

they may be at this very, very difficult time.

THE DRUG EPIDEMIC

Mr. COVERDELL. Today we are going to talk about another war, and that is the domestic war that is infecting millions upon millions of Americans—primarily teenagers—as we deal with yet a new drug epidemic in the United States. And “epidemic” is the right word. It is hard to believe that we are in the midst of one. And we hope that the next hour and a half will be in part a wake-up call to Americans across our land that all of us have to be engaged in—putting the question mark in the mind of every teenager as to the effect on their lives of abuse of drugs. All I can say is, even if they ultimately recuperate from it, that their lives will be unalterably and forever changed.

With that, Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas for up to 10 minutes on this issue. I know he wants to say a word or two about Iraq as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, let me thank our dear colleague from Georgia.

THE CONFLICT IN IRAQ

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I have always tried to make it a matter of policy to be supportive of the President on international and military affairs whenever possible. I think each of us in the Senate owe it to the President to give him the benefit of the doubt on military matters. Certainly we owe it to those in uniform to be supportive of them when they are in harm's way.

I believe that given the conflict among the warring Kurdish factions in the northern part of Iraq and the instability there that the President's actions can be justified both to send a warning to Saddam Hussein and to destroy the air defense capability in the southern part of the country so that we might extend the no-fly zone.

But, having said that, Mr. President, let me make it very clear that while giving the President the benefit of the doubt I can support the actions he has taken in firing 27 cruise missiles and destroying air defense capacity in expanding the no-fly zone, and while I certainly support our military forces in the region, if we look at the fundamental conflict, it is a conflict between two warring Kurdish factions—one backed by Iraq and one backed by Iran, and we do not have a dog in that fight.

If this conflict escalates, if this becomes a conflict between Iran and Iraq, I think the President would be poorly advised in becoming involved in that conflict and I would not and could not support such an involvement.

THE DRUG EPIDEMIC

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I want to talk a little bit about drug use. You

may recall that many people derided or made fun of Nancy Reagan's “just say no” approach to the use of illegal drugs. But I think it is interesting that for 11 years in a row during the Reagan-Bush era drug use among our children declined. Just saying no was a policy that worked. It seems now that we are not saying no enough in Washington and our children are not saying no enough in our junior high schools.

If we look at the record on drug use, it is a frightening sight as to what is happening. Overall drug use has more than doubled in the last 4 years. Drug use among teenagers is up 105 percent in the last 4 years. The use of marijuana among teenagers has risen 141 percent. Cocaine usage among teenagers in the last 2 years has gone up by 160 percent. Today 1 out of every 10 children in America between the ages of 12—that is the sixth grade—and 17 now are using drugs at least once a month.

How did Washington contribute to this tragedy that is occurring in every junior high school in America? I think it started when President Clinton took office and, in his first days, cut the drug czar's office by 83 percent. President Clinton cut drug interdiction spending 25 percent below the level carried in the last Bush budget. Between 1992 and 1995, 227 positions at DEA were eliminated. Drug prosecutions in 1993 and 1994 declined by 12 percent, and the average sentence for selling marijuana declined by 13 percent from 1992 to 1995.

I think if we are serious about this problem that we need to end the debate that we have been engaged in with the administration for the last 4 years where the President is trying to eliminate mandatory minimum prison sentences for hoodlums who are selling drugs at junior high schools, and we need to enact reforms that the Senate has adopted numerous times, and yet which has not yet become the law of the land. I have proposed 10 years in prison without parole for selling drugs to a minor or involving a minor in drug trafficking, so every hoodlum in America, when they are thinking about selling drugs to a child, will understand that if they are convicted they are going to prison and they are going to serve every day of 10 years in prison no matter who their daddy is or how they may think society has done them wrong.

I also want life in prison for people who get out of prison having been convicted once of selling drugs to a minor and turn right around and do it again.

I think when we look at this data on drug use it is obvious that we are not doing our job. I think we need to change that pattern. I want to double the size of the Border Patrol. This last year we took a first step. It is a major step in the right direction. Right now we have more police officers in Washington, DC, than we have Border Patrol agents trying to police and control the entire border of the United States of America. It is not unusual—in fact it is

the norm—to have on any shift in a 300-mile strip from Brownsville to Laredo 87 Border Patrol agents actually working that line. We are using in many cases near-obsolete sensing devices, while the military has great night vision and infrared capacity. We do not have similar capability in the Border Patrol. That needs to change.

We need to double the size of the Border Patrol over the next 5 years. I believe that given the threat we face from armed drug gangs, with automatic weapons, with night-vision capability, and with sophisticated electronic communications basically invading our country nightly, that we do not now have the resources we need and we have certainly not committed the will to keep drugs out of our country.

We need to expand the capacity of the FBI Academy. I think we should have a goal that within 5 years we double the training capacity of the FBI Academy. In no other way can we give local law enforcement personnel the enrichment of training that they need and which can, in turn, be passed on within their police departments and their sheriff departments.

We need to expand the size of the DEA. I think if you will look at your individual State, you are going to find that in many vast regions we have only two or three or four DEA agents. And let me make it clear. I have no criticism of our Border Patrol agents, our FBI agents, our DEA agents. They are doing their job. The problem is they are not getting the support they need from Washington.

We need to prosecute vigorously drug felons in general and criminals who are selling drugs to children. I would like to see us change our building code and stop building prisons like Holiday Inns. We have at least three Federal statutes which criminalize making prisoners work. Prisoners cannot produce goods to be sold across State lines. They cannot produce items to be sold within the State. We have limits on the transport of prison-produced goods and you have to pay the union scale if you make prisoners work. Needless to say, not many prisoners in America are working and producing anything of value.

We took the first step in the Senate toward changing that last year. That effort died because it was opposed in the House and by the President. But I think we need to continue to work to change the criminal justice system in America.

In addition to that, we have to take a zero-tolerance approach to drugs. We need to make it very clear to young people that drug use is not acceptable. We need to hold people who are buying drugs just as responsible as people who are selling drugs. Whether we are talking about a high school student or a wide receiver for the Dallas Cowboys, drug use should be a serious matter. I think we ought to call on our professional athletic leagues, the NFL, professional baseball, professional basketball, to set higher standards. If people

are going to be set out as role models for our children, I think when they have established a pattern of drug use they ought not to be playing professional football or professional basketball.

I think these are changes that need to be looked at. If you look at this data and you are not alarmed, then I think you do not understand this problem. I think drug use represents one of the greatest threats we face.

I thank our colleague from Georgia for leading this effort to try to make the public more aware of it. I am hopeful that we will have an opportunity in Commerce-State-Justice appropriations to look at our priorities in terms of the Border Patrol and law enforcement. We should pass a major new crime and antidrug bill which is aimed at getting tough on those who are selling drugs but which also holds accountable those who are buying drugs.

I am very proud of the provision in the welfare bill which for the first time takes the public policy position that if you are convicted of a drug felony, we are not going, through our welfare programs, to give you a base pay in welfare and food stamps while you are out selling drugs at the local junior high school; that one of the things that is going to happen to you if we convict you of a drug felony under our new welfare bill is you are going to lose your cash welfare benefits and you are going to lose your food stamps.

I think that is a perfectly reasonable proposal, and I think it is something that should be expanded. Our society should take a zero-tolerance approach to drugs. I think that is the only way we are going to solve this problem. When Nancy Reagan was saying no, when our country was taking a stronger approach, drug use fell for 11 years. It seems in recent years our Government has not been saying no, and, as a result, drug use has skyrocketed among our children. I think we need to do something about it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank the Senator from Texas for the remarks he has made and the contribution he has made over the years with regard to our constant battle with narcotics. I appreciate very much him joining us this afternoon.

Mr. GRAMM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, in a moment I am going to call on the distinguished Senator from Ohio, but I would like to take just a few moments to put before the Senate a question I put before local policymakers all across my State about a week ago. I went from one end of the State to the other and in each jurisdiction I said: I want this meeting to be a wakeup call. I want it to be absolutely clear in all of our minds when we leave this meeting and when we leave here today that

there is a new drug epidemic in the United States. Epidemic. You will hear these figures throughout the afternoon, but essentially drug use among teenagers has doubled.

What does that mean? That means 2 million more teenagers are involved with drugs today than were just 36 months ago. The increase on the part of teenagers in the last 12 months—12 months—increased 33 percent.

You heard the Senator from Texas begin to talk about the fact that we had to restore interdiction efforts on the border. You will hear many other suggestions that we need to restore and reopen the drug czar's office, that we need to double our efforts, we need to quit reducing military capacity involved in interdiction and restore it. But that is going to take some time. That is not going to happen tomorrow. These systems were being shut down, and it takes a lot of funding and time to turn them back on.

In the meantime, what I would ask is that every policymaker, be they Federal officers, Members of the of the Senate, a county commissioner or teacher, every policymaker at every level, every chamber member, every business leader, every church, every family at their kitchen table, the media, they can make an enormous contribution by being part of the wakeup system. While we are waiting for these other systems to be put back in gear, I would ask every citizen of this country to help us warn teenagers, particularly young children, kids that are 8 to 13, that drugs are dangerous, that drugs will ruin their lives, alter their lives, change the way they are educated, where they can get a job or cannot get a job. They are making decisions that are going to affect them for their whole life.

For some reason—and I am sure it will be talked about here this afternoon—we have the highest number of teenagers in modern history who do not think drugs are a threat or a risk, so, conversely, they are using drugs in unprecedented numbers. It is up to us, the leaders of our Nation, to warn them, to give them the opportunity to understand this is dangerous stuff; this will unalterably affect their lives. Hopefully, those who are ensnared can be rehabilitated. But even if we do, it will be at great cost and you will never be able to put all the pieces back together for these kids.

One last thing and I am going to turn to the Senator from Ohio. The difference between this epidemic that we are in now and the one in the 1960's and 1970's? There is a striking difference. The target audience then was age 17 to 21. The target of the cartels today is kids 8 to 13—8 to 13. This is the first war that has ever been waged against kids.

I yield up to 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I first thank my colleague from Georgia for leading this discussion today. I cannot think of a more appropriate forum than the U.S. Senate, nor can I think of a more appropriate topic for us to be discussing today than what is literally the crisis that is facing our young people.

The evidence is out. The statistics are there. We have seen the headlines in the newspapers in the last few weeks that others have detailed on this floor already today. But I would like to spend a little time talking about it and maybe reflecting on my personal experiences in dealing with this problem. I used to be a county prosecuting attorney in Ohio. I dealt with kids who were certainly at risk, kids who were starting out on lives of crime, kids who had unbelievable problems. Later I served as Lieutenant Governor in a State with a very large at-risk youth population. I worked on the education system, but I also worked on the prison system, and I saw a lot of kids leading, certainly what we would describe as, broken lives.

Based on that experience, I am convinced, if we truly want to save the next generation of young people in this country, we can no longer, as a country, pretend the problem does not exist. I am afraid, to some extent that is what we have been doing. We have to face the problem and we cannot do that, frankly, without Presidential leadership. Over the last 4 years, we have basically surrendered on the fight against drugs. A couple of weeks ago, President Clinton's Department of Health and Human Services released a report stating the total failure of the Clinton administration on this particular issue. The statistics are unbelievable.

From 1992 to 1995, overall drug use by teenagers, young people age 12 to 17, has risen by 78 percent. Marijuana use is up 105 percent, more than double what it was 4 years ago. That is after 11 years of declining marijuana use, 11 straight years of declining marijuana use under President Reagan and President Bush. Now we are up 105 percent in just a couple of years. Use of LSD and other hallucinogens is up 183 percent, nearly triple what it was 4 years ago. Cocaine use is up 166 percent. If you really want to see the tragedy my colleague from Georgia has talked about in the past, if you really want to see the tragedy, look at the emergency rooms and look at the people who have gone into the emergency rooms for overdose problems today.

One out of every ten children age 12 to 17 is using drugs on a monthly basis—1 out of every 10 children. We must do something. This administration's approach has basically been one of neglect. For years, the Reagan and Bush Justice Departments would concentrate their most intensive efforts on two areas of law enforcement: Gun crimes and drugs. When President Clinton came in, this effort simply withered away. Here are the statistics.

Under President Clinton, the prosecution of gun-related offenses in Federal court by U.S. attorneys went down 20 percent—down 20 percent. That is after an increase year after year under the Bush and Reagan administrations. Further, under President Clinton, drug prosecutions have gone down 12.5 percent.

It is incredible. The drug problem is skyrocketing but the Clinton administration's willingness to fight has gone down. President Clinton has cut 625 individuals, soldiers, out of the ranks of the war on drugs; 625 law enforcement personnel from 6 separate Federal agencies are gone. Under President Clinton, Federal spending on drug interdiction went down 25 percent.

These are not just statistics, these are not just facts. This matters. This makes a difference, because spending less on interdiction makes a difference. According to recent Federal law enforcement statistics, the disruption rate—that is the amount of drugs that are blocked from coming into this country—dropped 53 percent between 1993 and early 1995. That means that an additional 84 metric tons of marijuana and cocaine came into America and comes into America every single year.

Since 1993, Coast Guard seizures of cocaine are down 45 percent. Coast Guard seizures of marijuana for that same period of time are down 90 percent. That says a lot about the priorities of this administration. Instead of cracking down on gun criminals, people who use a firearm to commit an offense, repeat violent offenders, and instead of getting tough on drugs, this administration has literally taken a walk. I am sure that is one reason Democratic Congressman CHARLIE RANGEL—certainly someone in the U.S. Congress who is one of the foremost leaders in this area, who has spent a lot of time battling the drug problem—said, "I have never, never, never met a President who cares less about this issue."

That sums up very well the prevalent attitude of the current administration with regard to the war on drugs. It is an attitude of neglect. For anyone who cares about the future of this country, this attitude is totally unacceptable. The average young person who is using drugs in high school ends up in trouble. That individual represents America's future. This is something we have to get serious about. This administration, unfortunately, did just the opposite. They cut the drug czar's office. One of the first things they did is they cut the drug czar's office by 83 percent. Their Surgeon General talked about legalizing drugs. "We should study that," she said. Their National Security Council dropped drugs—this is astonishing, absolutely amazing—their National Security Council dropped drugs from the top 3 of national priorities down to 29th, the last, 29 out of 29, when they ranked the national priorities; dead last. That tells you something about what this administration's attitude has been.

As a statement of our national priorities, as a statement of our national consensus, this administration's attitude and record are simply unacceptable. It is time for our national leadership to let the teenagers of this country know we are serious. Drugs do kill. We have to speak in this country with one clear voice.

In the first 9 months of 1995, President Clinton was interviewed 112 times. He mentioned drugs just once. He made 119 statements during that period of time, formal statements. He mentioned drugs just twice.

We need an attitude of "just say no." This administration, by contrast, has just said nothing. Drugs are a threat to the future of our children. They are a threat to the future of our country. That will be true even after this election year. It is time, frankly, for some followthrough in the Oval Office. We need to realize that our national effort against drugs is really not a war. All of us, myself included, use that term. That really is not the best of terms, because in a sense it is something more difficult than a war. When we talk about a war, we usually think of something where we go in as a country, we make the commitment, we pay the price, we get the job done, and we win and we go home, men and women go home—mission accomplished.

The antidrug effort in that sense is a not a war. Rather, it is more of a struggle, a struggle that is always going to be with us day in and day out and for every young person is, in a sense, a new battlefield, and victory is never final.

We live, Mr. President, in a society where we want everything instant, quick—oatmeal, instant coffee, everything has to be resolved in 30 minutes on TV from beginning to end, everything has to happen quickly. That is how we live our lives.

I think we have to understand and accept the fact it simply is not true in regard to our efforts in the drug area, that we have to hang in there, we have to stay in there, we have to talk about this problem and fight this problem day in and day out. The good news is we can, in fact, make a difference if we are willing to stay in there and if we are willing to have patience and if we are willing to persevere.

Mr. President, we need to win this struggle, but to win this struggle, we need to be focused. We need leadership. We need leadership from the top. We need leadership all the way through the system. There are many things that, frankly, we need to do.

We spend a lot of time debating what is more important: treatment, education, or law enforcement. The reality is, they are all important; we have to do them all. That is what the reality is. We have to have education. We have to have treatment. We have to have domestic law enforcement, and we also have to have drug interdiction that goes to the source and goes to the transit countries. We have to do all four, and we have to continue to do them day in and day out.

Mr. President, in a sense, this is a tall order. It is difficult to accomplish even when we have the best of intentions. But if you turn away from this effort, as this administration has done for several years, if you really do not act like there is a drug problem, you send the wrong message to the American people, but particularly to the most impressionable, and that is our young people. You send them the message that drugs are really not that big a problem.

My colleague from Georgia said it very well a moment ago. The most frightening statistic in all these polls we have seen published, all this data we have seen, is that consistently as drug use goes up, the fear of drugs is going down, and there is a relationship—I should say an inverse relationship—between those two. Part of that lack of fear is maybe lack of experience. That is what we deal with when we deal with young people, a lack of experience. But part of it also is that the message has not been reinforced as it has to be time after time after time after time. That is what, frankly, we need the President of the United States to do.

So, Mr. President, I ask that we recommit ourselves, from the President on down, to this antidrug effort, understanding that it is a long fight, it is a struggle, and that we are going to have to hang in there to get the job done.

I, again, thank my colleague from Georgia for taking time on the Senate floor today. It is an appropriate forum for a very, very critical issue that we need to be dealing with in this country. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio. I know that he is the father of a very large family and that there are many teenagers in that family, and this has to be an issue of personal concern to any parent, including the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, I would like to, if I can, read from an article that appeared in the Washington Post this past Friday, August 30. It is an article about the military role in the drug war, which is now being debated, and ought to be, because I often say that we suffer more casualties annually in the drug war than we did during the entirety of the Vietnam war. If you add up the collateral damage, the personal damage, it is staggering.

But to read from this article, not in its entirety, it says:

It was the last Republican President, George Bush, who in 1989 began enlisting military forces in regular patrols of Caribbean trafficking routes. But 4 years later, the Clinton administration reduced the number of planes and ships monitoring narcotics transit zones as a Democratic Congress slashed counterdrug funds. The move came in part of a shift in U.S. strategy that placed less emphasis on interdicting shipments into the United States and more on assisting

South American countries where the narcotics are produced. Pentagon spending on antidrug actions dropped about 27 percent in 1993, from \$1.1 billion to \$800 million, and has remained at about that level since.

The point I am making here, Mr. President, is that, if I can take one exception with the Senator from Ohio, I don't believe our situation is one of neglect, but rather one of conscious decisions made to dismantle much of the interdiction force, just as this article has documented.

The impact of the change has been argued ever since. Cocaine seizures in the transit zone between the United States and South American borders declined 47 percent between 1992 and 1995.

That is by half.

A General Accounting Office report recently criticized interdiction activities as inadequately planned and staffed.

The Senator from Texas spoke to the downsizing of the efforts at interdiction. The article says:

A study for the White House last year by EBR, Inc., a Virginia research firm, estimated that restoring \$500 million in military assets to blocking Caribbean routes could lower—

Lower—

the traffickers' success rate in shipping cocaine from 69 to 53 percent. But the estimate carried a high degree of uncertainty and the administration—

The White House—

concluded the possible gain wasn't worth the cost.

My point here is that the administration made specific changes in policy: closed the drug czar's office, cut interdiction in half, lowered military assets across the board.

And now, Mr. President, the results are coming in. The data by the administration itself has ratified what we have been saying for well over a year: that drug use among our youngsters and teenagers is skyrocketing.

I was just quoting from the Washington Post.

Here is another periodical less known. This is called the Gwinnett Daily Post, which is in a county north of Atlanta. And they recently published an article in our own State. This is just a suburban newspaper and probably will not go down in the chronicles of policy setting.

But, Mr. President, it is sort of interesting. I picked this up over the weekend scanning through clippings. It is written by Stacey Kelley, a staff writer for the Gwinnett Daily Post. But what she chronicles here is very significant. It says, "The number of drug related cases handled by the Gwinnett County Juvenile Court has increased 738 percent since 1992, * * * " Mr. President, I will repeat that: 738 percent in 36 months. " * * * with the most common cases involving marijuana and LSD, according to court records." And in 1992 the juvenile court handled 21 cases of drug-related crimes involving juveniles, kids. In 1995, 3 years later, that figure had increased to 176.

As I said to community leaders across my State—I would say it any-

where in the Nation—do not think your community is not experiencing these kinds of data because they are. It is everywhere. There is nobody free of this new epidemic. Nobody is free from this. Juvenile court deals with minors 16 years of age and under. Remember, Mr. President, a moment ago I said this epidemic is with a different-aged audience, aged 8-13 when they are getting ensnared in this. And this documents it. You could document this anywhere you go in the country.

We have been joined by the distinguished Senator from Idaho. I am going to call on him in just a moment.

If I might read one other paragraph in this Gwinnett Daily Post. It says:

Most of the drug cases that end up there [in juvenile court] are cases of drug possession. Jackie White, Juvenile Court Administrator, said it is rare to see a juvenile charged with distributing drugs.

"Drug cases are growing at a rate higher than all our delinquent cases," White said. Delinquent cases are those presented in Juvenile Court which involve criminal charges. In 1992, the Gwinnett court had 2,275 delinquent cases, and in 1995, 2,740 cases.

If you had these kinds of records in county after county across the country, and if you talked to local sheriffs or police officers, people that deal with juvenile courts, youth detention, they would all tell you the same thing. This is a massive epidemic. This is affecting a younger and younger audience, and the consequences are stunning and staggering.

Mr. President, I yield up to 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator who joins us from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 10 minutes.

MR. CRAIG. Mr. President, thank you very much.

Let me express my appreciation to the Senator from Georgia for bringing about this special order in which we could discuss a topic that has just now again burst upon the scene, at least from the standpoint of us having new figures and statistics to be concerned about. But many of us have recognized that it has been going on for some time in a way that this administration and others have just either ignored it or failed to address it.

As I came to the floor this afternoon, my friend from Georgia was talking about national statistics on teenage drug abuse versus local statistics and that national averages probably mean local averages if you take a close look at the problem, because I have a feeling that many of us have the habit of saying, well, gee, that really does sound bad and certainly the consequence for younger Americans is tragic but that really is not going on in my backyard. I think in a State like Idaho that remains relatively rural and, at least from the standpoint of metropolitan areas has few, that would be the case with many of my friends and associates in Idaho.

Let me start my comments this afternoon by talking about my home

State of Idaho because what we are now finding in our checking of statistics with law enforcement is that the national trends are Idaho's trends. I think that is probably true across the Nation.

In the last 4 years we have seen a dramatic reversal in the trends that we saw in the late 1980's and early 1990's in my home State of Idaho according to the Idaho Statistical Analysis Center. Juvenile drug arrests have jumped from a 9 percent decrease—a 9-percent decrease in 1991—to a 69-percent increase in 1995, an absolute flip-flop of the record. Why is it going on?

Juvenile drug arrests in Idaho are now growing at a faster rate than adult drug arrests. Let me repeat that. Juvenile drug arrests in Idaho are growing at a faster rate than adult drug arrests. Teens are experiencing drugs at younger and younger ages. And 7.1 percent of the ninth grade females and 1.5 percent of the 12th grade females used marijuana for the first time before the age of 13 in Idaho. And those are the statistics that ought to be alarming all of us because those are the same kinds of statistics that we have had reported to us by the substance abuse and medical health services administration in their statistics of a few weeks ago.

Illicit drug use among youth doubling since 1992. Marijuana use among 12- and 13-year-olds more than doubled since 1992, and tripling among 14- to 15-year-olds. Those are the national statistics, Mr. President. And yet those are the same statistics of Idaho, a State of about 1,300,000 people.

Cocaine, crack, heroin, LSD use among teenagers is expected to soon rival the highest rates of the 1970's. Why? What has changed? What in America is different in 1995 and 1996 than was existing in 1990, in 1988, in 1987 when we actually saw peaks and then declines in the use of some of these substances by our teenaged population? I think one thing has changed. And while over the last several years I have been unwilling to be bold in talking about it, clearly I think it is time to talk about it.

I remember because I was here in the early 1980's when Nancy Reagan said, "Just say no." There were a lot of the press and a lot of the liberal critics that said, "Are you kidding me? Just say no? We have to have control. We have got to have institutional programs. You can't just argue with teenage America that they ought to just say no."

But what Nancy Reagan knew as a mother and what a lot of citizens know in our country, that one of the greatest areas of control is when national leaders speak out and when in most instances there is the kind of internal peer pressure that really does have an impact. And that kind of national leadership, certainly that kind of internal peer pressure that is produced as a product of national leadership has been relatively nonexistent since the early 1990's at a time when our President

openly admits he once smoked marijuana, at a time when his press secretary says, "Well, yes, of course I did. And I've used it from time to time." In other words, what I am saying is, a national leadership with a relatively cavalier attitude that just simply says, "oh, so what." Well, the "oh, so what" is very simple. The "oh, so what" is teenage America listening to our national leaders with a tone that it does not really make any difference, that there is not really a problem there, that somehow it is OK.

I am not suggesting in any sense that our President has openly said that. But what I am suggesting is that a White House that cannot get security clearances because of its current drug use, a White House whose press secretary says "so what" a President who says, "My only defense against a past action is that I really didn't inhale," I am sorry, that is a leadership speaking out. That is our national icon, and the President of the United States is less than caring and less than leading on this issue.

What remains today as the greater deterrent? A statement that was made in the early 1980's by a lady who was openly ridiculed for making it, "Just say no." That "just say no" amongst teenagers today, with high school counselors and those who associate in peer-type organizations with young Americans is the strongest defense today against the use of illegal drugs or substance abuse. Say no, stand up, be an individual, speak out. But most importantly, say no. Say no for yourself and no for your peers.

What is the rest of the story beyond that, beyond tone setting, beyond leadership? We could pour billions of dollars into this, and we should put more into it. We tried to put more into it. As you know, the Clinton Justice Department issued a study recommending a reduction in mandatory minimum drug sentences, and the Clinton administration cut 355 DEA agents and 102 persons from the Justice Department's crime drug enforcement task force, and the Clinton administration cut the Coast Guard drug interdiction budget by \$14.6 billion. I could go on and on and on. We do need that side of it. We must have that side of it to stem the flow, to deter that kind of activity. Put all of that together, and this Congress will work hard to get it back on line.

But well beyond that, Mr. President, remains the fundamental responsibility that our national leadership must speak out that this is no longer something that you shrug and grin and walk away from because those who you put around you cannot meet the test, cannot meet the standard, are violating the law by their action behind the scenes. That is something that is unacceptable in this country.

We reap the whirlwind of inaction. We reap the whirlwind amongst our teenagers for a failure on the part of our leadership to clearly and openly stand out in opposition to this kind of

illegal and harmful activity. We all know what it can mean when drug abuse starts, when substance abuse begins. One action can lead to another. The use of marijuana oftentimes—by the admission of those who have used it—can lead to the use of harder drugs. That can lead to criminal activity beyond the act itself. Those are the kind of things that we need to worry about.

Why now, then, do the criminologists of this country, why, now, do the people who study our demographics say to us that as a society we need to prepare for something that we are institutionally unprepared to handle? That in the coming decade, starting now, we can anticipate a teenage and juvenile crime wave of the kind this country has never seen. That is the whirlwind we reap because we have failed to be responsive in the kind of leadership necessary to deal with the current statistics, the kind that we now see today, be they national or in my State of Idaho or any other State in the Nation.

This is an issue that will not go away. It is clearly an issue that this administration and that this Congress has to redress and move forward on. I want to thank my colleague, the Senator from Georgia, for his willingness to take this kind of leadership. What I have said today and what he is saying is not easy to say. I do not want to be a condemner. I want to be a supporter. I want to build up. In this area, clearly, amongst all other areas, we would like to be proud of the statistics that would be positive for our young people. That is nonexistent in this area today. We must deal with it. I hope we deal with it aggressively.

Again, it will not come by throwing money at it. It must come by a national conscience. It must come by knowing the difference between right and wrong. It must come from all of us as leaders here in the Senate and in the very White House that I have spoken of. That is the kind of leadership that we must have if we are going to deal with this issue and convince the young of our country that their actions must be changed for themselves and for their future.

I thank my colleague and yield back the time.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Idaho. He has reinforced several points that are worth talking about a little more.

I am convinced that most parents, until very recently, did not realize that we are in a new epidemic. I think they had heard year after year that drug use amongst our teenagers was falling. It did from 1980 to 1992. It was cut in half, which should be a sign of optimism for us as a people because it means that you can win this battle.

As the Senator from Ohio said earlier, it is a long struggle. It will never be over. But we can change the behavior and relationship of teenagers to drugs.

What we are doing here today is something that has to reverberate all

across the country. That is that we have to warn our parents that once again their children are at grave risk of being embroiled in this epidemic.

The second point that the Senator from Idaho makes that I think is very important is that if you think as a parent or a policymaker that this problem is an inner city ghetto problem, that it is just in poverty zones across our country, you are making a grave, grave mistake.

I do not care where you go in this country, you are going to find data like we have been hearing all afternoon. There is going to be more action in the juvenile court. There will be more action among law enforcement officials and teenagers.

The article, which I will return to in a minute—the Gwinnett Daily Post is in one of the largest suburban counties in our country, just outside of Atlanta. In rural and inner city and suburban communities it was consistent. It did not matter where you went or what the sociostrata of the community was. It did not matter. This is the kind of data that we were finding in every kind of community. No one is exempt from this. Everybody better have that yellow light on in their home. Every church needs to rethink what it is doing about this problem. Every business leader needs to be thinking about what is happening with the colleagues in that business. If you think that you do not need a drug-free workplace program, you are making a mistake.

I was talking to an executive of a substantial company in Augusta, GA. They make water cups. It has been a very long success story. They bought some facilities and they doubled their production. All of a sudden, Mr. President, there was theft of petty items, wallets, and purses. Then suddenly more and more material was missing.

They called in outside consultants and they said, "We think you have a drug problem." They said "could not" then. They resisted it. Finally, they hired an outside consultant, went to an undercover agent and, indeed, discovered a drug ring in the company, robbing it of its production costs and much, much productivity and many, many funds. It was difficult to correct, but they corrected it.

The point I am making, Mr. President, is that any business, any family, any church, any community—it doesn't matter where—better have the wake-up bell on full. This is an epidemic, and it is in our backyard and our front yard.

Now, it also means you are talking about a classmate, a brother, or a sister. Sometimes we lose the proportions of this when we talk about numbers, such as 178 percent, 141 percent, 2 million people. Just remember, Mr. President, that every one of those numbers is a personal tragedy, and the tragedy goes far beyond the person that has been embroiled in the use of drugs. It is going to affect everybody around them—their family, their workplace, their school, their church.

Mr. President, about 4 months ago, I guess, I visited a youth development center. I know the chair, along with all of us, is constantly visiting places and trying to understand how they operate and work. Sometimes you are never quite prepared. You go to so many meetings like that, and you never really prepare yourself for them. The poignancy of them hits you cold in the face.

In this youth development center, I met around 12 young females. Their average age was 14 to 16. They agreed to come and talk to me about what happened to them. I thought that was pretty courageous. One by one, they walked around, and they represented every walk of life, every income level, the mix of America. And they were there for attempted murder, assault and battery, auto theft, you name it. You can look at these groups of innocent faces and wonder how in the world this could happen. In a word: drugs.

Every one of them had come there through a journey of drugs. Drugs had caused them to lose control of their lives. Three of them said that if they had not been arrested, they would be dead. I asked them, "What would you say to the youth of the country if you could speak to them?" I wish we could have filmed this and have every teenager in our country hear them talk.

Mr. President, they said, "Don't do it. Do not do it." No. 2, they said, "You think that you can control these drugs, and you are wrong. The drugs will take over." No. 3, they said, "Never, ever use drugs to enter a peer group or to be a part of it. If somebody wants you to use drugs to be their friend, they are not your friend."

I asked each of them, "Well, how did you get started on this, and how old were you?" Every one of them got into drugs between the ages of 8 and 11. Every one of them said drugs are everywhere. There was no problem at all getting them. And every one of them acknowledged that their lives would never be the same if they were lucky enough to get over it. The damage to their families, the damage to their dreams, the damage to their hopes and aspirations had in much part already occurred. I wish every youngster could have heard that message.

Now, the Senator from Idaho was talking about message. In the article I just read from the Post, we talked about the fact that we had lowered interdiction budgets. We have heard various figures about shutting down the drug czar's office. Yes, all of those things have had an affect and are the underlying reason for this change of attitude among teenagers. But, in my judgment, the single most profound change that has occurred is in the message, what these very vulnerable citizens, these youngsters aged 8 to 13, are hearing. I think everybody admits that the Hollywood message is very, very disruptive, the glorification of drug use. It is a great debate in our Nation.

The Senator from Texas talked about the role models that our great sports

heroes are to a very vulnerable population. And I believe that professional athletics is going to have to step back and take a look at what their contribution is here. Everywhere I went, somebody in the audience would stand up and say, "Well, what are we going to do about the fact that a national athlete, a \$20 million baby, gets involved in drugs, and there is nothing that really happens about it?" What does that say to these girls, to these 8 to 12-year olds, Mr. President?

Mr. President, on June 16, 1992, on MTV, a youth-driven communications system, the questioner asked the President of the United States, "If you had it to do over again, would you inhale?" Candidate Clinton: "Sure, if I could. I tried before." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, the message is having a more profound affect on what our young people think about drugs than probably all these other assets we are talking about. I don't mean to suggest that we don't need to get that drug czar's office back in line. I think the selection of General McCaffrey is an excellent one. I wish he had been there all along. I wish we weren't confronted with this epidemic. But the most profound affect is what our leaders are saying to the country about drug use. This cavalier response, and the fact that there are contemporary employees of the White House who have recently broken the law and have engaged in drug use, the remarks by the press office about it, the remarks that were made by the first Surgeon General of this administration flirting with legalization, that message races through the country and very quickly sanctions, becomes nonthreatening to this very, very young target of the drug cartels.

That is why I said earlier that we need a wake-up call at every level including the White House. All of us need to be engaged in putting that question mark in the head of every young person in America. This stuff is dangerous. This stuff is life altering. This will have a profound effect on you, your family, and your future. If that message begins to resonate, it will become the first line of defense in this struggle that we have with this new national epidemic. Message: What we say and how we act influences—always has and always will—the children of any country and any nation.

Mr. President, we have been joined by my colleague from Texas. I yield up to 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. President, and I thank the Senator from Georgia for starting off after Labor Day on this very important issue.

Many of us were stunned when the first report came out that showed the enormous leap in drug use and drug abuse in this country in the last 3

years. We knew that it was a problem. But I do not think we realized how big a problem this has become. In fact, I was privileged to be able to see Mrs. Ronald Reagan, Nancy Reagan, who started the "just say no" whole effort when she was the First Lady of this country. And I think she was a leader. She was prophetic.

I remember that people sort of ridiculed her in a way when she started the "just say no" program. They sort of acted like, oh, you know—that really was not cool. Well, it was proven by all of the studies that in fact her willingness to stand up and say we need to go out into our schools and tell our young people to just say no was in fact very effective because it started the thinking of our young people—that they did not have to be with their peers. They did not have to be cool just because their peers would ridicule people who just said no to drugs. In fact, it worked because she started the thinking process in their minds. And the studies showed that between 1985 and 1992 drug use did go down.

I remember the ads on television of some of our sports stars talking about the importance of keeping your body clean. That sold to our young people. But then when President Clinton came into office and his administration, he slashed the Office of Drug Control Policy from 147 people to 25 people. There was not a focus on this very important issue. So the gains that were won during those earlier years went by the wayside.

In the study that came out just recently in September 1995—the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services—said that since 1992 marijuana use among young people has increased an average of 50 percent. Marijuana use jumped 137 percent among 12- to 13-year olds since 1992, and 200 percent among 14- and 15-year olds.

Mr. President, we used to worry about our high school kids. And we still need to worry about our high school kids. We are talking junior high and even elementary schoolchildren who are now being introduced to marijuana and other kinds of drugs. And worse yet, of course, they are being introduced to it by their peers because the drug dealers have learned that if they can get a juvenile to do this crime that the juvenile will not be subject to the same penalties.

So, Mr. President, it is going to take a concerted effort by the President with his leadership, and by the Congress standing with the President and saying enough is enough. Just say no makes a lot more sense than just say nothing. We must not let a whole generation of our young people think that we do not care about their minds and their futures and their potential. We cannot let that happen, Mr. President. We have to stand up and say we are going to do something about this and we are going to take it from every level.

Gen. Barry McCaffrey, who is the new drug czar, is well aware of this. I think he is a man who can handle this issue. He, too, believes that having an annual drug awareness day is not enough for our young people; that we must show how serious we are by stopping drugs at our borders, by having education efforts, by having counseling efforts, by having peer groups work with troubled youth. And he is going to try to turn this around. But it is going to take more than just one person. It is going to take all of us working together to try to turn back this terrible increase that we are seeing. The national drug control strategy should interdict drugs in Latin America and at our borders.

I am particularly hit by this because I have seen in my State what is happening with the drugs coming from South America through Mexico and right into Texas as well as New Mexico, Arizona, and California. But I happen to be closer to it because my own ranchers are devastated by what they are seeing. And they are frankly in a war with no defenses. We have common ranchers who are now meeting drug warlords with automatic weapons. And if a rancher objects to a drug lord coming across his or her property along the border they will be shot down. It has happened. They are so scared and so defenseless that the worst of all things is now happening. They are having to sell their property. Who do you think is giving them 10 times the worth? The drug dealers. They are the only ones who can afford it.

So we are seeing drug dealers buying up the lands in remote parts of our borders so that they will have a free trail right up through South America through Mexico and into the United States. Mr. President, we cannot let this happen. This is a war and we must treat it as a war. If they had chemical weapons coming across our borders we would have an all-out alert. We would declare a war. Well, Mr. President, this is chemical weaponry. Drugs are chemical weapons that are ruining the people, and especially the young people of our country.

So, Mr. President, we must get serious about this. I have seen it firsthand. We must increase the number of Border Patrol agents. We must use all the technology that we have available that we are not now using. We have better technology than we are using. A drug enforcer can sit in an office and survey for 25 miles and see movement. But we do not have the up-to-date technology on our borders that is available to us in this country right now, and we have to do something about that. We have to stop the money laundering.

I was talking to a Border Patrol agent who said these people are getting so bold that they stopped a man walking down the streets of one of our border cities with a suitcase, dragging the suitcase along. And when they stopped the man and opened the suitcase there was \$3 million in cash. That is incred-

ible—that people would be dragging a suitcase with \$3 million of cash down the main street of a border community right here in our own country because that money was headed right back into the mainstream of America. That was clearly drug money.

So they think they can get by with this—that they would be so bold. Well, we have to tell them that the time has come and we are not going to allow the money laundering. We are not going to allow the buying up of our property. We are not going to allow people to just come into our country with chemical weapons against our young people.

We cannot let that happen. We are going to have to come at this from all angles.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for working with us to make sure that the people of this country know the seriousness of this issue and to let the people of this country know that Congress is going to get serious about it. We have to be able to work with the President to take control of this cancer on our society.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas particularly for the personal observations with regard to the property. I have heard of that, but I have never heard it so vividly described as the Senator from Texas just revealed, an unbelievable condition in her State. I appreciate her bringing that to our attention.

I yield up to 7 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank my good friend and colleague from Georgia for the time. I join with him in thanking our colleague from Texas, Senator HUTCHISON, for describing the scope of the problem.

We have all seen the numbers in recent surveys, the percentage of adolescents between the ages of 12 and 17 who admit to using drugs within the last month. That increase has gone from 5.3 percent in 1992 to 10.9 percent in 1995. The statistics from these surveys show that the use of LSD and hallucinogens is up anywhere from 183 percent, cocaine up 166 percent, marijuana use up 144 percent. But there are other factors that give us a better idea of the pervasiveness and the impact that drugs are having in our country. When the Senator from Texas tells about the Texas border and other places where ranchers are threatened by drug lords—and we have heard the same thing from the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], talking about how the drug efforts are really moving a foreign, hostile nation into our borders—we ought to be seriously concerned; the problems are very acute in the border areas.

There are some other statistics that are very alarming away from the bor-

ders, in the heartland of the United States. In the August 21 edition of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, we had the very frightening news that emergencies in the medical care units in St. Louis were up an astounding amount as it relates to drugs. The overall increase in drug-related emergencies nationally has gone up significantly, but St. Louis for one had an even greater increase. Since 1992, heroin-related emergencies are up 111 percent in St. Louis hospitals and medical care facilities. That is even worse than the national rate, which is up 58 percent. We are talking about an explosion of emergencies linked to heroin.

Now they say: Oh, well, it may not all be exactly statistically related to the increase in drug use. It may be some bad heroin.

When you look at the numbers nationwide and you see these emergencies, these are not people responding to a survey about whom we may question their veracity. These are people who are hauled in in serious condition to an emergency room. They are not deciding whether or not to honestly answer a question of a survey. They are hoping to start breathing again.

Cocaine-linked emergencies were up 38 percent in St. Louis in the last 4 years. They are up 19 percent nationwide. Marijuana-related emergencies increased 316 percent in St. Louis in the last 4 years.

There is no question, from whatever statistics you use, whether you listen to the Senator from Texas talk about the problems of property being taken over on the Texas-New Mexico-Arizona borders, whether you read the general national statistics that drug use is up, whether you take a look at the hospital and emergency-room-related emergencies, we see a very clear pattern that drug use is up, the abuse of drugs is up, and the problem for our society is getting worse, not better.

I believe that the Clinton administration has had countless failures in this area, and they have even taken actions which might be conducive to an atmosphere of permissiveness. The former Surgeon General, as has been pointed out here before, advocated legalization of many drugs and also advocated needle exchange programs for heroin addicts.

I served as the ranking member on the Treasury-Postal Appropriations Committee and wondered why, in 1993, there was so much of a problem in getting White House personnel security clearances. Well, it has come out that some of the officials in the White House have had recent drug use and among the drugs used were crack, powdered cocaine, and hallucinogens. The administration proposed and we opposed decimating the Office of National Drug Policy. But they were bringing into the White House people who used drugs in recent times.

We saw significant cuts in the funding for the efforts against drug importation. We saw cuts across the board.

We saw Customs cut significantly in terms of the efforts. The DEA has been cut by 227 agents. The FBI had proposed cuts of significance. All of these areas were where we are fighting on the front line against the importation, the trafficking and the use of drugs through law enforcement efforts. I think a primary goal of drug control policy must be to reduce the amount of cocaine entering the United States. Interdiction programs target source countries in the transit zone, about 2 million square miles between the United States and South American borders, including Central America, Mexico, Caribbean Sea, and the Caribbean Islands. About 780 metric tons of cocaine are produced each year in South America, and about 30 percent is shipped through the Caribbean into the United States, Puerto Rico, and Mexico.

Funding for interdiction declined from \$1 billion in 1992 to \$569 million in fiscal year 1995. There was no funding increase in source-country activities. So the overall funding was decreased by nearly half. As a result, cocaine seizures are down from 70,000 kilograms in 1992 to 37,000 kilograms in 1995. DOD funding for interdiction is down. Coast Guard funding for drug interdiction is down.

I think the executive branch needs to develop a plan to implement a national interdiction strategy. Agencies have their own plans, but they need the coordination of the ONDP. We need to get serious once again about the war on drugs.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. I know our time has expired. I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes just to wrap up this session.

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

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank the Senator from Missouri. I think he has reinforced everything we have been saying all afternoon. It does not matter what community you are in, whether St. Louis or Gwinnett County, GA, we are in the midst of a new epidemic.

Just to summarize, major policy with regard to the management of the drug issue in the United States has been changed. The message has been either nonexistent or acquiescent, and as a result we have produced headlines like the Marietta Daily Journal, "Georgia Crime Rate Reaches New High. Juveniles Are More Apt To Break the Law." Or, in the now famous Gwinnett Daily Post, "Juvenile Drug Cases Up 738 Percent Over 1992."

The first wake-up call has to be in our communities. Every policymaker has to get the message right. Drugs are not good and drugs will do enormous damage. Teenagers, do not use it. Listen to those little ladies, those friends in the Macon Youth Development Center, when they said: "Don't use drugs. Don't think you can control them. Never use drugs to be a part of a clique, a group. Just say no."

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO C.H. ALBRIGHT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in my many years of public service to the people of South Carolina, one of the finest and most dedicated public servants I have known in C.H. "Icky" Albright, a leading businessman, civic booster, and the former mayor of Rock Hill. Today, I rise to pay tribute to my friend, and to wish him a happy 90th birthday, which he celebrated on August 30.

Without question, Icky has had a full life, and one marked by many impressive accomplishments. A graduate of Clemson College, Icky's initial calling in life was as an architect, and he practiced his profession first at the South Carolina Highway Commission, and later in his beloved Rock Hill. To this day, many of the buildings he designed remain standing, including several on what has become the campus of Winthrop University. Despite his success as an architect, Icky, as so many enterprising Americans do, wanted to try his hand at running a business, and he eventually gave up architecture in order to manage the Marshall Hardware Co. where he demonstrated his skills as an administrator and entrepreneur.

In communities throughout the Nation, being a business leader is a natural springboard into public service, and it was not long before Icky's reputation for hard work, integrity, and desire to help others led my friend into politics. In the years following World War II, during which Icky had volunteered for the Navy and earned the rank of lieutenant, we was elected as a city councilman, mayor, and State senator. In each instance, he held himself to the highest standards of his office and he worked diligently to represent his constituents capably, effectively, and fully. During my term as governor, Icky was serving as Mayor of Rock Hill, and I remember being impressed by his dedication to improving his city and the many projects which he successfully undertook during his tenure.

Icky's reputation around Rock Hill was that of a man of action. He was always eager to become involved in any endeavor that would benefit his hometown and make it an even better place. Many of his initiatives are still part of life in Rock Hill, including the Come-See-Me celebration, an annual event designed to celebrate the beauty and hospitality of that city. Without question, Icky has left a commendable legacy through his many years of public service.

My friend's commitment to helping others was not limited to the public sector. Through his involvement with numerous boards, commissions, and committees, Icky worked to help build South Carolina and its business community into a vibrant and successful place. He established Albright Realty Company; served as president of both the South Carolina Hardware Association and the South Carolina Associa-

tion of Realtors; and ended his professional career as the District Director of the Small Business Administration in South Carolina. Additionally, Icky served on the board of visitors of Presbyterian College; the building committee for the Medical University of South Carolina; as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1948; and, as an elder in the Presbyterian Church. Icky's commitment to service has earned him many awards and recognitions, including being inducted as a Paul Harris Fellow by Rotary International, the highest recognition a non-Rotarian may be awarded.

Mr. President, Icky Albright is a man whose friendship I value greatly. He is the godfather of my daughter, Nancy Moore Thurmond, and a man who has been one of my strongest supporters through the years. I am always pleased whenever I have the opportunity to visit with Icky, his lovely wife Sophie, or their sons. Without question, Icky Albright is a man who has served his city, State, and Nation admirably, and it is my hope that others will follow the lead he has set for public spiritedness and willingness to help others. We are proud of his many accomplishments and contributions, and that we are able to claim him as a citizen of South Carolina.

TRIBUTE TO THE GOOD SAMARITAN HOSPITAL SCHOOL OF NURSING

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the opportunity today to pay tribute to the Good Samaritan Hospital School of Nursing, which is marking its 100th year of service to Cincinnati, OH, and northern Kentucky.

Good Samaritan, the sixth nursing education program established in Ohio, was founded by the Sisters of Charity and has graduated nearly 5,000 nurses over the past century. These nurses have brought skilled and compassionate care to hundreds of thousands of patients throughout the world.

Consistently a leader in nursing education, in 1906 Good Samaritan Hospital School of Nursing was among the first in the United States to earn accreditation. Its leadership status was again affirmed in 1927 when it affiliated with a baccalaureate degree program at the College of Mount St. Joseph; in 1952 when it created a third-year internship; in 1972 when it tailored a nationally recognized registered nurse program to further the skills of licensed practical nurses; and in 1981 when it introduced its diploma program for part-time students.

Good Samaritan has also been a good neighbor. More than 30 years ago, realizing the existence of a medically underserved population in the area, it reached out and created its community health nursing course.

Mr. President, I know I speak for many when I say that a huge debt of