

school students admit to smoking marijuana.

Even without being armed with these statistics, Americans see the rise of drug use in their communities. It is on their streets and in their schools. Understandably, citizens view narcotics as one of the most pressing problems facing our country. According to a Gallup poll released yesterday, 94 percent of Americans see drug use as a serious problem or a crisis.

These recent reports are a wake-up call to the administration to take action. It has served as the impetus for this Task Force on National Drug Policy to set a framework for policy and establish strategic plans to combat the drug epidemic. This, in turn, should move the White House to realize that this is a pressing issue that they can no longer neglect. Action must be taken now. Our children cannot afford to wait any longer.

Efforts must be stepped up to get at the drug suppliers, especially the drug kingpins. They are profiting while the rest of us suffer. There presence is being tolerated and should not be tolerated anymore.

In order to control the proliferation of illegal narcotics, law enforcement efforts must play a leading role in the Federal strategy. Law enforcement agencies, experts in this field, have been able to develop innovative techniques to respond to the spread of drugs in our communities. They are on the frontlines of this war against drugs and have the knowledge to fight its recent rise.

The members of this task force have the ability to establish policy and to take the initiative through legislative action. An example of this could be the implementation of a system such as the Automated Fingerprint Identification System [AFIS]. Using this biometric system, drug smugglers will not be able to repeatedly enter this country using fictitious identification with anonymity and impunity. Recidivistic drug felons could be immediately identified, detained, and prosecuted or deported before their heinous acts impact upon our children, families, and communities. This is at least one way to reduce the flow of drugs over our borders.

Another way to deter drug dealers is to raise sentencing guidelines and enact mandatory minimums to guarantee longer sentences. These will also act as a deterrent to potential offenders. We should be attacking their trade, not ignoring their presence.

It is evident that the illegal drug trade has profited with the focus shifted away from their activities. But this task force will change that. With the emphasis placed back on narcotics and the harm it spreads, this task force may be able to concentrate efforts to rekindle the decline of drug use that was noted prior to this administration.

I would also like to take this opportunity to commend my colleagues for their leadership and initiative in the

effort to control illicit drugs in the United States.●

#### TO HELP THOSE LIVING ON THE EDGE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the most dynamic people I have had a chance to meet in my years in public life is a Roman Catholic priest by the name of Father George Clements.

He has stirred controversy from time to time by his championing of causes that sometimes are unpopular but always, in my opinion, reflect favorably on his faith and his humanitarianism.

Recently Parade magazine had a story concerning his program of "One Church-One Addict" which I ask to be printed in full in the RECORD.

What a great thing for this Nation it would be if every church in the Nation were to follow this simple admonition.

Many churches would find that they have been unable to help people, a least not immediately. But many others would find they have been the difference in keeping people from going over the edge.

The article follows:

#### TO HELP THOSE LIVING ON THE EDGE (By Marie Ragghianti)

The only major institution not dealing with substance abuse is the church," the Rev. George Clements told me. "Look at our prisons and universities—they're fighting drugs. We can do no less."

For many years, Father Clements has been inspiring others to action through both his words and his deeds. In 1980, from his parish in Chicago, he started a program called One Church-One Child. His idea—for every church to place one homeless child with a family—eventually grew into a national program, and it has helped find homes for more than 50,000 children. In a controversial move, Clements himself adopted four youngsters. (The Vatican eventually supported him.) In 1987, a TV movie told his story.

Now, the 63-year-old priest has an even more ambitious mission: to help recovering addicts find support in their religious communities. Clements' new program is called One Church-One Addict, which he founded with the American Alliance for Rights and Responsibilities, a nonprofit organization based in Washington, D.C.

"If Jesus was walking around today, he'd be working in the area of substance abuse," Clements says when he speaks to religious groups around the country. "Jesus lived on the cutting edge and helped others. We must do the same."

One Church-One Addict is ecumenical: All faiths are asked to do something about drug addiction and/or alcoholism in their communities. Volunteers are trained to give counseling and support. They meet with clients in one-on-one sessions, helping them learn how to live without drugs or alcohol. Clients usually enter the program upon leaving a rehabilitation center or clinic. They receive support for about nine months, although no time limit is set.

I asked Father Clements how he got involved in helping recovering addicts. It began, he said, with a child he once knew who lived near his church—the Holy Angels Catholic church, in the drug-plagued housing projects of Chicago's South Side.

"I wouldn't be in this work today if it wasn't for Tommy," Clements explained. "Tommy was valedictorian of his eighth-

grade class. He was a great football player and had won an academic scholarship to attend an excellent high school. He wanted to be an obstetrician. One evening, he asked if I thought he could make it. 'Of course you can, Tommy,' I told him. 'I have no doubt.' "That night, after I was in bed, the phone rang. It was the emergency room at a local hospital. A kid was dying. He was unconscious and didn't have any identification, but they could make out the words 'Father Clements.' I raced to the hospital. When I arrived, I found Tommy lying on a slab, dead of a drug overdose.

"After the funeral, I sat at my desk and couldn't stop crying. How could I not have known? That day, it was as if a force grabbed me by the back of the neck, and I knew I had to do something."

Shortly after Tommy's death, Father Clements took a walk through his neighborhood. What he saw outraged him: Drug paraphernalia littered the streets and, to his astonishment, was being sold in the area's small liquor stores, pharmacies and candy shops—many of which were frequented by children. A few months later, Clements decided to organize protests. He went to a large wholesaler of drug paraphernalia and held a revival in the parking lot. The 1989 event was covered by regional media and prompted the Illinois Legislature to pass a law banning much of the paraphernalia.

For Clements, however, that victory was only the beginning: He decided that the church could no longer ignore the problem of drugs in the community. After five years of planning, One Church-One Addict was born in 1994, receiving funding through seed grants provided by nonprofit groups. Since then, 715 churches in 31 states have signed on; more than 2000 people have been helped by its network of support.

How does Father Clements compare the two programs he founded?

"I feel that One Church-One Addict is a natural outgrowth of One Church-One Child," he said. "People are much more sympathetic to kids than to addicts. But I tell people that I'm not excusing or defending addiction. We say, 'Love the addict, hate the addiction.'"●

#### PROTECTING THE FIRST AMENDMENT

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I did not support the effort yesterday to begin writing exceptions into the first amendment of our Constitution. The first amendment protects the right of free speech, no matter how unpopular or offensive that speech is. The Court interprets this to include the right of people to burn a flag if a person so chooses. Presumably, the Court would reach the same conclusion with regard to a person's right to burn the Constitution or even the Bill of Rights itself.

Modern technology has given us the ability to see political protest, including the burning of flags, as it occurs around the world—in Tiananmen Square, in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and in South Africa. We are not only able to see the political protest, we are also able to see those governments step in to prevent that expression, to limit that speech, and to silence dissent and criticism aimed at those in power.

This proposed constitutional amendment would sanction that same type of