

Farmer's determination grew from an early incident. At the age of 3½, he learned about racism for the first time when he was denied a Coca-Cola because of the color of his skin in Holly Springs, MS. From that day forward, he was burdened with a desire to bring about racial harmony and equality.

James Farmer is the last of the "Big Four" civil rights movement leaders. The other three coleaders of the civil rights movement of the 1960's are not around to tell their stories and give their historical perspective on America. The Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Roy Wilkins of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and Whitney Young of the Urban League are now deceased.

However, James Farmer is still with us. Referred to as a "young Negro aristocrat", Farmer was born in Texas, where his father was the first black person to earn a Ph.D. degree. Today, he is 77 years old, blind and he has lost the use of both legs.

As we approach a new millennium, Americans and the world are still trying to bring about racial justice and understanding; a philosophy Farmer espoused when he began training an interracial group of 13 young people in the nonviolent techniques of Gandhi. To ensure that this history is never lost, it is fitting that Mr. James Farmer be awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom for his meritorious contributions to our society.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice to those of my colleagues in appreciation of and respect for a quiet hero, Mr. James L. Farmer. During the turbulent 1960's, he rightfully earned his place as one of the "Big Four" in the civil rights movement along side the other giants: Whitney Young, Roy Wilkins, and Martin Luther King, Jr. Though famous for founding the Congress for Racial Equality, James Farmer was an unassuming, modest man. For that reason, many Americans—African-American as well as white—are unaware of the invaluable contributions he made to the civil rights movement, and, even more importantly, to the fulfillment of America's underlying principles and goals for all of its citizens. We call on President Clinton to honor James Farmer by awarding him the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Sadly, few who are familiar with photographs of James Farmer taken in the sixties when he orchestrated the first Freedom Rides would recognize him today. At 77, he is blind, suffers from severe diabetes, and has been forced to undergo several amputations. Even now, he is hospitalized, recovering from the latest operation to remove his left leg above the knee.

By where James Farmer's body may be weak, his achievements remain as strong as any man's. He continues his life-long work, teaching a popular civil rights course at Mary Washington College in my State. And the textbook for that class is his autobiography. The achievements of the civil rights movement are in large part the achievements of James Farmer. And the time is right to honor his achievements. Let him just this once feel the applause, receive the accolades, and hear the words of thanks from a grateful nation.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join in paying tribute to one of our Nation's heroes in the battle for racial equality. A man of unwavering faith and steadfast devotion to his

people and his Nation, James Farmer has devoted his whole life to the cause of racial harmony and individual justice. James Farmer is a man of vision who infused a generation of black Americans with the spirit and strength of nonviolent protest against the scourge of racism and injustice. Through countless contributions and endless personal sacrifices, James Farmer has played a critical role in profoundly changing the course of our Nation's history.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally grateful to Farmer for the support and inspiration he gave to me and to so many others at a critical time in the history of the civil rights movement. Farmer founded the Congress on Racial Equality. CORE was the catalyst for challenging and overcoming the entrenched segregation and racism that incarcerated black Americans and sentenced all Americans to a nation of unfulfilled promises, lost to its once cherished vision of freedom and equality. It was unfortunate that Farmer was unable to address the Great March on Washington, his remarks had to be read by someone else because he was jailed in Plaquemine, LA.

James Farmer was a founding father of the 20th century civil rights movement. In the beginning, there were only a handful who committed themselves to banishing segregation and building a colorblind nation. Although their numbers were few, their dedication was enormous. In just a few short years Farmer saw his followers grow from dozens to hundreds to thousands; under his leadership the Freedom Riders rose up and changed the direction of a nation.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to have worked with CORE in the 1950's and the 1960's. It was my privilege to be among those sent to jail for our peaceful protest at the Jefferson Bank in St. Louis. And, it has been a privilege to have spent my career fighting for equal rights and social justice. James Farmer has been a source of courage and strength to me and to thousands of others. All who cherish racial harmony are grateful to James Farmer for his wisdom and guidance and devotion. James Farmer is a man of peace and good will. He will be forever appreciated and celebrated for a life service to his people and his Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I salute James Farmer and urge President Clinton to award this outstanding American the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

□ 1900

#### DRUG ABUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to take some time and talk to you and the House about a very serious problem that faces this country, not only facing this country but it is facing many nations across this planet, and that is drug abuse.

Many times we see drug abuse in the guise of our children having OD's, being in the emergency room, finding problems in schools, drug gangs that are popping up across this country, especially in big cities and in towns ad-

joining big cities. We see the drug problem in OD's of kids in our neighborhoods, children, but it also is in corporate America, it is also in people who do work in blue collar areas.

We have worked in this country to make sure that people who fly airplanes and drive trucks and maneuver trains down the tracks certainly are drug free. We have worked hard to make sure that we have drug free workplaces in this country. And certainly the Federal Government and many, many State governments have worked to make sure their workplaces are drug free as well.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from the Second International Symposium Against Drugs in Switzerland, and what I learned there was truly disturbing. At the same time it was heartening to meet with doctors and world leaders engaged in the fight against drug abuse, drug-related crime, and international drug trafficking.

America and Europe are both under siege directly from international drug traffickers and internally from well-financed drug legalization movements. In Switzerland, legalizers give away 100 percent pure heroin, and between 300 and 5,000 needles a day, plus heroin cigarettes which Swiss legalizers claim are compassionate because these cigarettes, Mr. Speaker, do not contain tobacco.

Proponents of drug legalization are, at best, a dangerous and misguided crowd. For many it is an elaborate game, a way to retaliate against those who condemn their own drug using behavior. For others legalization is a means of achieving other ends, undermining moral values and democratic institutions, turning profits on an expanded population, creating new industries around the maintenance of addiction, and, in a few cases, even yearning to justify a tragic loss to drug abuse.

Whatever the motivation, drug legalization is wrong headed and destined to hurt those societies which indulge the instinct to experiment with the most vulnerable segments of their population, including their children.

So let us be clear about legalization, Mr. Speaker. The promoters of legalization forget the basic facts. They forget, for example, that drug use and abuse always and everywhere follows drug availability. They forget that there will always be more users trying drugs when there are more drugs to try.

This is clearly the experience of the United States. Between 1992 and 1995, the administration experimented with reduced drug interdiction. The result was more drugs inside our country and more kids trying those drugs. In 1994, there were three-quarters of a million more teenagers using drugs than in 1992, a reversal of the 1981 to 1992 downward trend in drug use.

By contrast, between 1985 and 1992, when the United States was firmly committed to halting the inflow of drugs, casual teen drug use fell dramatically. Regular drug users fell by 80

percent, from 5.8 to 1.3 million. Crack use declined from nearly a million in 1990 to just over 300,000 in 1992. And marijuana use plummeted from 22 million regular users in 1985 down to 8.5 million users in 1992, a 61 percent fall. That is what can happen when a society is serious about turning back the tide.

Legalization promoters also forget that the number of addicts invariably rises with the number of casual or experimental users. In the United States, as casual teen drugs rose after 1992, so did addiction.

Legalization advocates forget that the political leadership of a country that embraces legalization is also sending a message. I was a high school teacher for 16 years. I think I know kids. Kids are not stupid. They know if adults in their lives are giving consent or are forbidding it. They need and want limits set, even if they occasionally test those limits. And when there are no limits, they respond accordingly.

If someone is looking the other way and letting them get high or use drugs, they know it. If society legalizes dangerous drugs in any measure for those who wish to get high or are already addicted, kids get the message. Society will have put the stamp of approval on drug use. And, as the old saying goes, what is good for the goose is good for the gander. Kids know hypocrisy when they see it.

Finally, legalization promoters forget three other terrible and compelling facts: First, a drug overdose, for example, by heroin is not a simple or sterile or quick or painless event. It is a horrible, choking, suffocating event. The lungs fill with liquid in a lung edema, and the person, often a child, slowly chokes to death.

Second, they forget that there will always be a black market for drugs that are more pure than those being made legally available, and there will always be those who cannot get the drugs but want them.

Finally, the most drug-related crime is not between dealers or gangs. Most are committed by those on drugs, or so-called pharmacological crimes. Up to 70 percent of the United States' State prisons are filled with criminals who committed their crime on drugs. Legalization only increases this population.

Let me turn now to the heart of the matter: National security. This is a big area I want to discuss.

The Swiss national security is threatened by legalizers and traffickers in drugs, and so is our national security. In America, public complacency and indifference by the media are permitting drugs to erode public security, personal security, and ultimately, national security.

But we all must recognize the enormity of the threat. This threat to our society comes from the international cartels in Colombia and Mexico, who export literally hundreds of millions of

tons of heroin, cocaine, crack, and marijuana annually. But the threat also comes from within.

In the United States, we have been timid about confronting it on both fronts. In the United States, we are accustomed to thinking about national security and threats to national security in traditional ways. When I say, for example, that America faces a national security threat, and we do, most people think of bombs and tanks and espionage and intercontinental ballistic missiles, maybe theater nuclear weapons. They do not think of hypodermic needles filled with 90-percent pure Burmese or Colombian heroin. They do not think of crack or LSD or THC or methamphetamine.

When I say the world's leading democracies are in the jaws of an insidious national security threat, and they are, most people think of spies and uniformed soldiers and body bags and conventional warfare. The truth is different. Often most serious threats are those that masquerade as solutions or mere distractions.

In my view, the legalization initiatives passed by California and Arizona this last election season are the Trojan horses of the 21st century. My message is that this is not a game or a harmless distraction and it certainly is not a solution. The drug cartels are sophisticated and they welcome the legalization movement.

This is a war, and the traffickers and legalizers are intentionally slipping a Trojan horse within the gates of the United States and Switzerland and other countries around the world. On the whole, we in the United States have been too complacent, we have underestimated the organizations, the power of this \$40 billion annual industry. Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I said billion with a B, \$40 billion annual industry.

The power to corrupt, power to kill, the power to destroy the heart and soul of our society. We have underestimated the threat for a simple reason. Drug traffickers and promoters are not the sort of threat that we are used to responding to. They do not wear uniforms or come in battalions. Instead, they often come with stealth, in the dark, and inject society under the shroud of night.

But let us not kid ourselves. Let us go to the very heart of this. This adversary is well-financed, it is powerful, it is violent. We have had hearings in the Committee on Government Operations and Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice about the huge cartels in Colombia and Mexico, their far-reaching effect, that are in places as far away as Nigeria and Russia and Japan, the use of the Japanese yakuza organization and the Russian Mafia and the Nigerian drug runners across the world. Those stories are well-known.

So there is no limit to what these drug cartels are willing to do. They are well-financed, and they are powerful,

and they are very, very violent. It kills more people in 1 year than died in the entire cold war. Last year, in the United States, this underrated adversary killed more than 10,000 children. Think about it, 10,000 children.

If anything else in this country threatened our children, our kids that are in schools, kids that walk the streets in numbers of 10,000, this Congress and this society would be turned upside down. But drugs have done that.

On a personal note, I come from Illinois, and my brother works in a public school in Aurora, IL. Already this school year he has buried one of his students, buried him because the student was involved in a gang and the gang was involved in drug trafficking.

In my congressional district, in one of the major cities in Aurora, IL, 6 children have already died this year from drugs and drug-related violence. Why? Because they are involved in gangs and drive-by shootings and drug overdoses. It is something that is there in somebody else's neighborhood, not in somebody else's State, but in our own backyard.

On the national level, the numbers are stark. Over the past 3 years, we have witnessed a 200 percent increase in drug use by American children, the kids between the ages of 8 and 17, our kids. The price of dangerous drugs has fallen by several magnitudes, as availability has increased. Street purities of cocaine and heroin and marijuana have all jumped to record levels, all this because we let down our guard between 1992 and 1995 and we have been slow to see the national security implications.

This year, the fourth year in a row, a national reporting system by the U.S. hospitals called DAWN showed record level emergency room admissions for cocaine, heroin, methamphetamines, and THC or marijuana. In 1995, overall drug-related emergency room episodes jumped 12 percent; cocaine-related episodes leaped 21 percent; heroin-related episodes skyrocketed 27 percent. THC or marijuana-related emergencies, as a result of purities that are up to 25 times greater than in the 1970's and the lacing of marijuana with PCP, were up 32 percent. Methamphetamine emergencies were up 35 percent.

In short, drugs are destroying young lives in record numbers. So the crisis is here. The crisis is in Switzerland. The crisis is over the face of this planet. And the crisis is real, as real as World War II, as the air battles over Britain when Winston Churchill called for his nation to respond. It is as grave as the national security threat to the generation which must follow as the threat that animated the French Resistance to act against the Nazi government.

The difference here is that this threat is insidious, it is slow growing, it is like a cancer, it grows below seemingly healthy skin. It is threatening Switzerland's future, and it is threatening our own future in this country. That is why Congress is fighting legalization and fighting to fund drug prevention and drug interdiction. We must

respond. We must see the Trojan horse that is slipping even now between our gates, and we must turn it back.

□ 1915

We must recognize that drugs fund crime and dissolution of all that is best about America and Switzerland. They criminalize our banking and commercial systems. They finance terrorist groups in Russia and the Middle East and Peru and Mexico and Colombia, and they undermine the future that we wish to pass on to our children. I worry, too, that Swiss banks may not be fully on guard about drug money laundering. Even here we must do more.

In closing, I must say that we have now been to, and our committee has traveled to, the drug producing and shipping nations of Burma and Colombia and Bolivia and Peru and Panama and Mexico and certainly seen what we are up against. I traveled into the jungles where coca and poppy are grown and processed, and I think we have a mighty adversary to confront in those nations.

The first step for us is to support the drug war and drug prevention. The first step is for Switzerland's people to pass the youth-against-drugs referendum. But my hope is that we will not be misled or deceived and that we will see this national security threat for what it is and respond with a dedicated anti-drug effort in Switzerland and here in America. I especially want to congratulate VPM and Dr. Francesca Haller, as well as the AIDS-Information-Switzerland, for fighting against heroin legalization with all their hearts, and we are with you.

This problem, Mr. Speaker, is an insidious problem. It has reached down to the very heart of our society. It has reached into other societies around the world and into our commercial institutions. There are questions about banks and money laundering, because of all the efforts of people who grow illegal drugs and move them into countries such as Colombia to refine them and from Colombia move them into Mexico where drug families move them across the border and across this country and into the street corners where kids can buy them. It would never happen if we could not take the street bills, the 5- and 10- and 20- and 50-dollar bills that kids pay to drug dealers, and that money goes back to the drug cartels.

Money laundering is a problem. In Switzerland, it is even a greater problem because Swiss banks carry money and wires from all over the world. Later on I am going to borrow from an article written by a gentleman named Bob McGinnis, who talks about how Swiss banks are being implicated in moving drug money across this universe.

I yield to my good friend from Fort Wayne, IN [Mr. SOUDER], who has certainly worked with us on drug issues.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to associate myself with the chair-

man's remarks and to congratulate him on his leadership in the committee. Last fall when the National Security Committee was winding up a 2-year effort, there was some concern whether or not this was just a political effort. In fact, we had been working on this from the time we came in to control Congress because when we saw the facts of the results on the American streets and neighborhoods and families, we backed off of our commitment against drug interdiction, we were alarmed. We spent 2 years traveling across America, traveling down to foreign nations and confronting the leaders with the fact that most of those drugs were coming across the Mexican border, being produced in the coca leaves of Peru and Bolivia, processed in the labs of Colombia, and we confronted them. We confronted the television and the movie industry in Hollywood and said and challenged them with what they were producing and what impact they were having in our home communities.

We went around the country in every region of the country looking and hearing stories, tragic stories of young children, of families being destroyed, of women being intimidated by husbands who had been beating them. As one poor lady said in Arizona, in JOHN SHADEGG's district, she said she hated to say this but she hoped that the drugs killed her husband before he killed her because he had been beating her and her daughter, she was hiding and moving from shelter to shelter because of what had happened with drugs, all of which started with marijuana.

The myth that marijuana is not dangerous, all these people said, well, we started with marijuana, we heard from kids, oh, we thought marijuana was good, but then we wanted to get higher. We heard it from gangs, from women who were being beaten, from law enforcement officials, from school administrators. We heard it across the board. There was a clear linkage. There is a dispute as to whether this is a war or a cancer. It is in fact both. It is a war in the sense it is coming at us.

People are making money, they are destroying and undermining the fabric of our country. It is also a cancer eating away at our soul internally, person by person, as we relax our standards and say well, we do not want to judge other people's behavior and so on. But that behavior has a direct impact on all of our lives.

We had a case in Fort Wayne just recently where a high school student who was high on cocaine and alcohol flipped their vehicle, hit a senior citizen, then flipped over the median on the interstate and hit two more cars, two people dead, four people injured if I recall correctly. And it was a series we have had of multiple accidents with people on drugs.

If I cannot drive on a road, if my wife cannot drive on a road without fearing that somebody is high on drugs or alcohol endangering our lives, what is free-

dom? If my son cannot go to school, if my daughter cannot go to college, if they are not safe when they go out on the roads at night, if they are not safe when they go shopping, if the gang wars that we have in our district, the least we have heard is 70 percent, the highest is 85 percent of all crime of every type is drug and alcohol-related. These are tragic statistics. We cannot say we are worried about crime but oh, not about marijuana. It is not a question of well, alcohol is legal. Quite frankly, if we had the statistics today and looked at alcohol, we would not legalize it. It is not a justification to legalize marijuana.

Furthermore, if we are increasingly enforcing anything on zero tolerance in the schools, it is illegal for minors to have alcohol as well and we should not use that as an excuse to back off what is true. That is why it is so tragic about what has happened in Arizona and California with this false siren of medicinal use of marijuana. If there is a component in marijuana that can relieve pain, there are multiple other ways that you can do that without having the dangerous effects of marijuana. It was a false bill of goods sold by people with a vested interest in destroying our laws against drugs, and we need to stand up to that.

I am also concerned as we watch what happened there and to hear of our chairman's efforts in Switzerland to speak out and the things he has brought here tonight and will continue to bring out, it is very disturbing to see heroin needles being distributed, the massive level of experimentation they have been doing. That the United Nations would be involved in any way in this calls into question a lot of the judgments that many of us have anyway about how the U.N. Health Organization works. The fact is that we have been through this. This is not new.

My friend, JOHN SHADEGG, has this quote, I cannot remember the original person that had the quote, that history may not repeat itself but it rhymes, and that is often the problem that we are facing here. It may not be exactly the same thing but we can see these repetitive patterns. It is as if sometimes when you drive in on the interstate in the morning, if you see somebody who has run out of gas in a tunnel, you say, "Boy, I feel sorry for that person," because maybe they do not know all the information. But when you do it a second time, when you start to see the repetitive patterns, you go, do you not ever learn from history? Are there not things that are triggers and say, "We've been there, we've done that, we don't need to do that again?"

You give heroin needles away, heroin abuse goes up. You have these different programs that are out there that supposedly are getting people off, and instead you are getting people more addicted and you are expanding it.

We have to look to the past history of this and, that is, the things that work are a combination of different

variables. One is, we have to keep the pressure on the interdiction. Even if we cannot stop all the drugs coming across the Mexican border, which we cannot, and even if we cannot stop all the drugs that are coming from Colombia to Mexico because the coasts are too long, we can put the pressure on and reverse a problem that has been happening in Fort Wayne and all over America and, that is, the price was dropping, the purity was increasing, and that was meaning the street price was easier for the kids to get, easier for adults to get, more risk to the society, and it was more potent drugs. By putting the pressure on, we not only force the pricing structure to change in this country and the purity structure and the watering down by making it more difficult for them to get their prices on the street, but we also put pressure as we heard in Peru and other places that they were starting to have the breakthroughs after the interdiction pressure went up, after President Fujimori instituted his shutdown policy if planes did not respond because the campesinos were finding that, hey, the dealers did not want to take a profit hit so they were paying them less. And all of a sudden alternative crops to coca leaves look more attractive if your pricing structure is different. So interdiction has to be a critical component. But so does education and prevention. We need to be looking just like we look at what interdiction programs are working and not working, we need to look at does this work, does this not work? What can we target in the middle schools, clearly the place where so many kids are at risk and how can we focus in on that? How can we do better prevention programs to get addicts off and focus on that? Because a lot of these things have such high recidivism rates, it is a question of how they are working but it does not mean we should not work at treatment.

Furthermore, and we all know this, ultimately in a free society there is personal responsibility. Ultimately people have to take more and more responsibility for their own lives. Families need to be engaged. Churches need to be engaged. Individual teachers and others who can be an influence on kids where they may not have the family structure or have the means or anybody taking them to a church. As this country, we need to change this, because it is tearing us at the core like a cancer and it is a war coming at us more dangerous than any other war as the chairman clearly demonstrated in his statistics. We cannot say, "Oh, I'm bored with this drug problem, I've heard this before, can't you talk about something else?" It is not going to go away. It is going to be there. It is a constant battle because evil will be there. The struggles that everybody goes through, the temptation to try to cop out of your problems by getting high is a human temptation. But this is an insidious one. It is not a freedom

of yourself to practice something. It is a danger that when you smoke pot, when you take heroin, when you take cocaine, when you get drunk, you endanger other people. I thank the chairman.

Mr. HASTERT. I thank the gentleman from Indiana. It is interesting, you can imagine my shock and chagrin when I went to a place that I had visited 25, 30 years ago, Zurich, Switzerland which at that time it was a pristine city on a beautiful lake shore. Today that city is not so pristine. There are addicts in the train stations, there are addicts off in the alleyways. The city at one time just recently gave away 15,000 free needles for heroin use a day. Today if you declare yourself as an addict in Switzerland, you have a pension granted to you of 2,500 Swiss francs, and it is 1.4 Swiss francs to the dollar. If you have a dog, you get another 500 Swiss francs. If you have a wife, you get another 2,500 Swiss francs. If you have a child you get another 350 Swiss francs. So you can have a pension, declare yourself an addict, have a pension of about \$4,000 a month and live and get free heroin. What kind of a message does that send to the rest of Europe? What kind of a message does that send to the world? What kind of a message do our kids get from that country? We have enough problems. We do not have to just point to Switzerland. We have enough problems here. But we cannot afford to let countries who have traditionally been our allies slip into this type of morass.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] who has been one of the stalwarts in the fight against drugs, both in this country and trying in interdiction abroad.

Mr. MICA. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. I want to take a moment and particularly thank him for his leadership. I remember last week we had a discussion on the floor about the progress of this session of Congress and one of my colleagues said, well, what have you done about drugs on this side of the aisle, commenting to us, and that we had not done enough. I had to remind the gentleman that just in the few months of this session under the leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois, we have held more hearings than were held in the entire first Congress when I came from 1993 to 1994, my first term, that the leadership that Chairman HASTERT has provided is unprecedented. He has had before his subcommittee that oversees national drug policy just in the past few months the drug czar for very lengthy, in fact many hours of questioning not only in formal hearings but numerous meetings, countless meetings and work and cooperation with the drug czar. With this administration, he has had the Director and Administrator of DEA be-

fore the committee, very lengthy discussions, hearings. Another member and leader of this issue is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN], who has had legislation to bring together the efforts of local government, community-based organizations that are combating illicit drugs and drug abuse and working to promote prevention and education in our communities.

□ 1930

He has had hearings already on his legislation, and his proposal and funding of that proposal that is probably the most effective way of combating drugs with those successful community-based programs, not to mention other work.

My colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], who chairs the Subcommittee on Crime of the Committee on the Judiciary held a hearing recently in San Juan Harbor. Our subcommittee, under Chairman ZELIFF, who chaired the subcommittee last year, held a similar hearing. We were trying to put Humpty-Dumpty back together again.

The programs of interdiction, the programs of enforcement, the programs of military cooperation, the involvement of our Coast Guard, the whole picture was destroyed in 2 years when the other body took office, other party took office, the executive office, and then controlled both the House and the other body, and we have seen the results of it.

And I have a selfish interest in this. I have children. I come from central Florida, a beautiful area, and I held up in the last year this headline from the Orlando Sentinel: "Long Out of Sight, Heroin is Back Killing Teens." Central Florida, tranquil, prosperous area; we are not talking about ghettos or urban settings of Los Angeles, New York, Detroit. We are talking about peaceful, central Florida where heroin is epidemic, where our children are literally dying in the streets, and under the leadership of Chairman ZELIFF and others who are here tonight came into our community last fall and held an intensive hearing, and helping us get back on track.

Then the problem has not stopped, and the problem continues, and this is last week's Orlando Sentinel article: "Orlando No. 2 in Cocaine Deaths." This is just last week. One thousand eleven people died, up 7 percent in Florida, from cocaine; over a thousand potentially useful children, fathers, mothers, their lives destroyed because of what is going on. And part of this does relate back to this policy of just say maybe.

I am very concerned about what I have heard, what the chairman has outlined tonight, this policy that we have seen in Switzerland of just say try it.

Now we have an administration in this country that appointed a national health officer, the Surgeon General, Jocelyn Elders, who said just say

maybe, and we see where it has gotten us today with epidemic use of heroin, cocaine, methamphetamines, designer drugs with our youth, and now we have a good example that the chairman has brought before the Congress tonight, a very bad thing that happened in another country when the Swiss Government, in fact, said just say try it, and they tried it, and the result is a disaster.

So there are those now that want to legalize drugs that say this is the panacea, and we see the experience of this country, and it is not a Third World country. It is Switzerland, a very sophisticated country, very sophisticated economic system, and we are not talking again about just urban problems, but they have tried it, it does not work, and their people are demanding a referendum, and the referendum is called Youth Without Drugs, and they intend to repeal this government policy.

So those who would like to say just say maybe, or just say try it, we have a great example of a bad reaction to a program that did in fact fail.

Now it is easy to come and to criticize what has been done, and we make no bones that we are not pleased with what happened in the first 2 years of the past administration here. But what have we done? And let me tell you when the new majority took this responsibility on, that the current Chair, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], was appointed by the leadership to direct a House-wide effort to coordinate all the resources of the House of Representatives and the various committees of jurisdiction to again put Humpty-Dumpty back together again to make certain that interdiction was restored, to make certain that our military and our Coast Guard had the capability to become involved, to make certain that the eradication programs and these source countries were restored, to make certain that treatment programs were not just spending a great deal of money but we were concentrating on putting the money into effective treatment programs. And then education, which is so important, that other part of this four-legged stool, that that in fact also be properly funded and addressed, and the programs that are a success that had the support of this Congress.

So the Speaker of the House of Representatives appointed Mr. HASTERT. Now we are privileged to have him chair this Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee, national security, international affairs, criminal justice, that has authority over our drug policy, and each of the elements have in fact been restored. He has fought to get the funds back so that the military can become involved in this. He has restored the cuts. The first thing President Clinton did was cut the drug czar's office and staff and capability, and he has worked to restore that office. He has worked to bring the Coast Guard back into the action on some of

the heroin that is coming into this country. He worked to bring to the floor the first decertification measure ever heard in the House of Representatives or ever passed by the House of Representatives.

So he has helped to put Humpty-Dumpty back together again, and he brings to the floor tonight, to the attention, Mr. Speaker, of you and our colleagues a great example of a bad experiment, and that was to just say try it, to just legalize drugs. Switzerland tried it, it is a disaster. We do not need to be listening to those voices.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I salute the gentleman on what he has done and the leadership he has brought to this issue and to our Congress. He has done a remarkable job.

Mr. HASTERT. I thank the gentleman. One of the things that he was remiss in saying was that he was a sponsor of a bill that said we need to look at what is happening between our country and another country, a close neighbor, Mexico. He and a colleague from Florida, [Mr. SHAW], sponsored a very tough piece of legislation, and we are not done with that yet. So we really appreciate his efforts and his strong antidrug stance.

At this time I yield again to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER].

Mr. SOUDER. I wanted to again point out that this is not something new.

Interesting historical footnote: My first job here in Washington was Republican staff director of the Children Family Committee in Washington, and when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], who had been involved in Illinois with human services issues like this, came and we worked together there, we were already focusing on alcohol abuse, on crack babies being abandoned in hospitals. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] who was a chief of staff here in Washington worked with a lot in drafting the original antidrug legislation through the 1980's in the U.S. Senate. This has been a longtime commitment, and we cannot back off as Americans.

And what is so frustrating when we hear these stories like in Switzerland is do we not learn anything? When you were saying that behavior was in effect being rewarded, what one thing we have learned over and over in our country, and I say this as somebody who has a German background and partly Swiss and who always looked at the Swiss as an international model. To hear this type of thing is so disturbing. We have seen it with gangs. If you say you are going to get such and such, what you get is more kids joining gangs to get the things. If you give benefits to things, people come and abuse it more. You do not get them off.

And I hope you will share more on some of those articles, but this is very disturbing that a country that has been held up as an example and held up in my family and our heritage and in our region and also in the whole world, I think this is really important that

American companies help put the pressure on this, too, because it is a disturbing international trend, and I would hope that they can learn from some of our experiences here.

Mr. HASTERT. I would hope so, and I hope that they learn from our good experiences. But you are right on target. You know we have about 36, almost \$37 billion of Swiss investment in the United States so we are dealing with Swiss companies day in and day out, and we probably ought to send a message.

You know, it is not everybody has been coopted in Switzerland by this. I worked with a woman by the name of Dr. Francesca Haller who had led this group, and it is called Youth Against Drugs. They have an initiative that they are trying to move in the Swiss legislature, the Swiss Parliament, even as we speak, and they hope that this referendum comes sometime in September or October, that time period, but they have 140-some thousand people who signed this petition saying: "You know, we don't want drugs in our country. We're going to fight to stop drugs."

But it is amazing, it is just absolutely amazing that, you know, there is three languages that are spoken in Switzerland, and the German-speaking newspapers have been for liberalization, and liberalization is a code word for legalization of drugs, and there has been a lot of suspicion that the people who serve on those boards of directors of newspapers are also boards of directors of the Swiss banks, Swiss banks that we have always held up as being the epitome of solid issues until of course the Nazi gold issue came forward. And now we know that Swiss banks harbored millions of dollars of drug money that came from Mexico and was in the account of a fellow by the name of Salinas that we have heard of before; and there is a real suspicion out there that the Swiss banks are pushing the Swiss newspapers, the German-speaking newspapers, to legalize drugs so that they can be the holders and the movers of illegal drug money. And if that comes and happens, it is just not a Swiss problem, it is not only an American problem, but it is a huge international problem, and I think that is something that we have to be very, very cautious against, we have to make sure that that does not happen, and it is just a huge thing that the world financial system has a possibility of getting embroiled in.

And as I said before, the ability to move money from country to country is the whole key to drug narco-traffickers being able to move their products from South America to the United States, from South America to Europe, from Asia and Thailand and Burma and India, you know, to Turkey, to Europe. All these things have these huge interconnections, and the drug trafficking is only the other side of the coin from the whole issue of being able to move money or drug laundering.

The gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. If the gentleman will yield, I was quite shocked about this Swiss experiment, and I have also been a harsh critic of the lax attitude by both our President and this administration on the question of even a casual drug use, and that is not only translated into what our kids have heard in our country, but I was stunned to find out and get a copy of a billboard which is in downtown Zurich, Switzerland.

I do not know if my colleagues and the Speaker can see it, but this billboard in downtown Zurich says in German, and I will translate it; it says "Bill Clinton used one marijuana joint, and look, he's not a junkie. What's the big deal?"

And this is the kind of justification and commentary that was used to support this legalization effort in Switzerland in billboards, and here's a copy of one in Zurich, and I think that that is a sad commentary, and this program again has been such a failure that the Swiss are demanding that it be repealed. But when we have the leader of our administration sending the wrong signals by appointing a chief health officer, by saying that he might inhale, and then this is translated into support for a program in another country that is used for justification of legalization, we have the big problem.

So they have tried it, it does not work. Their countrymen are asking for this to be, for this program to be repealed, and we see a bad example that should not be repeated in this country.

The other thing, too, is the lax attitude is really creating even more problems in this country. There is a report just released by the Partnership for a Drug-free America and these statistics are startling.

□ 1945

There are key findings of 9- to 12-year-olds. They found in this Partnership Study that more teenagers are using drugs. In 1996, last year, one in four children was offered drugs. That is 24 percent of the 9- to 12-year-olds in 1996 compared to 19 percent in 1993.

Trial use of marijuana last year increased among children from 2 to 4 percent. It is an increase of approximately 230,000 children experimenting in 1995 to 460,000 children experimenting in 1996. Eight percent of sixth graders had experimented with marijuana and 23 percent of seventh graders and 33 percent of eighth graders reported trying drugs. Only 29 percent of parents of children age 9 to 12 are talking to their kids about drugs, and fewer children are receiving information about the dangers of drugs.

So what we have done is put drugs on the back burner. We have not sent the right message. In fact, we have sent the wrong message, not only to our children, but now overseas, and we see the results and its tragic consequence in our youth population.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague was talking about schools. The

gentleman would be interested to know, my weekend in Switzerland and during that period I gave about three workshops and a major speech, and some interviews. I talked to one Swiss school teacher who taught in a grade school, public grade school. She lost her job for warning her students against heroin use after one of her students died from an overdose.

My colleagues can imagine the pressure that school boards are under as a result of this liberalization, when a teacher is fired who warns her students not to use drugs after one of their classmates died, and this is an insidious thing and it is happening right now.

One of the things that we have to look at, Mr. Speaker, and certainly my colleagues, if we do not agree with heroin legalization, and I have to say we talked about what happened in California on the legalization of marijuana for glaucoma and pain relief. Our friends in Arizona also passed legislation. The Arizona Legislature just turned that around, much to their credit.

But we can say something. I would say if we do not agree with heroin legalization, if we think that administering to thousands of young people this ability for them to get marijuana, using propaganda like the gentleman used, certainly is not a great credit to our country or to Switzerland.

I recommend that probably the Speaker and our colleagues, we ought to call the Ambassador, Alfred Defago, at the Embassy of Switzerland, right here in the United States, right here in Washington, if we believe that the Swiss companies, who have had the privilege of doing business in the United States, would know that we disapprove of heroin legalization. We expect them to speak out, too. They should speak out in this country and in Switzerland.

The laws that these companies have to live under here where we have drug protection for workers and people who buy the products that these workers make, they do not exist in Switzerland, because the Swiss have not signed an agreement with the European Union, and they have not signed an agreement for the other European communities such as Holland and Sweden, who have had to virtually clean up their act because of this cooperation between European nations.

Switzerland is completely independent, and the newspapers in Switzerland called the people who were trying to change the drug policy and push this issue of Youth Against Drugs, they called them just insidious names such as psycho gangs, because they were psychologists and doctors that are trying to change this situation.

I think Swiss companies who have had the privilege of doing business here need to hear it from American citizens who buy their products. Some of the Swiss companies that are involved are right here doing business in the United States.

For instance, Asea Brown Boveri in Virginia and Indiana and North Carolina; New Jersey, Florida, and Ohio. ABB should be asked to publicly oppose heroin legalization if they are going to continue to do business in America.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, let me add that a few other Swiss companies that do business in America should be asked to stand up and oppose heroin legalization in Switzerland. AGIE USA in North Carolina; Swiss Alamo Cement Co. in San Antonio, Texas; and ASA Aerospace Company in New York; and the ASCOM Holding Company in Connecticut; all of those companies are doing business here and they have an influence back home.

The relationship between the United States and Switzerland is very close. We ought to stand up and say, no, in this country. They ought to stand up and say, no, in their own home country of Switzerland.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to reinforce that point as we look at the heroin problem and what can become a rogue nation when one nation starts to legalize heroin and how it can move. I know you have been in Asia and I was in Thailand as well, and in the Golden Triangle area much of the heroin goes through. There is a concern, for example, in our agencies over there that as most likely normalization occurs with Vietnam, that the heroin could move down and move out of there.

Would it not be ironic with some of our slowdown in working with Vietnam, that we are concerned about how tourism might bring drugs in, but if we see these types of things happening in countries like Switzerland, we have to look at our relationships of how it goes over and comes back.

This is a critical international issue. Nigeria has turned into a rogue agency that I hear a lot about, and I appeal to a lot of my fellow Hoosiers. As I said, I am not Swiss bashing, I am part Swiss. Mostly German, part Swiss. In my district, Bern, for example, where I annually go for Swiss days, we have a lot of Anabaptists who are predominantly of Swiss and German background.

Here is something that you can do. Contact these companies. Ciba-Geigy is a very big company. We need to keep the pressure on some of these big companies. None of us can be accused of not keeping the pressure on here in America. We have an international stake in this, too.

I commend the gentleman and want to reinforce contacting these different companies. In Indiana, ABB is a direct company with involvement in Indiana. We just need to keep the pressure on. They are not necessarily hostile at this point, but we need to move on it.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, in Minnesota, our Members from Minnesota might consider calling the Brudier Co. and tell them to take a stand in favor of Youth Against Drugs in Switzerland. We talked about our tourist trade.

Swiss hotels that are across this country in Chicago and other big cities, people who fly on Swiss Air, evidently in Switzerland, those pilots are not required to take drug tests because it is against the law in Switzerland to require somebody to take a drug test. I would think twice before I wanted to fly in that type of a situation.

People who go on ski vacations in Switzerland, there are literally tens of thousands of Americans that do it. There is no protection against the guy that runs the ski lifts and protect people on those slopes that somebody in there is not on drugs. Of all of the thousands of people who are drug free, it only takes one person who is a heroin addict who cannot be tested because of Swiss law and can cause real problems in those areas.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable to me that they do not drug test pilots. That is literally flying blind. Sometimes ignorance is not bliss. In other words, it is like we do not want to know whether they are abusing drugs, and then if you see a society already having these trends, I would think it would be more of a reason to drug test, not less of a reason.

Mr. HASTERT. I think the pressure could start here in the United States. You talked about Ciba-Geigy. I think we could call the president of Ciba-Geigy, Doug Watson, and tell him to stand up against the legalization of drugs in Switzerland. Perhaps hundreds of other Swiss companies who benefit from trade from the United States, Americans Against Heroin Legalization could call the Swiss Bank, Swiss Credit, or Credit Swiss, the big bank that has been silent on this issue that certainly should be vocal in supporting Youth Against Drugs in Switzerland. Credit Swiss should be vocal in Switzerland to stop the legalization of heroin.

In New York, Robert O'Brien is the regional head of Credit Swiss. In Los Angeles, the Credit Swiss head is David Worthington. In Florida, Max Lutz, who represents senior management at Credit Swiss. Those people should know that Members of Congress do not really appreciate that.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to, as we close up, remind folks that what this experiment in Switzerland, a beautiful country, you think of the Swiss Alps and mountain chalets and peaceful living.

Let me read from this. In one park, the number of addicts grew to 15,000 daily that came for free needles. Switzerland, again, a placid European tranquil State, Switzerland now has the highest heroin addiction rate in Europe and the second highest HIV infection. That is with the free needles, with the free heroin. So they have tried it. It is a disaster for their people.

We are joining their people who are now calling for a referendum to repeal this. Again, a good example of a program that went bad.

So I join my colleagues in whatever pressure we need to put on the Swiss,

United States interests, we will do that. We are not going to let what happened there happen here, and this is the evidence as to why we should not let that take place.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I think that is really an important point. I think that is one of the things we need to look at.

Mr. Speaker, for hundreds of years we looked to the Swiss for chocolate and we looked to them for Swiss watches and Swatches and things like that. We also respected the integrity of the Swiss banks.

During the Hitler era, the Jews trusted the Swiss to protect their accounts from the Nazis. However, after the war, the Swiss took bank deposits of murdered holocaust victims and funneled them to Swiss businessmen to cover assets seized by East European Communist regimes.

According to recent news reports, while the Swiss Bankers Association admits to \$32 million in diverted deposits, the World Jewish Congress believes the figure may be as high as \$7 billion. But in 1992, the Swiss bank secrecy laws, which had concealed the diversion of these funds, were repealed, and this change removed Switzerland from a short list of countries whose banks are capable of masking deposits delivered from such illicit sources as drug profits.

Some countries, like the Republic of Seychelles, have banking laws that permit large deposits of suspected money. Although there is no direct evidence that Switzerland may be joining these ranks, legalized drugs could normalize financial transactions with drug kingpins.

So one of the things we need to be careful of, if Switzerland does legalize drugs and legalize heroin, then the profits from those drugs can be moved into Swiss banks and that money can be transferred all over the world. Thus, the drug money that happens in the United States or Mexico or Thailand, moved into the wire system, moved to Swiss banks.

So I think that is something that is very, very treacherous, something that we need to be very, very careful about. Our committee will be looking into this, will be working on this, and I hope that we will have another special order on this issue.

I would encourage Mr. Speaker and all of the rest of my colleagues to be sensitive to this. Talk to these Swiss companies, be involved, and let us turn this around, turn it around in Switzerland because Switzerland is so important to this country. We can turn it around in this country as well.

We are not without fault, we have our problems, but we cannot let other countries slip into this type of a situation as well.

I certainly appreciate my colleagues from Indiana and Florida for joining us this evening on this very, very important issue.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOEKSTRA (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. MANZULLO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. PORTER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of back pain.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. CLEMENT (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business in the district.

## 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 Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. WELDON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HULSHOF, for 5 minutes, today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. MOAKLEY.

Mr. FARR.

Mr. KUCINICH.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. DOYLE.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. VENTO.

Mrs. THURMAN.

Mr. McNULTY.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mr. KILDEE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PICKERING) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. EHRLICH.

Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado in two instances.

Ms. PRYCE.

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Mr. COOK.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia in two instances.