

speaking briefly on the farm bill, and then I want to introduce a piece of legislation, if I can do that as in morning business. The total time I will consume will be about 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I am voting for the farm bill. I support the freedom-to-farm concept. This is not a perfect farm bill, but I find it somewhat ironic that some of my colleagues are voting against it, yet, urging the President to sign it, and then going out and criticizing it. It would be better to improve it and to be constructive.

Our farmers need a farm bill passed now. Many of them have already gone to the fields in our Nation. In South Dakota, they are meeting with their bankers, making their plans. It is time for us to pass a farm bill.

Mr. President, for years, we have had all this regulation and paperwork in agriculture. I come from a farm. I am a farmer. Last year, deficiency payments were sent out to the farmers. Then the commodity prices were high enough that the deficiency payments were sent back to the Department of Agriculture. All this requires a great deal of paperwork, and it costs the taxpayers a lot.

Let me commend Senator LUGAR and the managers of the farm bill, and Senator GRASSLEY and others, who have brought us a farm bill that will not only save taxpayers money, but will also help our Nation's farmers and ranchers.

Mr. President, let me say that I think the most important farm bill besides this is a balanced budget because, if we have a balanced budget, we will be able to export our commodities and the commodity prices will be high enough. Because of a balanced budget we will have low interest rates and a stable dollar and high exports. That is what farmers and ranchers really want. They do not seek handouts. They want good prices on the world market. And they are there for us if we take advantage of it.

So there are many improvements we could make in this farm bill the next year or the year after. But let us pass it now. This is the best deal we can get at this time. If somebody had a better one, they should have brought it up.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for 3 minutes for the purpose of introducing a bill.

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

Mr. PRESSLER. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. PRESSLER pertaining to the introduction of S. 1647 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I thank my colleague

from Iowa and Indiana and congratulate both of them for their work on the farm bill which was very outstanding.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, first, just one sentence to compliment the now Presiding Officer, the Senator from Indiana for his leadership on getting the farm bill passed. I am going to speak tomorrow on the farm bill. This evening, in morning business, I am speaking on the subject of the drug problem.

THE CIRCLE OF HURT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we have heard a great deal on this floor about the problem of drugs in this country. Senator HATCH, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator MOYNIHAN, and others, have spoken eloquently about the personal and societal costs that we bear because of illegal drug use. Add in the abuse of legal drugs in this country and the costs are staggering.

The record of the harm done is clear. The facts accumulate in depressing measure, detailing the damage done to individuals, to families, to communities, and to our civic life. Drugs destroy a person's capacity to live a decent life. They contribute to a widening circle of hurt that goes far beyond any individual choice to use drugs.

Like a stone dropped into a pond, the ripples move outward in an ever-widening circle. The result is an arc of pain and loss that is no respecter of social position, education, age, race, or location. Nothing brought this home to me more forcefully than a letter I received recently from a constituent. A constituent whose family has borne the brunt of what illegal drug use truly means. We can pile up facts and figures. We have the numbing statistics. But these cold, sterile numbers do not bring home to us the true meaning of what is involved. In order to understand the circle of hurt, let me share with you this story. As the dismaying figures on family violence, crime, and drug-addicted babies only too clearly show, this record is not unique.

Although is it not unique, it is, nevertheless, a story whose very prevalence is part of the harm done everyday by illegal drug use.

Kay and Jim Degrado of Marshalltown, IA, a community of 25,000, know firsthand what the facts and figures mean. Some years ago, their son began experimenting with drugs at 9 and was an addict by 13. Nothing that these good people could do made a difference. They watched as their son slowly sank into addiction and a world of violence, drug dealing, and abuse. As with many families, they were unprepared to deal with the problems. Their son became an addict and a dealer.

At 26, during his second treatment episode, he met a 22-year-old prostitute and crack addict. They subsequently

moved in together after they were expelled from the treatment program. In addition to living together, they also began dealing together. They had an 800 number, beepers, and a separate apartment to deal from. Sales helped them maintain a \$1,500 a day habit. This in a town of only 25,000. It was at this time that the couple learned that they were to have a baby, the woman's second. The first child was raised in a drug-addicted household, with all the emotional scars that involves. The second child, Tomi, now four, suffered a worse fate. She was born addicted.

As the Degrados learned, drug use damages the unborn child in profound ways. In ways that endure for a lifetime. Their granddaughter, young Tomi, was born with multiple problems. She has difficulty sleeping. She is averse to being touched. She's irritable and has a short attention span. In addition, she has difficulty swallowing, a common feature of drug-affected children. At four, she still must receive supplemental food and medication through a feeding tube in her abdomen. She is unable to use a spoon, lacking the coordination. The grandparents have adopted the child—after years of effort—and can give Tomi a loving home. But they can never heal the hurt. And there are many Tomis in this country.

According to some estimates, as many as 100,000 or more such babies are born every year to addicted mothers. The disabilities are lifelong. Tomi requires constant medical attention. And she has learning disabilities that will affect her as long as she lives. But this is not the end of the story. As with Tomi's parents, many addicts have more than just one child. These children are born addicted. Or they come into drug-using homes where physical and sexual abuse are common. Tomi has an older half-sister, and her mother is pregnant again.

Fortunately, the Degrados' son is in treatment, again, after two suicide attempts and numerous relapses. He visits his daughter but has not taken an active role in her life. It is still unclear if he will stay clean and sober. If he does, and I wish him well, it will come at great effort, one that will occupy him for the rest of his life.

And the cost? The monetary costs, of course, have been enormous. But that is only a small part of the expense. From the seemingly individual choice to use drugs, the Degrados' son, destroyed his own life. He brought pain and suffering to his family. It is a pain that still remains. In addition, he also fathered a child born with lifelong disabilities. Pushed drugs to others. And engaged in numerous crimes. From his one act, a decision to use drugs, the circle of hurt spreads outward in ever-widening arcs. That is the reality of drug use. The damage and harm are personal, immediate, and enduring.

Yet, what we hear from many these days—from some of our cultural and political elite—is that we should legalize such drugs. That we should make

them widely available. The common argument is that we should not interfere with a personal choice. A choice which is, according to the argument, a victimless crime. No one is harmed. What a cruel and insensitive lie that is. No wonder so many decent people like the Degrados feel like the country, or its culture leaders, has taken leave of its senses.

And one finds the argument and its logical consequences increasingly prevalent. Recently, a member of my staff learned that a bookstore right here in the Washington area had a whole display on how to process your own drugs at home. The display was full of books on how to start your own drug business in the comfort of your living room. This in a store in a suburban shopping mall frequented by teenagers and families. This is reminiscent of the 1960's. That was the last time we flirted with the "drugs-are-OK-for-everybody" theme. But this is not the 1960's and I had hoped that we had learned something from our past. Seemingly not. At least not some.

Turn on MTV or listen to much of the popular music these days and you get the drugs-are-OK message. First, leading political figures and cultural gurus openly discuss the idea of making drugs readily available at over-the-counter prices. Second, newspaper editors flirt with the idea of legalization. Third, movies and TV shows are once again introducing drugs as okay into their plots. Fourth, many of our political leaders are sending confusing messages. So far, the most notable comment from the President on drug use was, "I didn't inhale." Just think of the unfortunate signal that sends, however inadvertent. And fifth, one of the most remembered policy recommendations from this administration was the call by the Surgeon General for legalization.

Lately we have William F. Buckley, Jr., repeating the legalization theme. And he is in good, or rather, bad company. Some newspapers, magazines, and a variety of pundits have picked up the theme. This does not mean, however, that this is an idea whose time has come. All of this fulminating over the virtues of drugs or the harm caused by preventing people from self-administering deadly substances, is limited to a few, if well-financed, individuals. But their voice has a disproportionate access to the media. A media that then broadcasts and enlarges on the theme, making it seem more influential than it really is. Unfortunately, this posturing encourages young people to dismiss not only the harm that drugs cause but to question whether it is wrong to use drugs. And so, the hurt goes on.

After years of decline, after years in which teenage attitudes toward drugs was moving in the right direction, we now see dramatic reversals in teen drug use, heading back up. More disturbing, we see a decline in negative attitudes to drug use. We have not yet returned to the 1979 levels of abuse, but

we have made notable gains in that direction. As recent studies show, an increasingly large percentage of high school kids now report frequent marijuana use. The age at which use is beginning is also dropping. Experts now recommend that we must begin our antidrug prevention message in grade school.

Meanwhile, the casualties mount. The most recent data, released by the drug czar's office, confirm—as if more confirmation was necessary—that drug use is on the rise, especially among kids. This is particularly true of marijuana use. As we learned to our regret, marijuana is a gateway drug for further substance abuse. Heroin use is also on the rise. And much of the West and Middle West face a growing problem of methamphetamine use—the so-called workingman's cocaine. This drug is responsible for dramatic increases in family violence, in violent crime, and in hospital emergencies. What the numbers tell us is a depressing story of returning drug abuse.

We are still dealing with an addict population created by the drugs-are-OK argument from the 1960's and 1970's. Our current hardcore addicts were the 15-, 16-, and 17-year-olds of then. Today we are putting our 12-, 13-, and 14-year-olds at risk. We are mortgaging their futures and the lives of everyone they touch. We are exposing them to a cycle of hurt and suffering. I can imagine few more irresponsible acts. The last time we did it unconsciously or by inattention. If we do this again, we can make no claim to ignorance. We cannot appeal to our innocence. What we do now, we do with full knowledge. We simply cannot let this happen again.

I would like to ask my colleagues to look at my remarks from the standpoint of it portraying the problem of drugs that a family in Iowa had, the Kay and Jim Degrado family of Marshalltown, IA. It tells a story about how early drug use of a child leads to greater and greater problems. It talks about crack babies, and in the case of this family a crack grandchild that has been adopted by this family—the problems that families get into down the road of time in prison; all the crime that comes from illicit drug use.

I compliment this family for sharing their story with me and the granting of permission to me to discuss this issue on the floor of the Senate.

THE TRICKLE DOWN DEFECT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have had a number of things to say lately about leadership and moral posture. I have mentioned these issues several times on this floor in the past few days. I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to an example of what a void in clear leadership and guidance means. It illustrates what we might call the trickle down defect.

When there is uncertain leadership, when leaders are unclear on their true intent, their irresoluteness trickles

down. Nowhere is this effect easier to detect than in this administration's drug policy. From almost the first day of this administration there have been mixed signals and muddled directions about our drug policy. While the words have pointed in one direction, actions have gone off in every direction. The only thing that has been constant has been inconsistency.

One of the best examples of that was the President's move to fire most of the people in the drug czar's office just after his inauguration. That office was then not supported. The drug issue fell off the agenda. The President called "time out" in the war on drugs.

Lately, the administration is moving to restore personnel to the drug czar's office. I am sure there is no connection between that move and the fact that this is an election year. Miraculously and suddenly, the President has learned what the American people have known all along. One of the most important tools in fighting drug abuse among kids is to provide consistent leadership—to have a consistent message. At one time, we had that. The most remembered phrase from the years before Mr. Clinton was "Just say no." Unfortunately, we lost that message.

The most remembered phrase of this administration is, "I didn't inhale."

Today, a mixed and muddled message has trickled down through the bureaucracy. We have seen a falling off in effort. We have seen confused priorities. We have seen a decline in interagency coordination. We have not seen much in the way of leadership. What we have seen is rising drug abuse.

And, this lack of consistency has consequences. The latest example comes from just the past few days. The Centers for Disease Control, a Federal agency based in Atlanta and paid for by the taxpayers, cosponsored a conference this past weekend. The conference was held under the innocent enough title of "harm reduction." Unfortunately, that mild phrase conceals a bleak reality. Things are not always what they seem.

Many of the other cosponsors of the conference, such as the Drug Policy Foundation and the Lindesmith Center, are among the largest drug legalization lobbies in this country. The press release announcing the conference put out by the Drug Policy Foundation ends with a call, and I quote, "End the Drug War". The stated goal of these organizations is to get drugs legalized. The CDC, perhaps unknowingly, have associated themselves with this position. A position that is supposedly directly opposite of the administration's stated policy. What you have is a Government agency charged with dealing with controlling epidemics collaborating with those who want to legalize drugs, which would cause a major epidemic. This is a masquerade. But, it is clear that the CDC is confused about what our policy