

just grateful for the opportunity to honor you with a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statement.

ON THE CELEBRATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA'S 86TH ANNIVERSARY NATIONAL DAY

**HON. NANCY PELOSI**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 7, 1997*

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow in San Francisco, which I am privileged to represent in the U.S. Congress, a special celebration will take place marking the 86th Anniversary of the National Day of the Republic of China. I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues this, the "Double Tenth" celebration of freedom.

The people of the United States have a special bond with the people of the Republic of China [Taiwan], who have unflinchingly demonstrated to the world their commitment to democracy under steady pressure. The Republic of China is a vibrant, thriving nation for the present and a model for the future—a model characterized by strong economic growth and respect for basic human rights and democratic freedoms.

The Republic of China is an important partner of the United States, economically, culturally, strategically, and politically. I am proud to relay to the Double Tenth celebrants in San Francisco the support and best wishes of the Republic of China's many friends in Congress. I congratulate the participants in this festival of freedom on their 86th Anniversary National Day and look forward to celebrating this historic event annually for many, many years to come.

PRINCIPLES FOR PRACTICAL DRUG POLICIES

**HON. BARNEY FRANK**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 7, 1997*

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe that one of the areas in American public policy where debate is the most retarded and stunted is that of drug policy. For too many of us in elected office, debating drug policy means engaging in a competition to show how tough one can be, without regard for how intelligent one is. In many areas of public policy we have come to the thoughtful realization that good intentions do not necessarily solve a problem, and that persisting in failed policies may make political sense, but rarely serves as a useful way to achieve real progress in improving society. Unfortunately, none of this seems to have penetrated the area of drugs, where despite the enormous shortcomings of the current excessively punitive policy, which does not do nearly as much as we could do to reduce drug use, and, in fact, exacerbates some problems, elected officials appear afraid to reexamine the issue.

For this reason, I was delighted to read the report of the drug policy project of the Federation of American Scientists. A group organized by the FAS recently issued an extremely useful statement, embodying a set of principles for practical drug policies. The list of those

subscribing to these policies is an impressive one, and while I doubt that any single Member of Congress will agree with all of the principles—indeed I doubt that any single member of the group agrees fully with all of the principles—it represents a very important step forward in trying to produce rational discussion of public policy in the drug area, both because it seeks to break the taboo against precisely this sort of discussion, and because of the common sense embodied in the principles themselves.

Because I believe it is very important that we break out of the intellectual rut in which drug policy is now mired, I ask that this statement be printed here, along with the list of endorsers.

PRINCIPLES FOR PRACTICAL DRUG POLICIES

As a step toward redirecting discussion and action around drug abuse control into more useful channels, we propose the following as reasonable and moderate principles for practical drug policies.

1. [Why drug policy?] Any activity that diminishes normal capacities for self-control can create dangers for those who engage in it and for those around them. Drugs that threaten self-control, either through intoxication or through addiction, are therefore matters of social as well as personal concern. This applies to licit and illicit substances alike.

2. [Science and policy] Drug policies should be based on the best available knowledge and analysis and should be judged by the results they produce rather than by the intentions they embody. Too often, policies designed for their symbolic value have unanticipated and unwanted consequences.

[Minimizing overall damage] Drug control policies should be designed to minimize the damage done to individuals, to social institutions, and to the public health by (a) licit and illicit drug-taking, (b) drug trafficking, and (c) the drug control measures themselves. Damage can be reduced by shrinking the extent of drug abuse as well as by reducing the harm incident to any given level of drug consumption.

[Forms of damage] The forms of damage to be minimized—whether caused by drugs or drug control measures—include illness and accidents, crimes against person and property, corruption and disorder, disruption of family and other human relationships, loss of educational and economic opportunities, loss of productivity, loss of dignity and autonomy, loss of personal liberty and privacy, interference in pain management and other aspects of the practice of medicine, and the costs of public and private interventions.

5. [Laws and regulations] Laws and regulations are among the primary means of preventing drug abuse. Lifting prohibition on a substance is likely to increase its consumption, perhaps dramatically. Some substances present dangers such that even limited licit availability, other than for medically supervised use, would be unlikely to yield the desired minimum-damage outcome. Therefore, we cannot escape our current predicament by "ending prohibition" or "legalizing drugs."

6. [Enforcement for results] Enforcement and punishment, like other policies, should be designed to minimize overall damage. As long as some substances are illegal or tightly regulated, there will be attempts to evade those controls and therefore a need for enforcement and sanctions, in some cases including imprisonment. The use of disproportionate punishments to express social norms is neither just nor a prudent use of public funds and scarce prison capacity.

7. [Stance towards users] Social disapproval of substance abuse can be a power-

ful and economical means of reducing its extent. Such disapproval should not be translated into indiscriminate hostility towards all drug users based solely on their drug use. Persons who violate the rights of others under the influence of intoxicants or in order to obtain intoxicants are to be held fully responsible for their actions, criminally as well as civilly.

8. [Tailoring policies to drugs] Alcohol is familiar and widely accepted, yet it shares the intoxicating and addictive risks of some of the illicit drugs. Current policies make alcohol too easily and cheaply available and allow it to be too aggressively promoted. The resulting damage to users and others is very large. Taxation, regulation, and public information are all justified means to the end of reducing that damage.

10. [What about tobacco?] Nicotine, as commonly used, is not an intoxicant. But its addictive potential is great, and chronic cigarette smoking carries severe health risks. The wide prevalence of tobacco use under current policies makes cigarette smoking the leading cause of preventable early death. More stringent regulation is needed to protect the public health.

11. [Valuing treatment properly] Successful treatment for people with substance abuse disorders produces benefits for those treated and for those around them. Treatment episodes that reduce drug use and damage to self and others but do not produce immediate, complete, and lasting abstinence ought to be regarded as incomplete successes rather than as unredeemed failures.

12. [Prevention] For drug abuse as for other ills, the more successful the prevention effort the less the need for remediation. Developing and implementing effective drug abuse prevention strategies, especially for minors, is an essential means of drug abuse control. Prevention messages should accurately reflect what is known about the effects and risks of the substances they discuss.

13. [Taking measured steps] Drug policies need to be updated as social conditions change and the base of scientific knowledge grows. Policy changes that can be introduced incrementally and evaluated step by step are to be preferred over sweeping changes with less predictable consequences.

14. [Integrity and civility] Debate about drug policies engages deeply felt values and therefore often becomes heated and even acrimonious. Civility and honesty about facts, proposals, and motives can serve both to improve drug policies and to advance the broader public interest in healthy political discourse.

These principles may seem straightforward, hardly needing to be said. That they are in fact controversial illustrates something important about the way drugs and drug policy now tend to be discussed.

The current drug policy debate is marked by polarization into two positions stereotyped as "drug warrior" and "legalizer." This creates the false impression that "ending prohibition" is the only alternative to an unrestricted "war on drugs," effectively disenfranchising citizens who find both of those options unsatisfactory. Polarization and strong emotions give rise to misrepresentations of facts and motives, oversimplification of complex issues, and denial of uncertainty.

In the face of strong opposition, some of those who favor fundamental changes in the drug laws have elected to concentrate on more modest proposals which they intend as way stations towards their unstated longer-term goals. Partly as a consequence, some of those devoted to maintaining or intensifying present anti-drug efforts have taken to dismissing all criticisms of current policies—

even those based on solid research showing that one or another policy or program fails to serve its stated aim—as mere fronts for a covert “legalization” effort.

In this climate, every idea, research finding, or proposal put forth is scrutinized to determine which agenda it advances, and the partisans on each side are quick to brand anyone who deviates from their “party line” as an agent of the opposing side. As a result, propositions of dubious validity achieve the status of loyalty oaths, and questions that ought to be addressed on technical and practical grounds (what works in prevention, how well interdiction performs, which treatment approaches help which clients) are instead debated as matters of ideological conviction.

The tendency in each camp is to focus on only one face of the problem. One extreme talks as if the miseries surrounding drug distribution and abuse are entirely the product of unwise policies. The other is just as likely to say or imply that the damage comes entirely from the drugs themselves. In fact, both drugs and drug policies cause harm. Any policy, including inaction, does harm as well as good. Once that is acknowledged, we can begin the hard work of shaping policies that do more good than harm. That work will demand reasoned analysis and scientific respect for evidence, and doing it well will require learning from mistakes rather than denying them.

ENDORSEMENTS—PRINCIPLES FOR PRACTICAL DRUG POLICIES

Hamilton Beazley, former President, National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence.

George E. Bigelow, Professor of Behavioral Biology in the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.

Joseph V. Brady, Professor of Behavioral Biology in the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences and Professor of Neuroscience, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.

William J. Bratton, CEO, First Security Consulting; former Commissioner of the New York City Police Department.

Jonathan P. Caulkins, Professor of Public Affairs, Carnegie-Mellon University.

Philip J. Cook, Professor of Economics and Policy Studies and Acting Director of the Terry Sanford Institute for Public Policy, Duke University.

Harriet de Wit, Associate Professor of Psychiatry, University of Chicago.

John J. Dilulio Jr., Professor of Politics and Public Affairs at Princeton University and Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution.

William A. Donohue, President, Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights.

Peter Edelman, Professor, Georgetown University Law Center and former Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Margaret E. Ensminger, Associate Professor of Health and Policy Management, Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health; joint appointment in Psychiatry, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.

Marian W. Fischman, Professor of Behavioral Biology, Department of Psychiatry, Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Avram Goldstein, M.D., Professor Emeritus of Pharmacology, Stanford University.

Roland Griffiths, Professor of Behavioral Biology, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences and Professor of Neuroscience, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.

Francis X. Hartmann, Executive Director, Program in Criminal Justice Policy and

Management, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Chris-Ellyn Johanson, Professor of Psychiatry and Behavioral Neurosciences, Wayne State University School of Medicine.

Reese T. Jones, M.D., Professor of Psychiatry, University of California, San Francisco.

Carl Kayser, Professor Emeritus of Political Economy, MIT, and former Director, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton.

David McLean Kennedy, Senior Researcher, Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Sheppard G. Kellam, M.D., Professor of Mental Hygiene, Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene & Public Health; joint appointment in Psychiatry, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine.

Mark A.R. Kleiman, Professor, School of Public Policy and Social Research, University of California, Los Angeles.

Stanley Korenman, M.D., Professor of Medicine and Associate Dean, UCLA Medical School.

Robert E. Litan, Director of Economic Studies, Brookings Institution; former Associate Director, U.S. Government Office of Management and Budget.

Glenn Loury, University Professor, Professor of Economics, and Director of the Institute on Race and Social Division, Boston University.

Robert MacCoun, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Public Policy, University of California at Berkeley.

Mark H. Moore, Professor of Criminal Justice Policy and Management, Harvard University.

Dennis E. Nowicki, Chief of Police, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department, North Carolina.

John O'Hair, Prosecuting Attorney, Wayne County (Detroit), Michigan.

Peter Reuter, Professor of Public Affairs and Criminology, University of Maryland.

Michell S. Rosenthal, M.D., President, Phoenix House Foundation.

Sally L. Satel, Lecturer, Yale Medical School.

Thomas C. Schelling, Distinguished University Professor at University of Maryland.

Charles R. Schuster, Professor of Psychiatry and Behavioral Neurosciences and Director of the Clinical Research Division on Substance Abuse, Wayne State University School of Medicine; former Director of the National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Lewis Seiden, Professor and Chairman of the Department of Pharmacology, University of Chicago.

Solomon H. Snyder, M.D., Distinguished Service Professor of Neuroscience, Pharmacology, and Psychiatry; Director, Department of Neuroscience, The Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.

George Vaillant, M.D., Professor of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL BLACK McDONALD'S OPERATOR'S ASSOCIATION 25TH ANNIVERSARY

**HON. CARRIE P. MEEK**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 7, 1997*

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the 25th anniversary of the National Black McDonald's Operators Association. The association will hold its biennial convention October 7–10 in the Miami metropolitan area.

The establishment of the association grew out of McDonald's concern over riots following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. In the aftermath, McDonald's national management team expressed its belief that community business leaders, and in this instance, black community business leaders, were best able to address the issues and concerns of their communities.

On December 21, 1968, Herman Petty of Chicago became the first black owner/operator of a McDonald's franchise. Soon thereafter, McDonald's experienced a black-owned franchise growth spur. By the end of 1969, there were 12 black-operated McDonald's restaurants throughout the country. Today, there are over 300 franchises in the association, with a total of 800 restaurants nationwide.

This year's theme—“Pride in Progress”—reflects the association's commitment to teamwork in their efforts to improve the communities where they live and their businesses prosper. We often are encouraged to give back to our communities. For 25 years, members of the National Black McDonald's Operators Association have done that through scholarship programs, regional cooperative projects, and individual donations to special projects.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in free enterprise and strong economic growth. I also believe that the best antidote to despair and racism is full participation in our strong and growing economy. The black American business women and men of this association know that they must take the initiative to bring the spark of enterprise to their inner cities while striving to reach those communities that prosperity has passed.

As the National Black McDonald's Operators Association celebrates this impressive milestone, I salute the members for their philanthropic commitment and for their embodiment of the American spirit.

RECOGNITION OF ASHLEY CHOATE

**HON. RON PACKARD**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 7, 1997*

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, three times a year, a select group of high school juniors come to our Nation's Capital to serve in the congressional page program. Sixty-six of the best and brightest young men and women head to Washington for a semester in the Halls of Congress. This semester, one of my own constituents was chosen as a congressional page. Today, I am pleased to recognize Ashley Choate, of Dana Point, CA, as a member of the fall of 1997 class of congressional pages.

Ashley has not only excelled in academics at Dana Hills High School, but she has given back to her community and found the time to participate in high school athletics. It is truly commendable that Ashley was able to hold on to her 3.45 grade-point average while volunteering at an orphanage in Mexico and selling Christmas trees to raise money for her church. She also found the time to play softball for her high school during her freshman and sophomore years prior to coming to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, Ashley Choate is truly deserving of commendation. She is a wonderful individual and was recently recognized by the Los