discussed a great deal in our Nation and it should be discussed more because Turkey is a unique and special nation in relationship to ourselves. Throughout the cold war, Turkey was essentially the front line. It was a nation which did not really ask for much, yet gave us its alliance and its assistance. We have truly, as a nation, and this administration, as an administration, has truly treated Turkey poorly. This goes to the issue of Cyprus and it goes to the issue of Greece. Yet if you were to ask this administration, what is the relationship between the Turkish-Greek issue and the Cyprus issue and the capacity to deal with Saddam Hussein, they would say that there is none, that there is no relationship there. That is maybe why they have abandoned the effort to bring to resolution that very critical issue of international importance. Yet we find today that Turkey, again, is hesitant to allow us to use its bases in order to address the Iraq issue.

So, three major elements of the capacity to address the Iraq issue in a coordinated and effective way are tied to a variety of different historical and geographic and national and international confrontations, which this administration either, No. 1, doesn't appreciate or, No. 2, is actively ignoring. As a result, our capacity as a country to unite a coalition which can effectively address Saddam Hussein has been undermined.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 10 minutes?

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

Mr. GREGG. Most critical, of course, to this is the issue of how we deal with Iran and the fact that, once again, this administration has failed to reflect effectively on the policy dealing with that nation. Iran, as we recognize, has been dominated by a fundamentalist leadership which has viewed its purpose as promoting an aggressive religious philosophy internationally. It has viewed the United States as its enemy in this undertaking. But this fundamentalism cannot survive forever. It is much like when we confronted the Communist leadership after World War II and President Truman and President Eisenhower recognized that, through the process of constructive containment, we would be able to bring down that system of government because it would fall of its own weight because at some point, after a certain period of years, the fundamental flaws of that system and that philosophy would simply undermine it and decay it from within. And that is true also of the fundamentalist movement in Iran.

The Muslim religion is an extremely powerful and great religion, and it is a religion that is based on some very wonderful precepts. But the fundamentalism that captured a certain element of the Muslim believers is, as it is practiced in Iran, inherently self-destructive. If we are able to contain Iran but at the same time encourage within Iran the more moderate elements, we will, over a period of time, see, I believe, a collapse of the fundamentalist energy from within and a rising of a state which will be responsible. But this administration has passed over a series of opportunities to promote that option, which has been unfortunate.

If you are going to contain Iraq, then you must understand that in the process of containing Iraq, you must neutralize Iran as a threat to the region. Because if you were to eliminate Iraq as a force within their region, you would create a vacuum into which a fundamentalist Iran would step and be a threat to its neighbors of even greater proportions—greater proportions—than Iraq is. So, reflecting adequately on how we deal with Iran, and approaching Iran as part of the solution to how we deal with Iraq, is critical, critical to the capacity to take on the Iraqi issue. Yet this administration, in my opinion, has once again left the ball on the side of the field when it comes to understanding or pursuing that course of action.

So, where does that leave us? Unfortunately, where it leaves us is with a 19th century dictator who has 20th century weapons of mass destruction, in Saddam Hussein, an individual who lives by a code which is horrific to the sensibilities of a civilized world. It is a code that follows in the course of people like Adolph Hitler and Mussolini and others, who sought to promote themselves in the name of some cause which was really just superficial to their own megalomania.

But our capacity to address Hussein and to be able to deal with the situation in Iraq is fundamentally undermined by our inability, one, to focus on the situation with an international alliance and, two, to have the capacity, because we do not have an international alliance, to take action which will end up being definitive.

So we find ourselves with this administration stating that we are building up an arms capability to make an attack on Iraq without an alliance supporting it with a stated objective that nobody understands, because Secretary Cohen has said that a military attack will not replace Saddam Hussein, and the President said it is not our goal to replace Saddam Hussein. Secretary Cohen has stated that a military attack will not eliminate the weapons of mass destruction, and we know that to be the case. So what is the result of the military attack?

There is no clear understanding as to what it is. It will not be that Saddam Hussein is replaced. It will not be that the weapons of mass destruction are eliminated. It will not be that the alliance we had in the gulf war of 1991 are being reinstated. I have no idea what the conclusion of a military attack would be.

I think the unintended consequences of it will be dramatic. Some may be positive. We may successfully eliminate some weaponry that might otherwise be used against our neighbors. Some may be horrific. We may find that Saddam Hussein uses his weaponry in some other theater or some other place. It may even be here in the United States. But those are unintended consequences, because there appears to be no intended consequences.

Literally, there are no intended consequences. If the intended consequence is not to replace him and the intended consequence is not to destroy the weapons, what is the intended consequence of military action? I don't know what it is. Therefore, before we go forward with a resolution in this body—and I understand that we are not going to do that this week—before we go forward with a resolution in this body, I believe we have to bring some definition to the purpose of the process.

I believe, first, we have to recognize and we have to retouch our allies and our friends and people who should be our allies and our friends. We have to go back to Russia and understand their concerns. We have to go back to Turkey and understand their concerns. We have to go back to Egypt and understand their concerns. We have to go to Israel and talk about the need to get the peace process started again and to return to the concepts of Rabin as versus the concepts of Netanyahu.

More important, we, as a nation, have to know what is our purpose and what is our goal.

I believe our purpose and goal should be, first, to create a united approach on this to bring into the effort an alliance which is broader and more substantive than what we presently have, something more than an English-speaking alliance.

Second, it must be to remove Saddam Hussein and his government. We should have as our stated goal and purpose of any military action that we intend to have a democratic government in Iraq.

And, third, it should be that the weapons of mass destruction are destroyed; not that they will survive, but that they are destroyed.

These should be our goals, and I hope as we move down the road to considering the issue of what we do in Iraq and before we move forward with military action that we at least get some clarity of the process, hopefully along the lines I stated.

I appreciate the patience of the Chair, and I especially appreciate the patience of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for 10 minutes.

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

TEN STEPS TO FIGHTING DRUGS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as I have noted on earlier occasions, this country continues to face a major drug

problem. It is a problem that affects us all. No community escapes the consequences of drug use. Our streets and neighborhoods are made dangerous and unwelcoming by those who peddle illegal drugs. Our places of work are not drug free. Today, we live in a country where even our schools are not safe havens from the ravages of drugs.

In just a few days, the Administration will release its newest drug strategy. It will be welcome, even though it is two weeks late. I look forward to it, even as the Administration undertakes efforts to do away with an annual drug strategy. The budget for drugs will be increased. That, too, is welcome. But we need to remind ourselves that despite steady increases in our counter-drug spending, we have seen increases in drug use by kids.

This is a fact that the Administration has tried to sugar coat. It has tried to disguise the fact that drug use among kids has steadily increased throughout its tenure. Despite recent efforts by the Administration to paint over this fact with rhetoric, the facts remain.

We cannot fight drug use among our kids by being less than honest. We should not even try. But there is another lesson in our current and growing problem. I believe that the Administration has not done as much as it ought to do. I believe it has left undone much that it should do. But, our drug problem is a national concern that must go beyond what government can do. We must remind ourselves that this is a problem that we must all confront. Parents, community and religious leaders, the business community, local politicians, the media, Hollywood, and our opinion leaders must come together. We need more than just money. We need commitment. We need more than rhetoric.

Every day more of our kids start using illegal drugs. We need to roll up our sleeves and get to work.

For these reasons, I am today presenting a ten-point program to fight back. This is my agenda to try to get our counter-drug efforts back on the front burner. We need to better define the problem, and we need to be doing more. As Chairman of the International Narcotics Control Caucus, I will work to push a more visible and effective national counter-drug effort.

The first item on my agenda is to continue work to strengthen local community counter-drug problems. Last year, I sponsored legislation in the Senate, later signed into law, that provides funding to local community counter-drug coalitions. I will continue my efforts to ensure that this legislation is fully, speedily, and responsibly implemented.

Second, I will continue to work on implementing a statewide coalition effort in Iowa that I began last year. The aim of this effort is to help create a framework to complement state and local efforts to combat illegal drugs in communities across Iowa. Working with such national organizations as Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America, we are engaged in a project that can become a template for other states. The coalition will foster input and guidance from a non-political steering committee and six task forces. These include members from Iowa business and union leaders, the education community, religious leaders, and representatives from law enforcement. They also involve contributions from the media, doctors, and community anti-drug groups.

Third, I will be calling upon our national business leaders and advertisers to renew their commitment to drug-free advertising. We have seen in recent years a decline in this commitment. That decline lead to the use of public money to pay for advertizing.

But more to the point, I am concerned about what it says about the declining commitment of our business community to support a national effort to fight drug use. This is especially true given the problems that drug use creates in the workplace.

Fourth, I will be seeking more resources for communities across the country to deal with an emerging drug problem. This is the double whammy of methamphetamine. Communities in the West and Middle West face not only growing meth use problems. They also face a new trend: Mexican criminal organizations are increasingly building meth labs in our communities and rural areas. Meth is being funneled into Iowa by these organizations. Labs are also increasingly being discovered. These create an environmental hazard that is often beyond the resources of local police or fire organizations to deal with. Last year, I co-sponsored an effort to increase funding to these communities for meth lab clean up. I will expand that effort to ensure sustainable funding to help local communities.

Fifth, I will continue to press the Administration for a comprehensive drug strategy. One of the major deficits in our current effort is not a lack of funding but a lack of focus. I propose to deal with that through greater oversight of our national efforts. In particular, I will push for a more comprehensive southern tier approach. Too often, our efforts to control access to our southern border have been piecemeal and fragmented. The forthcoming national drug strategy will perpetuate that imbalance.

While we build a dyke in one area, the traffickers open a hole someplace else. We need a more focused effort that brings resources to bear consistently. We also need to ensure that our major drug control agencies receive adequate resources that implement consistent, well-conceived and integrated plans.

As part of this effort, I will pursue more vigorous oversight of our counter-drug programs.

I will do this through insisting that we maintain a strong commitment to the annual certification process on international drug control. I will continue efforts to investigate specific programs and activities to ensure that our efforts are on track and producing results. I will also seek to ensure that our efforts to protect the integrity of our law enforcement activities is a priority.

I will also pursue legislation that will provide greater authority to our law enforcement community to break the link between drug trafficking and alien smuggling. Many of our local communities find that drugs are introduced or produced by illegal aliens. I have supported increased resources to both U.S. Customs and the INS. I will continue my personal efforts to ensure adequate resources and focus at our borders and in our local communities.

As the eighth point in my agenda, I will pursue tougher penalties for those who traffic and sell drugs. In particular, I will seek enhanced penalties for trafficking or selling near our schools and for peddling drugs to minors.

As an integral part of this effort, I will also seek to toughen, not weaken, cocaine sentencing guidelines. I believe it sends an entirely wrong signal to lessen mandatory minimum sentences for those who traffick in crack cocaine. The Administration is proposing to weaken sentencing at a time when drug use is increasing. It is typical of the disconnect between the rhetoric we hear and the reality we see. Like the Administration, I will support efforts to bring powder cocaine sentencing into line with crack cocaine. But I will seek to do this by supporting Senator Abraham's efforts to enhance the sentences for trafficking powder cocaine, not by weakening our efforts.

Finally, as part of my action plan, I will continue to work to strengthen our ability to deal with money laundering and organized criminal activities. The drugs that reach our streets and target our kids do not get there by accident. They are directed there by well-organized, international criminal gangs. Their purpose is to make money at the expense of our kids. I will work to pass legislation that I introduced last year to go after the profits of these drug thugs. I will also continue to press the Administration to develop comprehensive legislation to go after international criminals wherever they may hide.

This agenda is my personal commitment to do what one Senator can do to deal with this nation's drug problem. I will pursue this agenda as Chairman of the Drug Caucus. In the coming days and weeks, I will be introducing specific legislation to deal with many of the things I have talked about today. I will be coming to my colleagues for support. I will be expecting the Administration to live up to its obligations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, is there an order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes in morning business.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. President.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RETURN OF AMERICAN POWS FROM VIETNAM

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to my Congressman. The House of Representatives is paying tribute today to our Vietnam prisoners of war. It was 25 years ago this month that those brave men began returning home to America.

Among those heroes was SAM JOHNSON. SAM was a prisoner 6 years 10 months 18 days and 23 hours, which he can tell you to this day.

All of us who know SAM know he is a fighter. He was called ''diehard'' by his North Vietnamese captors.

SAM was one of 11 prisoners whose total defiance to prison authority resulted in banishment to a high security prison that was dubbed ''Alcatraz.'' The prisoners were placed in tiny cubicles in an earthen-walled facility that was dug out of the center courtyard of the North Vietnam Ministry of Defense in downtown Hanoi. SAM and the other 10 wore leg irons and suffered from severe malnutrition.

SAM's defiance continued to the end, until February 13, 1973, when SAM boarded a plane at Gia Lam Airport to return home.

Our Nation recognized SAM JOHNSON's contributions by making him one of the most highly decorated aviators of his era. During SAM's military career, he was awarded two Silver Stars, two Legions of Merit, the Distinguished Flying Cross, one Bronze Star with Valor, two Purple Hearts, four Air Medals, and three Outstanding Unit awards.

Mr. President, I would like to note also that here in the Senate there are many heroes from among us from World War II, the Korean war and the war in Vietnam.

Today, 25 years after the POWs in Vietnam began to come home, it is also appropriate to recall the sacrifice made by our own colleague, my good friend, JOHN MCCAIN. JOHN returned from Vietnam after his own capture and imprisonment 25 years ago next month.

Patriots like Senator JOHN MCCAIN and Congressman SAM JOHNSON remind us of what makes America great—honor, courage, and duty. They enrich the Congress and remind us every day of the important responsibility we have as stewards of the young men and women in our armed forces. As we prepare for a possible conflict in Iraq, I have no higher priority than that those troops will get everything they need to do the job if they are sent.

As Americans we have many things for which to be thankful. But perhaps we should be most thankful for the brave Americans throughout our history who have fought the wars to keep America free. It is their sacrifice that has preserved democracy. It is their sense of patriotism and duty that Americans must always embrace if we are to remain free. Commemorating this 25th anniversary is one way that we will make sure that Americans do not forget the sacrifices that have been made for us to be able to stand here in this Senate Chamber and speak on an unfettered basis and openly and freely.

I want to say that I am proud that SAM JOHNSON is my Congressman. I also want to pay tribute to his wife, Shirley. Shirley and SAM are friends of Ray's and mine, and have been for years.

But Shirley is a hero, too. Sometimes we do not talk about those who were left home for 6 years to raise the children, to give them the hope and strength and love that both parents would normally give. It is to the Shirley Johnsons, also, that we owe a great debt of gratitude, because she was there never giving up, making sure that America never forgot that some were missing and some were imprisoned. She, too, should be commended today on this 25th anniversary.

I am honored to serve with SAM JOHNSON and Senator JOHN MCCAIN. As we honor them, we make sure that those who came home know how much we appreciate them. And, most of all, we remember those who did not come home.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Alaska is recognized to speak for up to 20 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair and wish the President a good morning.

(The remarks of Mr. MURKOWSKI pertaining to the submission of S. Con. Res. 76 are located in today's RECORD under ''Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. I believe I reserved a block of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. Let me say to my dear colleague I will not take all of that time.

HAPPY ANNIVERSARY, SAM JOHNSON

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak on on two topics. The first is that our dear friend and colleague, Congressman SAM JOHNSON, one of America's great warriors and one of America's great individuals, came home from Hanoi 25 years ago today, having been held as a prisoner of war for almost 7 years.

SAM grew up in Dallas. He graduated from Southern Methodist University. He went into the Air Force. He became one of the great pilots in the postwar period. He commanded the Top Gun school. He was a Thunderbird.

In fact, Senator MCCAIN loves to tell the story about the time when he and SAM were campaigning together in Texas—as all of you know, Senator MCCAIN was a great aviator in his own right and a great warrior and a real American hero—and he loves to tell the story when he and SAM were on a plane riding in the back and they came in pretty fast, and SAM calmly turned to Senator MCCAIN and said, ''We're going to run off the runway.'' Senator MCCAIN said, ''What makes you think so?'' just as they hit the railing and went off the runway.

The point being that SAM JOHNSON was a great aviator. He was flying a mission over North Vietnam. He was shot down. He was taken to prison in Hanoi. The North Vietnamese correctly concluded that he was a diehard and a recalcitrant, so they put him in solitary confinement year after year, basically a dugout, a little dungeon.

After 7 years in prison, enduring almost unbelievable hardship, he came home 25 years ago.

Now, the remarkable thing about all this is not all the medals that SAM JOHNSON won. We honor those and we should. It is not really the hardship that he endured, though I doubt many of us would be capable of doing it. But what is remarkable to me is that after 7 years in a dungeon in Hanoi, SAM JOHNSON came home and started his life again. He never complained about the 7 years he lost. You never see him that he doesn't have a smile on his face. He is a sweet, gentle, loving man. It is remarkable to me that somebody could go through 7 years of that kind of hardship—hunger, exhaustion, fear, physical and mental abuse—and yet come back home and be all the things that SAM JOHNSON is.

I wanted, on this 25th anniversary of the day that he came home to America, to stand on the floor of the Senate today and say to our colleague, Congressman SAM JOHNSON, that we are proud of him and that we are proud to associate with him. For most of us, the highest credential we are ever going to have other than being members of our family and being associated with our kinfolks is that we served in Congress. Many of us get whatever stature we might have from the position we hold, a position that was given to us in trust by the voter. But SAM JOHNSON is one of those rare people who brought stature to Congress with him when he came. He is a wonderful man. I love SAM JOHNSON.

I think in an era where there are a lot of people who kind of think politicians don't represent the best that America has to offer, that somehow politicians aren't exactly the kind of people you want your children to grow up to be, I ask them to look at Congressman SAM JOHNSON. He is the kind