large surveys of high school students, there has been a 52% increase in the number of seniors using drugs monthly. One in three report having used marijuana in the past year. Private anti-drug advocates such as Jim Burke of the Partnership for a Drug Free America and Joe Califano of Columbia University's Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse have been running alongside this drug fire, yelling for help to anyone who'd listen.

Better late than never, of course, and it is good that Mr. Clinton wants to mend his ways with General McCaffrey. We applaud the appointment and think General McCaffrey has sounded many right notes. Legalization, he says, ''is out of the question.''

A quarterly regional analysis put out by his office brings the problem up to date: ''A recent New York State high school survey reports that 12% of New York teens said that they smoked marijuana at least four times a month, double the number in the 1990 survey.'' Discussing ''Emerging Drugs.'' the report notes methamphetamine's popularity in the San Francisco area: ''in addition to its use by young users who combine it with heroin (''a meth speedball'') it can also be found in 'biker's coffee,' a combination of methamphetamine and coffee popular among young, fairly affluent urbanites.'' Additionally, the report notes that ''Club drugs, a name which generally includes MDMA, Ketamine, 2c-B, LSD, psilocybin and a range of other hallucinogens, are increasingly mentioned in this quarter.''

These recent events are not a coincidence. The drug retreat was the result of a series of explicit policy decisions by Mr. Clinton and those around him. Which is why we think it is worth focusing on the meaning of his wish that the anti-drug war be ''bipartisan, American, nonpolitical.'' This means that between now and November's election no one is allowed to utter the phrase ''didn't inhale.'' No one is allowed to remember Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders talking about drug legalization, even as her own son was arrested and convicted on drug-sale charges.

Nor should anyone be allowed to bring up White House deputy personnel director Patsy Thomasson's admission to a congressional committee that some dozen White House employees, including senior staff, had been ''requested to be part of an individual drug testing program'' because of their prior drug history. Ms. Thomasson's experience in these drug mop-up duties extends back to her days in Arkansas when she took over the business of Dan Lasater—Little Rock bond dealer, Clinton campaign contributor and friend-of-brother Roger—while Mr. Lasater served prison time for ''social distribution'' of cocaine. This week Mr. Lasater is testifying before the Senate Whitewater Committee, and we assume he will be asked to enlighten the committee about the millions of dollars of mysterious trades that his firm made through an account without the knowledge of the account's owner, Kentucky resident Dennis Patrick.

On matters of pure policy, among Bill Clinton's first acts was to cut spending on the war. The staff of the Office of National Drug Control Policy was cut to 25 from 146. Drug interdiction funds were cut. The number of trafficker aircraft seized by Customs fell to 10 from 37 in FY '93–'95. Drug czar Lee Brown wandered the nation's editorial pages seeking the public support he rarely got from his President. New York Democratic Congressman Charles Rangel announced: ''I really never thought I'd miss Nancy Reagan, but I do.''

Finally, about a year ago, Mr. Clinton received a stinging letter from FBI Director Louis Freeh and DEA director Tom Constantine, charging that the President's anti-drug effort was adrift. So now we have General McCaffrey, who says, ''There is no reason why we can't return America to a 1960s level, pre-Vietnam era level of drug use.''

Sorry, General, but pre-Vietnam America is not coming back. General McCaffrey's current President is a founding member of the generation that transformed America in the years of Vietnam and those that followed. It bequeathed to all of us a culture and ethos of such personal and moral slovenliness that we must now enlist a battle-hardened soldier to save the children of the anti-Vietnam generation from drugs. It is perhaps the most perfect, bitter irony that when these parents now exhort their children to stop using marijuana (of a strain that is significantly more potent than anything they dabbled in), the kids reply: ''Why should we? We're not hurting anyone.''

Basically, we'd very much like to know exactly why Bill Clinton took a powder on the drug wars after he became President. There was in fact a rationale of sorts offered at the time for the change in tone and direction. In contrast to what was thought to be the Republican approach of throwing people in jail for drug offenses, the Clinton approach would emphasize prevention and treatment. There is a case to be made for prevention and treatment, but the heart of our complaint with this President's attitude on drugs has to do with what we would call it character, its moral content.

Unlike the Reagans, you will never see the Clintons articulating the war on drugs as an essentially moral crusade. With its emphasis on treatment and programs and prevention, it is mainly the kind of effort that the sociologist Philip Rieff identified as the triumph of the therapeutic. Rather than the schoolmarmish Nancy Reagan, the Clintons, like the generation of liberal constituencies that they lead, are going to be rhetorically correct, believers in the powers of bureaucratic healing—and nonjudgmental. In their world, no one is ever quite caught for disastrous personal behavior or choices. Instead of absolution, there are explanations.

This, in our opinion, is the real reason the drug war waned when Bill Clinton became President. The message this new President sent to his young, yuppie, MTVish audiences was that he was just too cool to go relentlessly moralistic over something like recreational drugs. Sure he had an anti-drug policy in 1992 and a czar and speeches, but Bill Clinton wasn't going to have any cows over the subject. Surely, the drug-testing White House staff understood that much.

We don't doubt that a lot of people in this country, especially parents of teenaged and pre-teen children, would very much like to rediscover General McCaffrey's pre-Vietnam world of less constant cultural challenge. But the people who turned that culture upside down, making it a daily challenge for parents, have at last been given the chance to run the government. But this death-bed conversion on drugs simply lacks credibility. As much as we applaud General McCaffrey's new offensive, only a triumph of hope over experience could lead anyone to believe it would be sustained past November if Mr. Clinton and his crowd are returned to the White House.●

WHY NO HELP TO LIBERIA?

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the tragedy of Liberia should be of concern to all Americans.

I have twice visited that battle-scarred country which has more ties to the United States historically than any other nation of Africa.

And the United States bears a partial responsibility for what is happening there.

I'm pleased that the latest reports show that there is relative stability temporarily, but I am confident that this relative stability will be broken once again unless the nations move together effectively under U.S. leadership.

The ECOMOG forces have brought some stability but there needs to be a stronger indication of interest outside of Africa also. Bishop John H. Ricard, chairman of the board for Catholic Relief Services, had an op-ed piece in the Washington Post, which I ask to be printed in the RECORD after my remarks. I hope his article will stir policymakers a little more.

He eloquently pleads for help to this needy, desperate country.

The article follows:

WHY NO HELP TO LIBERIA?

(By John H. Richard)

When the leaders of Liberia's warring factions signed a peace agreement in Abuja, Nigeria, last August, they did not ask for American troops to back it up. They did not ask us to broker the peace or shed our blood. What they did ask for was a credible force of properly equipped peacekeepers to persuade combatants to give up their weapons.

They knew that this relatively modest assistance would provide stability and give the country an opportunity to rejoin the rest of the world. The signatories to the agreement had hoped that Liberia-like Bosnia, Haiti, Kuwait and Somalia—might qualify for the type of aid necessary to give the nation a chance.

Rejected by the international community, Liberians were left to face the formidable tasks of nation-building without the assistance that might have seen them through those tasks. Perhaps the violence we witnessed last week would have happened anyway. The sad truth is we won't ever know whether a stronger American and International commitment might have helped Liberia avoid this bloodshed.

Liberian warlords cannot be excused for the terror inflicted in Monrovia over the past week, but neither can we place the blame entirely on Africa's doorstep. Liberia's West African neighbors, committed to bringing peace to the region, brought the warring parties to the negotiating table more than a dozen times since fighting broke out in the fall of 1990, and scores of African peacekeepers have given their lives to end the war. When the accord was signed, the fueding leaders established a functioning government that all parties upheld for nearly five months.

As skirmishes flared up-country, one or another of the Liberian leaders traveled to the point of conflict to settle it. It was not exactly a constitutional system, but the Liberian Council of State represented the resolve of a critical mass of Liberians to achieve peace. They were willing to continue, and they need our help.

It is impossible to say whether there would be peace in Liberia today if the United Nations Security Council had made the sort of commitment there that it has made in other parts of the world. But the international community never gave the African peace agreement a chance.

A week ago, international donors meeting in Brussels agreed that it would take $1.2 billion to begin the reconstruction of Bosnia. Last September, the same international donors rejected a $110 million U.N. appeal to finance demilitarization, resettlement and economic rehabilitation in Liberia, demanding that African nations shoulder more of

the burden. The achievement of peace in the region is not a question of cash. But the vast disparity between monetary commitments in Eastern Europe and West Africa is telling; reflective perhaps of a basic unwillingness on the part of wealthier nations to meet Africans halfway in their efforts to build peace.

Last fall, Catholic Relief Services and other humanitarian organizations in Liberia warned the United States and European governments that if the peace process in Liberia was not supported, it would unravel. U.N. Secretary General Boutros-Boutros Ghali and Ghanaian President Jerry Rawlings noted at the time that the annual U.N. budget for Liberia would last only five days in the former Yugoslavia.

Without the support needed to foster a peaceful transition, war returned quickly. Disagreements that a well-established democracy would weather easily turned into life-and-death struggles. The resulting horror is an example of a fledgling government's inability to solve its problems. But tragically, it is also an example of our vacillation, of our reluctance to provide the sort of support and companionship that could have seen Liberians through the dark but hopeful days of an early peace.

In Liberia, thousands of teenage fighters have not only been denied formal education during the years of mayhem, but in fact have never learned how to be members of society; they know only how to kill. These boy soldiers, having grown up killing, realized as the Abuja agreement dissolved that there would be no alternative to war; there would be no chance to learn a way to make a living without a gun, or even to develop into normal human beings. Already robbed of the luxury of human emotion, they would also be denied the opportunity to leave behind the violent life they had always known.

By January, the peace was undone, and today Monrovia burns. The people of the United States and the members of the Security Council must ready themselves to pacify Liberia and reconstruct the country from the ground up, again. As Americans, we cannot throw up our hands and walk away. Why not? Because Liberians are not all warlords. They are farmers and merchants, women and children; they are our brothers and sisters. And they need our support.●

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE W. JENKINS, JR.

● Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, my colleague, Senator CONNIE MACK, and I join in a special tribute to one of the great business leaders of this century and a pioneer entrepreneur in food retailing: Mr. George W. Jenkins, Jr.

After a full and rewarding life, George Jenkins died peacefully in his sleep in Lakeland, FL, on April 8, 1996. He was 88.

Today, we salute the memory of this outstanding person, who personified the economic expansion of Florida in the 20th Century and the commitment to excellence in commerce.

On the eve of the Great Depression, George Jenkins invested funds he had been saving to buy a car in the first Publix grocery store. That was 1930. Since then, Publix has evolved into one of the largest supermarket operations in the Nation, with more than 500 stores in Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina, and annual sales exceeding $9 billion.

Publix employees affectionately referred to their founder as ''Mr. George.'' Consumer Reports, in 1993, rated Publix tops in America in customer service.

In most endeavors, the positive assessment of one's peers is perhaps the highest accolade. To say that George Jenkins' peers respected him would amount to understatement; they revered him as a genius in food retailing.

George Jenkins will long be remembered for his business leadership, but also for his generosity and love of family. His philanthropy for United Way, the Boy Scouts of America, and other beneficiaries touched countless lives.

Florida is a better place and America is a stronger nation because George Jenkins shared his special talents and his giving spirit through much of this century.●

THE ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION REFORM BILL

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I voted for the illegal immigration reform bill before the Senate yesterday. The final bill is a much more balanced approach than what was first proposed in committee. Importantly, the illegal immigration reform bill deals only with illegal immigration, and expanding deeming for legally sponsored immigrants.

I supported dealing with illegal immigration separately from legal immigration because of my concern that if the two issues were dealt with together, as first proposed, legal immigration would be swept up in very different issues surrounding illegal immigration.

The illegal immigration bill sets necessary and clear limits while continuing America's history of being a nation of immigrants.

In recent years, illegal immigration has become an issue of serious legislative and national security concern. The bombing of the World Trade Center in New York City by undocumented aliens led the Clinton administration and various Members of Congress to propose legislation reforming the immigration process in the United States, particularly political asylum.

This illegal immigration bill deals with stopping illegal immigration on two fronts—at our borders by keeping illegal aliens out in the first place, and within our borders for those who have entered the United States legally but are now here illegally.

It improves the controlling and policing of our borders from illegal entry by increasing border patrol and INS inspectors. It also addresses the magnet of jobs and public assistance that has attracted illegal immigrants to the United States by authorizing a series of pilot projects to verify eligibility for employment in the United States and for receiving public assistance and by establishing a program to develop tamper proof birth certificates and driver's licenses to reduce their vulnerability to forgery.

This bill also increases the number of border patrol agents by 4,700 over 5 years. It adds 300 full-time INS investigators over 3 years to enforce alien smuggling and employment laws.

It also deals with the fact that half of all illegal aliens in the United States came here legally—they then overstayed their visas and are now here illegally. We can't eliminate the problem of illegal immigration only by policing our borders. We must also find ways to keep people from coming here legally as tourists or students and not leaving. The bill deals with this in a number of ways, but its major thrust is clamping down on the magnets that attract illegal aliens in the first place by eliminating access to U.S. jobs and taxpayer supported benefits.

In order to block illegal aliens from working and receiving public assistance employers and administrators of public assistance need to have a reliable way to know who is eligible to work or to receive benefits and who isn't. It has been illegal since 1986 to hire illegal aliens, but far too many are working and taking jobs from American citizens and legal permanent residents. The relative ease of access to U.S. jobs is what is drawing illegal aliens to the United States. The main reason the current system is not working as it should is because we don't have an accurate or forgery-proof way to verify employment eligibility.

This bill attempts to address this issue. It simplifies the existing cumbersome employment verification system by reducing the number of acceptable documents that can be used by employers to verify a person's eligibility to work. It lays the groundwork to develop a new verification system for employment and public assistance eligibility. The INS is directed to conduct several local and regional pilot projects to demonstrate the feasibility of alternative systems for verifying eligibility. The pilot programs can last from 4 to 7 years in an effort to find a workable system. Congress must approve any permanent program.

The bill language specifically takes steps to protect privacy and guard against anti discrimination. It also contains language to protect privacy and criteria to reduce the burden and cost to business.

The verification system aims to eliminate counterfeit documents by requiring that any document required for verification must be tamper resistant. However, the legislation makes clear that this document may not be required as a national identification card. Importantly, employers are not liable if they hire a person in good faith who is later found to have been ineligible.

The bill reinforces and strengthens current U.S. immigration law requirements that immigrants be self-supporting and that they not become a public charge. Legal immigrants are accepted into the United States under the condition that their sponsors, not the taxpayer, will be responsible for them. This bill holds them to that promise. It