Clay, John C. Calhoun, Bob La Follette, Robert Taft and, yes, Daniel Webster. Daniel Webster used this very desk, Madam President, that I now have the privilege of speaking from.

It reminds me that we are just a brief blip on the radar screen of time; here for only an instant. But BOB DOLE is one of the great ones, and he will be remembered as one of the great ones.

As a history student, I tried to catch a sense of what was happening. I looked at faces, watched people in this Chamber, as I watched, at the same time, Senator DOLE. Without singling anybody out by name, I could not help but notice one page, a young lady, standing here on the floor of the Chamber during that speech and after the speech with tears running down her cheeks. It really was a very moving tribute to the kind of person BOB DOLE is, because he commands the respect of not only his colleagues but every single man, woman, youngster, page. He could talk to a page as easily as he could talk to a President or world leader. That is what makes him such a great man.

Today, he left the Senate to move on to other things. I remember many emotional private goodbyes that he shared with his colleagues. I remember when we had the meeting when he told us he was leaving. Most of us did not expect him to do it. If we were honest, we would say we did not expect him to say that. We thought he might leave the leadership post but not the Senate. But when he did it, and the way he told us, we knew it was the right thing. We knew it was right, because he needed to be out there debating, not other Senators on the floor of the Senate, but the President of the United States for the Presidency. We all knew that.

Today, I think you saw with the type of speech that BOB DOLE gave the kind of person he is: humble, gracious, and humorous, that great sense of humor.

In all the tough battles we have here, he still finds that humor, which has always been a remarkable characteristic.

So he is leaving the Senate. But he left today after that speech with the longest applause that I have ever seen given anyone in this Chamber or in the House Chamber. I have seen Presidents when we have gone to the State of the Union—great Presidents—receive a lot of ovations. I have never seen anybody receive a longer ovation than BOB DOLE received here today, and that is a tribute to this great man who was elected to the House of Representatives where, Madam President, you and I both served together. He was elected in 1960 and served four terms in the House before he was elected to the U.S. Senate, which really has come to be, the past 27 years, his home.

But he gave nearly 36 years of service to the State of Kansas and to the people of the United States of America. When you think about that many years of public service and reflect on the fact there is not one word or taint of scandal in any way, shape, or form, an unblemished, perfect political record, it is remarkable.

He served his country and the Senate and the people with humor, with humility, and we will never forget him.

His wife, Elizabeth, who has been by his side for so many years, is such a gracious woman and such an asset to BOB DOLE. Those who serve here know how important the support of your family is as you put in the long, long hours that we have to endure in the Senate.

BOB DOLE said today in his remarks, "My word is my bond." That is what it is all about. It is character. It is integrity and character. If you leave here, the legacy you leave, if no one says anything about you other than when he gave his word he kept it, you cannot do any better than that.

I tried to think about what I might say here as my tribute in my own way, because so many people have so many wonderful things to say about this great man. I just want to share a couple of personal things, because they are important to me and I think it captures my feeling about BOB DOLE.

I come from a military family. My father served in World War II as a naval aviator and was killed at the end of the war, leaving my mother as a widow to raise my brother and me. She did that alone. I lost my dad, as I say, in World War II, and BOB DOLE nearly lost his life in that same war. Severely injured, he had to fight his way back, not only from the brink of death but after that, paralysis, and became a U.S. Senator.

But we, the sons and daughters of that generation, those of us who had parents who were in that war, World War II, we know, we are grateful. Perhaps we know and are a little bit more grateful than others for what they did and the sacrifices they made and how important they were to save the world from tyranny. It took heroes like BOB