as a formality just continue to hold the title to the land and allow the people to use the land.

That is where the birth of what is called multiple use came. Multiple use means it is a land of many uses. And our lands out here have many uses. We have uses on environment, we have uses of ranching, farming. All of our highways come under federal lands. Our waters is stored upon, it comes across or originates on federal lands.

As I said, our cellular telephones, the towers, most of those are located on public lands. When we go through the mountains and you see those lights up on the top of the mountain, the radio tower, that is how we get our communication. All of our trucks, our traffic, our cattle, We use the public lands. We have a responsibility to use them in a responsible fashion. It is a duty of ours. And I think overall we have exercised it pretty well.

Now, there is a heavy propaganda effect by people who feel no pain, they feel no pain if they do not live in the public lands to kick us off the public lands or to restrict the multiple use or to convince the people out here who are not acquainted with the federal lands that those of us who live in the federal lands are abusing the federal lands, that we are clear-cutting all the forests, that we are putting up coal mines, that our ski areas are abusive, that our mountain bikers have ridden too many trails, that our horses are creating too much disturbance to the wildlife, that our rafters have taken over the rivers and demolished the ecosystem of the rivers. It is not true.

Clearly, we have advanced use. Clearly there are more people who are enjoying the outdoors of the Rocky Mountains than ever before in our history. Obviously, we have to manage it and we have to manage it with the preservation of land in mind. But we also have to manage it without a built-in anti-human bias.

The concept of multiple use is absolutely essential for the survival of the people in the Rocky Mountains in the West. If you take away that concept of multiple use in the West, you will devastate, and that is not an overestimation, I am not exaggerating here, you take away the concept of multiple use, you do what some of these more radical environmental organizations want to do, for example, the National Sierra Club wants to drain Lake Powell, which has more shoreline than the entire Pacific West Coast, now they have announced they want to drain Flaming Gorge, you allow some of these organizations, which, ironically, are all located up here in the East, you allow them to pursue their aggressive agenda of eliminating and pushing people off these public lands and look at what you are doing to about half of the country.

It is easy if you do not live in these public lands, if you live out here somewhere, it is easy for you to say because you feel no pain, it is easy, my colleagues, for you to agree with policies that, for example, have broad sweeps of taking people off the lands and designating areas that are not allowed or have a built-in anti-human bias to it.

What I urge my colleagues tonight and the reason I bring up multiple use is the same reason I bring up water. In the West it is essential for our survival. In the East you have got to figure out how to get rid of your water. In the West we have got to figure out how to preserve it, how to conserve it, how to store it. Water storage is critical.

Out in the West, if we are not allowed to use the public lands and use them with the responsibility of being diligent in our use, of making sure that we observe the rules of preservation but being able, nonetheless, to still use them is absolutely essentially for our preservation here in the West.

And so, my colleagues, before you cast a vote dealing with issues in the West, try and get a feeling of our pain, try and understand what the consequences, or even more dangerously, what the unintended consequences of your action will be for the people of the West.

Remember, the United States does not start here on the eastern border of the Third Congressional District and run to the Atlantic Ocean. The United States is one country and we have an obligation in the West to understand the problems and the issues of people in the East. And the people in the East we feel have an obligation to understand the issues in the West, which include the water issues, which include the concept of multiple use, which include the concept of involving a community from the very basic level up before you draft legislation expanding a monument like we have done on the Colorado canyons.

As a team, we can move this country continually in a positive direction. And as a team, the East and the West can mold together. But it will only mold together, my colleagues, if those of you in the East have a good understanding of our lives and what are necessary to preserve our lives in the West.

□

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4576, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS (during the special order of Mr. MCINNIS), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–757) on the resolution (H. Res. 554) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4118, RUSSIAN-AMERICAN TRUST AND COOPERATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS (during the special order of Mr. MCINNIS), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–758) on the resolution (H. Res. 555) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4118) to prohibit the rescheduling or forgiveness of any outstanding bilateral debt owed to the United States by the Government of the Russian Federation until the President certifies to the Congress that the Government of the Russian Federation has ceased all its operations at, removed all personnel from, and permanently closed the intelligence facility at Lourdes, Cuba, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO THE SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. REYNOLDS (during the special order of Mr. MCINNIS), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–759) on the resolution (H. Res. 556) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1102, COMPREHENSIVE RETIREMENT SECURITY AND PENSION REFORM ACT OF 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS (during the special order of Mr. MCINNIS), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–760) on the resolution (H. Res. 557) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1102) to provide for pension reform, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS AND DRUG ABUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come to the floor of the House tonight to address the House on the topic of illegal narcotics and drug abuse, the problems that it presents for our whole Nation, the challenge for the United States Congress.

I would be remiss, however, if I did not comment for just a moment tonight on the passing of our dear colleague in the other body, the United States Senate, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. PAUL COVERDELL, who passed away today.

Certainly, our hearts and prayers are with his family at this time and the whole Congress mourns this great loss, his many contributions I know in the war on narcotics. I know in the war on narcotics there was always a true leader and friend who we had the opportunity to work with. His presence will be sorely missed by the entire Congress, I know by the state of Georgia that he so ably represented, and by the American people for his dedication to our nation.

So our heartfelt sympathy is extended to the State of Georgia and his loved ones as they now cope with this tragic loss. And we have indeed lost one of the fighters in our war on narcotics, illegal drug trafficking, and the problem of substance abuse.

So, with those comments, again, we mourn this great loss to this esteemed institution and again to our country.

Tonight, as is customary for me as chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources, I attempt to use this special order and usually try to take an hour and discuss some of the problems and challenges we face with the problem of substance abuse in this country, with the problem of illegal narcotics, the problem of drug and illegal narcotic production and trafficking that has affected our entire Nation, that has affected every city, every community small, large, rural or urban.

Almost every family in America has been affected by substance abuse and the ravages of illegal narcotics. I always cite that the most recent statistic of 15,973 Americans have lost their lives as a direct result of illegal narcotics. And those are again the numbers in direct death.

Our drug czar estimates that over 52,000 Americans have died in the last year because of substance abuse, illegal narcotics direct, and indirect results. And the toll does go on and on.

Again, so many families are tragically affected. It is not only a cost in lost lives but a cost in our economy in the third of a trillion dollar range each year, a loss of jobs, and also of income, the glutting of our judicial system, our jails with nearly 2 million Americans incarcerated behind bars. Some 60 to 70 percent of those behind bars in most of our communities and States are there because of drug-related offenses.

□ 2215

As I have also tried to point out in my presentations based on the facts and substantial studies that have been conducted, the most recent being last spring in New York which analyzed the effects of the 20 some thousand incarcerated in that State for drug-related offenses, most of them are there for repeated felonies, most of them are there because they have really gamed the system and not cooperated. Some 70 percent, as I said, are there because of multiple felonies, but again you go back to illegal narcotics, drug abuse and the problems that it creates among those individuals and you cannot help but to say that we have a situation that is intolerable for our judicial system, that is intolerable for those incarcerated, their families, and for our society at large.

So our challenge has been the last year and a half plus of the subcommittee to try to weave together a coherent national drug policy, to look at all the options that we have for dealing with this problem, to review some of the initiatives and actions that have taken place across the Nation, see if they make sense, see if they can be adapted to other situations, and see if they provide some opportunity for relief from the situation.

I always like to take a minute and review how we got ourselves into this situation. I heard this weekend, just within the last few days, people repeat the question, is the war on drugs a failure? What is happening in the war on drugs? If people listen and take a few minutes to understand what has happened, I think there is a very clear picture of what works and what does not work. You would have people tell you that the war on drugs is again a failure, and I say absolutely not, that a war on drugs as devised by the Reagan administration and the Bush administration was in fact a success. In fact, the statistics, the facts, the pure facts, bear out the success of the war on drugs conducted by the two previous Presidents.

I have cited and I will cite again a national household survey that said based on the data that they collected, and this is consistent data over a good time period, illicit drug use declined by 50 percent from 1985 to 1992. That is a pretty dramatic decrease. If we look at the statistics from the beginning of the Clinton administration to the present time, we have almost the opposite, almost a 50 percent increase in illicit and illegal drug use. So the facts bear out, there are again surveys that have been conducted over a long period of time show that indeed a true, full-fledged effort, leadership by the President, leadership by the Vice President, at that time Mr. Bush who went on to be the President and also continued the policy, a multifaceted approach in which you have presidential leadership, you have a program to stop drugs at their source, a successful international drug program that deals with elimination of the crops, elimination of the narcotic at its source, which is most cost effective, and an interdiction policy, one that incorporates the use of our national resources and assets such as our military in a war on drugs to stop drugs as they leave their source where they are grown or where they begin and stop those drugs, those illegal narcotics in their tracks, a comprehensive program of prevention and treatment. We know that it takes again a multifaceted effort, that you must have successful treatment, you must have a successful prevention program, you must have a campaign that reiterates that illegal drugs do harm even if it is the first lady who has a ''Just Say No'' program or a DARE program in school, many of the programs that again were so successful under the Reagan and Bush administration that resulted from 1985 to 1992 in a 50 percent reduction of illicit drug use. Again part of a multifaceted approach, the utilization of all of our resources at the Federal level, the Coast Guard, the military, surveillance and intelligence information and, of course, a tough zero tolerance in law enforcement.

All that changed and took a 180 degree turn with this administration's coming into office, but again the success was really incredible during the past two administrations.

Let me, if I may, put this chart up here. Again, this shows the statistic that I just relayed from the national household survey. You see from the beginning of the Reagan administration through the Bush administration, a real war on drugs, a decline in the prevalence of lifetime drug use and abuse. You see the beginning of the Clinton administration, 1992, 1993, the tragedy we now see ourselves in. Only since the advent of the new Republican Congress have we seen any slight leveling out in again this long-term picture. Overall casual drug use was cut by more than half if we went back to 1997 and 1992. Casual cocaine use fell some 79 percent while monthly use fell from 2.9 million users in 1988 to 1.3 million in 1992. So if anyone tells you that the war on drugs, and this is when we had a real war on drugs, was a failure, these are the hard statistics, hard facts, something that I have not made up, something that has been part of a national survey, a very legitimate national survey. This is the record of the Clinton administration.

Now, the difference with the Clinton administration is when President Clinton took office in 1993, he began dismantling the war on drugs, and they dismantled piece by piece. The very first steps were in fiscal year 1994–1995, the Coast Guard was cut, their budget, and they have an important role in this effort and to conduct a real war on drugs. Their drug operations were cut from $310 million to $301 million. The customs, also an important part of this effort, their drug funds were cut by the Clinton administration, and the Clinton administration, remember, in 1994 and 1995 controlled the House of Representatives by a wide, wide margin, the other body by a wide margin and the White House, the executive branch. They cut the customs budget from $16.2 million to $12.8 million. DEA, our drug enforcement agency, our Federal agency dealing with the antinarcotics problems and enforcement was slashed from

$16.2 million to $12.8 million. And DOD, our first line of defense. Now, the Department of Defense does not arrest anyone in a war on drugs. The Department of Defense is prohibited even by the Constitution and provisions of our laws from being an enforcer in domestic law enforcement. What the Defense Department has done as enlisted in the Reagan and Bush administration was to provide intelligence and information. Our planes and our ships and our satellites, our AWACs, other equipment is already in the air for national security purposes. Now, if I told you that an enemy was to kill 15,972 Americans last year or 2 years ago and result in the deaths of over 50,000 Americans each year, Americans and Members of Congress should and would rise up and say, let's stop that, let's go after that. Using our military, we in fact in this period, in the Reagan-Bush period in interdiction and also in intelligence information gathering were able to stem the flow of illegal narcotics coming into the United States, also go after traffickers most successfully. You have heard the results of a successful war on drugs, a 50 percent reduction from 1985 to 1992 in illicit drug use. You heard that casual cocaine use fell by some 79 percent while monthly use fell from 2.9 million users in 1988 to 1.3 million in 1992. Now, the Bush and Reagan administration did not erase the problem of illegal narcotics or substance abuse but they made a dramatic decrease in them.

This is the Clinton record. Some 50 percent cut in interdiction programs and dramatic cuts in international programs, cost effectively stopping narcotics at their source.

This chart shows again the picture of the dismantling of the war on drugs and the reason we see this incredible flood of illegal narcotics coming into the United States and problems throughout every jurisdiction across our land. You see the levels in 1991, 1992, this shows the end of the Bush administration. The red shows interdiction, the blue shows international. Again, international would be stopping drugs at their source. You see the dramatic cuts in half of international programs. You see the dramatic decline in interdiction. This is the use of the military. You see this begin to pick up again with the advent of the Republican-controlled Congress. And we are getting back, and if we use 1991–1992 dollars, we are getting back just about to the level we were with the successful efforts at the end of the Bush administration. But this has been quite an uphill battle.

Now, we know where the illegal narcotics are coming from. This chart provided by the National Drug Intelligence Center to me shows us that the drugs are coming from South America and primarily today from Colombia, both cocaine and heroin. Now, I know it is hard for people to believe this, but 7 years ago at the beginning of the Clinton administration there was almost zero heroin being produced in Colombia. That is heroin actually being produced with poppy growth in that country. In 1992–1993 there was almost no coca, the base for cocaine, produced in Colombia. In 7 years and through very direct policy of this administration, the production of coca and cocaine is now reaching some 70 percent of the heroin that comes into the United States and is seized, we know 70 percent comes from Colombia. We know that cocaine that is produced in Colombia now accounts for about 80 percent of all the production coming in.

We know what works. We know that a successful international program, a program where we have tough enforcement, we have surveillance, and we also have crop alternatives, these peasants and others who were producing these crops need some alternative to make a living, and the reason they are doing it now is they are being paid for it. The reason they are doing it now in Colombia is they are financing narcoterrorist activity and receiving payment and protection.

□ 2230

We have not been going after those individuals, and, again, that is the direct result of this administration and its lack of will to really conduct a full scale war on drugs.

Mr. Speaker, instead of conducting a war on drugs, they have been dismantling the war on drugs. As we saw from the chart that I previously put up, the Clinton administration dramatically cut both the international and interdiction budgets. Federal spending under a Republican-controlled Congress has increased some 84 percent, again, for interdiction, and back to about the 1991–1992 levels.

On international programs, we have increased the funding some 170 percent over the last Democrat-controlled Congress. That number will probably even surge more with Plan Colombia, which, again, we know where the problem is, we know where our resources need to go.

During the past several years, under the Republican-controlled House and Senate, we have put together a strategic plan in Bolivia and Peru. We have cut coca production by some 63 percent in Peru, by over 55 percent in Bolivia. Part of Plan Colombia has funds for both Peru and Bolivia and also some of the neighboring countries, because we know when we apply pressure on Colombia that there will be an inclination to move some of that production to other neighboring areas.

The plan does entail bringing resources into this entire region. This is where the drugs are coming from; most of it is Colombia and a little bit in the peripheral area. That is where we need to concentrate some other resources.

Mr. Speaker, of course, interdiction and source country programs alone will not stop illegal narcotics. It takes a full effort.

It is interesting to note that one of the next steps that the Clinton administration took in 1993 after taking office was to dismantle the drug czar's office. They talked about cuts in Federal bureaucracy, and their idea was to cut the staffing of the Office of National Drug Control Policy. It was cut 80 percent from 147 positions to 25 positions.

Imagine conducting a war on drugs by dismantling the effective and very low dollar expenditure source country programs, stop drugs at their source. Imagine taking the military out of the war on narcotics, which they did. Their next step in cutting the budget for any type of antinarcotic, again, very few dollars, because we already have our military engaged in some of these activities, the next step was to gut the drug czar's office.

Mr. Speaker, probably the most disastrous two things that this administration did next was to appoint Lee Brown, I believe his name is, as the drug czar. He single-handedly did more damage in dismantling our war on drugs that had been started and so successfully executed by President Reagan and President Bush and their administration.

In fact, I remember as a Member of the minority in 1993 attending hearings of the predecessor of the Committee on Government Reform, it was called Government Operations, they held, I believe, one full hearing. Mr. Brown came up to testify.

The hearing was a farce, and over 130 Members, bipartisan Members, asked for hearings to be conducted on our national drug policy and the dismantling basically of the war on drugs, which they very directly were dismantling during that time frame.

One hearing in 2 years while they dismantled the program; it was sinful. One hearing while the drug czar, Mr. Brown, appointed by President Clinton destroyed 2 President's work, 2 administration's work and effort, which was reducing, and we heard there was a 50 percent reduction in drug use from 1985 to 1990 to a successful war on drugs shut down.

During the Bush administration, the United States shared real-time intelligence with some of the drug-producing countries, including Peru, in an effort to allow them to force down and, in some cases, provided information to allow them to shoot down drug trafficking aircraft so their illegal cargos could be seized or destroyed.

This was primarily done through again the interdiction program, through radar and through surveillance flights.

On May 1, 1994, the Clinton administration stopped this program. And it was not until there was an absolute uproar in the House of Representatives and the other body, we really had to pass a clarification in law to convince the administration to reinstitute these drug surveillance missions and provide that information for shoot down.

The Clinton administration did an incredible amount of damage in stopping that information sharing and repeatedly, as recently as 1998, the Clinton appointed ambassador to Peru wrote again, and I have a copy of it as reported to me by the General Accounting Office in a report. I had them independently conduct a study of the problem of declining DOD assets and participation.

In spite of even Congress now funding additional money, the assets have been diverted by the Clinton administration from this region and from conducting a real war on drugs. Again, in 1994, they made the first error. In 1998, they made the same error in not sharing with our allies in this effort information so that they can take action against drug traffickers, drug producers in their country.

I hate to drag up old problems, but we have to look at in the entire picture. And at the beginning of the Clinton administration, it is important to remind the Congress that White House staffers actually were forced with delays in obtaining security clearance process in the issuance of permanent White House passes.

As we may recall, in 1995 up to 21 White House staffers were on a special random drug testing program, because of concerns about recent drug use. Hearings were conducted on this. And I believe the problem became so serious that the Secret Service instituted a requirement that there be a special random drug testing program in the White House.

We might say, well, why would policy come out of the administration to destroy a war on drugs? And I submit, my colleagues, when we have 21 White House staffers on a special random drug testing program, which is instituted at the insistence of the Secret Service, because these individuals could not even pass a basic test and background check because of their recent illicit narcotics involvement, I think we see a little bit of the problem that we have been facing in this whole effort to really conduct a real antinarcotic effort.

In testimony before Congress, the Secret Service and FBI agents testified that the White House employees may have used illicit drugs at the Presidential inaugural in January of 1993.

One Secret Service Agent testified that he had reviewed more than 30 background investigations for White House employees that contained references to recent drug uses. In fact, we had testimony that said, and let me repeat it, I have seen cocaine usage. I have seen hallucinistic uses, crack uses. This is not something I said. This is from their direct testimony.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note, also, that in a sworn statement, one FBI agent said aides' drug use went well beyond the experimental use of marijuana in college, including cocaine, designer drugs and hallucinistic mushrooms.

We might all recall, some of the problems of a famous White House aide, we still do not know who hired him, that is a great mystery, we may never know. I believe the independent counsel has dropped the case, but the infamous who hired Craig Livingston.

I remember so well sitting in those hearings as he took the 5th amendment. He and others who suddenly lost their memory or ability to testify before our investigative panel.

Craig Livingston, as my colleagues will recall, was the chief of White House Personnel Security and reigned over his offices improper acquisition of FBI files. Those files were primarily of Reagan and Bush administration officials and staffers, even some of our congressional staffers.

He acknowledged in his own history illicit drug use and other problems which caused him to be fired from several jobs before he joined the White House staff in 1993. Now, Craig Livingston was the head of the personnel security office for the White House.

Again, we have to look at the whole picture of who we have been involved with in trying to conduct and put together a coherent national drug policy and a strategy that is effective.

Mr. Speaker, we have known from the very beginning that as we put pressure on Peru and Bolivia to stop production of coca and cocaine that we would have to deal at some point with Colombia. Everyone on our side of the aisle and many on the Democrat side of the aisle have urged that we get resources to Colombia. Again, this is not rocket science.

We know that most of the narcotics coming into the United States are produced in that area, in Colombia. We have known that it is very difficult to get to the crop, to destroy the crop, and also to the narcoterrorists who are involved in the narcotics trafficking. It takes helicopters. In this instance, we know it takes Blackhawk helicopters that are capable of high altitude flights and going after drug traffickers.

Mr. Speaker, time and time and time again, this administration has blocked resources to Colombia. Time and time again, this administration has blocked helicopters coming into Colombia.

According to the Defense Department, it took the Clinton administration 45 days to move 24 helicopters to Albania for an undeclared war in Kosovo.

According to the Defense Department also, it has taken the Clinton administration approximately 4 years to get 6 Blackhawk helicopters to Colombia in a so-called declared war on drugs.

Now, imagine fighting a war on the drugs, we do not go after the source of the production of the destructive device, which are the narcotics; we do not go after that. We do not try to get the narcotics or the destructive devices that leaves the source and uses our military, we take the military out of the battle. And here, where we need resources to go in and get that death and destruction, which is reigning in our cities and counties, and the Congress funds and appropriates and passes resolutions urging action, in fact, it took 4 years to get 6 helicopters to Colombia.

□ 2245

Now, if that was not bad enough, and this is not something I am making up, it is the absolute truth, when we finally got several of the helicopters delivered at the beginning of the year 2000, they were delivered without armor, adequate armor, to be used in conflict, without adequate ammunition.

Now again, I swear I am not making this up, but we needed to get ammunition if we are going to conduct a war on drugs. The Congress has appropriated funds year after year, at least since we took control of the Congress, to get these resources to Colombia. The administration, the President, the vice president, divert funds to other international deployments. The resources never got to Colombia.

Only the year before last we appropriated $300 million and, again, as of the end of last year almost nothing had gotten to Colombia, and the little bit that did get there of the $300 million most of it was in the helicopters that we had ordered some time ago which were delivered in an inoperable, noncombat condition; almost unbelievable.

Again I am not making this up, but there is more to this story. The ammunition that we needed to give the Colombians to fight the narcotraffickers ended up being delivered to the loading dock of the State Department in Washington instead of Colombia. Then I swear I am not making this up, but again the gang that could not shoot straight, the helicopters that cannot fly or are not armored, the story gets worse. The ammunition that is sent to the loading dock of the State Department, I swear this is the truth, they sent them 1952 ammunition, some of which they recommend is not usable in the other equipment that has been sent. So it really boggles the imagination.

Now we have provided very significant resources, $1.3 billion. That is not all for Colombia. It is in a larger package. Actually, the amount to be spent for equipment is a small portion of that, a small fraction of that. To appease the liberals and some of the others who are concerned about human rights violations, we have put in probably as much money for building institutions, nation building, we are going through another exercise of that in Colombia and other funds. There is some money in there that is for crop alternative, and I think that will be very wise to expend. We have known through our efforts in other countries that you have to have a successful crop alternative or alternative development program, but you also have to have tough enforcement. But there is a lot more to the story than meets the eye. These Black Hawk helicopters, in fact,

were promised to the Colombian national police back in 1996. Repeatedly you can get headlines. Here is one from February of 1998, Delay of Copters hobbles Colombia in Stopping Drugs. This little note says check the date. It is the end of 1997, 1998.

So year after year, the administration has blocked this. It is only after the administration, I am told, conducted a poll, and I cannot confirm this but they found that there was some criticism for their approach and that they needed to get their act together. Now, it took the President 4 or 5 years to come forward and change his policy, this administration, and declare an emergency. Only when the whole region is disrupted, only when we almost lost Colombia, only when part of the oil supply from that region, I think accounts for 20 percent of U.S. imports is endangered, only after 30,000 people have been killed in one of the bloodiest conflicts of the hemisphere and again only after the situation has reached disastrous proportions, has the administration come forward with a plan.

The end of last year they said that this was getting out of control; they had to do something. I am also told that they polled and saw that even the public was being concerned, and they usually act when they see a poll.

That forced the President to propose Plan Colombia and recommend to the Congress that we move forward with an emergency appropriation. Unfortunately, that emergency appropriation request did not get to the Congress until February of this year. So it took the President 5 years to get a plan and action where we know narcotics are being produced, where he allowed narcotics to be produced and become the center of narcotics activity, and I am pleased that the Congress has acted within 5 months. It started out as an emergency supplemental and was signed by the President, I believe, last week.

Now I keep my fingers crossed that we have given the gang that cannot shoot straight this responsibility now to get these resources to where we know the illegal narcotics are coming from.

If I may, I am going to try to conclude in a reasonable amount of time here tonight so staff can get home a little bit early, but this is another chart that I think the Congress, Mr. Speaker, and the American people should pay particular attention to. I always hear the war on drugs is a failure, and the other side always says we just have to spend money on treatment; treatment is the answer. I compare it a little bit to just treating the wounded in battle.

Imagine conducting a fight, not going after the enemy, not stopping the weapons of mass destruction where they are produced, not stopping the missiles and other things that are being lobbed at us, the illegal narcotics, and just treating the wounded in a battle. How long do you think you could last if we had just treated the wounded in battle in World War II or any of the major conflicts? And certainly a conflict that takes 15,900-plus lives in one year as a direct result of the conflict, the problem, or 50,000 a year, is a major threat to our Nation and our national security.

This chart shows that consistently, well we will go back to the beginning of the Clinton administration, we have increased funding for treatment. In fact, it is almost double for treatment. So we cut, under the Clinton administration, the war on drugs, the interdiction, the source country programs, the military, the Coast Guard, other budgets. They cut them by some 50 percent.

We are now restoring them, as you can see in these lines getting back to our equivalent of 1991/1992 dollars, but treatment has always been on the increase. It is just like here, but other than that we have basically doubled the amount of money that we have spent on treatment; and treatment alone does not work. I think the prime example of that is Baltimore, and I bring this chart up again.

Again, people just have to understand that a policy of toleration, of liberalization of the narcotics law, of nonenforcement of our laws relating to narcotics, attracts death and destruction.

This was provided to me in 1996 by our drug enforcement office. It shows the deaths in Baltimore: 1997, 312; 1998, 312; 1999, 308, and I believe 2000 is probably heading close to record. It shows the population decreasing. It shows about 39,000 drug addicts in 1996, and the estimates are now 60,000 to 80,000 drug addicts. These are people in need of treatment. This is a liberal policy, a policy of nonenforcement.

The police chief here in Baltimore, former police chief, fortunately he was fired, said in testimony before our subcommittee on a Monday several months ago that he had not participated in a high intensity drug trafficking program. The Feds had made dollars and cooperative efforts available. He had said he was only going to go after a limited number of open drug markets in Baltimore. Fortunately, the mayor heard him and on Thursday he was fired, and they are bringing in a zero tolerance law enforcement officer; but this shows the death and destruction.

This is just about half the number of New York City. New York City had about 350 murders in New York City last year. It went from 2,000 murders, a 58 percent reduction, down to about 650, a dramatic decrease, a zero tolerance policy with New York City versus a nonenforcement policy of Baltimore; incredible growth in addict population. If the entire country went to this policy, we saw this many deaths, this much destruction, we could never keep up with what we would face.

The New York statistics compared to Baltimore are startling. In red, Baltimore, 1993, you see the murder rate staying constant in red and Baltimore dropping dramatically from 2,000 down to the mid-650s. It is very dramatic.

Remember New York City has a population probably of 10 million and you are looking at probably 500,000, 600,000, continuing declining population in Baltimore. In fact, I picked up the Baltimore Sun and it says as population drops city must look to D.C. This is a July 15 article I read the other day. This is what the policy will do for your community if you are thinking of adopting a nonenforcement policy. With 4,890 residential properties appearing this week on the multiple listings and dozens of additional houses being advertised directly by the owners, the city has a glut of unsold homes.

Anyone doubting this should drive around various row house neighborhoods and count signs, and that is before the estimated 40,000 vacant houses are considered. In other words, the city is still losing population. Hopefully it is not too late. Hopefully the new mayor O'Malley and the new police chief can bring this situation under control.

I will say what has not worked is the policy they have had in place, and I will say what has worked is New York's zero tolerance policy.

This is, again, a dramatic representation of the way crime has been reduced in New York City from 1993 to 1998, and it continues. If you see the tough enforcement of drug-related offenses, and the arrests as they go up the crime goes down in New York City.

I also show that chart, and people would have you believe that this is not a success, but it is a success. Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter declined some 67 percent from 1993 to 1998. The total of all major felony crimes fell from 51 percent in 1993 to 1998, a 51 percent decrease in those categories.

As a result of Mayor Giuliani's tough enforcement policies, based on what the murder rate was before he took office, more than 3,500 people are alive in New York City; again, just dramatic results.

Now, the other side would probably say that this zero tolerance is a brutal regime. Let me say that we had Mayor Giuliani and we have had his police commissioner testify and provide our subcommittee the facts. For example, one thing is that the fatal shootings by police officers in 1999 was 11.

□ 2300

It was the lowest of any year since 1973, the first year for which records were kept. That is far less than the 41 police shootings that took place in 1990.

Now, where was Reverend Sharpton or whatever his name is in 1990 screaming when there were 41 shootings that took place. Moreover, the number of rounds intentionally fired by police in New York declined by 50.6 percent since 1993, and the number of intentional shooting incidents by police

dropped by 66.5 percent, while the number of actual police officers that were employed in New York City increased by 37.9 percent.

Now, do not deal with the facts, and these happen to be the facts. They will tell us that this tough enforcement does not work. It does work. Look at the crimes. Look at the people's lives who have not been ravaged. Look at the thousands who are living as a result of this policy, and there are less incidents of shootings, with a 37.9 percent increase in police officers.

Mr. Speaker, there were 62 percent more shootings by police officers per capita in the last year of David Dinkins' administration last year than under Mayor Giuliani. The press will not tell us that. Specifically, in 1993, there were 212 incidents involving police officers in intentional shootings. In 1994, there were 167. In 1998, under Mayor Giuliani, there were 111. Mr. Speaker, 111 compared to 212, a dramatic decrease under Mayor Giuliani. In 1993, under David Dinkins' last year in office, there were 7.4 shooting incidents per officer. That ratio is now down to 2.8 shooting incidents per 1,000 officers.

By contrast, the misguided approach of others will tell us that this does not work. They will tell us that the war on drugs is a failure, when we can show tonight that there was, in fact, a 50 percent plus reduction under Presidents Reagan and Bush, from 1985 to 1992, and since there has been a dramatic increase.

So the war on drugs is not a failure. The tough enforcement policy is not a failure. It does not brutalize anyone. In fact, these projects and programs of tough enforcement do work.

Finally, during the mid 1990s, I will cite as another example, Richmond, the capital of the Commonwealth of Virginia, had one of the worst per capita murder rates in history, peaking in 1997 with 140 murders. What they did in Richmond, the capital of the Commonwealth of Virginia, was institute a tough gun enforcement law entitled Project Exile, tough prosecution. Homicides in 1998 were approximately 33 percent below 1997, the lowest number since 1987, since the program was instituted. Tough enforcement works in Richmond, it works in New York City. The policies where we turn our back and let drug dealers rule the streets in our neighborhoods, those programs do not work. Just drive through Baltimore, move your business to Baltimore, or move to Baltimore and you will see. It is my hope we can turn Baltimore around. Baltimore is a great American city with a great history, a beautiful area and with wonderful people who have endured the wrong policy. The American people have also endured the wrong policy as it relates to not having a real war on drugs, and we can change that.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will learn by these costly lessons of the past. I hope that we will give a serious effort to conducting a real war on drugs, and that the funds that this Congress has appropriated from the American people, hard-working American taxpayers' monies they are sending here are appropriately expended to bring this situation under control so that we have a balanced program of interdiction, of source-country programs, of treatment, of education, of prevention; a well-balanced program that we know from the Reagan-Bush era did work, that reduced drug usage in this country by some 50 percent.

So that is my hope, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House and in the other body in an effort to again to find sensible, cost-effective and real solutions to the real problem we are facing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the staff for staying late again any hearing my Tuesday night presentation. I am tired too; I would like to have turned in early, but I think this is most important, that we keep repeating this message, and that people understand the problem and challenge that we are faced with, with illegal narcotics.

□

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BOSWELL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 3:00 p.m. on account of illness in the family.

□

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

(By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:)

The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MALONEY of New York) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. KIND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOSSELLA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KASICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PITTS, for 5 minutes, July 19 and July 24.

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOSSELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

□

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title.

H.R. 3544. To authorize a gold medal to be presented on behalf of the Congress to Pope John Paul II in recognition of his many and enduring contributions to peace and religious understanding, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3591. To provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan in recognition of their service to the Nation.

H.R. 4391. To amend title 4 of the United States Code to establish sourcing requirements for State and local taxation of mobile telecommunication services.

□

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 19, 2000, at 10 a.m.

□

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8829. A letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Elimination of Requirements for Partial Quality Control Programs [Docket No. 97–001F] (RIN: 0583–AC35) received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8830. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Melon Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area [Docket No. 99–097–2] received June 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8831. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Department's Report on Improvements to the Joint Manpower Process, pursuant to Public Law 104—201, section 509(a) (110 Stat. 2513); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8832. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting proposed legislation that would extend authority to carry out certain prototype projects for three years, authorize the use of other transactions for follow-on production for up to a maximum of twenty programs, and authorize the use of other transactions for prototypes developed under the Commercial Operations and Support Savings Initiative; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8833. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Progress Payments for Foreign Military Sales Contracts [DFARS Case 2000–D0009] received June 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8834. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Production Surveillance and Reporting [DFARS Case 99–D026] received June 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8835. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement;