

would probably refer to as a standard silver dollar, modeled after the old buffalo nickel which was designed by James Earle Fraser and minted from 1913 through 1938.

The proceeds of the sale of this coin will go towards funding the opening of the museum and will supplement the museums endowment and educational outreach funds. Because the mint will be reimbursed the cost of minting the coin before the funds are given to the museum, this bill will have no net cost to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that H.R. 4259 has reached the floor today. Again, I would like to thank my colleagues that have already shown their support for H.R. 4259, and I urge the remainder of my colleagues to support this bill as well.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to thank, again, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question, please?

Mr. LEACH. Yes, of course I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) made reference, I believe, to President Theodore Roosevelt, correct?

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I certainly did.

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Iowa said he was the one who thought that the design of the buffalo should be on that the nickel; is that correct?

Mr. LEACH. He is the one who inspired the design, yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I point out to the gentleman from Iowa that President Theodore Roosevelt was sworn into office as President of the United States in Buffalo, New York.

Mr. LEACH. That is newsworthy and an anecdote I did not know.

If the gentleman from New York could help me, what political party was Mr. Roosevelt associated with?

Mr. LaFALCE. The progressive party as I recall, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LEACH. Yes, of course. We are certainly in line that the President was a great American.

Mr. Schaffer. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4259.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES MINT NUMISMATIC COIN CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5273) to clarify the intention of the Congress with regard to the authority of the United States Mint to produce numismatic coins, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5273

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "United States Mint Numismatic Coin Clarification Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF MINT'S AUTHORITY.

(a) SILVER PROOF COINS.—Section 5132(a)(2)(B)(i) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking "paragraphs (1)" and inserting "paragraphs (2)".

(b) PLATINUM COINS.—Section 5112(k) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking "bullion" and inserting "platinum bullion coins".

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL REPORT REQUIREMENT.

Section 5134(e)(2) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "reflect" and inserting "contain";

(2) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (C);

(3) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting "; and"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following subparagraph:

"(E) a supplemental schedule detailing—
 "(i) the costs and expenses for the production, for the marketing, and for the distribution of each denomination of circulating coins produced by the Mint during the fiscal year and the per-unit cost of producing, of marketing, and of distributing each denomination of such coins; and
 "(ii) the gross revenue derived from the sales of each such denomination of coins."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LaFALCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5273.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House today, introduced by and at the request of the Treasury Department, is a simple technical corrections bill and does just three things. Most importantly, the mint has sought language that would excuse it from the law that requires it to make a silver proof version of the new golden \$1 coin. It is

obvious that this makes no sense at all to make a silver version of a coin that is gold in color. But language left over from the time when the silver-colored Susan B. Anthony dollar coins were made would require the all-silver proof version.

Not having this clarification has held up the mint's production of proof sets for collectors, and it is illegal to produce coins in a year other than in which they are issued. Failure to pass this bill would result either in a non-sensical proof set or no proof set for collectors at all this year.

Also contained in the bill is a clarifying section inserting the word "platinum" inadvertently dropped when Congress authorized production of platinum and platinum bullion coins a few years ago and a section calling for increased reporting requirements for the mint's cost of producing, distributing, and marketing circulating coins.

This is a small bill, but important to the mint and important to coin collectors. It has no cost implications whatsoever. I urge its immediate passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LaFALCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the United States Mint Numismatic Coin Clarification Act of 2000. The Act operates to introduce a "technical correction" into the language of the Dollar Coin Act of 1997. The Act that we consider today, will permit us to achieve the purposes of the Dollar Coin Act by removing the requirement that newly minted dollar coins be composed of 90% silver and 10% copper. Instead, the silver/copper content requirement will apply only to half-dollar, quarter-dollar and dime coins. A dollar coin, minted in gold coloring with manganese-brass content will be included with the proof sets.

The Act also grants the Secretary of the Treasury the discretionary authority that he or she may exercise from time to time to mint and issue platinum bullion coins.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the United States Mint Numismatic Coin Clarification Act of 2000, instructs the Secretary of the Treasury to provide periodic reports to Congress that will set forth the general and per-unit costs of production, marketing, and distribution of each denomination of circulating coins.

I would add for the record that the maximum mintage of 1 million (1,000,000) silver proof sets contemplated by the Act is eagerly anticipated by the numismatic community and will be produced at the U.S. Mint in San Francisco.

Due to the need for the correction in the legislative language that would be enacted by passage of the United States Mint Numismatic Coin Clarification Act of 2000, I urge my colleagues to support this measure as well.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House today, introduced by request of the Treasury Department, is a simple technical corrections bill, and does just three things.

Most importantly, the Mint has sought language that would excuse it from law that requires it to make a silver "proof" version of the

new golden one-dollar coin. It's obvious that it makes no sense at all to make a silver version of a coin that is golden in color, but language left over from the time when silver-colored Susan B. Anthony dollar coins were being made would require the all-silver "proof" version. Not having this clarification has held up the Mint's production of "proof" sets for collectors, and as it is illegal to produce coins in a year other than the one in which they are issued, failure to pass this bill would either result in a nonsensical "proof" set or no "proof" set for collectors at all this year.

Also contained in the bill is a clarifying section inserting the word "platinum," inadvertently dropped when Congress authorized the production of platinum and platinum bullion coins a few years ago, and a section calling for some increased reporting requirements on the Mint's costs of producing, distributing and marketing circulating coins.

This is a small bill, but important to the Mint and important to coin collectors. It has no cost implications whatsoever. I urge its immediate passage.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5273.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. NETHERCUTT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. METCALF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. THUNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STRICKLAND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. EHRLICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EHRLICH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. INSLEE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FOLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS AND DRUG ABUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come before the House of Representatives on another Tuesday night to talk about one of the most serious problems facing our Nation and the American people and the United States Congress; and that is the problem of illegal narcotics and drug abuse.

I have taken probably more than 40 occasions, usually on a Tuesday, or at least once a week in the past year and a half plus to come before the House and talk about what I consider the most important social problem is facing our Nation. There is nothing bar an attack from a foreign enemy that could do more destruction or impose more tragedy upon this Nation than that problem of illegal narcotics.

I took the responsibility of chairing the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources of the House of Representatives under the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight some 18 months ago; and I took that responsibility very seriously.

I wish I could come before my colleagues tonight and say that we have solved this problem. I cannot as a parent tell my colleagues that we have solved this problem. I cannot as a Member of Congress tell my colleagues that we have solved this problem. I cannot tell my colleagues as the chair of this subcommittee that we have solved this problem. In fact, sometimes I think we make a step forward, and I think that we take a couple steps backwards.

The news, unfortunately, has been even more grim recently, and part of this, I think, is a lack of national leadership and national focus. Let us face it, the Clinton-Gore administration has not been interested in addressing the problem of illegal narcotics. It has not been one of their primary concerns.

In fact, the President of the United States, our leader, our Chief Executive only mentioned up until the passage of several months ago of the Colombia package, the war on drugs some eight times in 7 years. So it has not been in the vocabulary or part of the agenda of this administration.

I do not mean that as a partisan statement. It is a matter of fact. This administration came in with a different agenda, with a different approach. Now, some 7 plus years later, we see the results. This President has been looking for a legacy and this Vice President, his companion, have a legacy. That legacy is not printed by the media. The media will not print this story. But every family in America knows about this story.

There is almost not a family in this Nation today untouched by the ravages of illegal narcotics. Just ask one's son, one's daughter, just ask a young child, and they will tell one about drugs in their school, drugs on their street, drugs in the community. Just pick up any newspaper.