

highly contentious issues in Committee and on the Senate Floor.

His passing, at a ripe old age, is another chapter, rounding out a history of remarkable men who have graced this chamber, and who have made their individual marks on the minds and memories and hearts of their colleagues and they have done it on the basis of their character, their instincts, and their talents. Senators would do well to read the story of Abraham Ribicoff's life. He came from humble beginnings and he made a success from his own resources, his own grit, and his own instincts. His life was one which can be used as a model by others on both sides of the aisle. He stood his ground when it really counted, and consequently he claimed the high road in his political life. I have missed Abe Ribicoff's counsel since his retirement, and I wish he had remained longer in this body. I wish he were here today.

Abe Ribicoff waged many political battles in life. The battle with death he finally lost, as we must all finally succumb to the onslaught of that grim and unrelenting enemy: death. But though that grim reaper may lay claim to ending the battle of this life, the claim of victory has always and will always elude death, even though it stalks each of our lives from the cradle to the grave. How sweet the words of thy great Apostle Paul in his first epistle to the Corinthians:

O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?

Mr. President, man was not created an animal, as we are taught in our universities and our high schools. Man was not created an animal, but as a living soul within which there is embedded a spark of the Divinity, a nexus with the Creator. It is that spark that lives on, a soul that an animal does not have, a soul that goes back, when one departs this earthly life, to the presence of his Maker. And we all have that journey to travel. Great Grecian and Roman philosophers, by pure reason and logic, arrived at the conclusion that there is indeed a creating, directing, and controlling Divine power, and an immortality of the soul. Throughout the ages, all races and all peoples have instinctively so believed. It is the basis of all religions, be they heathen, Mohammedan, Hebrew, or Christian. It is believed by savage tribes and by semicivilized and civilized nations, by those who believe in many gods and by those who believe in the one God. Atheists are and always have been few in number. But beyond all credulity is the credulousness of atheists, who believe that chance can make the world, when it cannot build a house!

So, Mr. President, as Longfellow said:

There is no death! What seems so is transition;
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life elysian,
whose portal we call death.

Mr. President, we have heard the story of an old king in the Middle Ages

who had his barons at a great banquet. They were quaffing their bumpers of ale. It was a bitter night outside. The storm raged. The snow was falling furiously. Suddenly, into the rude chamber in which they were gathered there flew through some crack or crevice in the roof a little bird. Blinded by the light and perplexed, it flew wildly here and there and beat itself against the rude beams. Finally, it found another crevice and out it went into the night again. The old king, advanced in years, spoke to his barons and said:

That bird is like a life: it comes from out of the night, it flits and flies around a little while, blinded by the light, and then it goes back out into the night again.

So, Mr. President, my friend Abraham Ribicoff has gone to what Hamlet said was "the undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns," but I have no doubt that the Creator, who stoops to give to the rose bush whose withered blossoms float upon the autumn breeze the sweet assurance of another springtime, has received into His bosom a man who was my friend, who loved his country, and who loved his fellow man—rich and poor, high and low, who neither looked up to the rich nor down on the poor—Abraham Alexander Ribicoff.

To his dear wife Casey, a graceful, charming, and noble woman, my wife, Erma, and I extend our sympathy and our love.

Let fate do her worst, there are relics of joy,
Bright dreams of the past that she cannot
destroy.

That come in the night-time of sorrow and
care,
And bring back the features that joy used to
wear.

Long, long be my heart with such memories
filled,

Like the vase in which roses have once been
distilled,

You may break, you may shatter the vase if
you will,

But the scent of the roses will hang round it
still.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SENATE VOTES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, as I suggested this morning and had been predicting for the last couple of weeks, we are going to start having Monday votes—not before 5, usually, unless there is plenty of notice. But we need to make some progress on the highway transportation bill and also to further clear the Executive Calendar.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—NOMINATION OF RICHARD YOUNG, OF INDIANA, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, as in executive session, I now ask unanimous consent that at 5:20 today, the Senate lay aside the pending business and turn to executive session to consider the nomination of Richard Young, of Indiana, to be U.S. District Judge for Indiana, that the time be equally divided between the chairman and ranking member, and the Senate proceed to an immediate vote on the nomination, without further debate, at 5:30.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to order the yeas and nays on the nomination.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

SENATE SCHEDULE IN MARCH

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, a rollcall vote will occur at 5:30 this evening with respect to the nomination of Richard Young of Indiana. I repeat, Senators can now expect votes every Monday and more than likely on every Friday throughout the month of March, so that we can complete the highway infrastructure bill, have debate and votes on the NATO enlargement issue, so that we can take up the budget resolution, the Internal Revenue Service reform, and possibly even a supplemental that could include funds for Bosnia, Iraq, and IMF. We need to do those issues, plus the COVERDELL A-plus education issue. There is no way we can do all of those in March without a much more aggressive schedule than we have had so far. So it is my intent to do that, and I believe I have the cooperation of the Democratic leader in that effort.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

LOSING OUR WAY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, there is an old saying that reminds us that

when you have no idea of where you're going, any road will get you there. Well, that wisdom explains a lot about our current national drug strategy. It's a poor little lamb that has lost its way. The administration has never made drug control a serious element in its policies. Oh, we have had all the right sound bites. But we have not had the sound efforts. Not now, not from the beginning. We are paying the price for this inattention. In this and a subsequent statement, I will explain in more detail why I believe our national drug efforts are in disarray. Why they need more attention, more oversight, and more consistency.

I remind you, Mr. President, that this administration opened its doors for business with a move to gut the Office of National Drug Control Policy. It then began a process of cutting support to law enforcement, interdiction, and international control efforts. That process continued until the Congress reversed the trend in 1995. Even then, the administration did not change its tune on drug policy until the 1996 campaign. To those who might believe that none of this made any difference anyway, let me remind you of some disturbing facts.

Let me begin with a reminder of why we have a drug policy. We have a drug control policy because this country has a big appetite for illegal drugs. We have a major problem with addiction because we have a lot of hardcore users and new initiates. We have the hardcore user problem because we ignored all the warning signs about drug use in the 1960's and 1970's and early 1980's. It was not until we woke up one morning to find many of our kids hooked and out streets war zones for traffickers that we understood our mistake. Although we began late, we did begin to address the problem of drug use, production, and trafficking.

Despite what many believe, the war on drugs in the late 1980's and early 1990's was not a failure. Indeed, there is not a single other major social program into which we put money and effort that can demonstrate the significant progress we made in reducing teen drug use. We were less successful with hardcore addicts. But, as anyone who knows who has dealt with well-established addiction, there is no cure. Even success is measured in multiple treatment episodes.

Treatment can stretch over a lifetime with limited results. A typical addict may go through treatment a dozen times, and success does not always mean ending addiction—only the moderation of use. Thus, our folly in the 1960's and after in ignoring the dangers of drug use, laid the foundations for an addict population that remains a problem today. But we had made great strides in convincing a new generation of kids to say no to drugs. The results were dramatic and, if sustained, promised to return us, gradually, to a largely drug-free community.

But, as I have noted here before, we did not sustain the successes. We did

not sustain the effort. The present administration shifted our priorities and our messages. We were told that we needed more focus on treatment. We were told we needed less talk about enforcement. We were told all these changes would be better. We were assured drug use would stay down. What happened? Well, the results are in. They have been accumulating for years.

They tell a revealing tale: Teen drug use reversed the downward trend. It is now on the rise and getting worse. The age of onset of use dropped to younger kids. Negative attitudes about the dangers of drug use went south. The legalization movement found a bag man to fund its efforts and is active on many fronts all over the country. We now see Hollywood and our music moguls back to pushing drug themes in movies and music. We see our major companies and advertisers dropping support to drug-free advertising. We see our major networks give less attention to this advertising. And now we know what happens. The consequence has been a growing drug crisis among our kids. This is no accident. We saw decisions made on wrong assumptions that have got us to this state. It's embarrassing and it's frustrating. And the administration still is lagging behind. It is just not serious. Having said this, let me give you just a few examples to illustrate the point.

I started by noting the cuts at the drug czar's office from the early days of the administration. That was not an isolated event. We saw the problem beginning with the White House's whole cavalier attitude toward drug use and drug testing among employees there. We saw it continued by the I-didn't-inhale atmosphere. As a result, we lost the "Just Say No" message from the start. But there was more than this. The administration also began to reduce support to interdiction and law enforcement. This has been well documented and I won't repeat that now. Suffice it to say that the administration substituted reducing supply reduction for reducing supply. The legacy of neglect and indifference continues.

Let me illustrate my point with a number of concrete examples. What these various cases I am going to talk about illustrate, when added together, is the lack of seriousness by the administration on drug policy. They are illustrative of the fragmented, incoherent thinking that has contributed to our growing crisis of teenage use.

In these remarks, I will focus on domestic issues. Later, I will discuss international problems. In either case, we have a peck of trouble.

Let me begin with some of those troubles. In the past 5 years of this administration, drug use among kids has doubled over the levels before it took office. Those increases came on top of almost a decade of declines. Although the use numbers are from every major survey of drug use, many the government's own numbers, the administra-

tion continues to argue that drug use is down. The President did this most recently in releasing the National Strategy and his State of the Union Address. He takes credit for this. How does the administration explain the difference between the claims and the facts? Simple. It charts drug use trends from the 1980's, when the numbers were getting better, in order to disguise present trends, when the numbers are getting worse. It also plays fast and loose with the figures.

They make the numbers work for them by doing what is called "data slicing." What that means is that you focus on only one part of the data while ignoring the whole. Thus, in discussing the most recent teenage drug use survey, the administration makes much of the fact that use among eighth graders went down. What the administration did not say, however, is that use was up in every other category. And, it failed to note that the indicators of use being down among eighth graders was not statistically significant.

This is what the Wall Street Journal had to say:

Clearly, the recent data from the Monitoring the Future Study are far more discouraging than the president has implied. If the president and his administration insist on talking credit for negligible improvements in relatively small cohorts, then they must accept responsibility for the overall dismal record that they have compiled over five years.

The figures are there for anyone to look at. The Washington-based research organization, the Statistical Assessment Service, did just that in their annual survey of the abuse of research and statistics. As this research organization noted, someone has been playing with the numbers. I offer a Washington Post story noting their findings and ask unanimous consent it be printed in the Record at the end of my remarks.

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

[See exhibit 1.]

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this playing with the numbers is of a piece with another fact. The administration has consistently avoided providing Congress and the public with accountable standards of performance on drug control as required by law. Although the law creating the national drug strategy requires annual quantifiable performance measures, this administration has not complied with the law from its first day. Although the present drug czar has repeatedly promised such standards, we have yet to see them. And what they propose to send us is not a report on performance but a methodology for reporting on performance.

If that system is ever put into place, we won't seek any accountability based on them until after this administration leaves office. Does this oversight strike you as paying serious attention to drug policy? Not to mention the law?

But this is not all. What the administration has also proposed is a formula

for downgrading the whole effort to have a national strategy. The administration's proposal for reauthorizing the drug czar's office drops the idea of a national strategy for an annual report. It proposes a 10-year strategy document instead. The effect of this sleight-of-hand is to reduce the drug strategy to a proforma exercise, which, by the way, is another means to dodge accountability. This administration will leave office without ever having provided a serious accounting for its drug policy. If present trends continue, it will leave office having presided over a renewed drug epidemic.

It is in keeping with a number of other things the administration has done to signal its real feelings about the war on drugs.

In keeping with this pattern, this administration has one of the worst records I know of in responding to congressional requests. I am not talking about responding to all the requests for information in response to major investigations. I am talking about responses to the normal business of Government. I am still waiting for the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Justice Department to respond to questions from a hearing last May. Last you think the questions were a burden, I only asked three. I am still waiting.

We only recently received responses from the administration to a hearing from last October, and not even all those are in. I also have requests of correspondence to the Department of Defense, Health and Human Services, Justice, and others that are months old. It routinely takes this administration, 3, 4, 5, even 6 months to answer a letter, respond to a request, or provide answers to complete the record of hearings. And the answers are often pretty slim and uncommunicative. This is an administration that needs to do a lot of explaining.

The administration is now proposing to undermine the laws on cocaine sentencing. Let me note at the outset, that contrary to the impression in some quarters, the United States does not, I repeat, does not fill its jails with nonviolent drug offenders. It does not fill its jails with simple users. The majority of felons in our jails for drug crimes are there for trafficking and violent crimes. In the face of the drug epidemic, Congress passed and the public supported tougher sentencing for dealers and traffickers who pushed crack to our kids.

Now, however, the administration is planning to walk backwards on crack. The administration plans to deal with a disparity in crack and powder cocaine sentencing by reducing sentencing for crack. Instead of lowering the boom they're lowering the standards. This is hardly a message to be sending at a time when use of drugs is on the rise. But it is in character with what we have seen.

From our borders to our streets, we see a similar image. We see disarray and a lack of seriousness. Let me share

with you one last example to illustrate why I am a little frustrated. Recently, \$3.5 million was set aside on ONDCP's budget to assist parent groups in prevention work with youth. Keep that number, \$3.5 million in mind. Remember, it was intended to support parent groups. Also keep in mind that these groups have a long track record of working with parents on drug prevention. Now, here goes. Of that \$3.5 million, ONDCP pocketed \$500,000 that did not go to the parent groups. That leaves \$3 million. So far so good. That money was transferred to the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) at HHS. Of that, it appears that CSAP kept \$600,000, presumably for administrative costs. That leaves \$2.4 million for parent groups. Of that, CSAP awarded a private contractor, with no experience in parent movements and drug prevention, some \$900,000. The purpose was to develop a program for parent groups. Never mind that the parent groups were the experts. Never mind that the contractor then had to spend its money talking to these same parent groups on how to help parent groups. Never mind that the parent groups have disavowed the resulting study and the proposed prevention effort as unworkable. That left roughly \$1.5 million for the parent groups. That is to be spread over 2 years. It is to be shared by several different groups. The result? Each group will receive less than \$70,000 a year, hardly enough to cover their costs. Is it any wonder that so many prevention groups have a hearty dislike for CSAP. This is hardly a reassuring story. It is, unfortunately, not atypical. It is a small example that explains a lot.

These are only some of the examples of problems in our drug control program. I will have more to say about failures and shortcomings in our international efforts later. The story there is just as grim.

EXHIBIT 1

DUBIOUS DATA MADE HEADLINES IN 1997

Each year at this time, the Statistical Assessment Service, a Washington research organization that abbreviates itself STATS, releases its annual list of the most absurd, amusing and alarming science and statistical news stories of 1997.

Herewith, a few of the group's choices. The full list may be found on the World Wide Web at www.stats.org.

Study Links Cancer Deaths to Site—Associated Press, Sept. 11.

The AP reported on a new study that linked low levels of radioactivity to cancer deaths among nuclear workers. The researchers found that 29 percent of all deaths among former employees of the Rocketdyne Santa Susana Field Laboratory were attributable to cancer.

Sounds pretty scary, but compared to what? For the general population, 35 percent of all deaths of those between 44 and 65 years of age are attributable to cancer, as are 25 percent for all deaths of those over 44, according to the National Center for Health Statistics. So the workers died from cancer at about the same rate as anyone else.

YOUR CHILD'S BRAIN ON DRUGS

Teen Drug Use Dips Down—Associated Press, Aug. 7.

Drug Use Rising Among Young Adults—Associated Press, a few hours later the same day.

These dueling headlines were based on the same National Household Study on Drug Abuse survey, which found that illicit drug use among the young was up, alarmingly in some cases. The AP's first headline and the story accompanying it illustrate the perils of data slicing—focusing on only one segment of the study population—and a failure to appreciate a concept called statistical significance. According to the study, young people between ages 12 and 15 did report a slight decline in the use of marijuana.

But another age bracket, dubbed "young adults" 18 to 25, showed a significant increase in marijuana use. More importantly, the drop among younger people was not statistically significant, which means there's a fair chance that the apparent decrease was due to sampling error.

YOUNGER THAN SPRINGTIME

Premature Puberty: Is Early Sexual Development the Price of Pollution?—E—The Environmental Magazine, Nov./Dec. issue.

In April, a study published in the medical journal *Pediatrics* reported that the mean age of onset of menstruation occurred at 12.2 years for African American girls and 12.9 years for white girls.

As The Washington Post correctly reported, this meant that American girls were "developing pubertal characteristics at younger ages than currently used norms," which were based on a study of British girls in the 1950s.

But many journalists interpreted the findings as an alarming new trend toward lower ages for puberty.

This produced scary headlines such as "Girls Facing the Perils of Puberty Earlier" (Hartford Courant), "Puberty Find Could Point to Danger" (Pittsburgh Post-Gazette) and "Girls Hitting Puberty at an Earlier Age; Some Worry Environmental Estrogens Could be Behind a New Study's Findings" (Des Moines Register).

These fears of pollution-induced puberty ignored the fact that, as The Post reported, "the age at which girls first menstruate hasn't changed much since 1950."

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATO EXPANSION

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, my attention was called to an article, an op-ed article, in the New York Times for Wednesday, February 4, of this year entitled: "NATO: A Debate Recast." It was authored by Howard Baker, Sam Nunn, Brent Scowcroft and Alton Frye.

I read the article with great interest and asked the question of whether this had been inserted in the RECORD at the time it was written. I am informed that that was not the case, that it has not been put in the RECORD, not been called to the attention of the Members of the Senate.

I call the attention of the Members in the Senate to this article because I