

ONE OUT OF SEVEN CHILDREN IN UNITED STATES DO NOT HAVE HEALTH INSURANCE

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the President of the United States said he wanted to give all Americans health care that could never be taken away, affordable health care that could never be taken away.

Now Members of the then minority and now majority take great pride in saying they stopped the President from advancing that particular change in our public policy. The result has been that more and more people are without health insurance in this country.

Now the article in today's Washington Post, page 3, says that one out of seven children in this country do not have insurance. Even more damning than that figure is that 9 out of 10 of those children live in a family where one adult works. These are people who are doing what the American system says we should do: We should work, we should get a job, we should try and take care of our families, but they do not have jobs where they get health care benefits.

Now we have waited for 2 years for the Republicans to offer any proposal, and there is none, and there is no budget that deals with it now.

WE MUST DO MORE TO PROTECT CHILDREN IN OUR SOCIETY

(Mr. GEJDENSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, never in the history of the world have we had a country with resources abandon its own children. I say to my colleagues, "It is one thing to say that you are poor, that you don't have the money, that you don't have the resources to get the job done. Well, we have the resources, and in this Congress we're making the choice not to put them where they are needed."

Frankly, the cost is far more. Many of these children, once crippled by their illnesses, end up in emergency rooms where the cost far exceeds anything that coverage would cost.

This Congress embarrasses itself to talk about bipartisanship and family values and not have the audacity to sit back and take the action. We sit back, we take no action when it comes to the most helpless in our society.

These children are without care. We are a country with the resources. There is no other country today in the world with the resources we have that does not protect its own children.

APPROPRIATE BEHAVIOR CONCERNING COMMENTS ABOUT FEDERAL EXPRESS

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning deeply concerned and deeply disturbed about the comments of a well-known Republican leader who approached the largest employer in my district, Federal Express, and informed them that it would be duly noted "if the Federal Express PAC continues to give to the Democrats at the Republican takeover of Congress."

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this Republican leader said that business PACs such as Federal Express would "squirm considerably" if they continue to give to Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, the employees of Federal Express contributed to their PAC with the expectations that they will not be pressured to promote the interests of one particular party.

Mr. Speaker, this type of actions and conduct is what leads to the grave cynicism and distrust that pervades the American public.

On behalf of the 30,000 employees of Federal Express, the hundreds of thousands of constituents in my district who benefit from the presence of Federal Express, I am asking the appropriate committees in both bodies, as well as the Justice Department, to answer the question: Is this appropriate behavior of one of our well-known Republican leaders?

DISAPPROVAL OF DETERMINATION OF PRESIDENT REGARDING MEXICO

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 95 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 95

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 58) disapproving the certification of the President under section 490(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 regarding foreign assistance for Mexico during fiscal year 1997. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations; (2) the amendment recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the joint resolution, which shall be considered as read, shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, and shall not be separately debatable; (3) the further amendment specified in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by a Member designated in the report, which shall be considered as read, shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, and

shall separately be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (4) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the consideration of House Joint Resolution 58 pursuant to House Resolution 95, the amendment printed in House Report 105-20 be considered as modified by (1) striking "the impact of such process on financial markets" from the text designated as section 6(C); and (2) striking "on currency markets, international financial markets and merchandise trade flow" from the text designated as section 6(g)(1)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof "in enhancing international counter narcotics cooperation".

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. FOLEY]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take the floor to begin this debate today on the drug war and the specific question of certifying Mexico's role in the drug war to make several points to all of my colleagues which I hope will be noted throughout the debate, and I hope on our side of the aisle that the managers both of the debate on the rule and the debate on the actual bill will help communicate. This is an effort on our part to help the people of Mexico to help the people of Colombia and to help the American people.

All of us are faced with a terrible challenge of international drug lords who are ruthless and who use the profits of American money from sales to Americans in order to sustain a level of violence that is tragic. No American can look at the thousands of Colombians who have died, no American can look at the Mexican prosecutors, the Mexican police who have died risking their lives to try to free their countries from the scourge of drug dealers and then talk in a self-righteous manner about these countries.

We have a challenge in America of ending the drug trade protecting our children and cutting off the flow of money to drug lords wherever they are. We have a challenge as good neighbors to recognize that we need to reach out to help the people of Mexico and to

help the people of Colombia, and yes, there are concerns about decertification, and yes, if you read the law and you answer honestly the questions written in the law, we find ourselves at the point, as the attorney generals of California and Arizona reported, that they felt decertification was appropriate. But we will be offering an amendment later to give the Clinton administration an additional 90 days to find ways to work with the Mexican Government to avoid any such decertification because we believe the key as good neighbors is to work together and to work to honor the memory of those in Colombia and Mexico who have lost their life fighting the drug dealers and to recognize that only by a true team effort in which the American Government and the American people also take on an all-out challenge of defeating the drug dealers here and stopping the drug purchases here and eliminating the flow of American money to other countries.

So I hope all of our colleagues will approach this debate in a positive effort to create a spirit across the Americas of defeating the drug dealers as allies together for civilization.

□ 1030

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

This is a straightforward rule that allows us to bring a resolution with strong bipartisan backing to the floor for timely consideration, as the Speaker has just indicated. The rule allows 2 hours of debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on International Relations. It makes in order as the base text House Joint Resolution 58 as amended by the Committee on International Relations and reported by a strong 27 to 5 bipartisan vote.

In addition, it provides for the consideration of an amendment by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] debatable for 20 minutes, equally divided between the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against the committee amendment and the Hastert amendment are waived. Finally, the rule allows for one motion to recommend, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is with a certain degree of reluctance that the House takes up this resolution. I believe collectively this body has been a strong supporter of the democratization and stabilization process in Mexico, but it is simply impossible to overlook the evidence we are confronting today on the matter of full cooperation in the war on drugs. That is the test under the certification process.

Mexico has been identified as the source or transfer point for a full 70 percent or thereabouts of the illicit drugs that flow into the United States every year. That is an extraordinary amount. As we seek closer cooperation with Mexico on trade and other areas, we do our closest Latin American neighbors and ourselves no favor if we

close our eyes to the endemic corruption that is confounding our efforts in Mexico.

Frankly, many of us were perplexed to see Mexico receive full certification by President Clinton, when countries like Colombia, where the National Police have fought a courageous battle against its drug cartels, were fully decertified. There seems to be a bit of a double standard there.

I think it is true, as we have seen in the certification process this year, that the process is imperfect, some might even say counterproductive. But for today it is the law we have to work with. And if we don't like the certification process, I would refer your attention to provisions in the Hastert amendment to reconsider that process and provide for a high-level counternarcotics commission.

But what are we looking for in Mexico? We are looking for reliable drug enforcement officials to work with us, willingly, effectively and cooperatively.

Many applauded when Mexico mobilized its military in the war on drugs, including myself, making the recent revelations unfortunately about General Gutierrez all the more troubling to us. It seems we were sharing sensitive information about drug cartels with a military man who was involved in fact with those cartels.

We also need evidence that once captured, notorious criminals like Humberto Garcia will be charged, tried and sentenced, not simply allowed to walk out of custody.

Our goal is not to take a step back from the many positive aspects of our relationship with Mexico, and they are many, and we are proud of them. I think the Committee on International Relations resolution does strike the right tone. It is tough, but it is fair, and the Hastert amendment is an additional opportunity for positive cooperation between our two countries.

It is my hope that once the initial reaction has passed, the Mexican Government will respond with a concerted effort to address the specific vital issues outlined in the Hastert amendment, where the United States and Mexico can do a better job of fighting drug traffic together.

Mr. Speaker, notice that I included the United States in the "can do better" category, because we all know the problem is not entirely one of Mexico's making. There are demand issues to deal with in the United States and some lingering questions about the commitment and efficiency of our own administration to the fight against drugs. We are working on that. Having said all of that, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the rule and in passing House Joint Resolution 58.

A little candor on the situation in Mexico will advance our cause a lot further than glossing over the rough spots. That is what friends are for.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to a bad rule for a questionable bill and a truly terrible substitute.

Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution is a slap in the face of our Nation's neighbor to the south, and the substitute, which was brought to the Committee on Rules, is a slap in the face of the President of the United States.

It is unrealistic to expect that the Government of a sovereign nation would be willing to cooperate with the United States if Congress passes legislation such as this. It is ludicrous to think that the President would sign anything which directly condemns him, as does the substitute made in order here.

The fact that this resolution has been brought to the floor in this manner, without opportunity to amend it with a more reasonable approach to a problem that everyone agrees is of critical national importance, demonstrates that the majority in this House is not interested in narcotics control. Rather, the majority is demonstrating its first priority is to bash the President and his administration, and then to bash the Government of one of our Nation's closest neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, no one can deny that drugs are the scourge of our society. Mr. Speaker, no one can deny that the influx of drugs from Mexico is a serious problem that affects every level of our society.

While the Mexican Government and President Zedillo have taken important steps toward implementing a meaningful drug control program, many, many serious deficiencies exist, and evidence of corruption is alarming.

None of us can deny that more must be done, much more. The Government of Mexico has not done everything to fully cooperate with our law enforcement agencies, and, despite 52 requests for drug-related extraditions, has not extradited a single Mexican national. This is serious business. But how can we expect another sovereign nation to work with us, to cooperate in our efforts to stem the tide of the influx of this poison into our country, when we move ahead with legislation like House Joint Resolution 58?

We need to step back, Mr. Speaker, and examine the implications of this legislation carefully and rationally. The lives of American children depend upon our actions.

Yesterday the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], a Member of the other party, came to the Committee on Rules and made a compelling case for a sense of the Congress resolution which he proposed as a substitute to the committee bill and the substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT].

The Schiff substitute recognizes the direct threat that drugs represent to the United States and that the Government of Mexico has failed to undertake measures which would significantly

curb the drug trade and corruption in that country. The language is strong and right on target.

But the Schiff resolution calls on our Government to continue to work with the Mexican Government to dismantle drug cartels and arrest and prosecute their leaders, to achieve compliance with our extradition requests, to increase interdiction, to step up efforts to enhance law enforcement efforts on both sides of the border, and, finally, to identify and eliminate corruption at every level of the Government of Mexico.

The Schiff resolution would have, had this House been permitted to consider it, sent a strong message to the Government of Mexico but would not have sent along with it a direct slap in the face. I offered an amendment to the rule to include the Schiff resolution in the amendments to be considered today, but my amendment was defeated on a straight party-line vote, with all the Republican Members voting against the substitute offered by their own fellow Republican [Mr. SCHIFF].

Mr. Speaker, the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations told the Committee on Rules yesterday afternoon that the current situation with Mexico and the certification process mandated by section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shows that the law does not work. The President was faced with an extremely difficult choice when he was presented with the choice of certifying or decertifying Mexico. There is little disagreement that this law does not allow the President adequate flexibility to deal both with the drug problem and with the totality of U.S. national interests. The law should be changed.

But in the meantime, there is little reason to believe that the Republican majority should use this outdated law as an opportunity to specifically condemn the President of the United States by bringing forward a substitute resolution which contains language which specifically states that the administration's policies of the past 4 years amount to, "the failed antidrug policy."

So, Mr. Speaker, I intend to oppose ordering the previous question on this resolution in order to try to amend the rule to allow the House to consider the sense of Congress resolution proposed by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF]. His proposal is reasonable and sends a strong message and encourages greater cooperation between the United States and Mexico. If we are serious about stemming the flow of narcotics into our country, reason and not insults should prevail.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, here on the floor and back in your offices, you know, there is a war going on in this country. Unfortunately, it is a one-sided war. The only people that are fighting are the drug lords, the people that are killing our young children. And we, including our allies, are doing little to fight that war.

I do not have to tell my colleagues I have spoken out many times on this floor about the illegal drug use in this country, criticizing the Mexican Government, the Colombian Government, and yes, criticizing the American Government, and yes, criticizing this Congress as well for not fighting that war.

In my view, if we are going to get results in our foreign affairs, we simply must be willing to use the stick once in a while. We cannot just hang that carrot out there and threaten and keep letting them eat the carrots. That is what we do all too often with our foreign policy.

In this case, unless we are prepared to suspend our aid to Mexico, they will know there will never be a penalty for their lack of cooperation in this war.

Has there been cooperation? Not very much.

Consider the comment from Tom Constantine, head of our Drug Enforcement Agency, one of the most credible law enforcement officers in America. I was proud to work with him in the New York State government for many, many years.

He said, "There is not one single law enforcement institution in Mexico with whom the DEA has an entirely trusting relationship."

Can you imagine that? That, my friends, is a damning indictment. And that is why I feel Mexico should be decertified.

Let me read some statistics. Seventy-five percent of all the violent crime in America today is committed against our women and children and it is drug-related, 75 percent of all violent crime in America today.

Did we all know that? Does that not mean anything to us?

And let me tell my colleagues something else that is so startling. The Rand Corp. says that 75 percent of all the illegal drug purchases in America today are made by whom? They are made by upper-middle class Americans. I guess my colleagues and I could be put in that category. But recreational drug users who use a little cocaine, sniff a little cocaine or smoke a little marijuana over the weekend, and they come into the innercities and they buy these illegal drugs. That is what creates the territories, and that is what creates the murder.

Did my colleagues know that marijuana use in American 12- and 13-year-olds is up 127 percent over the last 4 years? Did we know among 14- and 15-year-olds that marijuana use is up 200 percent? And it goes higher and higher as you get up.

We are destroying a whole new generation of Americans, financially and

physically. And that is why it is part of our fault, because we are not fighting the war inside our boundaries.

But listen to this, 50 to 70 percent of the cocaine entering the United States of America today transits through Mexico. Seventy percent? And 20 to 30 percent of heroin crosses the borders from Mexico. Eighty percent of grown marijuana comes in from Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, we need to fight a battle here, and that is why I would have liked to have seen a much stronger bill than the one we are considering here today. But this House is a body of compromise. And if we were to send any kind of message expressing our dissatisfaction to Mexico, it was necessary to reach a compromise that took care of the concerns, legitimate concerns, like the gentleman sitting over here from Texas that represents border States. We have to take those considerations into consideration, because they believe that a straight decertification would be destabilizing in Mexico.

While this bill grants a waiver of sanctions to the President and while the Hastert amendment made in order by the rule delays decertification for 90 days, it still does send a strong message of our dissatisfaction with Mexico's level of cooperation in the drug war. That is why I am going to do what Ronald Reagan taught me to do, you cannot always have it your own way, you have to compromise. To me, this is a reasonable compromise.

But, Mr. Speaker, after we do this, let us get on with fighting that war to save our children, please.

□ 1045

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES].

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time to speak on a very, very emotional issue, and a very important issue to us. I want to say to my colleagues in the House that I deeply appreciate the comments made this morning both by the Speaker and the Democratic leader in the context of the Hershey retreat that half of us attended over the weekend. I think it is important that we listen to what the Speaker said immediately preceding these arguments on the rule.

I stand this morning against the rule because I think at times those of us that understand, those of us that have the experience of the impact of decisions made in Congress and how they impact border communities, not border countries, but border communities on both sides of the international boundary are often disregarded and not taken into account.

We have heard this morning, and probably will hear some more, some rhetorical statements such as there is a war going on, that this issue is tough, but fair, that 75 percent of crime committed in this country is related to drugs, and that drug use is up 100 and something percent. We all know this; I know this.

Yet, over the course of the last week or so, I have been talking to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to try to educate them about the implications of something we are about to do that is going to have long-term and profound impact on the relationship that this country has with our neighbor to the south, namely, Mexico.

I think certification of Mexico is critical. I think it is critical not as an issue of checking off on a report card, but I think it is critical from the context of, we cannot expect cooperation, we cannot expect teamwork if we do not provide our fellow members of the team an opportunity to work with us.

I can tell my colleagues from personal experience, experience predicated on 26½ years of working this Nation's border to enforce immigration and narcotic laws, that the issue is tough, the issue is serious. What we are about to do here in voting to decertify Mexico and voting on the alternative amendment is serious business.

This morning we are being watched and monitored throughout Latin America. This morning we are being monitored because people south of our border know that we do not have our own house in order, yet we are taking a position that we are making an attempt to tell people that they have to have their house in order.

I think it is critically important that we understand that a vote for this rule is a vote that ultimately will come back to haunt us in many different ways, including a profound way where our neighbor to the south may choose a path and a road that ultimately comes back to haunt not just us, not those of us in this Congress today, but ultimately future relationships with future generations of this country. I think we deserve better; I think our children deserve better.

I think we need to step back and we need to have a cooling-off period. From that perspective, I appreciate having had an opportunity to be heard by the Speaker, by the leader, and by Members of both sides of the aisle in terms of what I offer in terms of my experience on that border.

I would urge my colleagues to vote against this rule because it is the wrong thing to do at the wrong time and gives us the wrong kinds of consequences.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART].

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for yielding me this time.

I am sorry that my friends on the other side of the aisle do not seem to grasp that one of the essences of democracy is permanent dissatisfaction. I am among those who believe that the resolution that came out of the Committee on International Relations, decertifying the Mexican Government for its blatant and obvious actions, is not fulfilling the responsibilities of all governments in fighting drug trafficking.

I would have supported that resolution if I had been in the Committee on International Relations, and would have preferred that it be the final product today in this House. But as a consequence of a negotiation, a bipartisan negotiation, a very intense negotiation over the last couple of days, there is an amendment that is made in order by this rule that I fully support, an amendment by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], that while not satisfying many of us, I think at least moves forward in a way that both sides of the aisle and all positions should appreciate this morning.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] says that it postpones decertification of the Mexican Government for 90 days, and gives an opportunity to the Mexican Government to show good faith in very concrete ways in the field against the fight against narcotrafficking within these 90 days, and avoid decertification if those steps are taken. I think that is a reasonable measure, a reasonable measure that both sides of the aisle should support. People from the border States as well as from the rest of the country should support and express gratitude to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] and the Speaker and all others who have so diligently worked for that compromise on both sides of the aisle.

However, I think that even a more important aspect of the Hastert amendment is that this obviously hypocritical and fatally flawed certification process is put under the microscope, and a commission will be created to look at this process, a process that while it says that the Colombian Government, and obviously there is a very serious allegation of the President of Colombia having taken money directly from drug traffickers during his campaign, that is a very serious allegation; while Colombia is decertified, though Colombia has perhaps given the largest quota of blood against the narcotraffickers, the soldiers, the policemen of Colombia, they have given the largest quota of blood against the drug traffickers programs in the entire hemisphere, yet they are decertified.

At the same time, the Mexican Government, infiltrated to the teeth by narcotraffickers, infiltrated to the extent that hours after our President certified Mexico, a major drug trafficker was let out and apparently given a Mercedes to leave, despite that, Mexico was certified and Colombia is decertified.

And wait a minute. The most corrupt government in the hemisphere, even more corrupt than the PRI government, the government of gangsters, by gangsters and for gangsters, the government of the dictator Castro, no, our Government said no, they should not be on the list of people that have to be certified. They are cooperating, Castro is cooperating.

That is what the administration says, despite the fact that I have on video our local drug-fighting authori-

ties in south Florida saying that over 50 percent of the cocaine that comes in through the Caribbean comes by and through Cuba, and yet the Clinton administration says no, they should not be on the list.

This certification process is flawed, it is hypocritical, it is discriminatory, it has to be put under the microscope. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] does that.

Let us look at this process, let us see if there is a better way to cut back on drug trafficking, to reduce consumption and avoid the politicization of this process which is obviously occurring, and I think that my friends on the other side of the aisle would agree. So let us support the Hastert amendment, let us be bipartisan, let us be serious, and let us avoid petty politics.

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

Mr. Speaker, a President of the other party, Mr. Nixon, once observed, watch what I do, not what I say.

The folks on the other side are following that advice, of course. They are claiming to be bipartisan, claiming sweetness and light, and then they bring forward the Hastert amendment on which Democrats were not consulted. They brought it to the Committee on Rules, imposed on a straight party line vote, and they used the Hastert amendment to attack the President and his administration. Let me read from the Hastert amendment which they are presenting as this wonderful compromise.

On page 4:

United States Government strategy has been weak in responding to statutory deadlines, has been characterized by an absence of statutorily mandated measurable goals, lack of effective coordination and program accountability, and often untargeted and insufficient funding, from the smallest agencies involved in the drug war up to and including the White House Drug Policy Office.

They are not talking about another country, they are talking about our President in our own country.

They further say:

United States Government policy has emphasized additional funding for unproven drug treatment techniques at the expense of accountable drug prevention programs that effectively teach a right-wrong distinction.

And then they go on to say:

For the past four years, United States Government strategy has failed to use the media to communicate a consistent, intense anti-drug message to young people.

The folks on the other side, in praising this compromise, I guess they are compromising between their right wing and their far right wing, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], neglect to tell us that what they are doing is condemning the President of the United States, condemning the activities of our own Government in trying to counteract this drug trade.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his kindness.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with the same kind of outrage that has been expressed by my colleagues, but I also understand the frustration and the pleas that has been made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES]. So I rise in opposition to the rule because I believe there is more that could have been done.

It is crucial that we acknowledge that this is not, this question of drug usage and drug devastation, it is not a Democratic problem or a Republican problem, it is an American problem. I think it is important for us to rise on this floor and come together to associate ourselves with a resolution that is an American resolution.

The Federal Government now spends currently \$15 billion per year in the war on drugs. But, interestingly enough, as it is under President Clinton, it has not been substantially or was not substantially different under President Bush. We focused a lot on border control, interdiction, law enforcement, punishment, and prevention. We do work some with education, treatment, and rehabilitation.

Individuals in my community suffer extensively. Black men comprise 12 percent of the total population; 13 percent of drug users, 35 percent of arrests and 55 percent of convictions.

I want a real solution. I want to acknowledge that there are problems with Mexico, but yet we can find data that says that the Mexican officials seized 30 percent more marijuana in 1995, which in turn was up 40 percent over 1994. Cocaine seizures went from 22.2 tons to 23.8 tons, and heroin seizures increased 78 percent from 1995.

So I think we need to recognize that work has been done. We have sufficiently cooperated with many Mexican officials so that the extradition process has been expanded.

I want to see us come together around solutions, to emphasize treatment, to emphasize the importance of bringing down the desire for drugs in our community. I do not want to see us not recognize the problems in Colombia or Mexico, but I do realize that we must do more about international smuggling, we must do more about money laundering, and in that instance I am disappointed that the Schiff amendment substitute was not considered to be brought to the floor of the House. I appreciate that there were those who supported this in the Committee on Rules.

□ 1100

This had viable solutions by offering it as a sense of Congress:

First, the suggestion to dismantle major drug cartels and arrest and prosecute leaders of such cartels; that we would continue to work to implement effective legislation for Mexico to prohibit money laundering.

We would also like to achieve compliance with Mexico with outstanding ex-

tradition requests, and that effort has been enhanced; we need more of that. That we would work to increase the interdiction of narcotics and other controlled substances, and we would do more on prevention and treatment, I might add.

It again does this Congress no good and it does us great ill, if you will, in international relations and working with countries to improve this cooperative effort in fighting drugs if we castigate an administration that has shown itself well with the drug czar, that we are concerned about decreasing the amount of drugs that have come into this country, and to have an amendment on the floor that has been offered now that gives some and then takes some away by castigating the hard work of DEA agents, border control agents, and the various other Federal employees that have worked so hard with local government, with the President, and treatment programs, it does not show itself well, and does not get the job done in terms of helping Mexico do what it is supposed to do.

I am frustrated by this process. I want action, but I want us to recognize that it is an American problem and we must treat it as such, to make sure we can fight this drug problem and help the American citizens get rid of it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL].

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, today, we are potentially faced with a vote to decertify Mexico for not cooperating with the United States to adequately fight the war on drugs. This is yet another of the truly frustrating votes in which a Member of Congress is forced to choose between two alternatives, both of which mandate not only an unconstitutional use of American taxpayer's dollars but pursue an ineffective policy action.

President Clinton recently certified Mexico as a good drug warrior. However, absent some procedural maneuvering to remove a waiver that allows the President to release Mexican foreign assistance notwithstanding decertification, the only choice we as Members of Congress will be left with is: First, certify Mexico and further encourage an obviously corrupt political regime to continue its corruption-based, prohibition-era-style activities with a check from the United States taxpayers in the amount of \$25 million; or, second, decertify Mexico and pressure that same regime to increase its corruption-based, prohibition-era-style activities with a check from the United States taxpayers in the amount of \$25 million.

Voting against certification does little more than pressure Mexico to pretend it's cracking down on drug producers. Voting for certification condones the President's position that Mexico is doing everything possible and the corruption remains both ignored and subsidized. This vote has become meaningless; the process of Mexican certification has become a kind of political dog and pony show. Unfortunately for the American taxpayer, foreign aid will continue to flow to Mexico regardless of the vote and regardless of whether this

money accomplishes anything positive or productive.

Today's war on drugs consists of inherently defective tactics and, as such, a new approach to the drug problem is desperately warranted. If we are going to be honest with ourselves, we would have to decertify our border guards, prison wardens, and school principals; after all, we cannot even keep drugs out of our own country, prisons, or schools.

We never seem to learn anything from our failures. Two years ago Texas banned smoking in all prisons. The price of a 99-cent pack of cigarettes suddenly soared to \$25 within the prison system, yet smoking continues while corruption thrives. Just last year, 40 prison employees faced felony charges for dealing in cigarettes.

I cannot possibly vote to certify Mexico as a drug warrior obediently taking orders from the United States Government. How can I in good conscience vote for a resolution to decertify Mexico whether it has teeth in it or not since our whole approach to the drug problem is flawed and doomed to fail. Most Members recognize this and thus, the frustration with this resolution.

This resolution, whether it passes or fails, embraces and subsidizes the same flaws prohibition-era approach and does little more than increase potential corruption and crime. The sooner we realize and acknowledge this, the better.

I urge a no vote on the rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 95, the rule for consideration of House Joint Resolution 58.

First, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for his skillful work on this proposed rule, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules, for his support of our resolution.

House Joint Resolution 58, introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW], disapproves the President's recent certification that Mexico had cooperated fully with the United States' antidrug efforts last year. This resolution of disapproval was reported favorably by the Committee on International Relations by a bipartisan vote of 27 to 5. This measure is supported by our ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] as well as the leadership of both parties.

Mr. Speaker, the latest data indicates that 60 percent of the illegal drugs entering our Nation passed through Mexico. That figure may be higher. It is a conservative estimate. If we do not work together to confront this problem, thousands of Mexican and American citizens, particularly our young people, will pay a terrible price. That is why we expect that our friends in Mexico would give their very best efforts, along with our Nation, to confront this terrible threat.

Regrettably, I have reached the conclusion that Mexico's government up until now has not shown the kind of full commitment that is needed.

We acknowledge that Mexico has indeed been open to new antidrug initiatives. For that we commend them. But that cooperation was completely undermined because Mexico's antidrug chief was actually on the payroll of that country's most powerful cartel. He is now in prison.

We also recognize that several massive drug syndicates continue to operate with impunity in Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, our DEA administrator, Tom Constantine, told Congress just a few days before the President's certification that there is not one single law enforcement institution in Mexico with whom DEA has an entirely trusting relationship.

In short, this administration gives Mexico a failing grade for its antidrug cooperation last year. But it would allow the President to maintain aid programs that are important to us, including some forms of counternarcotics aid that might otherwise be prohibited to a decertified country.

I believe that is a responsible approach to this thorny issue.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 95 provides for a full and fair debate on this issue. It is time we establish a relationship that is trusting and meaningful. We must end the divisiveness that surround drugs, and the best way to do this is to lance this boil and develop real, substantive counter-drug cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call our colleagues' attention to a New York Times editorial of March 12 of this month entitled "Mexico Without Illusions," in coming out for decertification, stating: "Unless President Zedillo attacks these problems boldly by initiating a thorough housecleaning of corporate officials, Congress should override Mexico certification."

I urge our Members to support the rule on House Joint Resolution 58 and to support final passage of the measure.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the editorial I mentioned.

The material referred to is as follows:
[From the New York Times, Mar. 12, 1997]

MEXICO WITHOUT ILLUSIONS

Congress and the Clinton Administration appear headed for a collision over Mexico. Just weeks before President Clinton is scheduled to visit Mexico, Congress is moving to override the Administration's disingenuous certification that its Government is fully cooperating in the fight against illegal drugs. A successful override would invite a diplomatic confrontation with Mexico. But the crisis would be worth enduring if it led Washington to a more realistic appreciation of Mexico's problems and of President Ernesto Zedillo's failure to address them with sufficient resolve.

The Administration invited a Congressional rebuff when it pretended all was well with Mexican drug enforcement. It acted immediately after a series of embarrassing incidents made plain that pervasive corruption in Mexico's police, military and ruling party

has blunted drug enforcement and led Mexican officials to withhold vital information from American authorities.

Only days before the certification decision came word that Mexico's recently appointed drug enforcement chief had been arrested for corruption, and that news of his downfall had been kept secret for nearly two weeks.

Largely because of this breakdown of enforcement and cooperation, well over half the cocaine entering the United States now passes through Mexico. Mexico has become the principal conduit for South American cocaine as well as a supplier of homegrown marijuana and heroin.

Mexico already resents the idea of a Washington report card on its law enforcement efforts. The insult would be far greater if Mexico received a failing grade, even if the Administration, as it surely would, waived the economic penalties that decertification could bring. The annual drug certification review is of a useful process. But as long as it is required by law, Washington does best to tell the American people, and itself, the truth.

In Mexico's case, that truth is cause for considerable concern. The drug enforcement problems are symptomatic of a deeper crisis in Mexican political life.

The old regime, represented by the Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI, has used patronage networks and, on occasion, electoral fraud to monopolize Mexico's presidency and dominate its politics for nearly seven decades. It is now in deep disarray, unable to reform itself and unwilling to give way to a more democratic and accountable system. President Zedillo is a weak but decent leader, apparently too beholden to the PRI establishment to reform it.

He has failed, for example, to move aggressively to clean up the notoriously drug-corrupted Federal Judicial Police. Mr. Zedillo has instead relied on regular army generals who are themselves proving vulnerable to bribery and other abuses. New reports link army drug fighters to a series of mysterious kidnapping incidents. Mr. Zedillo has failed to challenge federal and state politicians whose failure to halt drug trafficking in their areas of jurisdiction suggests either active complicity or incompetence.

With a long common boarder and a wide array of common interests the United States has compelling reasons to maintain constructive relations with Mexico. But such relations can only be based on an honest assessment of Mexican conditions, including the obvious problems now afflicting its drug enforcement programs.

Unless President Zedillo attacks these problems boldly by initiating a thorough housecleaning of corrupt officials, Congress should override Mexico's certification.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to our colleague and friend, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], vice chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Sanibel, FL, for yielding me this time.

I would like to say to the House that sometimes we have a tendency around here to do what makes us feel good, rather than what is actually the right thing to do. Clearly, the politically expedient best thing to do is to bash the living hell out of Mexico.

I have plenty of grist for criticism of what we have seen from Mexico, but we

have to ask this question, Mr. Speaker: What does it get us? What does decertification get us? What does listing a whole load of items that would exacerbate the anti-gringo sentiment from Mexico get us in this war which, frankly, we are in large part responsible for?

If Members will look at a country that is trying to emerge and bring about economic reforms and political reforms, as Mexico is, and it is a long and difficult struggle, and it has not been as successful as we would like, but if we look at the problems that exist there and then look at the magnet of \$30 billion which we in this country are providing, it obviously has to impose quite a strain on Mexico.

There is a sense that every government official in Mexico is corrupt. We know that is not the case. There have been 25 assassinations which have taken place in Mexico. Loads of judges, police officers, and a wide range of other people are strongly committed in Mexico to dealing with this scourge of drugs. But obviously the \$30 billion which we are providing as consumers here in the United States has clearly played a role in creating that corruption.

I will support the manager's amendment compromise, but I have trouble with it. Why? Because as we look at that litany of criticisms that we are going to be imposing, which we are going to be leveling at the Mexican Government, it seems to me it will make it tougher for them to try and deal with many of these items.

Why? Because of the political problems that exist in Mexico, as I said earlier, that anti-gringo sentiment. So I will say that reluctantly I will join in support of this compromise, and hope that we can do so in a bipartisan way and deal with this very, very serious problem.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES].

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding the additional time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would call attention to a Dear Colleague letter that I sent out to my colleagues yesterday. It is a follow-up to another letter that I had sent last week, and before I read a portion of this, I would like for my colleagues in the House to know that when I first heard about the question of certification of Mexico for this year, I was in El Paso. I sent a letter to the President urging him to certify Mexico. I did so because the impact that decertification would have on border communities on both sides of the international border would be devastating.

We have a border that is interdependent economically. We have a border where we have made significant progress since the passage of NAFTA, and I know that NAFTA for some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle is still an issue of controversy. But the progress that we have made is significant.

One of the things that I want the record to reflect that has not been mentioned here is that Mexico has not been sitting on its hands. Mexico has lost a presidential candidate to their effort on the war on drugs. Mexico has lost a bishop to the war on drugs. Mexico has lost a number of clergy that stand up and address drug trafficking and the scourge of the impact of drugs on the society in Mexico, and they have paid with their lives, they have paid with their lives.

Mexico has in the past lost lives of its policemen and soldiers fighting in remote regions of that country against very well-financed and well-armed drug traffickers. So the price Mexico has paid has been significant.

I think when we get caught up in the rhetoric and in the language even of the certification process, where we say we have to have proof that they have fully cooperated, well fully can mean different things to different people. One of the issues here has to be clearly defined and attainable goals in the context of what we expect on this war on drugs, clearly defined objectives, even of what we expect of ourselves.

We should not be on the floor taking this opportunity to again take it out on Mexico in terms of the frustration that we all feel about the impact of drugs in our communities. I think we can reach consensus on this floor on both sides of the aisle that all of us are opposed to narcotics, all of us are opposed to seeing what is going on, even in the neighborhoods around this great institution.

I think we have to understand that from the perspective of the Mexican Government, from the perspective of the Mexican people, decertification, even decertification with a waiver, even with the amendment that we will be voting on and are considering this morning, in all probability, even with all of those things being fully understood by Mexico and Mexican citizens, it is still an affront to them, and an affront to the price they have paid in helping us to try to deal with what can best be termed, from my experience, as an issue of national security for this country. But we forget in the process that it is also a threat on the national stability and the national security of Mexico.

I would urge my colleagues to step back and rethink their position on this. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY], well known in the areas of commerce.

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I served 10 years on the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, and having dealt with this issue for a number of years, I truly come to the floor today with mixed emotions. One of the things

I learned, I think, long ago when I came to this body was to listen to the folks who are closest to the problem.

When I listen to my colleagues from Texas, from Arizona, from southern California, and they explain to me the difficulties of the decertification process, and what it is going to mean to our relations with our neighbors to the South, I think it behooves us to listen to those arguments.

This is not a partisan issue. While I agree with all of the failed antidrug policy indictments in this resolution with this administration, that is really beside the point. The point is how do we solve the problem of drugs coming in through our borders from Mexico.

I am not certain that the approach we take today, whether it is the Hastert approach or the approach from the committee, really gets that job done. If I had a problem in the Great Lakes region, I would hope that other Members from other parts of the country would listen to my particular problem and pay me some heed, because I might know what I am talking about.

I think we ought to really take a look at the arguments being made by our friends on the southern border, and take that into account before we cast this important vote.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1115

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time.

I rise with some degree of uneasiness because I believe I have established a reputation in this body as one of the strongest antidrug crusaders that there is. With the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. SOLOMON], we have been successful in having a rule put in that sometime in this Congress there needs to be a drug testing plan put in for Members of Congress. At one time I had a full-time antidrug coordinator on my staff in Texas.

I have consistently voted for the most tough and effective measures to fight the war on drugs so that it would appear that I would stand in support of the rule and in support of the resolution to decertify Mexico. I am not going to do that. I spent 2 days in Mexico this past weekend. I am convinced that, while they have problems in their antidrug efforts, President Zedillo and his Government are making a good-faith effort to be a good-faith partner with the United States in the war against drugs.

If we go ahead today, report this rule, report the resolution and pass either the Gilman resolution that came out of committee or the Hastert substitute, what we are doing is an exercise in self-flagellation. Neither of those has true sanctions. One waives

the sanctions, the other delays it for 90 days.

So we have a symbolic effort where we are pointing fingers at Mexico with no teeth behind the finger pointing which is going to infuriate not the Mexican Government but the Mexican people. When the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] and myself were in Mexico over the weekend, all the Mexican papers had front-page headlines that Mexico viewed this as a very serious issue of national sovereignty. Quite frankly, they could not understand how we could be thinking about decertifying their Government without decertifying our Government.

For example, there are 20,000 Mexican troops in the field eradicating marijuana crops. How many law enforcement officials are in the United States eradicating marijuana crops? My information is the answer in the United States is zero. Last year the Mexican Government extradited or expelled 16 people to this country that were wanted on either murder charges or drug charges or charges of that nature. How many did we expel to Mexico? My understanding is the answer is zero.

I could go on and on, and in the debate later in the afternoon I will go into some detail. But the pure point of the matter is, if we continue with this exercise, we are going to make the House of Representatives irrelevant in a true dialog with Mexico and the administration on the war against drugs. We need to be involved. We have got expertise in this House that needs to be involved, but a symbolic vote that is a 1-day political victory is not the answer. I hope we would vote against the rule and, if that passes, vote against the resolution.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule, and I was an original cosponsor of the bill. I support the bill. I do not mean to demean or condemn the President, I am just a pragmatist and I keep a look at the scoreboard. As high as 50 to 70 percent of all narcotics comes through and from Mexico, and, if there is a war on drugs going on in America, I am Stonewall Jackson. I liken certifying Mexico as a cooperative partner in our war against drugs as giving a special tax exemption to Al Capone during Prohibition to sell booze.

Nothing personal against Mexico. It is not working. American cities are busting at the seams with narcotics.

Let me say this to the Congress. Other than a nuclear threat, that is the greatest national security threat our Nation faces and every citizens feels it in every city across this country. In fact, I do not think the bill goes far enough. I recommend to the majority party that they bring to the floor the

Traficant bill that does not mandate but allows for the deployment of military troops falling out of chairs without armrests all over the world, put them on our border, not to make arrests but simply to detain and keep both illegal immigrants out and narcotics. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have a war on drugs, we cannot do it with the Peace Corps. It is time to start fighting. I support the rule. I support the bill.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against the rule, and I am going to vote against the Hastert amendment. Let me tell my colleagues why.

In the 1980's, I helped draft the certification laws as a staffer in the other body. If we read the Hastert amendment, it requires a studying, the decertification process. I come before my colleagues to say that we do not need to study the decertification process. We need to toughen the decertification process and the penalties against countries that traffic in drugs. The 1986 Antidrug Abuse Act established four very clear criteria, tests of cooperation. Let me read them.

It requires steps that would prevent smuggling. And how can anyone in their consciousness certify Mexico when Mexico has 70 percent of the cocaine coming into the United States, when they do not even produce one gram of cocaine that is not naturally produced there? So it is all being smuggled. So by that criteria, do they judge cooperation? Punish money laundering? They have not prosecuted one person under their money laundering law.

Achieve maximum reductions in drug production? Achieve maximum reductions? Eighty percent of the marijuana is coming out of Mexico; 30 percent of the heroin flooding our streets and our neighborhoods and our schools. Are they cooperating with the letter of the law? No.

Do they facilitate the prosecution of traffickers, as the law says to the maximum extent possible? This is what Tom Constantine, the head of DEA, told our subcommittee just before certification.

There is not one single law enforcement institution in Mexico with whom DEA has a trusting relationship.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW], my colleague who is in fact the original proposer of the resolution.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I ask to speak immediately after one of the cosponsors of the resolution that is going to be before the House today, my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

I rise in support of this particular rule. Plain and simple, regardless of

where you come down on the Hastert amendment, if you want to vote on the decertification process you must pass this rule. Otherwise, it is not going to happen. It is a question of do you just want to have a sense of the Congress, business as usual in our war against drugs, then vote against the rule. It is that simple.

Now, the fact that we vote for the rule does not mean that we have to vote for the Hastert amendment. I have some very, very serious problems with the Hastert amendment and in all probability will vote against it. However, this is a good rule. I think there are plenty of good things in the Hastert amendment, but there are some things that I would have dropped out.

I think to put the criticism of the administration, even though I think it is deserved, but I think to put that into the bill and then ask the Democrats to vote for it is going to be pretty much of a tough call.

I think also the question of setting up a commission should be done by a separate bill, and I think it should have moved separately through the House. But please, if Members feel that Mexico has not fully cooperated, the bill says, the certification process says, that the President certifies that Mexico has cooperated, fully cooperated, with us, they cannot possibly vote for certification. Therefore, approve the rule and vote for the bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as one of the original cosponsors of the resolution calling for the decertification of Mexico, I rise today in support, not wholehearted support of this rule but in support of it nonetheless because it is important, Mr. Speaker, to at least take one small step for the people of this country and let the Government of Mexico know that its days of getting a free ride and having us worry more about Mexico's self-esteem and our children and drugs on our streets has, indeed, come.

We have witnessed some rather strange things during even this preliminary debate on the rule, Mr. Speaker. We have heard Members call for a cooling-off period. A cooling-off period? We have had a cooling-off period for several years in this country which has given us an unprecedented level of teen drug usage.

We have also witnessed a cooling-off period in this country over the last few years that has skyrocketed the amount of drugs coming into this country, and not from 134 counties thousands of miles away but from Mexico itself, which stands before us today trying to convince the American people and this Congress that it is doing everything that it can to stop that flow. Nothing could be further from the truth.

We have also heard Members take to the well of this great body and try to make us feel guilty about standing up

and saying the time has come to say that Mexico is not doing everything it can. Rather than a cooling-off period, Mr. Speaker, we need to turn up the heat, and the only way that we can do that is to stand up and say, Mexico must be decertified.

There may be circumstances prevailing here that allow for a waiver, but it must be decertified because, Mr. Speaker, that is the truth. That reflects reality, and it is time to get real in the fight, in the war against drugs which this administration has not seen fit to do.

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

There is a serious matter here that is being discussed, of course. And we are saying that this rule is unfair. We are not suggesting that there is not a serious drug problem, that we have serious reasons to question the degree to which we have gotten cooperation, none of that is under question here.

The question is what is the most reasonable policy to make sure that Mexico will in fact continue to cooperate with the United States and continue to do the things necessary to decrease the flow of drugs into our country.

This is not a fair rule that the majority reported out of the committee. They rejected the amendment offered by one of their own Members, a sense of Congress amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

I include the Schiff amendment for the RECORD at this point:

AMENDMENT OFFERED AS A SUBSTITUTE TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT TO H.J. RES. 58

OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF OF NEW MEXICO

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The international drug trade poses a direct threat to the United States and to international efforts to promote democracy, economic stability, human rights, and the rule of law.

(2) 12,800,000 Americans use illegal drugs representing all ethnic and socioeconomic groups, including 1,500,000 cocaine users, 600,000 addicted to heroin, and 9,800,000 smokers of marijuana.

(3) 10.9 percent of all young Americans between 12 and 17 years of age use illegal drugs, and 1 in 4 children say they have been offered drugs in the last year.

(4) Drug-related illness, death, and crime cost the Nation approximately \$66,900,000,000 in 1996, including costs for lost productivity, premature death, and incarceration.

(5) The effort to reduce the social and economic costs imposed by drugs on United States society is contingent on the ability to stop drugs at the Nation's borders and to forge effective cooperative relationships with other nations.

(6) According to the Department of State, Mexico is the source of 20-30 percent of heroin, up to 70 percent of the foreign grown marijuana, and a transit point for 50-70 percent of the cocaine shipped to the United States.

(7) Drug traffickers along the United States-Mexico border smuggle about \$10,000,000,000 worth of narcotics into the United States annually, and the drug trade generates \$30,000,000,000 for the Mexican economy.

(8) There has been a failure to take effective action against drug cartels and other significant narcotics traffickers in Mexico, and the Department of State reports that there has been insufficient effort to confront the Juarez and Tijuana drug cartels.

(9) The Government of Mexico has to date failed to honor a single United States extradition request for Mexican nationals indicted in our courts on charges of narcotics trafficking.

(10) The number of drug seizures in Mexico in 1996 was only half the number of seizures in 1993, and the number of drug-related arrests in Mexico in 1996 was only half the number of such arrests in 1992.

(11) There is evidence of official corruption in counter-drug efforts in Mexico, including the recent arrest of General Jesus Gutierrez, the Government of Mexico's highest ranking counter-drug official.

(12) There has been insufficient coordination between United States and Mexican drug enforcement agencies, including Mexico's refusal to allow United States agents to carry weapons on the Mexican side of the United States-Mexico border.

(13) The banking and financial sectors in Mexico lack mechanisms necessary to prevent money laundering, estimated at nearly \$10,000,000,000 in 1996 by the Department of the Treasury.

(14) The Department of State reports that Mexico has become a majority money laundering center and the preferred international placement point for United States dollars.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING EFFORTS BY MEXICO TO STOP THE PRODUCTION AND TRANSIT OF ILLEGAL NARCOTICS.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Government of Mexico has made ineffective and insufficient progress to stop the production and transit of illicit narcotics or drugs or other controlled substances; and

(2) the President should work with the Government of Mexico—

(A) to dismantle major drug cartels and to arrest and prosecute the leaders of such drug cartels;

(B) to implement effective legislation in Mexico to prohibit money laundering;

(C) to achieve compliance by Mexico with outstanding extradition requests by the United States, particularly compliance with requests for the extradition of Mexican nationals indicted in the United States on charges of narcotics trafficking;

(D) to increase the interdiction of narcotics and other controlled substances coming across the United States-Mexico border;

(E) to increase cooperation between the Government of Mexico and United States law enforcement officials by allowing such officials to resume carrying weapons on the Mexican side of the United States-Mexico border; and

(F) to establish and carry out a program designed to identify and eliminate public corruption, and to prosecute officials who are involved in such corruption, at every level of the Government of Mexico, including the Mexican police and military.

SENSE OF THE CONGRESS RESOLUTION ON MEXICO CERTIFICATION

Whereas, the international drug trade poses a direct threat to the United States and to international efforts to promote democracy, economic stability, human rights, and the rule of law; and,

Whereas, 12.8 million Americans use illegal drugs representing all ethnic and socioeconomic groups including, 1.5 million cocaine users, 600,000 addicted to heroin, and 9.8 million smokers of marijuana; and,

Whereas, 10.9 percent of all young Americans between twelve and seventeen years of

age use illegal drugs; and, one in four children say they have been offered drugs in the last year,

Whereas, drug-related illness, death, and crime cost the nation approximately \$66.9 billion in 1996 including costs for lost productivity, premature death, and incarceration; and,

Whereas, the effort to reduce the social and economic costs imposed by drugs on U.S. society is contingent on the ability to stop drugs at the nation's borders and to forge effective cooperative relationships with other nations; and,

Whereas, according to the U.S. State Department, Mexico is the source of 20-30% of heroin, up to 70% of the foreign grown marijuana, and transit point for 50-70% of the cocaine shipped to the United States; and,

Whereas, drug traffickers along the U.S.-Mexico border smuggle about \$10 billion worth of narcotics into the United States annually; and the drug trade generates \$30 billion for the Mexican economy,

Whereas, there has been a failure to take effective action against drug cartels and other significant narcotics traffickers in Mexico, and the U.S. State Department reports that there has been insufficient effort to confront the Juarez and Tijuana Drug Cartels; and,

Whereas, the number of drug seizures in Mexico in 1996 was only half the number of seizures in 1993, and the number of drug-related arrests in Mexico in 1996 was only half the number of such arrests in 1992; and,

Whereas, there is evidence of official corruption in counter-drug efforts in Mexico; including the recent arrest of General Jesus Gutierrez, the Government of Mexico's highest-ranking, counter-drug official; and,

Whereas, there has been insufficient coordination between U.S. and Mexican drug enforcement agencies, including Mexico's refusal to allow U.S. agents to carry weapons on the Mexico side of the United States border with Mexico; and

Whereas, the banking and financial sectors in Mexico lack mechanisms necessary to prevent money laundering, estimated at nearly \$10 billion in 1996 by the U.S. Department of the * * *

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, the committee did not give us a reasonable series of choices. What they presented was the bill out of the committee, out of the Committee on International Relations, and then their own substitute, a Republican crafted substitute in which they took great pains to criticize the President of the United States.

There are Members on their own side of the aisle, on their side of the aisle who do not agree with this position. We should have had a range of choices. There should have been a sense of Congress alternative offer. That is clearly what is going to be done in the other body. That is clearly what is being presented by the Senator from my State, a member of their own party, Senator HUTCHISON. That is what the Senate perhaps will vote on soon. Yet they deny us the right to vote on that option in the House of Representatives.

I would urge that the House vote on this rule, send this back to the Committee on Rules so that a fair rule may be crafted on this most controversial and most delicate matter of relationships between us and our neighbor to the south, Mexico.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the war on drugs is not a partisan matter. It is going to take the full cooperation of all of us in this country and all our friends and allies around the world that are involved. And that, of course, includes Mexico.

The issue today is the question of certification and the facts are very simple. As ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] said yesterday, There is just simply no possible way that you can come to a rational conclusion that we can possibly certify Mexico as being fully cooperative in the efforts that we are taking together on the war on drugs.

□ 1130

I think that is very strong. I respect the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], I always have, and I am glad to find myself in agreement with him on this conclusion.

I think that under Chairman GILMAN'S leadership that HIRC has brought forward a very good resolution. I think the Hastert amendment adds to it in a positive way by giving us some specific matters that we wish to set out in areas that we will measure in terms of cooperation from the Mexican Government as well as it brings into question, can we do better than the certification process that we are using now? I believe the answer is yes, we certainly can do better than the process we have now, and I think the key word here is together with Mexico we can make a huge dent in the war on drugs. That is why I strongly urge passage of this rule and passage of the resolution and the Hastert amendment as well.

I would point out that the Schiff amendment is a sense of Congress and does not address the specific issues that we are talking about in the Hastert amendment nor does it get to the question of overcoming the President's certification situation that he has left us with today.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 209, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—213

Aderholt	Gillmor	Packard
Archer	Gilman	Pappas
Armey	Goodlatte	Parker
Bachus	Goodling	Paxon
Baker	Goss	Pease
Ballenger	Graham	Peterson (PA)
Barr	Granger	Petri
Barrett (NE)	Greenwood	Pickering
Bartlett	Gutknecht	Pitts
Bass	Hall (TX)	Pombo
Bateman	Hansen	Porter
Bereuter	Hastert	Portman
Billirakis	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Bliley	Hayworth	Quinn
Blunt	Hefley	Radanovich
Boehlert	Herger	Ramstad
Boehner	Hill	Regula
Brady	Hilleary	Riggs
Bryant	Hobson	Riley
Bunning	Hoekstra	Rogan
Burr	Horn	Rogers
Burton	Hostettler	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Houghton	Ros-Lehtinen
Callahan	Hulshof	Roukema
Calvert	Hunter	Royce
Camp	Hyde	Ryun
Campbell	Inglis	Salmon
Canady	Istook	Sanford
Cannon	Jenkins	Saxton
Castle	Jones	Scarborough
Chabot	Kasich	Schaefer, Dan
Chambliss	Kelly	Schaffer, Bob
Chenoweth	Kim	Sensenbrenner
Christensen	King (NY)	Sessions
Coble	Klug	Shaw
Coburn	Knollenberg	Shays
Collins	LaHood	Shimkus
Combest	Largent	Shuster
Cook	Latham	Skeen
Crane	LaTourette	Smith (MI)
Crapo	Lazio	Smith (NJ)
Cubin	Leach	Smith (OR)
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Smith (TX)
Davis (VA)	Lewis (KY)	Smith, Linda
Deal	Linder	Snowbarger
DeLay	Livingston	Solomon
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Souder
Dickey	Manzullo	Spence
Doolittle	McCollum	Stump
Dreier	McCrery	Sununu
Duncan	McDade	Talent
Dunn	McHugh	Tauzin
Ehlers	McInnis	Taylor (NC)
Ehrlich	McIntosh	Thomas
Emerson	McKeon	Thornberry
English	McKinney	Thune
Ensign	Meek	Tiahrt
Everett	Metcalf	Trafficant
Ewing	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Fawell	Molinar	Wamp
Foley	Moran (KS)	Watkins
Forbes	Morella	Watts (OK)
Fowler	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Fox	Nethercutt	Weldon (PA)
Franks (NJ)	Neumann	Weller
Frelinghuysen	Ney	White
Galleghy	Northup	Whitfield
Ganske	Norwood	Wicker
Gekas	Nussle	Wolf
Gibbons	Oxley	Young (AK)
Gilchrest		Young (FL)

NAYS—209

Abercrombie	Boyd	Deutsch
Ackerman	Brown (CA)	Dicks
Allen	Brown (FL)	Dingell
Andrews	Brown (OH)	Dixon
Baesler	Capps	Doggett
Baldacci	Cardin	Dooley
Barcia	Carson	Doyle
Barrett (WI)	Clay	Edwards
Barton	Clement	Engel
Becerra	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bentsen	Condit	Evans
Berman	Conyers	Farr
Berry	Costello	Fattah
Bilbray	Coyne	Fazio
Bishop	Cramer	Filner
Blagojevich	Cummings	Flake
Blumenauer	Danner	Foglietta
Bonilla	Davis (FL)	Ford
Bonior	Davis (IL)	Frank (MA)
Bono	DeFazio	Frost
Borski	DeGette	Furse
Boswell	DeLauro	Gejdenson
Boucher	Dellums	Gephardt

Gonzalez	Markey	Sanchez
Goode	Martinez	Sanders
Gordon	Mascara	Sandlin
Green	Matsui	Sawyer
Gutierrez	McCarthy (MO)	Schiff
Hall (OH)	McCarthy (NY)	Schumer
Hamilton	McDermott	Scott
Harman	McGovern	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	McHale	Shadegg
Hefner	McNulty	Sherman
Hilliard	Meehan	Sisisky
Hinches	Menendez	Skaggs
Hinojosa	Mica	Skelton
Holden	Millender	Slaughter
Hooley	McDonald	Smith, Adam
Hoyer	Miller (CA)	Snyder
Jackson (IL)	Minge	Spratt
Jackson-Lee	Mink	Stabenow
(TX)	Moakley	Stark
Jefferson	Mollohan	Stearns
John	Moran (VA)	Stenholm
Johnson (CT)	Murtha	Stokes
Johnson (WI)	Nadler	Strickland
Johnson, E.B.	Neal	Stupak
Johnson, Sam	Oberstar	Tanner
Kanjorski	Obey	Tauscher
Kennedy (MA)	Olver	Taylor (MS)
Kennedy (RI)	Ortiz	Thompson
Kennelly	Owens	Thurman
Kildee	Pallone	Tierney
Kilpatrick	Pascrell	Torres
Kind (WI)	Pastor	Towns
Klecza	Paul	Turner
Klink	Payne	Upton
Kolbe	Pelosi	Velazquez
Kucinich	Peterson (MN)	Vento
LaFalce	Pickett	Visclosky
Lampson	Pomeroy	Waters
Lantos	Poshard	Watt (NC)
Levin	Rahall	Waxman
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Wexler
Lipinski	Reyes	Weygand
Lofgren	Rivers	Wise
Lowey	Roemer	Woolsey
Luther	Rothman	Wynn
Maloney (CT)	Roybal-Allard	Yates
Maloney (NY)	Rush	
Manton	Sabo	

NOT VOTING—10

Clayton	Etheridge	McIntyre
Cooksey	Hutchinson	Price (NC)
Cox	Kaptur	
Delahunt	Kingston	

□ 1153

Messrs. CUMMINGS, WISE, DEL-
LUMS, SAM JOHNSON of Texas,
UPTON, and BONILLA changed their
vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. SHAYS, CHRISTENSEN, and
LEACH changed their vote from "nay"
to "yea."

Mr. SKEEN changed his vote from
"present" to "yea."

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and
Mr. PAUL changed their vote from
"present" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on
the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, offi-
cial business off the Hill kept me de-
tained during the vote on House Reso-
lution 95, the rule accompanying House
Joint Resolution 58. Had I been present
for this vote—rollcall No. 45—I would
have voted aye.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant
to House Resolution 95, I call up the
joint resolution (H.J. Res. 58) dis-
approving the certification of the
President under section 490(b) of the
Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 regard-
ing foreign assistance for Mexico dur-
ing fiscal year 1997, and ask for its im-
mediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint
resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr.
FOLEY). Pursuant to House Resolution
95, the gentleman from New York [Mr.
GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indi-
ana [Mr. HAMILTON] each will control 1
hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman
from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given
permission to revise and extend his re-
marks.)

□ 1200

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent that the gentleman
from California [Mr. BECERRA] be per-
mitted to control 30 minutes of my de-
bate time, and that he be permitted to
yield that time at his discretion.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the mi-
nority is pleased to yield 5 minutes to
the gentleman from California [Mr.
BECERRA], and I ask unanimous con-
sent that the gentleman be permitted
to yield that time at his discretion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from Illinois [Mr. HAMILTON]
and the gentleman from New York [Mr.
GILMAN]? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr.
FOLEY]. The gentleman from California
[Mr. BECERRA] will control 35 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent that all Members
may have 5 legislative days within
which to revise and extend their re-
marks on House Joint Resolution 58.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House
Joint Resolution 58, expresses congres-
sional disapproval of the President's
February 28, 1997, certification to Con-
gress that Mexico has fully cooperated
with our Nation's antinarcotics efforts
during the past year. I am pleased to be
joined by the gentleman from Florida
[Mr. SHAW] in support of our substitute
to his original bill, which did not con-
tain any waiver of imposition of sanc-
tions.

Mr. Speaker, the issue before today is
nothing less than a matter of vital U.S.
national interest, dealing directly with
the well-being of our Nation's children
and their future. It is not about the
value of the peso nor the health of the
Mexican economy nor the status of dip-
lomatic relations between our two na-
tions. These critical issues, while ex-
tremely important, must not override
the importance of fighting drugs in our
bilateral relations.

The importance of Mexico's coopera-
tion with our antidrug efforts cannot
be overstated, Mr. Speaker. In the past
4 years, drug use among American

teenagers has nearly doubled. It has been estimated that 60 percent of our Nation's illegal drugs entering our country come from Mexico. The societal costs for the impact of these illicit drugs and the drug-related crime, incarceration, health care, among other costs, is staggering, in the billions of dollars.

The President unwisely certified that Mexico has fully cooperated with our antinarcotics efforts, but the facts show the opposite.

Last month, the Mexican equivalent of our DEA administrator, General Gutierrez, was arrested for conspiring with Mexico's largest drug cartel. Only 4 hours after President Clinton certified Mexico's cooperation, the police allowed a top money launderer to walk out of custody as a free man. Mexico withheld that revelation from our officials with whom they were supposed to be fully cooperating.

Drug cartels have penetrated the highest level of Mexico's antinarcotics law enforcement agencies. Our own DEA Administrator, Mr. Constantine admits, "There is not one single law enforcement institution in Mexico with whom DEA has an entirely trusting relationship." Mr. Speaker, such a relationship is absolutely essential.

Tom Constantine of DEA, according to newspaper accounts, also states that the damage from this most recent Mexican law enforcement scandal to our war on drugs appears to be worse than that done by the United States spy, Aldrich Ames.

The New York Times editorial of March 12 on this issue of drug-related corruption said, "Unless Mexican President Zedilla attacks these problems boldly by initiating a thorough housecleaning of corrupt officials, Congress should override Mexico's certification." That is the New York Times March 12 editorial.

The administration's statement that the prompt arrest of General Gutierrez, the head of their DEA, demonstrates Mexico's full cooperation on drugs is sadly analogous to a young man who attempts murder on his parents and throws himself on the mercy of the courts, since he is now an orphan.

The resolution before us is simple. It gives Mexico's drug cooperation a failing grade instead of the President's passing grade. Not only are we changing Mexico's grade on drugs, we are also sending a message to this administration that its international narcotics control strategy is sadly lacking.

In addition, based upon our experience last year when Colombian decertification unintentionally cut off key antidrug support, this resolution gives the President the authority to continue United States assistance to Mexico, particularly military assistance, which is likely our last best hope down there if he certifies it is in our vital national interests.

We have already provided 20 excess Vietnam era Huey helicopters to the Mexican military to fight drugs along

our common border and 53 more will soon follow. To suspend FMS assistance and IMET training for the Mexican military now would be counterproductive and render this excess military equipment useless, and that is why we reiterated the waiver.

The strong 27 to 5 vote in our Committee on International Relations vote on March 6 in support of this resolution was evidence of the strong bipartisan sentiment against the President's ill-advised determination of Mexico's real performance in fighting drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to my colleagues that the President made the wrong decision, and this resolution will help us set the record straight, while preserving appropriate assistance and stability in our relations with the Government of Mexico.

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a good friend, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this ill-conceived piece of legislation and in strong support of the position of the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that we keep this issue in perspective. The drug problem is an American problem. It is our problem. It is a demand-driven issue. If there were no demand for drugs in the United States, the drug lords in Mexico and elsewhere would not be able to sell their products.

Now, it is very easy to vote against Mexico. It is very easy to decertify. But our question should be what can we do to most effectively help the fight against illegal drugs?

Passing this ill-conceived legislation will make the Mexican Government less likely to cooperate with us, and it will make the Mexican people justifiably outraged.

There are far too many courageous Mexican policemen, soldiers, judges, journalists, government officials who have lost their lives in the fight against the drug lords. It is an insult to them to attempt to decertify this Government, which has given us better cooperation than we have ever had from Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, we all understand that the cases of corruption in Mexico are appalling. We understand that there are high-level people who have been paid off, and not all of them are as yet imprisoned. But do we decertify the New York City Police Department when there is corruption? Do we decertify the FBI or the CIA when there is corruption and even the sale of our national secrets?

Mr. Chairman, this legislation today has much more to do with political posturing than with helping fight the drug war. There are no negative political consequences for Members in this House from insulting the Government of Mexico.

Last November, the American people made it clear that they want a bipartisan approach to solving the drug problem. This resolution and its amendment is an insult to the President. The President clearly understands that Mexico's record is far from perfect, but it is better than it has been, and it is critical that this Mexican Government work with us in fighting against illegal drugs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. Hamilton. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I support the committee-reported version of House Joint Resolution 58. Let me briefly explain what that language does. It disapproves the President's decision to certify that results in the decertification of Mexico. It permits the President, however, to waive the sanctions associated with decertification if he determines it is in the vital national interests of the United States to do so.

Mr. Speaker, we are confronted here with the application of a law which this Chamber passed. That law requires Mexico, in order to be certified, to have fully cooperated with the United States or to have taken adequate steps to deal with the narcotics problem.

I simply do not believe that Mexico's record over the past year meets the law's high standard for full certification.

I am quick to acknowledge that the president here faced a tough decision. He could certify Mexico as having fully cooperated, and that is what he did; he could decertify Mexico, and of course that raises a lot of difficult foreign policy problems for the United States and Mexico; or he could have decertified but exercised the vital national interest waiver that the law provides.

The President made the judgment that he would certify Mexico. By so doing, he found that Mexico had fully cooperated with the United States in the fight against drugs.

I disagree with that judgment. I believe that this decertification-certification statute should be repealed. It forces the President to make a legal assessment without providing adequate options for the policy dilemma that he faced. It forces him to make a narrow judgment about each country at issue. But, my friends in this Chamber, we do not have the privilege of ignoring the law. We may not like the law, and I do not like the law, but we should not evade the law. And the law provides today, the law which most of us in this Chamber voted for, the law provides that Mexico must fully cooperate. Not partially cooperate, not cooperate more today than it did 2 years ago or 4 years ago. The law provides that they must fully cooperate, and I do not think any person can find full cooperation by the Mexican Government in the fight against drugs. Some cooperation, yes. Maybe it is better than a year or 2 years ago, but not full cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot play fast and loose with the requirements of the law,

because we are the body that makes the law.

Now, let me say if you look back over the last 6 or 7 years, what we have done again and again and again is to find that the Mexicans have cooperated, that they have had great success in combating drugs. Every President has found that now for 7 or 8 years.

We have been deceiving ourselves. We would better serve the national interest, in my view, if we spoke the truth about that cooperation. Some good things, some bad things, but not full cooperation. We should speak the truth, the good and the bad, and we should apply the law. We should not evade the law.

Everybody in this Chamber knows the Mexican record. It does have some good features. The administration believes at the very highest levels of the Mexican Government we are getting good cooperation today. You go down each of the major measures of cooperation, corruption, extradition, the task force, the number of arrests, cooperation on overflight rights and marine agreements and all of the rest, and you cannot find cooperation.

□ 1215

So I believe the best choice here, and the choices are not easy, is to say that the Mexicans should be decertified. But because this relationship with Mexico is so important, because we understand that the national interest of the United States is to stop the flow of drugs into this country, because we understand that we are not going to be able to do that successfully without the cooperation of Mexico, the better thing to do here is to decertify Mexico because they have not fully cooperated, because that is what the statute demands of us, and then to say, because of the importance of this relationship and all of its aspects, we waive, under the national security waiver, and that is the position I think this body should adopt.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], our ranking minority member, for his very strong support of our resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this moment to respond to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] that said if we did not have demand here at home, we would not have the problem. Amazingly, we used to hear that the U.S. demand is a problem when we discussed this issue with other nations. Not anymore, as these other nations' drug use soars and we see their democratic institutions corrupted and threatened from within and destroyed by the drug barons.

It is even sadder to hear it right here at home. Sure, we must do something about demand, and we are. But an unlimited supply of ever purer, cheaper, and more addictive drugs also creates demand. So we must fight this problem on both the supply and demand side.

But we must recognize that the purer and additional supplies coming into our country creates demand, and that is why we are so concerned about the lack of cooperation south of our border.

I would like to note also that the Governor of California, Mr. Wilson, in an article in the Washington Times on March 13 stated, "Let us stipulate to the existence of a tragically large market for illegal drugs and to our own obligation to reduce demand for them by every available means, but the drug trade is one business in which the abundant supply creates demand." That is the Washington Times today by Governor Wilson of California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the distinguished chairman of the committee, for yielding to me, and also for his leadership in this area.

I would just say to my colleagues that now is the time to tell the truth. We have a law which is on the books that orders us to make a judgment, and it is time to make that judgment, and I think that the anecdotal evidence and the statistical evidence that tells us that a large part of the drug trade in Mexico and the drug trade through Mexico to America's children is large segments of the government in Mexico. The government is heavily involved in the drug trade.

Now, if we tell that truth, and that is a truth that is manifested in hundreds of case files, in hundreds of cases that are in the possession of the U.S. attorneys and are on the front pages, if you tell that truth, we cannot in good conscience certify that Mexico has been cooperative in the war against drugs.

About 10 years ago, Kiki Camarena, our drug enforcement agent, was murdered in Guadalajara, and Carroll Quintero, who was later jailed for that murder, coasted down the runway before he took off and toasted our DEA agents with a bottle of champagne as they tried to stop him at the Guadalajara airport, and we said, never again.

We entered a new series of talks with Mexico and thought we would have a new bright dawn, a new era. We thought that that era would rejuvenate, when NAFTA was passed, over the objections of some of us, but that was supposed to boost cooperation with respect to the war against drugs, and that did not work.

Last year, Jefferson Barr was murdered in Texas, and we tried to extradite the killer of Mr. Barr, and Mexico did not give us any more cooperation in extraditing that killer than they did with the killers of Enrique Camarena 10 years earlier.

So I would just say to my colleagues, we have a duty, and it is a simple duty, it is an easy duty to discharge, it is a duty to tell the truth. If we erect that fiction that somehow they have cooperated with us when we know they have

not, we disserve the people of the United States, we disserve the hard-working people in Mexico and the people who have died in Mexico, the good prosecutors who were assassinated trying to turn this war around, and most of all, we disserve our children.

There is no interest more important than our children and their well-being, and there is no way you can make an argument that somehow making this certification helps them.

Please support the bill.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for allowing me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the committee's bipartisan bill to decertify Mexico with the waiver. The fact of the matter is that 75 percent of the cocaine that comes into the United States comes from Mexico. Approximately 25 percent of the heroin that comes into this country comes from Mexico.

Now, my point today is not to lambast the Mexican people. They are certainly fine people. Not to lambast the Mexican police. Many have given their lives for this cause. But the fact of the matter is that the Mexican Government has not complied with our law with respect to full cooperation. That is American law. We only certify if there is full cooperation. There is not full cooperation.

The fact of the matter is that the Mexican drug czar is in league with drug cartels. The fact of the matter is that he lived in a luxury apartment supplied by a major drug dealer. The fact of the matter is that our DEA could not track him because Mexican officials were tracking them. The fact of the matter is there are 150 extradition requests still pending in Mexico where we have requested that they send drug traffickers back to this country for prosecution.

I have to say that I am very concerned when I hear people say, well, this is totally a demand problem. It is not a demand problem, but it is easy to wag your finger at poor kids in the ghettos. It is much harder to take on official corruption, and that is the dual standard that I take offense at.

We should not smooth over this incident. We should say that Mexico has not cooperated fully. But rather, people would like to have harsher penalties on teenagers and mandatory sentences for teenagers. Well, there is a place for that. But there is also a place to stand up and say to the Mexican Government that we expect better performance, we expect a higher standard.

We should not continue to allow business as usual. We will never convince kids in poor communities that we are serious about fighting the war against drugs when all they see is us shaking hands with governments that do business with drug dealers.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can do better; I think the committee has proposed a fair policy, which is to decertify with the waiver.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRADY], a member of our committee.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, today's vote is a difficult one. As a Texan, we share the largest border with Mexico of any State in the country. Mexico is a valued friend and a neighbor of Texas and of the United States. Clearly America and Mexico have an equal stake in stopping the sale and use of illegal drugs in our countries.

My goal is to support legislation of the United States that will effectively and significantly cut off both the supply and the demand for illegal drugs. I recognize the strong commitment of President Zedillo and the stand taken by individual prosecutors, of judges and law enforcement officials in Mexico to challenge the powerful drug cartels. It is a stand which is often life threatening, and more than 20 times in the past year has resulted in torture, in death, and in assassination for our heroic fighters in the international war on drugs.

But what is even more tragic is that the leadership of President Zedillo and the sacrifice of these individuals has been undone by an all too pervasive corruption within the Mexican Government, within its police force, and within the judiciary. It has been undone by an estimated \$6 billion worth of bribes from the drug cartels, \$6 billion which General Barry McCaffrey says has severely impaired Mexico's law enforcement system and, in his words, are ruining cooperative United States-Mexico antidrug operations.

In hearings before our committee America's Drug Enforcement Agency confirms that despite repeated efforts, no Mexican law enforcement agency exists today that the United States can trust, no law enforcement agency with which the cooperative antidrug operations can occur without either compromising the operation itself or the agents, honest agents on both sides of the border, in America and in Mexico.

Now, think about this a minute. Think about how the lack of a single law enforcement agency undermines literally every antidrug initiative our two countries undertake. Imagine the likelihood in America. If the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Agency, every State police, every law enforcement agency could not be trusted, no matter the will of Congress, the will of the President, the chance for success in fighting drugs in our country would be hopeless.

I respect Mexico too much to overlook this fatal flaw, and without the immediate creation of a law enforcement agency we can trust, that both countries can trust, our successes will be isolated, our gains temporary, and our cooperation cosmetic at best.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, for years Mexico has served as a gateway to the United States for drug traffickers. In fact, just 3 weeks ago, Mexico's drug czar was arrested on charges that he took bribes from cocaine dealers. This was just after he received highly sensitive information from U.S. officials detailing our antinarcotic strategy.

Thus, if decertification is what happens to those who have hurt our efforts in the drug war, we must not only decertify Mexico and Colombia, we must also decertify our other unreliable partner in the drug war, the CIA.

Last year the San Jose Mercury News reported that the CIA has had a major role in the flow of illegal narcotics from Mexico and other Latin American countries into the United States. Former financiers of the Nicaraguan Contras, testifying under oath, admitted that the CIA was an active participant in the drug trade and then used the profits to fund covert military operations.

The administration's decision to certify Mexico, decertify Colombia, and sidestep the CIA has made a joke of the entire certification process. I call on the administration and Congress to report to the American people what role the CIA has played in moving drugs in our country.

While drug dealers are preying on America's youth in the inner cities, millions of dollars are being laundered in American banks. Our prisons are brimming over, young people are dying in the streets, and the message that the administration sends is that a buck of trade is worth more than the tears of our mothers, the deaths of our brothers, and the shattered lives of too many American people.

□ 1230

Some of us have just, quite frankly, had enough.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN].

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose House Joint Resolution 58, as well as the amendment to be offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], because I believe the resolution and the amendment send the wrong message to Mexico at a very critical time.

Even with a waiver of the sanctions, the damage will have already been done. Clearly the President had and we have a difficult and unpleasant decision to make. Mexico has serious problems, which no one doubts. The arrest of General Gutierrez-Rebollo, the former commissioner of the National Counternarcotics Institute; the release of Humberto Garcia Abrego, a reputed money launderer; and the general pervasiveness of corruption in Mexico all indicate the depth of the problem.

At the same time, we must recognize the circumstances that President Zedillo and the Mexican Government face. Mexico is striving to defeat the

narcotraffickers at a time of wrenching social and political change. It would be naive to assume that any Mexican leader could produce the kind of change we want in a short time and without enormous effort. So the point of this process ought to be the measurement of the progress Mexico has made, not just a regurgitation of the problems that Mexico has.

A few months ago Mexico had a corrupt drug czar and nobody knew. Two weeks ago, at a crucial point in the certification process, President Zedillo announced that they had arrested their drug czar for bribery and corruption. Had their President not taken this step, we would likely have certified Mexico without much fuss. Now that he has, he is rewarded for his courage with the threat of decertification.

The message here is, do not expose corrupt officials and do not cooperate with the United States. Decertification would have terrible consequences for our relationship with Mexico and for the future of our reform efforts. Already the Mexican Congress has reacted badly to the decertification vote in our Committee on International Relations. With midterm elections coming in July, does anyone think that Mexican politicians who advocate closer ties with the United States will not pay a price? How would a Mexican Congress that we cause to be hostile to the United States help us in the fight against drugs?

And lastly, decertifying Mexico would tell the financial markets that there is greater investment risk, which would lead to higher borrowing costs, higher inflation, lower growth, undermining the economic recovery that benefits us as well as Mexico.

I believe that the better message to send would be to certify Mexico and continue to work with President Zedillo to reduce the flow of drugs into the United States. It is just common sense.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about House Joint Resolution 58. While I will not support it on final passage, I do intend to vote for the Hastert amendment to it.

Let me begin by saying that I have grave concerns about the whole decertification process and whether we should be acting to decertify any country. But I do think that the Hastert amendment represents a real compromise. It is a good-faith effort to try to make the process work better. It stays decertification for 90 days, and it gives the United States and Mexican Governments and diplomatic people time to work on resolving some of the common problems we have.

I am not very optimistic about reaching agreement on those, given the glare of this amendment—of this bill—by

putting people under the gun. But I do think it is a much better solution than full and immediate decertification.

Mr. Speaker, I think everyone in this Congress and everyone in this country wants the same thing. We want the eradication of the poison of narcotics and the scourge of them in our society. And I think everybody agrees we are losing this battle. In the last 4 years we have seen drug use double. We have seen that happen after a 12-year decline in drug use by adolescents. Over the past 3 years, 227 agent positions have been eliminated by the administration from the Drug Enforcement Agency. That is 227 fewer agents at a time when drug use among our youth is increasing.

I represent a district in Arizona along the border. Because we share this common border with Mexico, we see it; we are right on the front lines of this drug war. I can tell the Members from experience, we need more DEA agents, not less. We have to get the support we need on the front lines, and we need it today.

Yes, there is a problem of cooperation with Mexico. We saw that the Mexican drug czar, Gutierrez-Rebollo, was arrested recently. It shows the deep roots of corruption in Mexico. We want to see more progress in this area. But I do not think decertification is the solution. In fact, it is a big part of the problem. Rather than enhancing international cooperation with our neighbors, the process has a boomerang effect. It results in a further deterioration in our international relations.

Like it or not, deterioration of our bilateral relations spills over into cooperation or lack of cooperation in a number of other areas, including drug control. I think the Hastert amendment, while representing a compromise, is likely to prove this out when we come to negotiations on these specific issues.

The conditions placed on Mexico puts them in an almost impossible political situation. If progress is made in the six specified areas, it will be seen in Mexico as kowtowing to the will of the United States. Such a perception puts all reform-minded politicians in Mexico in a box. Even if they want to meet the conditions, it will be politically impossible for them to do so, and remember they have elections in just 90 days there.

Mexico is a proud country. Some might even say it is a nationalistic country. There is a saying in Mexico: Every time the United States sneezes, Mexico gets the flu. There is no question that today's vote is going to have an impact on Mexico and our cooperative efforts to stop narcotics trafficking. Let me tell the Members, I think it is going to have an adverse impact. That is why, in the end, I will vote against the bill on final passage.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, Members are looking at a desperate woman, a woman who is worried and distressed by what I see going on in our country. I have been elected to do something about this problem. I have tried my very best. It has pretty much gone on ears who do not realize what is happening in the inner cities of this community, the community of this world of ours.

I applaud the efforts that have been made by the Clinton administration, the drug czar. I applaud what Mexico has done. But I say to the Members, it is not enough. It is just not enough. The cooperation, the safeguards and all, have not been enough. Mexico has not fully cooperated. They have cooperated, but not fully.

Therefore, I beg this Congress to vote "yes" on decertifying Mexico so the message will be taken that until they straighten up and fly right, we are going to stop the flow of drugs coming into our communities. My constituents say to me, CARRIE MEEK, why can't you do something to stop the drugs coming into inner cities, into the housing projects, killing our senior citizens, killing our children? Why? Why can't you do something? We know, they say to me, that this can be stopped. Whatever the Government wants to stop, they have the resources to stop.

So as much as I would like to help Mexico and all other countries, now we have to save our children, Mr. Speaker. It is just that desperate. We have got to take desperate action. We can no longer say, let us equivocate and try to help. I do not want to help anymore. I want some action. I want to see that the crimes committed in my community by addicts who are selling drugs that were dropped off, and remember, drugs are not brought into the black community by the store, they are brought there by people who are making a living out of this. There is a trade. There is trafficking.

Let us take some drastic action, Mr. Speaker, and see if we can call on this country to stop the flow of drugs by decertifying Mexico or any other country that is assisting this traffic.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. BART STUPAK.

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, when I came down here I was going to speak about extradition and the concerns I have, but as I have listened to the debate, what has gone on here, being a former law enforcement officer for 12 years, I want to tell the Members a little what I see here.

What I see here today is everybody pointing fingers. Everyone is saying this person is corrupt, that person is no good, this policy is wrong. Mr. Speaker, if we take a look at it from a law

enforcement point of view, they are probably very cynical about what is going on here. They are probably very frustrated about what they see in the U.S. Congress.

We cannot be changing policy every 2 years and expect to win a drug war. It is going to take more than 2 years; it is going to take more than 5 years. It is going to take more than 6 or 7 years. From a law enforcement point of view, we cannot be fighting a war on drugs or crime in the United States if we are changing policy.

We are going to have an amendment later today, the Hastert amendment, which basically condemns the administration. In 1993 the administration put forth a crime bill. I did not agree with all of it, but it passed. It became the law of the land. So what happened in 1995? We tried to repeal it. What is going to happen in 1997? We are going to try to repeal it again. What happens in 2000? We will have a new President and they come with a new drug policy, a new drug war, a new get tough on crime.

Mr. Speaker, if we are serious about fighting drugs, whether it is here in the United States or abroad, we must have a sustained policy. By sustained I mean more than 2 years, more than the next election. I know it is not politically expedient, but I ask Members to look at the long-term effect of what we are doing here. It is going to take more than 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that as we vote today, I would hope we would all recognize there is no magic bullet in the war against drugs. If there was, we would have recognized it by now and we would not have a drug problem here in the United States. I would hope that we take a look at what is going on, that we set a course, a policy, and stick to it more than the next election, longer than the next Presidential term, but look at it over the long haul and put our resources and our investments in education, in economic opportunities for everyone, and in working with our partners abroad to fight the drug war.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think Mexico has been there, but let us take a bigger view. Let us take a broader view of this whole thing. Again, from the law enforcement point of view, we are not helping any of us by changing policy every 2 years. The poor ATF agent, the CIA, DEA, ATF, the Customs, the Secret Service, they do not know if they are on foot or horseback, because we keep changing policy. We share some responsibility here.

Before we all point fingers, I hope we would just at least look at what we are doing. I implore the Members to put forth a long-term policy, more than one election's worth.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate whether to disapprove the certification of Mexico as fully cooperating in antinarcotics efforts I feel compelled to voice my concerns on a related matter, the extradition of criminals to the United States from Mexico.

Although I am pleased by recent State Department reports suggesting improvements have been made regarding Mexico's compliance to extradition agreements, I am still extremely concerned with the low number of extraditions being fully carried out. There are currently 110 pending extraditions that the United States Government has requested from Mexico. Fifty-two of these requests are related to drug trafficking.

I am most concerned with Mexico's lack of willingness to extradite Mexican nationals. The Mexican Constitution prohibits extradition of Mexican nationals except under "extraordinary circumstances." Mr. Speaker, no Mexican national has ever been extradited to the United States.

In September of last year, Mexico's President Zedillo delivered his State-of-the-Nation address. In this address, he emphasized the need for a "new culture of respect" for law and law enforcement officials in order to fight crime. We need more than just words to foster an atmosphere of respect. By continuing to allow these criminals freedom from extradition, Mexico is actually endorsing criminal activity. Until the Mexican Government fully follows through with their promises to extradite criminals, a culture of respect will not be possible.

I am truly hopeful that recently held talks between U.S. drug czar Barry McCaffrey and President Zedillo which did address this problem, will result in drastic improvements in the area of extradition. I am aware that President Zedillo's administration has made tremendous strides. Before President Zedillo's administration we never saw any extradition from Mexico, but in 1995 we saw 5, and in 1996 we saw 13.

If we vote to decertify, there is no reason to believe Mexico will continue on their path of progress, or that we will ever see an extradition of a Mexican national. Although the Mexican Government is far from where it should be, we cannot ignore, and should acknowledge the progress they have made. It is because of this progress that I will vote against House Joint Resolution 58.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT].

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan resolution, and I commend our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for his strong leadership in this area.

As my colleagues know, our Nation's chief drug enforcement officer on February 25 said, "There is not one single law enforcement institution in Mexico with whom the DEA has an entirely trusting relationship." Yet on February 28, just 3 days later, President Clinton determined that Mexico has cooperated fully with the United States in the war against drugs.

Finding that determination incredible, I asked a DEA official at a hearing last week if in fact his drug-fighting agency could cooperate in fighting against drugs in this country when there has not been full cooperation, and when we cannot fully trust and depend upon that particular country and

the agencies there. He said absolutely not.

We have a serious drug problem in this country, and as the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] in committee and I and many others recognize, we in this country certainly share some of the blame. There is a demand from this country, and we have to fight against that demand coming from this country. But we must also understand that the demand within our own borders is so much easier to satisfy because of the tremendous amount of narcotics flowing across the borders from Mexico.

The State Department, the very agency that is defending President Clinton's decision to certify here on Capitol Hill, reports to us that approximately 80 percent of the marijuana entering this country comes through Mexico, 70 percent of the cocaine, 30 percent of the heroin. We have learned Mexico now dominates the methamphetamine market. Yet in recent days President Clinton has stepped up his efforts to uphold his determination that Mexico is fully cooperating in the war against drugs.

That, I believe, sends a very bad message to the American people, Mr. Speaker, and it sends a bad message to Mexico as well. Mr. Speaker, some of those who oppose this resolution maintain that decertification of Mexico will lead to destabilization of Mexico. I disagree. In fact, I agree with the New York Times, a paper I do not always agree with. They say that decertification is certainly something we have to consider.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

□ 1245

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that 25 years ago we had the same debate, and Mexico was cooperating then. We have had any number of declarations of war, and yet it seems as though we send the DEA, we send so many people over there, not with the bullets and the resources even to attempt to negotiate a truce as the situation worsens.

How ironic, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] over there and me over here having drafted the bill on which we are working today; and I think everyone is saying, it just does not work. For those that join with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and some on the other side to say, let us get out of the business of certification, let me join. It was a good-faith effort. I thought war meant war. But I do not throw sand in people's faces unless I am prepared to bury them.

There is no sense running around insulting people and threatening people if you do not intend to do anything. With all the wars that we have had, one office has never been on our side in the war, and that is Secretary of State,

no matter whether it was a Democrat or Republican administration.

I am on the Committee on Ways and Means. I have negotiated with them on the North American Free Trade Agreement. Do my colleagues think we might be able to talk about drugs when we are talking about this historic treaty? No, the State Department says, that is apples and oranges. The Trade Representative said: You cannot insult the Mexicans in talking about drugs when you are talking about legitimate trade.

So now we have sanctions here. I tell my colleagues who is going to get the sanctions: Cuba, Iran, Syria, Afghanistan, any country that does not matter to us as it relates to trade or diplomatic relationships. So what have we done? We have just embarrassed ourselves. Now we are just dealing with the sensitivities of the offending nations. I do not think a Nation as great as ours should be shaking their finger at the people on the other side of the border where they know, if we have the decertification or not, nothing, nothing is going to change.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 58 and in support of Mexico's certification as an ally in our war on drugs. We should not see the Government of Mexico as our enemy on the war on drugs but as our most important ally. This is a pivotal issue governing our relations with one another. If we take steps to counter the President's decision to recertify Mexico, we will reverse the progress that we have made, even limited progress.

The Mexican Government has made significant steps in their own internal efforts to curb trafficking of illegal drugs. President Zedillo's administration has been engaged in a campaign to reform the judicial system and crack down on government corruption. Some of our colleagues have cited the occurrences of corruption amongst high-level Mexican officials charged with drug trafficking crimes and other such activities as the basis for decertification.

However, the record demonstrates that the Mexican Government has the political will to purge such characters from its system and that the preponderance of the officials risk their lives and work hard to cooperate on the war on drugs. We need to show our confidence and support of our allies and our friends in Mexico's resolve to counter this internal problem, and we do not do that by slapping Mexico around.

The drug problem runs deeper than the certification and decertification of countries as our allies in the war

against drugs. As long as there are large numbers of drug consumers in our country, the dealers will have great incentives to seek other routes to bring the drugs in. If they do not bring it through Mexico, and I know this from representing an island thousands of miles from Mexico, they certainly will bring it in from other countries. We need to remember that, as long as we have this social scourge in our midst, we will continue to have problems regardless of what happens in Mexico.

We must continue our joint efforts and expand on the progress we have already made and not be caught up in a short-sighted, bad neighbor policy with one of our friends and closest neighbors.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic vote. In fact, this is the first time in the history of the House of Representatives that we have voted to decertify a nation. It is our duty under the Constitution to protect our citizens against all enemies foreign and domestic, but I submit to my colleagues that our Nation, our way of life, and our children's future are in fact under attack by the scourge of drugs that are entering our lands.

If Mexico were to lob missiles across our border, they could not do as much damage as they have done in expediting the flow of drugs into our Nation. I know Mexico is our friend and neighbor, but friends are not accomplices in the painful deaths of our children. Neighbors do not turn away when crime is committed in their backyard. This is the headline from my paper. It has been said by those who support certification of Mexico that we may endanger United States trade and business. To that argument one must ask, can we ignore the slaughter on our streets for the sake of a few dollars on Wall Street? Tens of thousands of Americans have lost their lives as Mexico has reached the status of a narco capital of the world.

What has Mexico done to deserve certification? You heard the statistics. The cocaine, 70 percent of all the cocaine. I submit to my colleagues that a few years ago there was hardly a blip of cocaine coming through. They do not even produce 1 ounce of cocaine in Mexico, and it is coming in, 70 percent, destroying us. Heroin, marijuana, tons of metamphetamines. So my colleagues, I ask, just take a few minutes, look at the facts. It is our responsibility and duty under the laws of this Nation, under the Constitution to pass this certification and decertify Mexico.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Barrett].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the

measure that came out of the committee that decertifies Mexico and gives a vital national security interest. The issue today is not whether we like Mexico or whether we like the Mexican Government. The issue today is whether Mexico has fully cooperated with us in trying to stop the inflow of drugs into this country.

I do not see how there is a person in this room who can say they have fully cooperated when the fact is 70 percent of the cocaine in this country today has come through Mexico. I am sensitive to the concerns of offending Mexico. But it is also a reality that, if we were going to offend them, if we were going to cause economic damage to them, we would not give them a vital national security interest.

All we are doing today is stating the obvious. The obvious is Mexico has not fully cooperated with us. But I am also sensitive to the young men and women in the district I represent in the inner city of Milwaukee who come to me and say: This Government is not serious about the war on drugs; because if this Government were serious about the war on drugs, they would be doing more to stop the drugs from coming into this country. There are many people in my district who think that the Government is part and parcel of this entire scheme. And we have to be sensitive to them and we have to do what we can to send the message that we do not want those drugs in inner cities. We also have to look at this issue in relation to the jobs that have left this country.

When I look at the people in my district, I see many jobs that have now gone to Mexico. What do we get in return? Cocaine on our streets. It is time that the companies that have moved their jobs to Mexico start putting more pressure on the Mexican Government as well. Yes, there is corruption in the Mexican police force. Part of the corruption is due to the fact that they are not paid enough. But you have corporations that have moved down to Mexico to reap huge profits, and they are not paying to increase the professional nature of the Mexican police force.

That is how we are going to end the corruption in the police force in Mexico. But to stand here today and say that there has been full cooperation simply belies reality. We have to recognize what is going on, and we have to send the message that we want full cooperation.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

While I agree with some of what my colleague from Wisconsin just spoke about, I have to say this is an emotional resolution. This is from the heart and not from the head. That is what the problem is that we are dealing with today.

There is no question we are all frustrated with Mexico. We are frustrated

that they have not made the progress that we want them to make. But if we look at Mexico in this last century, they are a changed country. They have made progress. They are moving from a one-party dictatorship to a multiparty democracy. For those of us who have lived along the border, those of us who have traveled and studied in Mexico, the change has been tremendous.

This resolution does not move us forward. It moves us backward. Yes, we do not want more drugs on our streets, we want the Mexicans to do more, but we want to engage the Mexicans to do more. We do not want to push them back into that corner, and that is what this resolution would do. It would do it in a number of ways. First, we would be thumbing our nose at them. Second, we would be undercutting them in the financial markets throughout the world. We want to maintain confidence in the Mexican economy and stabilize the peso so it does not continue to devalue against the dollar so it does not create more exports into the United States but creates more exports back into Mexico.

We want to build up their economy so they have a strong middle class, so they can pay the police officers, pay the military officers, fight off the drug dealers, just like we need to do here in our own country. This resolution takes us in the wrong direction for doing it. Why should we undercut the Zedillo government when it is the really true reform government that is in there trying to make these changes? That does not make any sense whatsoever.

Now, I appreciate that we want to try and do things. I appreciate that we want to try and move them, but we are not going to do it with this resolution. It is in the wrong direction. It is wrong headed. It will not solve the problems with Mexico. It will not belie the fact that we will tomorrow, after we pass this, continue to share a 2000-mile border. They will continue to be our third largest trading partner. They will continue to trade with every State here.

Let us not make this mistake today because of emotions. Let us do what is right.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing perhaps more troubling than this administration's lack of a true drug strategy is the inconsistency of its policies with which it seeks to carry out a nonstrategy.

We are certifying or this administration is seeking to certify Mexico saying they are an A No. 1 full-fledged cooperating partner in the war against drugs, and we are decertifying Colombia which although it has its problems, I think over the course of the last year during which it has been forced to work under the disability of decertification, has made progress.

That is one reason, to bring a little bit more consistency back, that I have introduced a bill, with a number of other very distinguished proponents of consistency in our foreign policies and in our drug policies, that would continue the decertification against Colombia but grant a very important waiver.

Let us talk very briefly about what the debate today concerning Mexico is about and what it is not about. It is not about building up Mexico's self-esteem. It is not about NAFTA. It is not about loans to prop up Mexico's economy. It is not about interfering in a sovereign state.

What we are talking about here is placing limitations on what we are giving to Mexico. That is not interfering in anybody's sovereignty. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that when one looks at Mexico's sorry, sorry record in the war against drugs that one can reach any conclusion other than the fact that they are not a full-fledged A No. 1, fully cooperating partner in the war against drugs. And to claim that is to lose whatever shred of credibility this administration might have or might have able to salvage in the war against drugs.

Mexico does not deserve the imprimatur of a certified country in the war against drugs, and we are not going to do anything whatsoever to get it to get its own House in order by certifying it and say that what you are doing is just fine with us, keep on giving us more of the same.

Those who say, what would decertification get us, are asking the wrong question. We must ask, what has certification gotten us. Nothing.

At least it is time to stand up and do something, Mr. Speaker. I urge support for the resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. JEFFERSON].

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the administration's certification of Mexico as a country cooperating in the war on drugs and to support the bipartisan committee version of House Joint Resolution 58.

Mr. Speaker, my State, Louisiana, is being overrun by drug traffic from Mexico. And my city, New Orleans, is fighting the reputation as the murder capital of our Nation, largely because drugs entering Louisiana from Mexico are driving a spiraling crime rate. Drug merchants battling over drug money and drug turf are killing each other on the streets of our city and across America, often catching innocent citizens, even our children, in the cross-fire.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that because Mexico has been a traditional political and economic ally, it is difficult to now declare that it is not an ally with us in our war against drugs. But the issue here is not politics or the economy. The issue is, how do we find a way to close the floodgates out of Mexico

through which the vast majority of marijuana and cocaine and a large percentage of the heroin flow into our country.

□ 1300

I am not sure how effective our present certification policy is to address this question. I do not know if its inflexible requirement of a pass/fail grade, an A or an F is preferable to a multitiered grading system. And I am far from certain that it makes sense for us to have a certification policy that cuts off antidrug support to countries with the poorest drug fighting records, ensuring that they will do even less, and that punishes the innocent citizens of the decertified countries through the imposition of sanctions that cut off international monetary assistance to their countries while leaving drug kingpins in these countries unaffected and free to continue their illegal drug enterprises.

I do not know, therefore, Mr. Speaker, if we would not be better off to scrap the entire approach of the decertification process and replace it with a law better designed to achieve a more targeted campaign against drug importation.

But this I do know. So long as we have our present policy of listing decertified countries, Mexico deserves its place on that list.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the day when our country has a better and more effective policy to achieve cooperation with Mexico and other countries in stemming the flow of smuggled drugs.

Common sense and compliance with current law demand that we now vote to overturn the certification of Mexico, and I urge the Congress to do so.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ].

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton was right in certifying to Congress Mexican cooperation on narcotics matters with the United States. Critics of the President's decision are mistaken in arguing that there has been little progress on narcotics cooperation. In recommending decertification, they exhibit a limited understanding of the fundamental changes that are occurring in Mexico and the enormous stakes for the United States of continued cooperation with one of this country's most important partners.

At this delicate time in Mexican history, a decision on the part of the United States to decertify Mexico could seriously jeopardize Mexico's efforts to strengthen the rule of law and the collaboration that we have in the war against the drug lords. It would also dampen the Mexico-United States relationship, from trade, to immigration, even to border environmental concerns.

The financial markets would react poorly to a rumble in bilateral relations, undermining the painstaking efforts that Mexico has made to stabilize

its currency and to strengthen its economy. It is the Mexican people who would end up paying the economic price for decertification, not drug traffickers.

And as one who has family in Mexico who fights every day to stop this drug trafficking, it is an affront that this Congress would think that the Mexican people are not working hard to stop drug trafficking. By certifying Mexico, the United States can continue the progress achieved thus far, mindful of the fact that drug trafficking is as much an American problem as it is a Mexican problem.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

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

Mr. BUNNING. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 58.

The President's decision to certify Mexico's nonexistent antidrug efforts is just one more step in his ongoing retreat from the war on drugs. And this Congress should not allow it to stand.

First he cut funding for our own Nation's antidrug programs and emasculated the drug czar's office and now he is saying to Latin America, the status quo is just fine with us.

But take a look at the status quo. It's putrid. Fifty to seventy percent of the cocaine entering the United States comes through Mexico. Twenty to thirty percent of the heroin coming into our country is supplied by Mexico. Eighty percent of the foreign-grown marijuana entering our country comes from Mexico.

With statistics like this staring us in the face, we cannot and should not pretend that the Government of Mexico is making any kind of good-faith effort to stem the tide of corruption and money laundering and drug activity that currently exists in that nation.

I urge my colleagues to support the Hastert amendment to delay certification for 90 days unless the President obtains real assurances that the Government of Mexico intends to cooperate in our antidrug efforts.

Certifying Mexico now would send the wrong message to our friends in Latin America and around the world. If we are serious about fighting drugs, we have to show Mexico we are serious now.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time. I especially appreciate his integrity because he knows I am going to come up here to speak against the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, there is no difference here in my view of the facts than those who are speaking in favor of this decertification resolution. The issue is, what is the approach to get the better cooperation of the Government of Mexico with the United States in reducing the drug trade which affects both of our countries?

I propose that the best approach is a sense of Congress that would embody

many of the statements we have heard here today. I tried to make that in order with the Rules Committee. They chose not to make it in order. If decertification ultimately is not approved, I will still again propose a sense of Congress resolution.

Why do we vote for decertification? Well, first we have been told it is required that we vote for decertification under the law, because Mexico is not fully complying with cooperation in the antidrug trade. But the definition of being fully cooperative seems to be that every official at every level has to be doing his or her utmost, in this case in Mexico, to fight the drug trade.

If that is the standard, Mr. Speaker, there is no country that could probably be certified under that kind of guideline. In fact, if one looks at the Hastert amendment, which states numerous criticisms of the Clinton administration toward fighting the drug trade, one could argue that our own Government could be not fully certified under this exact same criteria if it were being examined from the outside.

The fact of the matter is I believe that we should look at the top of the government, at the top officials. I have heard both Chairman GILMAN and ranking member HAMILTON say that they believe that President Zedillo and his top people in government are committed to fighting the drug trade.

I believe that there are governments in this world where there is no such commitment, and for those governments I do support decertification. But we have to look at the impact of having the President and the top government officials of Mexico on our side.

Several speakers have already mentioned the fact that the recently appointed drug czar in Mexico was removed from that position because he might have ties to the drug trade in that country. How was that gentleman identified as possibly being involved in the drug trade? It was not by our government's intelligence. In fact, my recollection is that General McCaffrey, our own drug czar, was lavish in his praise for the Mexican drug czar, General Gutierrez Rebollo.

It was the Mexican Government that identified this person's connection to the drug trade in Mexico. It was the Mexican Government that removed him publicly from office, knowing that they would take a severe international hit for that kind of action, that it would be a severe international embarrassment for them. They did it, anyway. I believe that we should be working to cooperate with Mexico and not to just trade insults with them.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I also thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman of the committee.

I rise in support of the committee resolution and do not wish to question whether or not this is the perfect vehicle. It is the only vehicle that we have. And though the certification-decertification process may not please any one of us completely, at least it provides us with a way of ending the denial by both Governments, the United States and Mexico, of what is going on with our respective countries.

In fact, I think we should hold a session of Congress at the border. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I have traveled along that border and have had our own border agents tell us, "Well, Congresswoman, you know if you really want to move drugs, you don't do it through this checkpoint. You just drive an over-the-road vehicle a mile away where there aren't any inspectors. And, by the way, hear that airplane up there? We know where that's headed."

Our own Government knows that the border is a sieve. We know of the corruption throughout Mexico related to the drug trade. And today this is the only vehicle that we have to express our displeasure at this administration's actions and prior administrations' actions that continue denial.

I ask myself, why the denial, what are we afraid of as a country? We know we only inspect maybe 1 of every 100 to 200 trucks and vehicles that now come over the border. We have a \$40 billion trade deficit over the last 2 years with Mexico and it is growing. We cannot possibly inspect all of the vehicles that come over that border, and the drug traders know it. They are even picking which vegetable crates to put the stuff in and whether they put it in steel drums or auto rims. It is that cleverly done.

The GAO tells us that Mexico is the primary transit route for cocaine coming in from Colombia. So we decertify Colombia and the administration sort of closes its eyes with Mexico. What sense does that make?

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution, but I hope that we would move in more expeditious ways, beginning with a session at the border. I would urge the chairman's consideration of that alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following newspaper article for the RECORD:

[From the San Diego Union-Tribune, Aug. 4, 1996]

THE DRUG TRADE CLIMBS ABOARD SHIPMENTS OF GOODS FROM MEXICO

(By Peter Andreas)

Mexico has long been enmeshed in the drug trade, but its involvement has been transformed in the last decade. Primarily, Mexico has emerged as the primary shipping point for Colombian cocaine into the United States.

The State Department estimates that the percentage of the cocaine bound for the U.S. market entering through Mexico was negligible during the mid-1980s but increased to as much as 70 percent by 1995. Mexico also supplies up to 30 percent of the heroin consumed in the United States and up to 80 percent of the imported marijuana, according to a March 1996 State Department report.

Mexico earns more than \$7 billion a year from the illegal drug trade, Drug Enforcement Administration estimates. Some Mexican estimates place the figure much higher. The prosecutor general's office estimates that drug traffickers operating in Mexico accumulated revenues of approximately \$30 billion in 1994.

Mexico's growing role in the drug trade has significantly increased the power and wealth of Mexico's trafficking organizations and that has, in turn, exacerbated well-entrenched political corruption.

Corrupt officials sell an essential service to drug traffickers: the nonenforcement of the law. Not surprisingly, as Mexico's role in the illicit drug trade has grown, so too has the buying off of law enforcement—not only within Mexico, but on the U.S. side as well.

Not coincidentally, Mexico's expanding role in the drug trade parallels the opening of the Mexican economy and the deepening of U.S.-Mexican economic integration.

Colombian cocaine traffickers began turning to Mexico as a major entry point to the U.S. market in the early 1980s after the United States cracked down on cocaine shipping through the Caribbean. By now a strategic alliance exists between Colombian and Mexican traffickers. The Colombians process the cocaine and ship it to Mexico, the Mexicans smuggle it into the United States.

Mexican imports of legal goods from Colombia increased from \$17 million in 1980 to \$121 million in 1985. At the same time, Mexican imports from the rest of Latin America decreased from \$768 million to \$630 million.

Legal exports from Mexico to the United States doubled between 1986 and 1993. Hiding drug shipments within the growing volume of goods exported from Mexico to the United States has become an increasingly favored method of smuggling cocaine.

These trends thrive under the North American Free Trade Agreement.

A report written by an intelligence officer at the U.S. embassy in Mexico City claims that cocaine traffickers established factories, warehouses and trucking companies as fronts in Mexico in anticipation of the cross-border commerce boom under NAFTA.

"If NAFTA provides opportunity for legitimate businesses, it may clearly provide opportunities for illegitimate businessmen," Assistant U.S. Attorney Glenn MacTaggart has said.

Trucking provides the most concrete illustration of this trend. According to one senior customs official, to inspect every truck coming across the border would create a traffic jam as far as Mexico City. So only a small percentage of trucks are fully inspected.

Under the NAFTA agreement, trucking into the United States from Mexico is increasing rapidly. In 1994, 2.8 million trucks crossed over from Mexico. In 1993, on the eve of NAFTA, the number was 1.9 million. The U.S. Southwest Border Capital Improvement Program will upgrade the road network so that it will be able to handle more than double today's traffic level—as many as 8.4 million trucks annually.

Mexican truckers will soon be allowed to operate throughout the border states of Arizona, California, New Mexico and Texas. They will eventually be able to travel anywhere in the United States and Canada.

Trucks can carry illegal goods as easily as legal goods. One truck that was stopped near San Diego carried 8 tons of cocaine stuffed into cans of jalapeno peppers. Law enforcement officials believe that the cocaine belonged to a businessman who owns one of the biggest trucking companies in Mexico.

As part of an effort to hide drugs within trans-border shipments of legal goods, some Mexican traffickers have reportedly hired trade consultants to determine which products move most quickly through border inspection under NAFTA guidelines. "They

have very specific issues," notes Craig Chretien, the special agent in charge of the DEA's San Diego office. "Does a perishable get through quicker than a load of steel? What kind of cargoes go through faster than others?"

Concerns about drug control were not discussed during the negotiations over NAFTA. "This was in the too hot to handle" category," says Gary Hufbauer, an economist at the Institute for International Economics in Washington, D.C. Reportedly, U.S. customs and drug enforcement personnel openly call NAFTA the "North American Drug Trade Agreement."

Meanwhile, the privatization of state-owned enterprises and the deregulation of the Mexican banking system facilitate the laundering of drug profits.

And the cutting of government subsidies in Mexico's rural areas are increasing the incentive for peasant farmers to produce illegal crops such as marijuana.

An internal DEA report—obtained by the National Security Archive through the Freedom of Information Act—concludes that "increased illicit drug production will probably be a direct result of the discontinuation of subsistence crop subsidies." Drug production is expanding in Mexico's more remote rural regions.

Efforts to cut the foreign drug supply into the United States have a long history of failure. And the likelihood of success diminishes further as market liberalization and economic integration propel ever more extensive cross-border exchange.

Evaluations of free market reform are largely divorced and insulated from evaluations of drug market prohibition. Thus, congressional committees and government agencies endlessly debate how to attack the drug supply and gain greater cooperation from Mexico and other Latin America countries.

Meanwhile, those concerned with the implementation of market-based reforms carefully monitor an assortment of economic indicators. The reports they publish rarely even mention the drug trade, let alone discuss its ties to the formal economy.

It is as if drug trafficking were not an economic matter at all. But while such institutionalized denial may be politically convenient, it perpetuates both a fundamental misreading of the problem and unworkable strategies for dealing with it.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, the level of drug corruption in Mexico is indeed a real and serious problem. I sympathize with many of our colleagues who are frustrated with America's own drug addiction and are in search of quick solutions. However, Mr. Speaker, humiliating Mexico with the threat of decertification is not the answer. Neither is cutting off Mexico's bilateral aid and access to multilateral bank loans, which decertification mandates, while thrusting Mexico in the company of Iran, Burma and Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Mexican President Zedillo has acted in good faith in stating narcotics trafficking is the greatest threat to Mexico's own national security. Certainly his administration has taken steps to combat the tremendous drug trade.

Mr. Speaker, in February, Mexico's appointed drug czar, General Rebollo, was arrested for ties to drug lords. While many of our Members were outraged and saw this as a sign of pervasive corruption in the Mexican Government, I see it differently. I believe President Zedillo should be commended for his courage in revealing this embarrassing and damaging incident at a highly sensitive time, and his administration's commitment to pursue corruption at the highest levels should be recognized and commended.

Mr. Speaker, in examining the situation in Mexico, it raises doubts in my mind about the entire drug certification process conducted by our own country. I find it hypocritical that we sit here and condescendingly judge other sovereign nations on their anti-drug efforts while America constitutes one of the largest consumer narcotics markets in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask, how many Americans, not foreigners, how many American drug lords have we prosecuted lately? How would it sit with us if other countries suddenly based their relations with our Nation on foreign assessments of how rigorously and successfully we are combating drug consumption in America? Is it any wonder that this month the Mexican Congress voted unanimously to condemn the United States certification process as being insulting to their national dignity?

Mr. Speaker, decertifying Mexico will only deny the real accomplishments of President Zedillo, discourage Mexican cooperation in the future for joint narcotics interdiction, and alienate the good people of Mexico.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and an acknowledged longtime fighter and expert on the drug war.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think that everybody here understands that today in our history the United States has a supply of drugs that is cheaper, more potent and more available than any time in our history. One of the primary reasons why that is so is because the Government of Mexico has not been fully cooperating with the United States in the war on drugs. It is by no means the only reason why we have this problem. I think up front we need to say that President Zedillo has been cooperating, he personally has been, and some of the top people in his administration have been cooperating. They have been encouraging money laundering laws to be established, they have been doing things recently to vet the situation there for their law enforcement community to get rid of the corruption that is rampant. But the truth of the matter is that Mexico is not fully cooperating, which is what the certification laws require. They have clearly not been fully cooperating when we

look at the question of the fact that our Drug Enforcement Administration officers that interface the most in law enforcement on the drug issue have been unable to accept the word or trust anybody in law enforcement in Mexico for some time, and when they did put their faith recently in one individual, they got burned. It is not fully cooperating when that condition exists. And so the resolution is very appropriate today. We need to pass it. I believe the Hastert amendment is also appropriate, not only because the certification process is flawed in my judgment and we need the commission that is in there, but also because it lays forth some of the other facts that I think are very critical to us today in this war on drugs.

The fact of the matter is that we cannot win the war on drugs unless we have a balanced program. The particular program that we are looking for is to say two things: First, in the interdiction area with regard to Mexico, there is going to be a 90-day period in this Hastert amendment which if the administration, our administration, gets Mexico to cooperate more on, then the decertification trigger will not even happen.

□ 1315

One of those things is to get more law enforcement agents of the United States inside Mexico. If they will show progress toward doing that, that will be one of the things that will help, and that these DEA agents, if they are inside Mexico, can carry arms for their safe protection, and there are more radar sites to be handled, and so on. If certain things happen, then there would not even be a decertification of the Hastert amendment occurring and the debate will not even be there.

The other thing is the Hastert amendment shows and spells out the fact that we have not been doing enough in the United States in a balanced approach to win this war on drugs. Too much emphasis, and I think we should have some on rehabilitation, and not enough emphasis on education, and most of all not enough emphasis on the interdiction program, on the resources we need to supply; our own Government has not been doing enough, and it is spelled out in the Hastert amendment.

So I urge the adoption of the amendment and the adoption of this decertification resolution.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, as a former law enforcement official I am deeply concerned about the certification and the effect that it will have because we do have cooperation on both sides, and I wonder how many of us has taken time to travel to the border and to talk to judges

from both sides of the border, to talk to police on both sides of the border, because believe me, now we have a tier, a level, of cooperation that begins here all the way down. We are looking at the top. Well, what about the cooperation between State, county and cities? If we decertify Mexico, we destroy this foundation that has taken time to build.

I know this. I used to be a sheriff in south Texas. There exists a tremendous working relationship between officers who care, officers who have given of their life, whose families have been threatened. But they have been dedicated to making both countries a better place for their children and my children to reside.

It is not easy; it is hard. But the dedication continues to be there, their loyalty to make our areas better. Do we want to destroy this foundation that has taken time to build? We cannot afford to do that.

As my colleagues know, last year Mexico captured and extradited to the States, Humberto Garcia Abrego, a world-renown lord, the head of the Gulf cartel. Garcia Abrego was recently sentenced to life in prison. That was an act of enormous national political courage on Mexico's part.

As my colleagues know, both sides of the border are poor. We have enormous problems on both sides of the border. I was in law enforcement for 15 years before I came to this House. There is a lot of things that go on that we do not see. A lot of information is traded back and forth between local, State, county officials on both sides, and I implore to my friends: Let us take time before we do anything that we will regret for a long time. There is a lot at stake.

Mexico is a country that has pride, sure. Bad apples? We got them on our side, and we continue to lose friends, and I am talking about this great country, because we seem to want to appear worldwide as a knight in shining armor. Everybody is wrong; we are the only ones that are correct and right.

Let us not make this mistake. Let us not decertify Mexico.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and a senior member of our Committee on International Relations, a gentleman who has stood shoulder to shoulder in this war against drugs, especially with helping our allies, the Colombian National Police.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that there is enough blame to go around. Obviously we do have a consumption problem here in the United States, but a major part of the responsibility for the drug problem in America rests in Mexico, and for people to deny that and say that it is all our problem is in my opinion a ludicrous argument. Let me just give you some facts:

Seven hours after the President's certification of Mexico was made public

Mexico's attorney general issued a statement that its own senior officials had allowed Humberto Garcia Abrego, a reputed money launderer and brother of convicted drug kingpin Juan Garcia Abrego, to walk free from police custody. They waited until the certification took place, and then they released this known drug dealer.

Thomas Constantine, the administrator of the U.S. DEA said on February 25, "Historically, corruption has been a central problem in DEA's relationship with counterparts. In short, there is not," now get this, "In short, there is not one single law enforcement institution in Mexico with whom DEA has an entirely trusting relationship," not one in all of Mexico.

According to the DEA, 70 percent of the cocaine entering the United States comes across the Mexican-American border, and that is up from 50 percent just about 3 or 4 years ago, a huge increase. Despite an apparent increased level of production in transit, Mexico's cocaine seizures in 1996 are less than half of what they were 5 years ago. There has been an increase, but the seizures are down by more than 50 percent, 23.8 metric tons in 1996 compared to 50.3 metric tons in 1991.

The bottom line is they are not cooperating. Should we reward that kind of activity? It makes no sense to me. The Mexican Government takes credit for firing 1,200 officials for corruption, but not one of those people has been prosecuted, not 1 out of 1,200. U.S. extradition documents cite evidence in a single case that the attorney general and 90 percent, get that, 90 percent of the police, prosecutors and judges in Tijuana and the State of Baja California are on the payroll of a major drug cartel, 90 percent of them. That is amazing.

Although the United States Department of Justice has submitted provisional warrants for the arrest of Mexican drug kingpins, only one, Juan Garcia Abrego, a dual national, has been sent to the United States to face justice.

And finally, drug-related arrests in Mexico are down dramatically, dramatically down in the last 4 years; 11,283 in 1996 compared to almost 28,000 just a few years ago.

Mr. Speaker, we need to send the strongest possible message to Mexico right now. Let them start helping us. America is fighting a losing battle against drugs, and we need their help.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN].

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Gilman-Hamilton bipartisan committee proposal and in opposition to the Hastert amendment.

Mr. Speaker, on March 8 the Mexican police and the State of Chiapas illegally detained two Jesuit priests and two Mayan Indians. The two priests, Fathers Rosas and Hernandez, had been beaten, tortured and continued to be

imprisoned on the outrageously false charges of participating in the deaths of two policemen. The priests were actually at a religious conference at the time the deaths occurred.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter into the RECORD at this time the announcement of this abuse by the Society of Jesus in Mexico and a summary of the news articles. We can no longer turn a blind eye to such human rights abuses in Mexico, and again I urge a no vote on the Hastert amendment in order to get to a yes vote on the Gilman-Hamilton proposal.

Yesterday, the 8th of March, the Government of Chiapas illegally detained two priests of the Society of Jesus, Gonzalo Rosas Morales and Jeronimo ALberto Hernandez Lopez, as well as Francisco Gonzalez Gutierrez and Ramon Parcerio Martinez whom it attempted to like to a supposed ambush in which two members of the State Public Security Police were supposed killed.

The Society of Jesus in Mexico utterly rejects the version of the events that has been given out by the State Government of Chiapas. It similarly rejects that these detained persons had any responsibility in the illicit acts of which they are accused. The State Government of Chiapas has falsified reality and in so doing has given serious provocation against the rule of law and order, against the peace and against human rights.

Fathers Rosas and Hernandez have distinguished themselves in their work of several years of pastoral accompaniment in solidarity with the Indian peoples of the northern part of Chiapas State. In like manner, they have participated in processes of organization and initiative that the indigenous communities have been furthering in their search for a greater justice, welfare and fraternity between peoples. We affirm categorically then they had no involvement in the acts for which they have been wantonly accused.

For its part, the Coordinator of Social Organizations, Xi'Nich',—and not "Arriera Nocturna" which the State Government mentions—is a legal group made up of indigenous people who are struggling peacefully to satisfy their most basic needs. The false accusation against Xi'Nich' and against its detained members represent an aggressive message against those who keep within the legal framework to find a solution to their demands.

In the difficult context of violence that is being experienced in the State of Chiapas, this provocation is extremely irresponsible.

We ask for the immediate and unconditional release of all the detained persons. We ask for the truthful clarification of the events and the cessation of all police harassment. We repeat that, despite the defamations of this type, the work of the Jesuits will be maintained, faithful to our mission in the service of the faith and the promotion of justice.

Reuters News Service reported today that two Jesuits had been arrested, beaten and charged "with leading a deadly ambush against police" in the Mexico state of Chiapas.

Arrested were Frs. Gonzalo Rosas and Jeronimo Hernandez. The arrests took place on Saturday afternoon at Palenque, a tourist city 150 km. east of the state capital Tuxtla Gutierrez.

Two Mayan Indian leaders were also arrested—Francisco Gonzalez and Ramon Parcerio. The four were charged with "taking part on Friday in an ambush of state police who hours earlier forcibly removed peasants

from farms they had illegally occupied. In the ambush two policemen were killed and five others injured."

Diocesan officials in San Cristobal de las Casas contradicted the police version, however, saying the two priests were in that city "at the time of the ambush after having taken part in a religious conference."

Reuters reported that dozens of plainclothes and uniformed police violently yanked the pair from their car. The police showed no arrest warrant and have since added false weapons possession charges against one of the priests.

According to Reuters, after the police removed the peasants on Friday from two local collective farms they had occupied since 1994, members of a local Indian rights group called Xi-Nich blocked a local highway to protest the police operation and demand the release of their arrested comrades. Police claim they peacefully broke up the protest and were later ambushed by the priests and the two Xi-Nich leaders.

Xi-Nich, however, said in a statement on Sunday that police, backed by helicopters, began firing at the highway protesters, who fired back.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH], a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 58. As one of the 10 original cosponsors of this bill, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida for his leadership in sending this important message that the status quo on the war on drugs is not good enough.

The deadly tide of illegal narcotics, much of which flows to the United States through our southern border, should be a top national health and security priority. What other external threat has such a direct impact on our communities, our streets, and our children every day?

The President's decision on February 28 that Mexico had fully cooperated with the United States in the battle against illegal narcotics sends the wrong message at the wrong time. Mexico sadly has simply failed to make the progress in joining us in the war on drugs that we had every right to expect.

Our message today is that this is totally unacceptable. Much of the violence on our streets of our cities is related to the torrent of illegal narcotics flooding into our country. This is a matter of life and death for many of our citizens.

As the gentleman from Georgia earlier noted, the President felt it was important to send a message to Colombia again this year by decertifying them and withholding assistance. If this was a good drug policy, then I believe it is critical to make clear to Mexico that our assistance to them is conditioned on strong bilateral cooperation and domestic action. To do otherwise is to hold out a double standard, which is not in the long-term best interests of

the citizens of Mexico or the citizens of the United States.

In my view this resolution finds the appropriate balance between an honest assessment of Mexico's performance in drug interdiction efforts and continued support for those in Mexico committed to arresting, prosecuting, and convicting drug traffickers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join in support of this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for House Joint Resolution 58, Disapproving the Certification of the President Regarding Foreign Assistance to Mexico. As one of 10 original cosponsors of this bill, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida for his leadership in sending this important message that the status quo in the war on drugs is not good enough.

The deadly tide of illegal narcotics, much of which flows to the United States through our southern border, should be a top national and security priority. What other external threat has such a direct impact on our communities, streets, and children each day? The President's decision on February 28, that Mexico had fully cooperated with the United States in the battle against illegal narcotics sends the wrong message at the wrong time. Mexico, sadly, has simply failed to make the progress in joining us in the war on drugs that we had every right to expect.

Our message today is that this is unacceptable. Much of the violence blighting the streets of our cities is related to the torrent of illegal narcotics flooding our country. This is a matter of life and death for many of our citizens. As the gentleman from Georgia noted, the President felt it was important to send a message to Colombia again this year by decertifying them and withholding assistance. If this is good drug policy, then I believe it is critical to make clear to Mexico that our assistance is conditioned on strong bilateral cooperation and their vigorous domestic action. To do otherwise is to hold out a double standard which is not in the long-term best interests of the citizens of Mexico or the citizens of the United States.

This resolution finds the appropriate balance between an honest assessment of Mexico's performance in drug interdiction efforts and continued support for those in Mexico committed to arresting, prosecuting, and convicting drug traffickers. Thomas Constantine, Administrator of the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, told a congressional committee on February 25:

Historically corruption has been a central problem in DEA's relationship with Mexican counterparts. In short, there is not one single law enforcement institution in Mexico with whom DEA has an entirely trusting relationship.

We should not make a mockery of the annual certification process by turning a blind eye to the shortcomings of Mexican efforts.

Mexico's criminal cartels are now our No. 1 threat when it comes to drugs; 70 percent of the cocaine that enters the United States comes from the southwest border and we even see this poison in my district on the U.S. northern border. Increasingly we are seeing larger levels of methamphetamine, marijuana, and heroin moving across our border. Last year, Mexico's drug cartels shipped approxi-

mately 300 tons of cocaine, 150 tons of methamphetamine and 15 tons of heroin to the United States. Moreover, the Mexican Government has refused to let the 20 new DEA agents Congress appropriated money for to enter Mexico, and barred U.S. law enforcement agents from carrying weapons. This is inexcusable and vitiates any argument about full cooperation and partnership.

Omniously, illegal drug use has been on the rise in recent years among our young people in America. It is clear that the wrong response to this tragic increase is to be satisfied with where we are. While as some have argued here we need to work harder in our communities to limit the demand for narcotics which kill dreams and kids, we should not be telling our children that the status quo is adequate, when it is not. We should not be telling Mexico and the predatory drug cartels which operate in Mexico, that our Nation is apathetic to outcomes. We are no longer satisfied with an annual public relations gesture; the time has come to condition assistance on results not promises. This resolution does just that and has my wholehearted support.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, oppose the Clinton administration's ill conceived policy of expediency, and send a message that Congress won't tolerate the Mexican drug trade any longer.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES], a distinguished new Member and a good friend.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to come again for the third time, I think, today to urge my colleagues to stop and think about the ramifications and the serious consequences of what we are doing in this great institution today. I say that with a tremendous amount of trepidation because, having firsthand experience, having the background that I share in common with my colleague from Florida [Mr. SHAW], my colleague from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ], it is difficult to sit here and watch what is going on here in terms of the statements that are going on the RECORD that will be scrutinized not only by our constituents in respect to our districts, but also will be scrutinized very carefully by the people of Mexico, by the Government of Mexico and the people of Latin America.

I think there have been a number of points that have been made here. I think there have been way too many statistics that have been thrown around. I think we have obfuscated the real issue and the real context of what we ought to be doing in this body representing the people of this great Nation.

I know that all of us share a frustration about what the scourge of drugs has done to our neighborhoods, what it has done to our children, what it is doing to our institutions, but no one understands these issues better than the Government of Mexico, better than the citizens of Mexico. Certainly nobody has paid a higher price than the Government of Mexico, nobody has paid a price and continues to pay the price and will continue to pay the price

if we stand here and allow the amendment or the resolution to go forward to decertify Mexico.

I am proud to tell this body that I was probably the first to urge the President to certify Mexico. I think to not certify Mexico would be very counterproductive. Not only does it send the wrong message to the Mexican Government, but it sends clearly the wrong message to the Mexican people, a people that collectively have paid a very high price.

□ 1330

I ask my colleagues in this Congress to listen to the implications, to listen to the consequences. For anyone to think that a decertification move on Mexico would not have serious political consequences and would not destabilize the country and would not lead to economic destabilization, is to me incredible. But then in the context of the argument, in the context of what we have discussed, in the context of what I have heard in this Chamber today, that, for me at least, would not be surprising.

Mr. Speaker, I just hope that sanity and reason prevail. I hope that we understand the implications of what we are about to do if we do not stand with the President and agree to certify Mexico.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to strongly emphasize that all of us in this Chamber take the responsibility to listen to this debate, to come to some resolution. We are missing the mark, and I think to a large extent overpoliticizing this statement about certifying or decertifying.

We have got to get together, decent, honest Americans, must get together with decent, honest Mexicans. It is as simple as that.

There are drug profiteers in Mexico; there are drug profiteers in the United States. It is an external problem; it is an internal problem.

Let us be clear on just a couple of points. The United States is responsible for 60 to 70 percent of the world's consumption of drugs. It is a lucrative, lucrative business.

The Mexican Government is spending billions of dollars trying to fight this. They are confronted with tens of billions of dollars on the other side which we, the American consumers of drugs, are supplying to Mexico.

As has been documented, Mexico's problems arise because the shift in the drugs from the Caribbean up from Colombia through Mexico has taken place in dramatic proportions in the last few years. Amazingly, we are now discussing at a point when Mexico is moving into an arena where they can begin, however small, in a very small way, to begin to resist the drug cartels. We are

talking about decertifying Mexico as though it was somehow Mexico's problem, Mexico's problem, to save us from ourselves.

We have all these laws which say just say no. Now, we say it with our laws, but we do not seem to say it with our noses. We always seem to be pointing the finger at the wrong people.

Mr. Speaker, it is always politically convenient to blame somebody else. It is time that we demand from Mexico what we must demand from ourselves.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the committee for yielding me time.

I rise in strong opposition to House Joint Resolution 58 in its totality and to all amendments. This effort to disprove the decertification of Mexico as a fully cooperating partner in the fight against drugs is misguided. If Congress adopts this resolution, the United States is sending the wrong message to the government and the people of Mexico.

We should be strengthening our ties to Mexico and helping the Mexican Government in its fight against drugs rather than punishing them with punitive measures that will hurt, not help, the fight against drug trafficking.

By any reasonable standard, the efforts and policies that President Zedillo has instituted over the last several years to combat the scourge of drugs in his country have been a success. Marijuana, cocaine, and heroine seizures are all up by 40 percent since 1994. Drug-related arrests are up significantly. The extradition process has been strengthened. Major anticrime legislation dealing with money laundering and organized crime in Mexico have been passed and adopted into law.

I know many Members see the arrest of General Rebollo on ties to the Mexican drug cartels as an indication of systematic, systemwide failure on the part of the Mexican Government. If nothing else, the swift arrest of General Rebollo is a strong indication of President Zedillo's commitment to punish corruption and to ensure that no one else is seen as above the law.

The United States Government must continue to keep the pressure on and work with those elements of the Mexican Government that are on the side of change. But decertifying Mexico and cutting off the minimal assistance we do provide would be a major mistake.

We have made great strides with Mexico in the last several years, and we should not undermine that success with this vote. Decertifying Mexico will only hurt the Mexican economy, fuel nationalistic resentment, and set back United States-Mexican relations.

We have to be aware of the fact that it is the insatiable craving for drugs in this country that does as much to undermine Colombia and Mexico and others who have developed these huge narco-drug trafficking involvements.

These folks are suffering far more than many Americans who we represent here on the House floor.

We have got to get our House in order. We have got to reduce our demand through every possible means, not just in terms of corrections and law enforcement, but in terms of helping people in this country through education and treatment.

Mr. Speaker, when we take those steps, then perhaps we will be in a better position to take an attitude of somewhat self-righteous criticism toward our friends to the south.

So I urge a no vote at this time on H.R. 58 and on the Hastert amendment.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress during the Presidency of Ronald Reagan, that President faced a situation in which he needed to have our Congress commit an additional \$10 billion to the International Monetary Fund.

You might say what does that have to do with the issue at hand? But it laid the background for this Member on how I finally cast my vote on the pending measure.

The President saw that many of us were reluctant to commit additional American dollars for an International Monetary Fund where we could not see immediate benefits or additions to the national security. But the President then, Ronald Reagan, at a meeting we had in the Oval Office, termed it and turned the question into one of foreign policy. He felt that support for the additional \$10 billion was to support the President in a foreign policy initiative.

That was enough for many of us. We turned around and did support the infusion of new American dollars into the International Monetary Fund.

Faced with that same configuration here, at first my inclination was to support the President, because I termed it first in my own heart as a foreign policy question, should we not support the President in a foreign policy initiative? But that would mean I would have to overlook the statute, which is the organ at issue here. And in doing so, I would be, in trying to support the President, flaunting the congressional act which is at the core of this entire issue.

So, reluctantly here, I differentiated from a foreign policy question, and I simply term it as one of implementation of current law as we, the Members of Congress, fashioned it, and as we are bound to enforce it.

Mr. Speaker, with that background, I support the resolution at hand.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, [Mr. BARTON].

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are here today engaged in a debate about whether the government of Mexico has fully complied in their efforts to cooperate with the United States of America in the war against drugs.

We seem to be putting a lot of emphasis on the word "fully." I want to ask the Members of this body, have we fully cooperated with ourselves? How many Members of this body have a drug testing program in their office? One, two. I have got mandatory, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] has one. That is 2 out of 435.

How many Members of this body have a full-time antidrug coordinator on their congressional staffs in their district and how many Members of this body have done everything possible in terms of education and outreach in their congressional districts?

I think we should first look at ourselves before we look south of the border. But let us look south of the border, and look at what happened just in the last year.

Is Mexico trying to do its part? In 1996, they eradicated 56,000 acres of marijuana production. How many did we eradicate in this country? In 1996, they eradicated 36,000 acres of poppy production. In 1996, they seized 24,000 kilograms of cocaine, they seized 363 kilograms of heroin, and they seized 1,006 of marijuana.

Let us look at extradition. There seems to be quite a bit of concern in the Congress about extradition. Before 1995, the Government of Mexico had never extradited anyone, nada, zero. In 1995, they extradited 5 non-Mexicans. In 1996, last year, 16, of which 2 were Mexican nationals. In the 2 months of this year, January and February, they have extradited six people.

We have pending 135 active requests for extradition, of which we classify 14 as priority. Eight of those are drug related, three are murder related, and two are violent crimes-related. Eleven of them are Mexican nationals, one is a United States citizen, and one is a Cuban. I feel very confident that throughout the legislative process this year, many of those people will be extradited once they have been apprehended in Mexico.

Let us look internally. In 1996, Mexico arrested within their borders 28 major drug kingpins. They made over 11,000 total arrests. Within their own law enforcement agencies they arrested, detained, or dismissed 1,200 of their 4,500 national antidrug force.

They have passed and changed their Constitution to have the first organized crime statutes on their books. That was not passed until October 1996. They changed their Constitution and changed their penal code to make money laundering illegal. That was done in the latter part of this year, begun in May 1996. They have decided they cannot totally cleanse their antidrug law enforcement agencies as they are, so they are starting from scratch to rebuild in totality. Overall, they

spent \$1.7 billion, which is double as a percent of their Federal budget what we spent on antidrug efforts.

Are they doing enough? No, they are not. Should we decertify them because they are not doing anything? No, we should not. Please vote against these resolutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] has 18½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 7¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] has 8½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the gentleman who just left the well that not one of those extraditions has been a Mexican national on a drug offense. That is the problem that we are facing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman New York [Mr. PAXON].

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 58, a resolution to reverse the President's February 28 certification of Mexico as a nation fully cooperating with the United States in its war on drugs. The facts, unfortunately, show otherwise.

Mexico is the entry point of most of the drugs that are sold in the United States. It is the transfer point of 70 percent of the cocaine and up to 80 percent of the marijuana brought into this country and sold on the streets of the United States.

However, this is not and should not be just a debate about Mexico and its failed war on drugs. Rather, unfortunately, this debate is underscoring the lack of leadership from our own administration in the war on drugs.

One of the President's first actions was to slash the budget of the drug czar. Then his Attorney General suggested we reduce mandatory minimum sentences for drug traffickers. But the icing on the cake if you will remember back was when one of the top leaders of his administration suggested legalizing marijuana.

□ 1345

It is ironic, I believe, that the President was claiming success in the war on drugs during his press conference certifying Mexico at the exact same time that the Partnership for a Drug-Free America was releasing a study showing that the domestic war on drugs is a total and utter failure.

Mr. Speaker, what are the results of this failed leadership? Well, let me tell my colleagues. The war on drugs was successful in the 1980's, and drug use went down steadily for 11 years prior to 1992. Since 1992, drug use by teenagers has risen 105 percent. The Partnership study released last week showed that in 1 year drug use doubled amongst teenagers, from 1995 to 1996, doubled amongst teenagers. We have now found, according to the Partnership, that 1 in 4 children nationwide was offered drugs in 1996.

Most of these drugs end up in the hands of children in our communities, in our home towns. But let me emphasize, this is not a debate on statistics, this is a debate on real lives, the lives of the children in our country today.

I believe very strongly that the sponsors of House Joint Resolution 58 are right on track. We need to make very clear to the Government of Mexico we are serious, but it must not stop there. If the administration in this country is not willing to take the leadership in fighting the war on drugs, this Congress will have to step up to the plate and exercise our leadership to make sure that the war on drugs is real and that the future of our children is saved for the generations to come.

Before I yield back I would note that the attorneys general of both Arizona and California, Attorney General Grant Woods and Attorney General Dan Lungren, have sent a letter to the President, of which we have obtained copies, underscoring their support for the effort to decertify Mexico and to take this very strong and clear stand today.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the committee's resolution and against the Hastert amendment. I have to say that I come to this floor reluctantly. I regret that I and many other Members find themselves in the unfortunate position of having to support the decertification and waiver for Mexico as an ally in the drug war.

Over the last several weeks, Democrats and Republicans working together authored legislation that would decertify, but waive sanctions. I commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] for their hard work.

The bill also includes language requiring that the administration begin to consult and work with Congress in addressing the problem facing both of our countries with regard to drugs.

There are many who oppose this effort and I deeply respect their opinions. But I believe that under the law, we have to respond, and the response that I think has to be given is decertification, but waiver. I hope that in the days ahead we get a chance to consider changing the underlying law. I am uncomfortable with certifying or decertifying Colombia or Mexico or other countries, or our own efforts with regard to the war against drugs.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership yesterday chose to allow an amendment to be offered that gratuitously attacks the President's actions to address the problem of drugs in this country. To me, this is simply an effort to gain partisan advantage from the fear that we all share about the impact of drugs in our country.

The war on drugs should not be a political football. Parents across America deserve to know that their leaders are working together to solve these problems. They want to be able to send their kids to school and to play with their friends free from the fear that drugs will be offered.

The question before us today is whether or not Mexico has fully cooperated to fight the war on drugs. This is not a question of motive. It is a question of fact. I deeply respect those who are valiantly fighting against the drug lords and cartels in Mexico. Many valiant police officers and prosecutors and government officials in Mexico are giving their lives and fighting on a daily basis to stop this problem. They must be honored in all that we do.

Mostly, we cannot validate the status quo. None of us can be satisfied with what we are doing, what America is doing, what Mexico is doing, what Colombia is doing, what we are all doing to fight this problem of drugs. It is an evil influence that is stalking our people. What we are doing is not working. Blame is everywhere.

I hope that if nothing else comes out of this debate and this action today, that in the days ahead we can find new ways and more effective ways of fighting this problem of drugs. If all we do today is place blame, we have failed again. If what comes out of today is renewed vigor and enthusiasm to fight this problem in Mexico and to fight it in the United States, then this will have been a day well spent.

I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA], my friend, and the other members of our caucus who have worked on this. I congratulate the ranking member, I congratulate the chairman, and I hope that we will come out of this today with a renewed sense of purpose to work together to solve the problem and to change the facts of today.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minority leader [Mr. GEPHARDT], for his strong arguments in support of this legislation, and hopefully, by working together on both sides of the aisle, and on both sides of the border, we will find a better way to fight this war on drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER].

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, it is important in the decertification process that we not only look toward the future but, indeed, that whole process has to look somewhat toward the past as well, not only on what Mexico has been doing but acknowledging in the Hastert amendment some things that we did not do. We cut back our interdiction funding, we cut back our source country funding, so we acknowledge that we have made some mistakes in our country, too.

But the evidence and the facts are staring us straight in the face. If indeed we are going to have a decertifica-

tion process, if the drugs coming into our country increase, if up to 90 percent of the police forces in Tijuana and Baja California are corrupt, so corrupt that we have pulled our DEA back; if we have questions about the top leadership of the country, I mean one of the things even that the administration passed out said that the defense department and the national police in Mexico cooperated more together last year. Yes, they moved a guy who was on the payroll of the cartel from the defense department over to the drug czar, and they cooperated in giving the information to the drug dealers.

I personally believe that President Zedillo and his top staff are committed to changing their Nation. He understands the terrorist threat of the narcotraffickers there. But we have to make this decision today based on the facts that are in front of us, and the facts that are in front of us say a 90-day delay is helpful, they have more time to do that; we are not putting the sanctions in effect with the decertification in the Hastert amendment. I support that in the sense of giving them additional time.

When I met with President Zedillo, along with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] and Senator COVERDELL, he expressed his concern about his son being approached by drug dealers in Mexico and what was happening to his country. I am concerned about my sons being approached at school as well. I am concerned about my daughter in college.

We cannot, in Fort Wayne, IN or anywhere else in this country, we cannot get enough drug dogs, we cannot get enough prisons, we cannot do enough in prevention programs and treatment programs if the supply keeps pouring in the way it is. We have to work in partnership with our friends in the south. We need maritime agreements, we need DEA agreements, we need extradition agreements, and then they do not have to fear decertification.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished ranking member of his kindness, and I would like to thank the Committee on International Relations for its hard work, and certainly the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rose on the floor earlier to express my opposition to the rule because I believe there is much more opportunity for us to discuss what is really at issue, and that is the devastation of drugs in our community. I just had an opportunity to talk to a constituent, a banker in our community, and he spoke the truth: Find the money and you will find the drugs.

So I rise today to make this an issue about drugs and the abuse that is going on in our Nation. I want to see us dis-

cuss real laws dealing with money laundering. I want to see us have real legislation that helps to eradicate drugs in our community. The inner cities see young African-American men convicted 55 percent on drugs charges, most of them under 25 years old. I would like to see legislation that truly helps to eliminate the crossing over of drugs over the border into our inner cities and communities, eradicating the transfer of drugs that come from the border into my city and community. I would like to see the eradication of the viciousness and the travesty that it impacts on the lives of citizens.

I will vote for a drug czar proposal by General McCaffrey to be able to fight on two fronts, and that is to be able to fight the illegal utilization of moneys that help to create opportunities for drugs in our community, and to fight for hard-core, no-nonsense prevention and treatment with money that directly gets to the victims of drug abuse and not to the bureaucrats.

I will not vote, however, for drug bashing, and I will recognize that it is extremely important that this debate be turned around to make it a debate on how we can end the ravages of drugs in America. I hope we will turn to that.

With that in mind, maybe we will help solve the problem and begin real legislation that faces what I am concerned about, which is the loss of lives in our Nation.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY].

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is no secret that this Member came from the southern parts of San Diego County to this institution, in no little way to try to sensitize this institution in Washington, DC, to the extent and the massiveness of the problems along our frontier and the problems that we encounter, those of us that live along the border.

I find myself in a very, very interesting position here today, because I have to say quite frankly that I think that we are seeing this week Washington and Congress finally starting to talk about and realize the magnitude of the problem that lies across our border to the south, and along our border and the entire area that we call the Frontera.

I have to say to my colleagues that I find it hard to believe that this institution did not realize, and does not realize today, the magnitude of the quest and the challenge the people of the Republic of Mexico have faced for many years and face today in trying to liberate their country from the tyranny of drug traffickers. Their national sovereignty is being threatened not by a force from outside, but from within. I think for us to underestimate the magnitude of that impact and that challenge is really demeaning to both of us.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out, Mexico has done things to fight drug trafficking that we in the United States have not been brave enough to do. Mexico has not found it easier to put only half as many agents at the border as has been authorized by Congress. So I will say that about the administration. But I will also say this about the majority in Congress. Mexico has put troops at the border, not because they want armed troops at the border, but because they realize the problem is so big that they cannot find excuses not to do everything humanly possible.

So I would ask the administration, put the resources to cooperate with Mexico along the frontier, but I would also ask the majority, look at the bipartisan Trafficking-Hunter bill and tell me, have we done everything, everything possible to be certified as being one who is willing to take on this battle and be able to judge Mexico?

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we do not judge those who are doing more than we have ever dreamed. Let us cooperate with them and move forward.

□ 1400

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is certainly not intended to bash Mexico or to insult the Mexican people. Millions of Mexicans are in the cross hairs of the drug cartels, just as a number of our people are in the same situation. We stand together with those honest Mexican officials in facing the fact that their government is simply not doing enough to help us front the scourge of drugs on both sides of the border.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that we have been doing something in our own Nation about drug use. When we fought the scourge on the supply as well as on the demand side simultaneously, we reduced monthly cocaine use by nearly 80 percent between 1985 and 1992. We reduced monthly cocaine users from 5.8 million in 1985 down to 1.3 in 1992, so the old argument that nothing works is not true, and that we must reduce demand is pure nonsense. It has to be fought on every level.

In a recent letter by the Mexican Ambassador, Silva Herzog, said to me in concluding his letter, "It is important to stress three basic points: First, Mexico and the United States have carried on with an intense agenda of cooperation against drug trafficking. It has been, despite political and external interests, an uninterrupted work at all levels of government. Second, to truly fight drug lords and drugs present on both sides of the border, we have to work effectively on both sides; third, regardless of any circumstances," he states that Mexico will continue to fight against drug trafficking.

We want to enhance that cooperation. What we are seeking is a more effective policy on both sides of the border.

Mr. Speaker, let me also take this opportunity to thank our courageous DEA agents who, day in and day out, fight the battle for future generations. We have lost a number of them in the drug battle.

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, even on its own terms I think the variants of this resolution are kind of silly.

As I understand it, what they say is we will decertify Mexico but we will immediately then waive the decertification so it will have no tangible effect. This is a new policy. It is called substituting insult for injury. We will not deny anything substantive to Mexico, we will just call them some names. People seem to think somehow that this will help. I do not understand how they think it will. It may help some people politically. It clearly will not help promote cooperation with Mexico.

What it says is, we will decertify you and immediately thereafter make sure the decertification has no effect except to hurt your feelings and make you angry. We spent all last week congratulating, this is our first step on the way to legislate, and as of now I would say that my colleagues seem to be better congratulators rather than legislators because I do not understand what this does, except make it worse.

Second, it is fundamentally flawed. The notion, and my friends have forgotten, particularly on the other side, what they, I thought, knew about a free market. The notion that in a free society, where tens of millions of people come and go on a regular basis monthly, where goods come and go, the notion that you can physically keep something in great demand out as your main strategy is seriously flawed.

The resolution that came from the Republican leadership denounces drug treatment, untested drug treatment, and says we should rely instead on physical interdiction. That has it absolutely backward. The notion that this country points the fingers of blame and objects to others because they meet an unfortunate high demand in this country absolves us of responsibility, plays political games. It does nothing to really advance the problem.

What we ought to do is to allow the President to go forward, change our legislation, and focus our resources on the kind of efforts within our own country, which is the only place we can deal with this problem.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW], the main sponsor of this provision.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LEE HAMILTON], and I want to congratulate both the Democratic ranking member and the chairman for working so hard to

bring this legislation forward and in doing it in such a bipartisan manner. I hope the spirit of that bipartisanship continues through the amendment process and that we get a good, unified vote out of here. I will have more to say about the amendment when my turn comes to do so.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the certification process itself on the House floor. Let us turn our attention just a moment to whether or not this is really interfering within the internal affairs of Mexico. The question has been made, why would we insult them, why would we embarrass them? Let us look at some of the things we use to judge our foreign policy toward other countries and what we look at in determining what our foreign policy is to be.

Every year we go through a debate on the human rights in China, and the human rights and the way people treat their own citizens is always a consideration in our own foreign policy. We even look at the economic system that other countries have. We look at how they vote in the United Nations. We look at what their trade laws are, whether they protect our copyrights, their banking laws. We look at all of these things. We even look at the way they treat dolphins in deciding what our foreign policy and trade law is going to be with other countries.

Surely we can also judge them as to how they treat our kids, how they treat our drug laws, how they assist us in a problem that is tearing the fabric out of America today.

We have long worried about hostile countries throughout the world and the weapons of giant destruction they have. We go in and take out and bomb plants that have the ability to create and build weapons of great destruction. Surely we can enforce our own laws.

We are talking about has Mexico fully cooperated. Fully cooperated. The answer under any measure, as the gentleman said in his opening statement, is of course not; they have not fully cooperated. In fact, it could be argued whether they have hardly cooperated.

Let me run down a few items that I think must be placed on the table and must be considered by this body when we go to our vote today on decertification. Well over 50 percent of the illegal drugs coming into the country today come in through Mexico. They supply 20 to 30 percent of the heroin in the United States. Eighty percent of the foreign-grown marijuana comes in from Mexico, and they supply it.

The corruption in Mexico and their law enforcement is monumental. A nation with between \$10 and \$30 billion in an annual drug trade, this is Mexico we are talking about. Almost half a billion dollars a year is spent in bribes, and they have failed to extradite one single Mexican national on a drug offense.

Mr. Speaker, surely we should not tiptoe around and worry about offending them. I want every Member of this body this afternoon, when they come

down to vote, to think about looking in the eyes of their children, their grandchildren, the innercity kids, the kids whose future is being destroyed, look at those who are struggling to get out of welfare today. Over 1 million of them are going to need drug rehabilitation before we can even find jobs for them. Think of all the people who are flunking drug tests and cannot be hired today because of policies that corporations have. Then look and see where these drugs are coming from.

For a moment, dream with me about a drug-free America. Should this not be the No. 1 issue on our foreign policy today? The gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] talked about it a few moments ago. There was a question of where does it stand on the priority list of our State Department. I am not talking about just the Clinton administration, I am talking about previous administrations, too.

It should be No. 1. It should be No. 1. There should not be one single issue that should rise above the question of the drug problem here in the United States. That is where we are going to lose our country. That is where we are going to lose our future if we do not get serious about it.

This is a small step. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] said this is only an insult. Let us begin with an insult. But we have to bring about the reality of what is going on, what is going on in the world today. We have a certification process. Let us use it. Let us go forward. Let us continue this bipartisan effort that we have to pass this most important piece of legislation.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time on general debate to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. CHAMBLISS]. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 1¼ minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the administration policy on Mexico. I certainly do not agree with their policy on NAFTA. But I am going to support the committee proposition because I think this entire process is ridiculous.

Under the certification process, what happens is that the Congress requires the President to certify that the world is perfect and the conduct of other people in the world is perfect. Then when he has to do that to further the interests of American foreign policy, the Congress as an institution then poses for political holy pictures because he has to do it when we put him in a box and virtually require him to do it in the first place.

It seems to me the question is not whether Mexico has cooperated. Of course they have not, certainly not to the degree we would like to see them cooperate. But the question is whether or not we will take an action which will make it more difficult to obtain the goal we want with respect to drug

control, because we give additional arguments to those in the struggle against drugs who are not our friends.

That is the issue. The issue is simply what action can be taken by the Congress today which will produce the best results for our kids and for our country. I submit that that action is to stick with the committee, not to get into other political arguments. So I would strongly urge that we support the committee's position.

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

Let me begin by first thanking the chairman of the Committee on International Relations and also the ranking member for having yielded me time for this debate.

Mr. Speaker, let me also take a moment to give appreciation to all those who have risen today and spoken against the political Goliath that is decertification. Let me begin by saying that our goal, I hope our goal here, is to keep the drugs off of the streets and out of the homes of America. Decertifying Mexico, however, dampens our cooperation with Mexico, and I fear will do just the opposite of keeping those drugs out of those homes and off of those streets.

Let me call Members' attention to some statistics and some studies. Almost 13 million Americans today use illicit drugs, and they spend, by most estimates, somewhere between \$50 billion to perhaps as much as \$150 billion to satisfy that desire.

According to a 1994 Rand Corp. study, if we want to reduce the consumption of drugs, we are going to have to spend a ton of money, but for every \$1 million we spend on trying to reduce the demand on our side, drug rehabilitation, trying to keep kids off of drugs to begin with, to do the same amount of work we do with keeping the demand down, we have to spend \$23 million to try to stop or help do the eradication in some of the foreign countries that are producing the drugs in the first place; \$1 million to try to curtail the demand, \$23 million to try to do the eradication.

If Members think that is bad, how much do they think it costs to eradicate, as opposed to trying to reduce the demand? For every \$1 million you spend to reduce the demand domestically, you have to spend \$11 million to try to interdict those same drugs that otherwise would be used.

Certainly it is more cost-effective for us to try to reduce the demand, make sure they never hit the streets, those drugs never hit the streets, and that we do the best job we can to rehabilitate those who are using drugs.

Third, a former DEA official has been quoted to say that the average drug organization can afford to lose between 70 to 80 percent of its product and still be profitable. With that type of losses being sustainable, it is going to take a lot to stop someone from producing and shipping drugs into this country. When you can lose fully 70 to 80 per-

cent of your product and still come out ahead, you know there is going to be a big supply.

□ 1415

Well, what helps make that supply so efficient? There are estimates that somewhere between \$10 billion, or 60 percent, of the annual proceeds that drug cartels receive is placed by them into corruption financing, buying off elected officials, buying off law enforcement, buying off business people to help them launder the money, \$6 billion available to drug cartels just to buy people off. Is it any wonder that on both sides of our border and not just the United States-Mexican border but the United States-Canadian border, we find that there are so many people willing to help allow these drugs to flow into our borders.

Mr. Speaker, I think the problem is one that goes beyond the issue of who is right, who is wrong, who is helped, who is not helped. Let me talk for a moment about the issue of cooperation. I know many folks have cited already some of the work that has been done by the Mexican Government and of course our own Government to try to stop the flow of drugs. But I should note for the record that, since President Zedillo took office in 1995, the Attorney General from Mexico has dismissed more than 1,250 Federal law enforcement officers and technical personnel for corruption or incompetence and placed those individuals' names on a national register to ensure that they would not be rehired by any other agency.

Further, Mexico has eradicated per year more hectares that have marijuana than any other country in the hemisphere. Those are all statistics that point out that cooperation is necessary, not attacks. If we go the route of cooperation, what we will find is that we will be able to do a better job of interdicting the drugs that come into our country.

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

As I prepare to conclude our arguments, I would like to note some thoughts expressed by an experienced drug fighter, DEA Deputy Administrator Stephen Green, who recently stated that the Mexican nationalism is no excuse for its failure to stop drugs and went on to say, I always question the argument that United States law enforcement is infringing on Mexican nationalism and that they do not need United States help. He went on to say, if that is the case, they should do what they say they are capable of doing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

I would like to begin by expressing my appreciation to the committee of jurisdiction, the gentleman from New York, chairman of the committee, and

our distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], who recently disappointed us all with his announcement that he may soon retire from this body.

Mr. Speaker, I understand how difficult it was for the committee to deal with this issue. There are a great many facets of this action that deserve consideration, and there are many troubling things, not the least of which is the point made just a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Wisconsin that perhaps the whole process of certification is a process we might want to reexamine.

But we really have to address things where we are. As we do that, we have to have a really sharp focus about what is it really about. We are concerned about the political stability of Mexico, and we are concerned about the economic prosperity of Mexico. And I think I can say that this Congress, this body has on many, many occasions expressed their concern on both those points with concrete actions. We want for the people of Mexico everything we want for the people of the United States in political stability and economic well-being.

So the possibility that an action that we take on this floor might impair either of these two goals for the people of Mexico is a possibility that weighs heavily on our hearts as we bring a resolution to the floor. But that, Mr. Speaker, is not what this resolution is about. This resolution is about whether or not this Congress will put its stamp of approval on a certification of an effort by the Government of Mexico to control the flow of drugs through their nation and into our Nation.

We are concerned with our focus here about the adequacy of our own Government's effort to control drug usage in this country, and there have been many statements in this debate about the inadequacy of that effort. I do not have to recite chapter and verse. So the essential question is, is this Congress going to demonstrate a resolve to save not only our children but the children of Mexico as well from what can only be described as the horrors of drug usage and drug trafficking, the attendance crime, the attendance violence, the personal and critical danger that each child faces if they are lured into this trap of drug usage or drug trafficking? Can we demonstrate a resolve to the children of this Nation and the children of our friends and neighbors south of the border by doing anything less than saying with this resolution that this Congress believes too much about the importance of these children, cares too much about the outcome in their lives, demands too much in the effort that would be made by any government in the interest of protecting these children to allow a certification by a government that has failed in its own responsibilities on behalf of another government that, too, has not fulfilled all its responsibilities for those very same precious children in both countries?

That is what it is about, Mr. Speaker. That is what it is about. It is not about this Congress's duty to this Government. It is not about this Congress's duty to the Mexican Government. It is not about this Congress's duty to things that are real and yet somewhat abstract in the lives of real people in their ordinary business of life called political stability and economic growth. It is about the safety, security, happiness of the children of both countries, and the sacred moral obligation of all governments, all places to protect the children from harm, violence, moral decay, and personal tragedy.

We must stand in support of both the Hastert amendment and the resolution brought by this committee because the children are precious, and the children is why we address this issue; in doing so, do so in all respect and a wish of Godspeed for the prosperity of the Mexican people and a tranquil stability in the politics of our friends to the south as well as a resolve to fulfill our responsibility in this Congress and this government for all these children.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his supporting arguments of our proposal, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I supported House Joint Resolution 58 today to decertify Mexico as fully cooperating in the war on drugs. There are few threats to the health and welfare of our country more dangerous than the flood of illegal drugs which is inundating our borders. President Clinton was correct when he decertified Colombia as a fully cooperating partner in the international war on drugs, but his certification of Mexico's efforts is completely unjustified.

My constituents and all Americans face a very grave danger from illegal drugs from Mexico. Let's examine just a few of the facts. In each of the last 4 years Mexico has been certified as fully cooperating in the war on drugs. But, in 1993, 50 percent of all the cocaine entering the United States came from Mexico. During this period of fully cooperating, the amount of cocaine entering the United States from Mexico increased by 40 percent. Today, Mexico is the source of 70 percent of all of the cocaine entering the United States. I do not understand how any thinking person can characterize this as fully cooperating.

There are many examples of the corruption within Mexico's law enforcement agencies, but the two most recent examples, which occurred in the days just before the State Department certified Mexico's cooperation, are nothing short of outrageous. Gen. Jesus Gutierrez Rebollo, the top official in Mexico's counternarcotics program was arrested last month because of his close association with one of that country's most notorious drug lords. How can this happen? The man who was commanding Mexico's war on drugs is an associate of a drug lord? Unbelievable.

Or, take the example of Humberto Garcia Abrego, the brother of the head of the Gulf Cartel. He was arrested on a money-laundering charge, released by a local court because it was an illegal arrest, taken into custody again on another court order, and then he simply walked out of the National Institute for

Combating Drugs. The explanation from the Mexican Government was that Abrego "left * * * before the investigation was completed. These are examples of Mexican behavior during a period of heightened sensitivity toward the impending certification deadline.

This level of cooperation is unacceptable and must not be tolerated. Certification of Mexico at this time will only send the message that the United States is more than willing to give a wink and nod to Mexico's corruption and inadequate law enforcement. If our war on drugs is going to succeed, we must vigorously enforce our policies and hold Mexico accountable for its clear lack of cooperation in our efforts.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the final passage of House Joint Resolution 58, the decertification of Mexico. This is not a Democratic problem or a Republican problem, this is indeed an American problem. I do not think we need a resolution passed by the House castigating the administration's drug policy. My colleagues, this problem should be solved in a more constructive manner. I propose that we pass a sense of Congress resolution that does not attack the President of the United States but that is critical of Mexico. In the case of Mexico, it is generally estimated that the illegal drug trade generates \$30 billion per year and the U.S. Treasury estimates that Mexican financial institutions launder in the neighborhood of \$10 billion per year. It is true that at least four-fifths of all the illicit drugs consumed in the United States are of foreign origin, including all the cocaine and heroin. It is also true that most of the cocaine is produced and transported through Mexico. However, the real problem is not what is going on in Mexico, but what is going on with the drug trade in America, and in my own 18th Congressional District of Houston. In 1994, 47 percent of all drug arrests nationwide were in the city of Houston. We must combat the drug problem at home and we must impress upon our Mexican neighbors that if they want to continue a good working relationship with the United States, then they must improve their enforcement of the drug trafficking into the United States. However, decertification in this case might not be the best answer. Mr. Speaker, I am calling for a sense of the Congress resolution that would compel Mexico to cooperate with the United States when it comes to extradition of major drug traffickers, cutting down on organized crime, and arresting and convicting Mexican drug lords. There are other and more constructive ways the Congress can act in this matter, but decertification right now might not be the way to go. Cutting the source of money through tougher money laundering laws, however should be one of our major considerations.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the administration's decision to certify Mexico. If we are serious about combating money laundering and drug trafficking, we must help Mexico and keep them as our ally. They should not be expected to fight this war alone.

Money laundering and narcotic trafficking are a global epidemic—not just Mexico's. The Mexican Government—*itself*—recognizes these activities as the principal security risk to that nation. It is up to us to help Mexico constructively, instead of slamming the door on a strong and close friend.

My colleagues, if we do not support the administration, we will be sending the wrong message to the Government of Mexico. We should make it clear to our neighbor that we truly intend to fight this war together. I urge all of you to support the administration's Mexico certification decision and to oppose this resolution.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, the legislation to decertify Mexico, reflects the failed practice of legislating foreign policy. My friends, history has clearly demonstrated that doesn't work. This Congress has no authority over foreign nations and our efforts to legislate another country's actions will either be ignored or fan the flames of anti-Americanism.

The fact is that the normal diplomatic process provides the tried and true means to voice our concerns. Traditional actions such as withdrawing our Ambassador, limiting or stopping cooperation, opposing loan requests and a variety of other measures that impact the day-to-day relations between nations are by far the most effective means of forcing other nations to consider our concerns.

What we really should be voting on today is scraping the entire failed certification process. Policies, like decertification, which are waived once they are implemented only serve to increase contempt, while lessening respect, for American power. Decertification has not stopped the flow a single dollar's worth of drugs from Colombia and decertification of Mexico will prove no more effective. I represent well over 600 miles of our border with Mexico. I know first hand that our current domestic policies are not working. Too many of my constituents are living in fear of the drug smugglers. This must stop.

Our Government needs to take substantive action to get more cooperation from Mexico. Further statements, such as decertification, promise only to deliver further failures in the war on drugs while possibly threatening the stability of the Mexican economy leading to increasing illegal immigration. My colleagues, please join me in rolling up your sleeves and do the hard work of stopping the flow of drugs rather than continuing the business-as-usual decertification approach of empty promises.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 58, and the Hastert amendment. The President failed to exercise good judgement when, on February 28, he certified Mexico as a fully cooperating ally in the war against drugs. Some 30 percent of the heroin, 70 percent of the marijuana, and 60 percent of the cocaine imported into the United States originates in or is shipped through Mexico.

That fact alone demonstrates that the brave men and women of Mexico and Latin America who are our allies in the war against drugs face tremendous odds. They face corruption in their governments. The evil influence of drug kingpins threatens their lives, livelihoods, and families day after day. We should recognize the very real and personal sacrifices they make to fight an enemy who, by every measure, is stronger, richer, and more brutal than they are. All of us salute those allies south of the border who fight individual wars against illegal drugs not because the financial and professional rewards are great, but because they believe it is right. Though they are not Americans, they are fighting on behalf of our children, our families, and our country. We owe them a debt of gratitude.

These allies in the war against drugs simply do not get the support they need from north of the border.

The enormous global enterprise that is the illegal drug trade simply would not exist if there was not an available and willing American market to purchase its deadly product. If there was no domestic demand for illegal drugs, if illegal drug abuse was seen by all of us socially unacceptable, these international drug kingpins and their ill-gotten wealth would vanish.

Unfortunately, there is a domestic market for illegal drugs. It is our young people.

Among 12- to 17-year-olds, since 1992: Marijuana use has doubled. More importantly for our children, today's marijuana is far more potent than the drug abused in the 1960's.

LSD use has climbed to record highs.

And the number of young people who have used any illegal drug has risen an appalling 78 percent.

Furthermore, while teen drug abuse has climbed the past 4 years, leadership in Washington has been pulling in different directions. A parent whose child has lost a life to drugs does not care which politicians bicker for partisan advantage. They want to know what has been done, and what needs to be done.

What kind of leadership has President Clinton exercised in the war against drugs?

In 1992, an MTV interviewer asked Bill Clinton whether he would "inhale" given the chance to "do it over again." Of course, we're talking about inhaling a marijuana joint. Bill Clinton's reply: "Sure, if I could. I tried before."

President Clinton slashed the drug czar's office 83 percent.

When President Clinton had a Democratic Congress, they cut Safe and Drug Free Schools, by \$111 million in fiscal year 1994, and by an additional \$21 million in 1995. Meanwhile, lack of oversight at the Department of Education gave over the program to waste and fraud. Safe and Drug Free Schools money was spent in Michigan on giant plastic teeth and toothbrushes, on the idea that kids who brush don't abuse drugs. In Fairfax County, it was spent on a \$176,000 staff retreat, on Funds for Lumber for a step aerobics class, and on a field trip to Deep Run Lodge.

The President's negotiating team, seeking to expand antidrug activities in Mexico just days before the President's 1997 certification was due, came away from those negotiations empty-handed—and then recommended recertification of Mexico as an ally in the war on drugs.

The President's National Security Council placed the war on drugs as its 29th priority out of 29—dead last on its list of national security priorities.

Faced with these facts, Lee Brown, the President's drug policy director, wrote in 1995 about a "troubling" decline in drug prosecutions. And a senior Democratic Congressman, CHARLIE RANGEL, who is very active on the drug issue, said "I have never, never, never seen a President who cares less about this issue."

Despite the ambiguous message from the White House, Congress has taken decisive action in the war against drugs.

We have provided level funding for the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program, while fighting fraud and abuse. No cuts.

We increased the drug czar's office, the DEA budget, Coast Guard antidrug operations,

the State Department's international narcotics control program, the Southwest Border States Anti-drug Information System, and several other programs like military drug interdiction over the President's request.

We are taking action against crystal meth, which is a major problem in California and the Southwest, and against trafficking of so-called roofies, otherwise known as the date-rape drug.

Without a doubt, more must be done. The Border Patrol and the Customs Service should be provided additional resources, beyond the essentially status-quo levels in the President's budget, to fight illegal drugs at the border and at our ports of entry to combat the supply of illegal drugs. And domestic demand for illegal drugs can be reduced through more stringent law enforcement, random drug testing campaigns, and a relentless campaign of public education. No one will help our children better than those closest to them—their parents, pastors, neighbors, teachers, local police, and community leaders. When we all publicly agree that drugs kill, and that their use will not be tolerated, and repeat that message with clarity over and over and over again, only then will we make headway in the war on drugs.

We cannot win the war on drugs with the Keystone Kops. The unsung heroes who are fighting drugs every day, in Mexico and across Latin America, and in homes and schools across the United States, demand a vote of confidence in their work. Let us take up their battle and fight to win.

I am attaching two articles that Members may find of interest. The first outlines the Clinton administration's complete failure to properly advance the war on drugs in Latin America. The second is an op-ed I wrote last fall, making a call to arms against illegal drug abuse.

[From the San Diego Union-Tribune, Mar. 12, 1997]

U.S. FAILED TO GET MEXICO TO RESHAPE WAR ON DRUGS

(By Marcus Stern)

WASHINGTON—Eight days before President Clinton's Feb. 28 decision to give Mexico's anti-drug program his seal of approval, U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno issued a tongue-lashing to Mexico Foreign Minister Jose Angel Gurria.

The icy rebuke delivered in her stately conference room and Gurria's angry reaction to it set a confrontational tone for the next eight days as U.S. officials tried—and ultimately failed—to wring meaningful concessions from Mexico to reshape the fight against drugs.

Mexico's refusal to grant immediate concessions could influence a House vote expected this week to try to overturn Clinton's controversial decision to label Mexico a cooperative partner in the war on drugs.

Throughout the week leading up to Clinton's decision, Reno and other U.S. officials aggressively pushed Mexico on numerous nettlesome issues, such as a broader extradition policy and permission for U.S. anti-drug agents to carry guns in Mexico.

But, even though they came away empty-handed at the end of the week, senior Clinton administration officials nonetheless walked into the Cabinet Room of the White House on Feb. 28 and urged the president to certify Mexico. Those who were troubled by continuing signs of corruption in Mexico, including Reno, nonetheless concluded that certification was the only realistic political option.

"Some people thought it was the right thing to do," said one of those in attendance, "and some people thought it was the only choice."

But many members of Congress are rejecting the administration's view that yanking Mexico's certification could jeopardize its economic recovery, undermine President Ernesto Zedillo's political standing and lead to less cooperation.

With sentiment running heavily against the president, the House is expected to vote this week on whether to overturn Clinton's decision, and the full Senate is expected to consider similar legislation as soon as next week.

Clinton administration officials insist that no effort was made to pressure Mexico into concessions in exchange for certification. However, the discussions have been shrouded in secrecy and confusion. Conflicting and ambiguous statements have been issued by both sides about what transpired between the two countries during the days leading up to the president's decision.

Unofficial accounts of the flurry of diplomatic exchanges suggest that concerted efforts were made to win concessions from Mexico during that period. However, the tone of the exchanges became marked by confrontation rather than conciliation, and by the end of the week there were no signals coming from Mexican officials that they were ready to consider clear concessions.

The U.S. push for them began when Foreign Minister Gurria landed in Washington on Feb. 20 for two days of talks with administration officials.

It was his first visit since U.S. officials had been stunned by news that Gen. Jesus Gutierrez Rebollo, the newly installed coordinator of Mexico's anti-drug program, had been arrested after allegations that he had maintained a long association with one of Mexico's most powerful drug cartel leaders.

After making a stop at the State Department, Gurria headed to the Justice Department for a 45-minute meeting with Reno, who would play the role of the bad cop during the U.S. negotiations with Gurria that week.

"It was not a pleasant meeting," said a senior Mexican official. "The attorney general was very tough. She said they were very upset about the whole incident of Gutierrez Rebollo. She said it turned the whole question of certification upside down."

Reno raised a range of issues on which quick progress was needed.

"We clearly understood them as requirements the U.S. administration felt it needed either to certify or to justify a decision to certify," the Mexican official said. "We knew there was a lot of infighting within the administration and without some of these issues being resolved it was going to be very difficult for them to certify us."

The next morning, Gurria met Clinton's drug czar, Gen. Barry McCaffrey.

"The tone was the same," said a White House official. "Gen. McCaffrey expressed how extremely distraught he was with what happened with Gutierrez Rebollo. He told Gurria we face a problem with Congress and that progress in some areas would be extremely helpful."

Gurria flew back to Mexico City and during the days ahead he publicly warned the Clinton administration that anything less than full certification would "make us doubt whether cooperating with the United States would bring anything other than a lot of grief."

The tough rhetoric was partly a precaution to avoid public impressions in Mexico that he was yielding to demands from Washington, but it was also a genuine statement of his pique with the pressure from U.S. officials, said officials close to Gurria.

"I don't think he was happy with the way things were being played out," said a senior Mexican official. "All of his statements in Mexico City are a clear indication of that."

At one point during the week, Gurria reportedly called Reno and gave her an unusually blunt piece of his mind over the pressure being applied.

The night before Clinton was to announce his decision on whether he would certify Mexico, there were still no signs from Mexican officials that they intended to act on the points raised by Reno, McCaffrey and others. Officials in Mexico City remained in the dark about whether Mexico would be certified the next day.

Shortly after noon Feb. 28, a group of senior officials filed into the White House Cabinet Room, where they soon were joined by the president. Among those in the room were Reno, McCaffrey, Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. She would make the official recommendation to the president.

Despite the failure to conclude any concrete agreements with Mexico during the previous eight days, the president accepted Albright's recommendation that he certify.

[From the San Diego Union-Tribune, Sept. 24, 1996]

A CALL TO ARMS AGAINST YOUTH DRUG ABUSE (By Randy "Duke" Cunningham)

America's young people are in danger. Alarming new statistics show drug use skyrocketing among teen-agers. Drugs have invaded our classrooms, our homes and our communities. They have destroyed promising young lives, torn families apart and crushed hope. We can continue to go down this destructive path, or we can act now to save our children's future.

Illustrating the depth of this crisis are reports from the Department of Health and Human Services that show overall drug use among 12- to 17-year-olds has increased an appalling 78 percent from 1992 to 1995. Among 14- and 15-year-olds, marijuana use has jumped 200 percent. Use of LSD and other hallucinogens has nearly tripled among young people during the same time.

In 1994, emergency-room reports of cocaine-related episodes were at their highest level over. And emergency room reports for methamphetamine ("meth"), a powerful and deadly drug widely popular among teens in San Diego and the western United States, are up a whopping 308 percent.

These are not mere statistics. Behind every number is a young person whose life has taken a dangerous turn. We must take this crisis seriously. We must strengthen America's families by having a real war on drugs at our borders, in our communities, schools and homes. We can win this war, but only with a serious commitment from everyone—parents, teachers, clergy, local police, entertainers, the media, Congress and the president of the United States.

We cannot, however, win this war with the current cavalier attitude toward illicit drug use. It has sent a powerful and dangerous message to America's children that drugs are OK. We don't need parents or society saying drugs are just a passing fancy that we all go through. We don't need the entertainment industry to falsely romanticize drugs in movies or TV shows. And we don't need President Clinton to maintain the attitude of candidate Clinton, who told teens on MTV that he would inhale if he had the chance to do it again.

What we need from our policy leaders and law enforcement is a real war on drugs. We must get tough on drug dealers, fully fund the war on drugs, and stop drugs at the border. We must reverse the Clinton record: 80

percent cuts in the Office of National Drug Control Policy staff, fewer drug-enforcement agents, reduced drug-interdiction efforts, declining drug prosecutions, reduced mandatory-minimum sentences for drug trafficking and "soft on crime" liberal judges.

Congress has already begun to revitalize the drug war by pumping \$7.1 billion into anti-drug programs. We are going right to the source, focusing our efforts on countries where drugs originate. And to help halt the flow of drugs into America, our immigration-reform bill doubles our Border Patrol over the next five years. We also passed a law that stops activist federal judges from ordering the early release of violent criminals and drug traffickers. Those who would peddle destruction on our children must pay dearly.

To give states the resources and flexibility to crack down to juvenile drug use and violent crime, I introduced the Juvenile Crime Prevention Act. It established mandatory-minimum prison sentences for juveniles who use firearms during drug-trafficking offenses.

And the bill gives states the tools they need to hold youth accountable for their actions before they become serious, violent criminals. We recognize that if we turn troubled young persons around, we give them another chance at the American Dream.

Crucial to winning the war on drugs and education and community campaigns. So on Thursday, my House Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families will team up with Government Reform Oversight to send a strong message to Americans: Drugs kill. We will hear from health and community experts on what can be done to reverse the drug crisis. And we will also examine ways to marshal community leadership and resources to start local anti-drug coalitions.

Finally, I believe we must revive in word and deed the simple phrase, "Just Say No," coined by Nancy Reagan in the 1980s. While cynical elites once joked about its effectiveness, I believe it played a significant role in reducing drug use.

Many successful community-based initiatives were modeled on this campaign. It helped establish the mind-set among America's teens that zero tolerance for drugs was "cool," an attitude that is in jeopardy today.

While Washington sets a standard and provides resources to fight the drug war, no one can help our children better than those closest to them—parents, teachers, local law enforcement and community leaders. We cannot fail our children by dismissing drug use with a wink and a nod, ignoring it, or slashing funds to fight it. We must meet the challenge head-on. We must let our children know that drugs kill, and their use will not be tolerated. Only then will we be victorious.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 95, the joint resolution is considered read for amendment.

The text of House Joint Resolution 58 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 58

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That pursuant to subsection (d) of section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j), the Congress disapproves the determination of the President with respect to Mexico for fiscal year 1997 that is contained in the certification (transmittal No. 97-18) submitted to the Congress by the President under subsection (b) of that section on February 28, 1997.

The Clerk will designate the committee amendment printed in the joint resolution.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

H.J. RES. 58

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DISAPPROVAL OF DETERMINATION OF PRESIDENT REGARDING MEXICO.

Pursuant to subsection (d) of section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j), Congress disapproves the determination of the President with respect to Mexico for fiscal year 1997 that is contained in the certification (transmittal No. 97-18) submitted to Congress by the President under subsection (b) of that section on February 28, 1997.

SEC. 2. WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT TO WITHHOLD ASSISTANCE FOR MEXICO.

(a) **WAIVER.**—Notwithstanding subsections (e) and (f) of section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the requirement to withhold United States assistance and to vote against multilateral development bank assistance contained in such subsection (e) shall not apply with respect to Mexico until March 1, 1998, if at any time after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the President submits to Congress a determination and certification described in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) **DETERMINATION AND CERTIFICATION.**—A determination and certification described in this subsection is a determination and certification consistent with section 490(b)(1)(B) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 that the vital national interests of the United States require that the assistance withheld pursuant to section 490(e)(1) of such Act be provided for Mexico and that the United States not vote against multilateral development bank assistance for Mexico pursuant to section 490(e)(2) of such Act.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

For purposes of section 490(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, this joint resolution shall be deemed to have been enacted within 30 calendar days after February 28, 1997.

SEC. 4. CONSULTATIONS WITH THE CONGRESS.

(a) **CONSULTATIONS.**—The President shall consult with the Congress on the status of counter-narcotics cooperation between the United States and each major illicit drug producing country or major drug-transit country.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The purpose of the consultations under subsection (a) shall be to facilitate improved discussion and understanding between the Congress and the President on United States counter-narcotics goals and objectives with regard to the countries described in subsection (a), including the strategy for achieving such goals and objectives.

(2) **REGULAR AND SPECIAL CONSULTATIONS.**—In order to carry out paragraph (1), the President (or senior officials designated by the President who are responsible for international narcotics programs and policies) shall meet with Members of Congress—

(A) on a quarterly basis for discussions and consultations; and

(B) whenever time-sensitive issues arise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider the further amendment specified in House Report 105-20, as modified by the order of the House of today.

AMENDMENT, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. HASTERT

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, as modified.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment, as modified.

The text of amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. HASTERT:

Page 2, after line 7, insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS; DECLARATION OF POLICY.

(a) **GENERAL FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds the following:

(1) International drug traffickers, aided by individuals in the United States and across the Western Hemisphere who sell and distribute deadly drugs, pose the largest threat to Americans since the end of the Cold War.

(2) The United States is faced with a supply of drugs that is cheaper, more potent, and more available than at any time in our history.

(3) The drug cartels are becoming wealthier, bolder, and closer to the United States, and their corruption of officials is beginning to reach inside the United States.

(4)(A) No single action is a sufficient response to the threat posed to our society by illegal drugs.

(B) The goal of the United States is to save our children by eliminating the illegal drug trade.

(C) The United States Government must set forth a comprehensive strategy that dedicates the resources necessary to decisively win the war on drugs.

(b) **THREAT DRUGS POSE TO OUR CHILDREN.**—The Congress further finds the following:

(1)(A) Casual teenage drug use trends have suffered a marked reversal over the past 5 years. Casual teenage drug use has dramatically increased for virtually every childhood age group and for virtually every illicit drug, including heroin, crack, cocaine hydrochloride, lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD), non-LSD hallucinogens, methamphetamine, inhalants, stimulants, and marijuana (often laced with phencyclidine (PCP) and cocaine).

(B) Specifically, illicit drug use among 8th and 10th graders has doubled in the last 5 years. 8 percent of 6th graders, 23 percent of 7th graders, and 33 percent of 8th graders have tried marijuana. Since 1993, the number of 8th graders using marijuana has increased 146 percent and overall teen drug use is up 50 percent.

(2) Rising casual teenage drug use is closely correlated with rising juvenile violent crime, as reported by the Department of Justice.

(3) If rising teenage drug use and the close correlation with violent juvenile crime continue to rise on their current path, the United States will experience a doubling of violent crime by 2010, according to the Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

(4) The nature of casual teenage drug use is changing, such that annual or infrequent teenage experimentation with illegal drugs is being replaced by regular, monthly, or addictive teenage drug use.

(5) Nationwide, drug-related emergencies are at an all-time high, having risen for 5 straight years by increments of between 10 and 30 percentage points per year for each drug measured.

(6) The nationwide street price for most illicit drugs is lower than at any time in recent years, and the potency of those same drugs, particularly heroin, crack and marijuana, is higher.

(c) **THE FAILED ANTIDRUG POLICY.**—The Congress further finds the following:

(1) United States Government strategy has dramatically shifted precious antidrug resources away from United States priorities

set in the 1980's—away from the prior emphasis on drug prevention for children, drug interdiction, and international source country programs.

(2) United States Government strategy has been weak in responding to statutory deadlines, has been characterized by an absence of statutorily mandated measurable goals, lack of effective coordination and program accountability, and often untargeted and insufficient funding, from the smallest agencies involved in the drug war up to and including the White House Drug Policy Office.

(3) It has been reported that United States Government policy reduced the national security priority placed on international drug trafficking from the top tier (number 3) to the bottom tier (number 29).

(4) United States Government policy has emphasized additional funding for unproven drug treatment techniques at the expense of accountable drug prevention programs that effectively teach a right-wrong distinction.

(5) The United States Government has failed to assess the outcomes of \$3,000,000,000 spent per year in drug rehabilitation and has failed to shift resources from ineffective programs to programs that save lives.

(6) United States Government policy has not offered sufficient flexibility to local and State law enforcement agencies to combat drug abuse through measures such as additional block grant funding.

(7) United States Government strategy has not properly emphasized the important, increased role that can legitimately be played by the National Guard, the United States military, and United States intelligence agencies in confronting the rising drug trafficking threat.

(8) United States Government strategy underemphasizes community and parental actions and the need to engage children at an early age in prevention activities.

(9) For the past four years, United States Government strategy has failed to use the media to communicate a consistent, intense antidrug message to young people.

(d) **DECLARATION OF POLICY.**—The Congress declares that—

(1) a thorough review of the United States counternarcotics strategy is urgently needed; and

(2) the establishment of a commission on international narcotics control in accordance with section 6 will assist in such review.

Page 2, line 8, strike "section 1" and insert "sec. 2".

Page 2, line 10, strike "Pursuant to" and insert "(a) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to".

Page 2, line 11, insert before "Congress" the following: "effective 90 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution".

Page 2, after line 16, insert the following:

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—Subsection (a) shall not take effect if, within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the President determines and reports in writing to the Congress that the President has obtained reliable assurances of substantial progress toward—

(1) obtaining authorization from the Government of Mexico to allow additional agents of the Drug Enforcement Administration, or other United States law enforcement agents (as of February 28, 1997), for critical narcotics control operations in Mexico, including authorization of appropriate privileges and immunities for such agents;

(2) obtaining authorization from the Government of Mexico to allow United States law enforcement agents in Mexico to carry firearms for self-defense in areas where required to cooperate with the Government of Mexico on narcotics control efforts;

(3) obtaining assurances of substantial progress by, and commitments from, the

Government of Mexico that the Government will take concrete measures to find and eliminate law enforcement corruption in Mexico and will cooperate fully with United States law enforcement personnel on narcotics control matters;

(4) obtaining assurances of substantial progress by, and commitments from, the Government of Mexico that the Government will extradite Mexican nationals wanted by the United States Government for drug trafficking and other drug-related offenses;

(5) obtaining assurances from the Government of Mexico that the Government is making substantial progress in securing aircraft overflight and refueling rights that are necessary for full cooperation with the United States on narcotics control efforts, including adequate aircraft radar coverage to monitor and detect all aircraft entering and transiting through Mexico that are suspected of involvement in drug trafficking; and

(6) obtaining assurances from the Government of Mexico that the Government is making substantial progress toward a permanent maritime agreement with the United States to allow vessels of the United States Coast Guard and other appropriate vessels to halt and hold drug traffickers pursued into Mexican waters.

Page 2, line 17, strike "**sec. 2**" and insert "**sec. 3**".

Page 3, line 12, strike "**sec. 3**" and insert "**sec. 4**".

Page 3, line 17, strike "**sec. 4**" and insert "**sec. 5**".

Page 4, after line 12, add the following:

SEC. 6. HIGH LEVEL COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The consumption of narcotics in the United States is a serious problem that is ravaging the United States, especially America's youth.

(2) Despite the dedicated and persistent efforts of the United States and other nations, international narcotics trafficking and consumption remains a serious problem.

(3) The total eradication of international narcotics trafficking requires a long-term strategy that necessitates close international cooperation.

(4) The annual certification process relating to international narcotics control under section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j) is flawed because—

(A) the process addresses only whether or not the source country is cooperating with United States narcotics control efforts and does not take into account all underlying factors;

(B) the process reviews narcotics control efforts only on an annual basis; and

(C) the process fails to account for the divergent economic, political, and social circumstances of countries under review which can influence the decision by the United States to decertify a foreign nation, thereby leading to unpredictability, non-transparency, and lack of international credibility in the process.

(5) The problem of international narcotics trafficking is not being effectively addressed by the annual certification process under section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a commission to be known as the High Level Commission on International Narcotics Control (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(c) DUTIES.—The Commission shall conduct a review of the annual certification process relating to international narcotics control under section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j) to determine the

effectiveness of such process in curtailing international drug trafficking, and the effectiveness of such process in reducing drug use and consumption within the United States.

(d) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall consist of 14 members, as follows:

(A) The Secretary of State or the Secretary's designee.

(B) The Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's designee.

(C) The Attorney General or the Attorney General's designee.

(D) The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy or the Director's designee.

(E) The Governors of the States of Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas, or their designees.

(F) The following Members of Congress appointed not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution as follows:

(i)(I) 2 Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(II) 1 member of the House of Representatives appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(ii)(I) 2 Members of the Senate appointed by the majority leader of the Senate.

(II) 1 member of the Senate appointed by the minority leader of the Senate.

(2) TERMS.—Each member of the Commission shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(3) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(4) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the Commission shall be elected by the members.

(5) BASIC PAY.—Each member shall serve without pay. Each member shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(6) QUORUM.—A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(7) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the chairperson.

(e) DIRECTOR AND STAFF; EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—

(1) DIRECTOR.—The Commission shall have a director who shall be appointed by the chairperson subject to rules prescribed by the Commission.

(2) STAFF.—Subject to rules prescribed by the Commission, the chairperson may appoint and fix the pay of such additional personnel as the chairperson considers appropriate.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.—The director and staff of the Commission may be appointed without regard to title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the requirements of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that an individual so appointed may not receive pay in excess of the maximum annual rate of basic pay payable for GS-15 of the General Schedule.

(4) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The chairperson may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals not to exceed the daily equivalent of the maximum annual rate of basic pay payable for GS-15 of the General Schedule.

(5) STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon request of the chairperson, the head of any Federal agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of the agency

to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties.

(f) POWERS.—

(1) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The chairperson may secure directly from any Federal agency information necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its duties. Upon request of the chairperson, the head of the agency shall furnish such information to the Commission to the extent such information is not prohibited from disclosure by law.

(2) MAILS.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other Federal agencies.

(3) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.—Upon the request of the chairperson, the Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, the administrative support services necessary for the Commission to carry out its duties.

(4) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—The chairperson may contract with and compensate government and private agencies or persons for the purpose of conducting research, surveys, and other services necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its duties.

(g) REPORTS.—

(1) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the President and the Congress an interim report on the following:

(A) The overall effectiveness of the annual certification process relating to international narcotics control under section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j) in curtailing international drug trafficking.

(B) The impact of such annual certification process in enhancing international counternarcotics cooperation.

(C) The transparency and predictability of such annual certification process in curtailing international drug trafficking.

(D) Recommendations for actions that are necessary—

(i) to eliminate international narcotics trafficking;

(ii) to improve cooperation among countries in efforts to curtail international narcotics trafficking, including necessary steps to identify all areas in which inter-American cooperation can be initiated and institutionalized; and

(iii) to improve the transparency and predictability of the annual certification process relating to international narcotics control under section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j).

(E) Any additional measures to win the war on drugs.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the President and the Congress a final report that, at a minimum, contains the following:

(A) Information that meets the requirements of the information described in the initial report under paragraph (1) and that has been updated since the date of the submission of the interim report, as appropriate.

(B) Any other related information that the Commission considers to be appropriate.

(h) TERMINATION.—The Commission shall terminate 6 months after the date on which the Commission submits its final report under subsection (g)(2).

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) are authorized to remain available until expended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 95, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] and a Member opposed, each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT].

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

I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and certainly the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] for the fine work that they have done on this issue.

Let me say that my amendment, first of all, does not change the decertification of Mexico. What we do is to stay that decertification for 90 days. What we are trying to say is there has got to be a commonsense approach with our Government, who is not without fault, certainly, in the drug program, we have the demand problems and, certainly, with the Government of Mexico who I do not think anybody can argue that they have fully cooperated over the years and deserve certification.

What we are saying is that our President and our State Department reach out to the people of Mexico and the President of Mexico to get, over a 90-day period, assurances of substantial progress in several areas, several areas such as our law enforcement agents being able to work in Mexico and being able to defend themselves, assurances that Mexico does not become a safe haven for dangerous drug felons who commit crimes. We need to be able to, both countries, get the extradition agreements that we need to have.

We need to get vital antidrug radars in place in the south of Mexico. That needs to happen. We need to get permanent maritime agreements to stop drug traffickers who are skirting our law enforcement agencies and duck into Mexican waters. Twenty out of twenty six countries in the Caribbean have that agreement.

And we need to get concrete progress on rooting out corruption, not only on our side of the border but also on the Mexican side of the border. That needs to happen.

Who benefits from this? Is it the Mexican Government? No. Is it our Government? No. But let me tell Members about my district.

I have the cities of Aurora and Elgin, IL. Aurora, IL, where my brother teaches in junior high, has had one of his Mexican American children, Hispanic children killed this year by narcotics traffickers, shot down in the streets next to his home. Why? Because the drugs come across our borders. It is not just American kids who get killed. It is kids that are of a Hispanic origin, American and Mexican origins. We need to work together to solve the problem.

People have said that this whole issue of certification is flawed. We need to have a commission to take a look at it and find a commonsense way to treat

it. This amendment is a commonsense way that our Government can work together, that we stay the decertification for 90 days, that we find a way to solve the problem.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LAHOOD]. Is the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] opposed to the amendment?

Mr. HAMILTON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, let me say that what we are faced with here is a diversion from Hershey. We have great discussions about bipartisanship and rather than dealing with the responsibilities that are before us, we take up the campaign rhetoric over the debate on how to proceed internally in this country on the issue of fighting drugs. A legitimate issue, we ought to take it up.

You are in the majority. Bring a bill to the floor that provides a new drug policy. But the challenge before the Congress, as it came from the Committee on International Relations, is a challenge that has to deal with the issue of whether or not we feel that our Mexican neighbor has met the requirements in laws established in this Congress to deal with fighting of drugs and fighting the shipment of drugs and the operations in the drug industry.

When we look at the bottom of page 3, page 4 and page 5, we are not dealing with Mexican certification. We are taking the Dole campaign language or some variation on it. We are going after the Clinton administration. You may want to go after the Clinton administration and maybe you ought to be after the Clinton administration on drug policy. Maybe you have differences.

□ 1430

That is not what we ought to be doing here today. What we ought to do here today is fulfill our responsibilities. There are some people here that say the Mexicans have tried, they maybe have not made it, but it would be very damaging to reject the Mexicans altogether.

Some of us on the Committee on International Relations understand the pressure the President was under to help a President of Mexico he was working with, and he certified them. Some other people, myself included, joined with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] to say, "Maybe they tried but they haven't met the law and we don't think they've met certification, they haven't really fulfilled their responsibility, but we think it is in the vital national interest to continue to work with the Mexicans."

That is not what this amendment is about. This amendment is about bash-

ing the administration. That is a great sideshow. But we ought to make a decision here. If we are going to have speeches about bipartisanship, about sticking to the substance, then we ought to do it. There are legitimate positions to argue here. Some people argue, "Certify them, they're trying, they've lost lots of police officers, they're making an effort and this would hurt the Mexican Government if we don't do it."

Some feel, "Yes, you've made an effort, you haven't met the law, we ought to use our vital national interests of both countries to certify." That is not what this amendment is about.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my friends on both sides of the aisle to reject this amendment if we want to do the work we were sent here to do. If we want to play politics and rerun the Presidential campaign, then vote for this amendment. If we want to deal with the national policies on how we fight drugs here in more than political rhetoric, bring the bill forward, bring the budget forward. If we want to deal with the responsibilities we have, then let us deal with this issue in the way it was meant to be dealt with.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT]. He has worked long and hard in the fight against illicit narcotics from abroad.

Staying the effect of decertification for 90 days until we see evidence presented by the President of increased Mexican cooperation in fighting drugs is a sound idea.

Extraditions of Mexican nationals on real drug charges so that they can stand trial here in the United States, maritime boarding agreements, and the effective assignment of more DEA agents to Mexico; these are significant efforts forward. They can seriously help fight the war on drugs along our long Mexican border to the South.

For far too long, the administration has been satisfied with business as usual in this serious drug situation with Mexico, and glossed over it with high-level official photo ops, while these items languished unresolved.

No more. Congress wants to see real, concrete action by the administration to bring about real change in stemming the flow of nearly 50 to 60 percent of the illicit drugs coming to our Nation across Mexico, and later destroying our kids.

For those critics who might say nothing works, and the United States demand is the major factor in the crisis of drugs, let me remind them of a little recent history.

Not long ago, this nation was able to reduce monthly cocaine use by nearly 80 percent during a sustained period from 1985 to 1992. We went from 5.8 million monthly cocaine users down to just 1.3 million cocaine users, each month. Few Federal programs can point to such success.

Nancy Reagan's "Just Say No" policy, combined with tough eradication, interdiction, and strong law enforcement on the supply side, along with education, treatment, and rehabilitation on the demand side, worked.

The administration needs to get back to basics.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support the Hastert amendment to House Joint Resolution 58.

Let's send a message both to this administration and to the Mexican Government that the American people have spoken, enough is enough. Let our children and our future generations not have to endure the scourge of illicit drugs from abroad.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN] who is well noted for his work on both supply and demand reduction in this country.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am rising today because I am in strong support of this approach, the Hastert amendment. I think it is a balanced and reasonable approach. As the gentleman said, I have been involved in this issue, actually not on the supply side, on the demand side. I have focused more on prevention, on education, on trying to help in our communities to change kids' attitudes so they do not do drugs, trying to make a real difference in reversing what is a very tragic trend around our country of younger and younger kids using drugs more and more.

One thing I like about this amendment is I do not think it does point the finger at Mexico. Let me read something in the amendment. It clearly states in the findings, "No single action is a sufficient response to the threat posed to our society by illegal drugs." It goes on. It talks about the need to emphasize in our drug control policy prevention, education, community action, parents, getting our parents to talk to their kids about the dangers of drug abuse, why it is wrong. If we do that, we are really going to make a difference. I do not think anything is more important.

But this fight also needs to be fought at every level. How can we say we are really serious about fighting the drug war if, in the face of all the evidence we have, we simply certify Mexico? It just does not make any sense.

It does not need to be partisan, it should be bipartisan, but how can we in our communities push this, do everything we can in Congress? And I was just testifying on the bill we have got before a subcommittee on the community side of this thing. We need to do more, all of us, both sides of the aisle. And Congress needs to do more.

But how can we with any legitimacy be out there pushing this drug war and then say Mexico deserves certification? They cannot get a clean bill of health. It just does not make sense.

Instead we need to do something reasonable. I think this is reasonable. We do not decertify Mexico. Instead we

give the President 90 days. We say the President can work with Mexico for 90 days on 6 what I think are very tangible, very concrete and legitimate concerns. If the President works with Mexico during this 90-day period, certification can result. The effort to reduce drugs in this country, the future of our kids, is too important for us not to do all we can to get Mexico to do the right thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would advise both Members that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has the right to close on this amendment.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in the years that I have been in Congress, I cannot think of one time that I have disagreed with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] or the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] on a question having to do with the war on drugs. Both of these gentlemen have been in the forefront of every worthwhile project. And I must say, in looking at the amendment that has been filed and that is before the House at this time, that the 6 points are very well thought out and should be in this bill.

However, going on to the second provision in the bill, we find what for many of our Democrat friends will be a poison pill. It is unnecessary. It does not add to the meaning of the bill and it should not be part of this particular bill. I regret that it is in there, and therefore I must reluctantly oppose this particular amendment.

I think it is time for us to build an alliance on what we agree upon and not try to, when we find that we are coming together on an issue and working on such an important issue, with Democrats and Republicans working together and building an alliance, we should not trample on that alliance by putting something into an amendment that is going to be a difficult poison pill for our friends on the Democrat side to swallow. Therefore, I disagree with this particular provision within the amendment.

I think it is vitally important, and I would speak now to my Republican side, it is vitally important that we come out of this particular session and this vote with a huge majority. We need to send a message down to the Senate that we are serious about what we are talking about on decertification.

We need as many on the Democrat side as we can possible get. It is a difficult vote for them voting to override the certification that the Democrat President has placed upon Mexico. Let us not make it tougher. Let us work together.

These 6 points, I am confident that they add so much to the bill that they will end up in the bill that will finally come back after the conference, be-

cause it is a good amendment until you get to the poison pill. But we do not have the ability here to separate the amendment. We do not have the ability under the rule to separate out that particular portion. But we do have the ability in conference to put back the good, sound thinking of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] on the part of the amendment that really makes sense and has substance to it.

Therefore, I would ask that the Republicans look at this as a chance to build bridges to the other side and to build on this alliance. Drug policy has never been and should not be a partisan issue. We will have plenty of times to talk about the record of Mr. Clinton as far as the drug issue. As a Republican, I cannot say that anything I disagree with is in the bill, but this is no place for it. It should not be in this amendment. Therefore, I ask all the members to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Chair how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX of California. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that we are here, of course, is that last month Mexican President Zedillo had a tough decision to make and he made it. The arrest of General Gutierrez at the same time makes it impossible for us today to say that Mexico has met the standard in our statute that would permit us to certify them as fully cooperating in the war on drugs. That is because, according to our own administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, General Gutierrez's damage, the damage that he did to ongoing operations in the United States and in Mexico, was so serious that it ranks with the damage caused to our international intelligence operations by admitted spy Aldrich Ames. The conditions in the law have not been met, and we cannot certify. And yet the President has already done so.

There is some talk on the floor of the need for bipartisanship, but every Democrat and every Republican on the committee that sent this bill to the floor, even though there was unanimity, found himself or herself in direct opposition to the Clinton administration because the President and the administration have already certified Mexico even though all of us agree that is wrong.

If, therefore, the committee bill is passed, we have this inexorable result. Not only will the Senate not take it up, and we know that our colleagues in the other body have told us that nothing will come of this if we pass it unamended, but the President will ignore it, and the committee itself put a waiver in it which if somehow this

were to become law, the President would exercise. So after a lot of sound and fury and possibly injury to our bilateral relations with Mexico, we would have accomplished precisely nothing. But with this considered amendment, we have an opportunity to do significantly more than nothing. We have an opportunity to take the decertification process, itself a blunt instrument, and make it a more delicate one, one that will encourage both the United States and Mexico to redouble their efforts in the war on drugs. Our goal should be not simply to decertify Mexico as a partner in the war on drugs but in fact to fully certify them, to bring them to the point where they are in compliance and to bring the United States efforts up to par where we will not have to admit honestly to ourselves that drug use among adults has gone up every year in this country since 1992, the first sustained increase since the 1970s; where we will have to no longer admit to ourselves that marijuana use among teens is doubling.

We and Mexico both have steps that we must take. By decertifying, as this amendment will do, because it leaves the committee bill intact in that respect, and staying that for 90 days during which time the administration of President Clinton and the administration of President Zedillo can work and take positive, constructive steps to satisfy our concerns that cause us now to say we cannot certify, we will have done far more, both in fighting the war on drugs and for improving our relations with Mexico.

Our goal should not be in the end even to have Mexico as a fully certified partner in the drug war, but to have Mexico as a full partner in all matters, civil, societal, cultural, defense, and national security. They should be our close ally. Many people in Mexico intend for that indeed to be our relationship.

The arrest of General Gutierrez and the exposure of all the damage he caused is the reason we are here today. Let us make sure that this is an opportunity for us to move forward and not a permanent setback.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I think we have the right to close. We have only one other speaker here. I believe they have time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] has 1 minute remaining and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. I thank my colleague from Illinois for allowing me this opportunity to close the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I was down in Mexico last weekend when the headlines appeared in the newspaper and President Zedillo said that the sovereignty of Mexico was at stake. What became apparent to me is that this country (Mexico) would react very unfavorably to a

motion to decertify. I think the motion that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] has outlined is an able compromise that we should all get behind, particularly on this side of the aisle. For those Members who are considering that this is not a compromise, it is a compromise, because we could get something that could be much more damaging to economic progress in Mexico and to their feeling that their integrity is being questioned. There is no doubt we could improve our relationships, improve our drug programs between the two countries. We need to improve our drug program here too. So I pose this question to all my colleagues. How does the money get from the people who use drugs here in the United States back to the Mexican drug cartels? Does the United States not have a level of responsibility here? These are huge sums of money, billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly think the best solution is to vote for the Hastert amendment.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First let me say a word of appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman of the House International Relations Committee. He has cooperated with me and with the minority throughout this process and I am deeply grateful to him. I think the work product of the committee is still the best option before us, and he deserves a lot of credit for that. Second, although I am not able to support the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], I recognize that he has tried very hard to build a consensus on a critical issue, he has done it in a very nice manner, and I want to let him know that I appreciate his willingness to talk with me and try to develop a consensus.

□ 1445

I am not able, however, to support the Hastert amendment. Before I mention specifically the reasons, I think it is important to recognize in this debate that there really are a lot of areas of agreement. Debate tends to emphasize the areas of disagreement.

We all want to stop drugs flowing into this country. We all know we need the cooperation of the Mexican Government in order to stop the flow. We all know we are wrestling here with a difficult law in many respects. We are applying a present law here more than we are drafting a new law, and that law puts us in some difficult positions.

There are two reasons I think why I cannot support the Hastert amendment. One of them is that I really think it is highly partisan and will not permit us to adopt a bipartisan posture which I think is most important here. In many ways the amendment is a vehicle for criticizing the President's drug policy.

I do not need to quote a lot of things here, but it talks about the U.S. Government strategy being weak, it talks

about our policy reducing the national security policies, it talks about supporting unproven drug treatment techniques, and in general has a pretty strong attack against the President. I think it ensures that the President would not be able to sign it, and that means the amendment that we are debating and discussing and will vote on in just a few minutes will not be enacted into law.

I say to my colleagues, "If you adopt the Hastert amendment, you abandon the opportunity we have had under the bill reported by Chairman GILMAN for a clear bipartisan message to the world about the seriousness with which the Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle consider narcotics."

Now, second, I want to say on the substance of the Hastert amendment that I think it puts President Zedillo in a real box. The U.S. national interest here is clear. We want to stop the flow of drugs through Mexico to the United States, we have got to have the cooperation of Mexico, but what this does is to require the President to report to the Congress in 90 days that he has obtained reliable assurances and substantial progress toward 6 critical areas of United States-Mexican cooperation on counternarcotics.

I want to remind my colleagues that 90 days from now we have national elections in Mexico. The United States congressional decertification debate has generated a nationalist fury in Mexico, and we can be sure that no one in Mexico, and especially not the President, will be able to advance these critical initiatives without being accused of conspiring with the United States to infringe on Mexican sovereignty. What we do here is we put President Zedillo, I think, in a box by detailing the demands for Mexico in this amendment, and he simply cannot be seen, especially in these next 90 days, as capitulating to a long list of American demands. And during that 90-day period we put him in the spotlight, and anything that he does to cooperate with the United States will be revoked and criticized by opposition politicians and by nationalists within his own party. And so I think we threaten the prospect of cooperation.

Let me urge if we defeat Hastert, then we will vote immediately on the committee product, and I urge that course.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time having expired, pursuant to House Resolution 95 the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution and on the pending amendments.

The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 205, answered “present” 9, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]		
YEAS—212		
Aderholt	Gilchrest	Pappas
Archer	Gillmor	Parker
Armey	Gilman	Pastor
Bachus	Gingrich	Paxon
Baker	Goodlatte	Pease
Ballenger	Goodling	Peterson (PA)
Barr	Goss	Petri
Barrett (NE)	Graham	Pickering
Bartlett	Granger	Pitts
Bass	Greenwood	Pombo
Bateman	Gutknecht	Porter
Bereuter	Hall (TX)	Portman
Bilbray	Hansen	Pryce (OH)
Bilirakis	Hastert	Quinn
Bliley	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Blunt	Hayworth	Ramstad
Boehlert	Herger	Regula
Boehner	Hill	Riggs
Bono	Hilleary	Riley
Boucher	Hobson	Rogan
Brady	Hoekstra	Rogers
Bryant	Horn	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Hostettler	Ros-Lehtinen
Burr	Houghton	Royce
Burton	Hulshof	Ryun
Buyer	Hutchinson	Salmon
Callahan	Hyde	Sanford
Calvert	Inglis	Saxton
Camp	Istook	Schaefer, Dan
Canady	Jenkins	Schaffer, Bob
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Castle	Jones	Sessions
Chabot	Kasich	Shadegg
Chambliss	Kelly	Shays
Christensen	Kim	Shimkus
Coble	Klug	Shuster
Coburn	Knollenberg	Skeen
Collins	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Cook	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Cooksey	Largent	Smith (OR)
Cox	Latham	Smith (TX)
Crane	LaTourette	Smith, Linda
Crapo	Lazio	Snowbarger
Cubin	Leach	Solomon
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Souder
Danner	Lewis (KY)	Spence
Davis (VA)	Linder	Stearns
Deal	Livingston	Stump
DeLay	LoBiondo	Sununu
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Talent
Dickey	Manzullo	Tauzin
Doolittle	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
Dreier	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	McDade	Thomas
Dunn	McInnis	Thornberry
Ehlers	McIntosh	Thune
Ehrlich	McKeon	Tiahrt
Emerson	McKinney	Trafficant
Everett	Metcalf	Upton
Ewing	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Fawell	Molinari	Wamp
Foley	Moran (KS)	Watkins
Forbes	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Fowler	Nethercutt	Weller
Fox	Neumann	White
Franks (NJ)	Ney	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Northup	Wicker
Gallegly	Norwood	Wolf
Ganske	Nussle	Young (AK)
Gekas	Oxley	Young (FL)
Gibbons	Packard	

NAYS—205

Abercrombie	Bonior	Condit
Ackerman	Borski	Conyers
Allen	Boswell	Costello
Andrews	Boyd	Coyne
Baesler	Brown (CA)	Cramer
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	Cummings
Barcia	Brown (OH)	Davis (FL)
Barrett (WI)	Campbell	Davis (IL)
Barton	Capps	DeFazio
Bentsen	Cardin	DeGette
Berman	Carson	Delahunt
Berry	Chenoweth	DeLauro
Bishop	Clay	Dellums
Blagojevich	Clement	Deutsch
Blumenauer	Clyburn	Dicks
Bonilla	Combust	Dingell

Dixon	Kind (WI)	Pomeroy
Doggett	King (NY)	Poshard
Dooley	Klecza	Rahall
Doyle	Klink	Rangel
Edwards	Kucinich	Reyes
Engel	LaFalce	Rivers
English	Lampson	Roemer
Ensign	Lantos	Rothman
Eshoo	Levin	Roukema
Evans	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Farr	Lipinski	Sabo
Fattah	Lowe	Sanders
Fazio	Luther	Sandlin
Flake	Maloney (CT)	Sawyer
Foglietta	Maloney (NY)	Scarborough
Ford	Manton	Schiff
Frank (MA)	Markey	Schumer
Frost	Martinez	Scott
Furse	Mascara	Serrano
Gejdenson	Matsui	Shaw
Gephardt	McCarthy (MO)	Sherman
Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)	Sisisky
Goode	McDermott	Skaggs
Gordon	McGovern	Skelton
Green	McHale	Slaughter
Hall (OH)	McNulty	Smith, Adam
Hamilton	Meehan	Snyder
Harman	Meek	Spratt
Hastings (FL)	Menendez	Stabenow
Hefley	Mica	Stark
Hefner	Millender-McDonald	Stenholm
Hilliard	Miller (CA)	Stokes
Hinchee	Minge	Strickland
Hinojosa	Mink	Stupak
Holden	Moakley	Tanner
Hooley	Mollohan	Tauscher
Hoyer	Moran (VA)	Thompson
Hunter	Morella	Thurman
Jackson (IL)	Murtha	Tierney
Jackson-Lee	Nadler	Towns
(TX)	Neal	Turner
Jefferson	Obenstar	Vento
John	Oberstar	Visclosky
Johnson (CT)	Obey	Waters
Johnson (WI)	Olver	Watt (NC)
Johnson, E. B.	Owens	Waxman
Kanjorski	Pallone	Weldon (PA)
Kaptur	Pascrell	Wexler
Kennedy (MA)	Paul	Weygand
Kennedy (RI)	Payne	Wise
Kennelly	Pelosi	Woolsey
Kildee	Peterson (MN)	Wynn
Kilpatrick	Pickett	Yates

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—9

Becerra	Lofgren	Sanchez
Filner	Ortiz	Torres
Gutierrez	Roybal-Allard	Velazquez

NOT VOTING—7

Clayton	McHugh	Watts (OK)
Etheridge	McIntyre	
Kingston	Price (NC)	

□ 1507

Messrs. KIND, CLEMENT, and MORAN of Virginia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. SHUSTER, GILLMOR, PARKER, BILBRAY, and DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed her vote from “nay” to “present.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 46, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 229, noes 195, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]		
AYES—229		
Aderholt	Gibbons	Pappas
Archer	Gilchrest	Pastor
Armey	Gilman	Paxon
Bachus	Gingrich	Pease
Baesler	Goode	Peterson (PA)
Baker	Goodlatte	Petri
Ballenger	Goodling	Pickering
Barr	Gordon	Pitts
Barrett (NE)	Goss	Pombo
Bartlett	Graham	Porter
Bass	Granger	Portman
Bateman	Greenwood	Poshard
Bereuter	Gutknecht	Pryce (OH)
Bilirakis	Hansen	Quinn
Bliley	Hastert	Radanovich
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hayworth	Regula
Boehner	Herger	Riggs
Bono	Hill	Riley
Brady	Hilleary	Roemer
Bryant	Hobson	Rogan
Bunning	Hoekstra	Rogers
Burr	Holden	Rohrabacher
Burton	Horn	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Hostettler	Roukema
Callahan	Houghton	Royce
Calvert	Hulshof	Ryun
Camp	Hutchinson	Salmon
Campbell	Hyde	Sanders
Canady	Inglis	Sanford
Castle	Istook	Saxton
Chabot	Jenkins	Schiff
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Chenoweth	Jones	Sessions
Christensen	Kaptur	Shadegg
Clement	Kasich	Shaw
Coble	Kelly	Shimkus
Coburn	Kim	Shuster
Collins	Klug	Sisisky
Combust	Knollenberg	Skeen
Cook	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Cooksey	Kucinich	Smith (NJ)
Cox	LaHood	Smith (OR)
Cramer	Largent	Smith (TX)
Crane	Latham	Smith, Adam
Crapo	LaTourette	Smith, Linda
Cubin	Lazio	Snowbarger
Cunningham	Leach	Solomon
Danner	Lewis (CA)	Souder
Davis (FL)	Lewis (KY)	Spence
Davis (VA)	Linder	Stearns
Deal	Lipinski	Stump
DeFazio	Livingston	Sununu
Delahunt	LoBiondo	Talent
DeLay	Lucas	Tanner
Diaz-Balart	Manzullo	Tauzin
Dickey	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
Doolittle	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Dreier	McDade	Thomas
Duncan	McHale	Thune
Dunn	McInnis	Tiahrt
Ehlers	McKeon	Trafficant
Ehrlich	McKinney	Upton
Emerson	Metcalf	Walsh
English	Mica	Wamp
Everett	Miller (FL)	Watkins
Ewing	Molinari	Weldon (FL)
Fawell	Moran (KS)	Weldon (PA)
Foley	Moran (VA)	Weller
Forbes	Myrick	White
Fowler	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Fox	Neumann	Wicker
Franks (NJ)	Ney	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Northup	Young (AK)
Gallegly	Norwood	Young (FL)
Ganske	Nussle	
Gekas	Packard	

NOES—195

Abercrombie	Bilbray	Brown (OH)
Ackerman	Bishop	Cannon
Allen	Blagojevich	Capps
Andrews	Blumenauer	Cardin
Baldacci	Bonilla	Carson
Barcia	Bonior	Clay
Barrett (WI)	Borski	Clyburn
Barton	Boswell	Condit
Becerra	Boucher	Conyers
Bentsen	Boyd	Costello
Berman	Brown (CA)	Coyne
Berry	Brown (FL)	Cummings

Davis (IL)	Kennelly	Pickett
DeGette	Kildee	Pomeroy
DeLauro	Kilpatrick	Rahall
Deutsch	Kind (WI)	Rangel
Dicks	Kings (NY)	Reyes
Dingell	Klecza	Rivers
Dixon	Klink	Rothman
Doggett	LaFalce	Roybal-Allard
Dooley	Lampson	Rush
Doyle	Lantos	Sabo
Edwards	Levin	Sanchez
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Sandlin
Ensign	Lofgren	Sawyer
Eshoo	Lowey	Scarborough
Evans	Luther	Schaefer, Dan
Farr	Maloney (CT)	Schaffer, Bob
Fattah	Maloney (NY)	Schumer
Fazio	Manton	Scott
Filner	Markey	Serrano
Flake	Martinez	Shays
Foglietta	Mascara	Sherman
Ford	Matsui	Skaggs
Frank (MA)	McCarthy (MO)	Skelton
Frost	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter
Furse	McDermott	Snyder
Gejdenson	McGovern	Spratt
Gephardt	McIntosh	Stabenow
Gillmor	McNulty	Stark
Gonzalez	Meehan	Stenholm
Green	Meek	Stokes
Gutierrez	Menendez	Strickland
Hall (OH)	Millender	Stupak
Hall (TX)	McDonald	Tauscher
Hamilton	Miller (CA)	Thompson
Hastings (FL)	Minge	Thornberry
Hefley	Mink	Thurman
Hefner	Moakley	Tierney
Hilliard	Mollohan	Torres
Hinchey	Morella	Towns
Hinojosa	Murtha	Turner
Hookey	Nadler	Velazquez
Hoyer	Neal	Vento
Hunter	Oberstar	Visclosky
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Waters
Jackson-Lee	Oliver	Watt (NC)
(TX)	Ortiz	Watts (OK)
Jefferson	Owens	Waxman
John	Oxley	Wexler
Johnson (CT)	Pallone	Weygand
Johnson (WI)	Parker	Wise
Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Woolsey
Kanjorski	Paul	Wynn
Kennedy (MA)	Pelosi	Yates
Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (MN)	

NOT VOTING—9

Clayton	Harman	McIntyre
Dellums	Kingston	Payne
Etheridge	McHugh	Price (NC)

□ 1525

Mrs. MEEK of Florida changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KUCINICH changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. HAMILTON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAMILTON moves to recommit the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 58, to the Committee on International Relations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 251, noes 175, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

AYES—251

Aderholt	Franks (NJ)	McNulty
Archer	Frelinghuysen	Meek
Army	Gallegly	Metcalf
Bachus	Ganske	Mica
Baesler	Gekas	Miller (FL)
Baker	Gibbons	Molinari
Ballenger	Gilman	Moran (KS)
Barcia	Gingrich	Moran (VA)
Barr	Goode	Myrick
Barrett (NE)	Goodlatte	Neal
Bartlett	Goodling	Nethercutt
Bass	Gordon	Neumann
Bateman	Goss	Ney
Bereuter	Graham	Northup
Bilirakis	Granger	Norwood
Bliley	Greenwood	Nussle
Blunt	Gutknecht	Packard
Boehlert	Hall (TX)	Pappas
Boehner	Hansen	Pascrell
Bono	Harman	Paxon
Boyd	Hastert	Pease
Brown (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)
Bryant	Hastings (WA)	Peterson (PA)
Bunning	Hayworth	Petri
Burr	Hefley	Pickering
Burton	Hefner	Pitts
Buyer	Herger	Pombo
Callahan	Hill	Porter
Calvert	Hilleary	Portman
Camp	Hobson	Poshard
Campbell	Hoekstra	Pryce (OH)
Canady	Holden	Quinn
Castle	Horn	Radanovich
Chabot	Hostettler	Ramstad
Chambliss	Hulshof	Regula
Chenoweth	Hunter	Riggs
Christensen	Hutchinson	Riley
Clement	Hyde	Roemer
Coble	Inglis	Rogan
Collins	Istook	Rogers
Combest	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Condit	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Cook	Jones	Roukema
Cooksey	Kaptur	Royce
Costello	Kasich	Ryun
Cox	Kelly	Salmon
Cramer	Kildee	Sanders
Crane	Kim	Sanford
Crapo	King (NY)	Saxton
Cubin	Klug	Scarborough
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Schaefer, Dan
Danner	Kucinich	Schaffer, Bob
Davis (FL)	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Davis (VA)	Largent	Sessions
Deal	Latham	Shaw
DeFazio	LaTourette	Shimkus
Delahunt	Lazio	Shuster
DeLay	Leach	Sisisky
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Skeen
Dickey	Lewis (KY)	Skelton
Doolittle	Linder	Slaughter
Duncan	Lipinski	Smith (MI)
Dunn	Livingston	Smith (NJ)
Ehrlich	LoBiondo	Smith (OR)
Emerson	Lucas	Smith (TX)
English	Manzullo	Smith, Adam
Ensign	Markey	Smith, Linda
Evans	McCollum	Snowbarger
Everett	McCrery	Solomon
Ewing	McDade	Souder
Fawell	McHale	Spence
Foley	McInnis	Spratt
Forbes	McIntosh	Stark
Fowler	McKeon	Stearns
Fox	McKinney	Stump

Sununu	Tiahrt	Weldon (PA)
Talent	Trafigant	Weller
Tanner	Upton	White
Tauzin	Visclosky	Whitfield
Taylor (MS)	Walsh	Wicker
Taylor (NC)	Wamp	Wolf
Thomas	Watkins	Young (AK)
Thune	Watts (OK)	Young (FL)
Thurman	Weldon (FL)	

NOES—175

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Murtha
Ackerman	Gilchrest	Nadler
Allen	Gillmor	Oberstar
Andrews	Gonzalez	Obey
Baldacci	Green	Oliver
Barrett (WI)	Gutierrez	Ortiz
Barton	Hall (OH)	Owens
Becerra	Hamilton	Oxley
Bentsen	Hilliard	Pallone
Berman	Hinchey	Parker
Berry	Hinojosa	Pastor
Bilbray	Hookey	Paul
Bishop	Houghton	Payne
Blagojevich	Hoyer	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Pickett
Bonilla	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy
Bonior	(TX)	Rahall
Borski	Jefferson	Rangel
Boswell	John	Reyes
Boucher	Johnson (CT)	Rivers
Brady	Johnson (WI)	Rothman
Brown (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Rush
Cannon	Kennedy (MA)	Sabo
Capps	Kennedy (RI)	Sanchez
Cardin	Kennelly	Sandlin
Carson	Kilpatrick	Sawyer
Clay	Kind (WI)	Schiff
Clyburn	Klecza	Schumer
Coburn	Klink	Scott
Coyne	Kolbe	Serrano
Cummings	LaFalce	Shadegg
Davis (IL)	Lampson	Shays
DeGette	Lantos	Sherman
DeLauro	Levin	Skaggs
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Snyder
Deutsch	Lofgren	Stabenow
Dicks	Lowey	Stenholm
Dingell	Luther	Stokes
Dixon	Maloney (CT)	Strickland
Doggett	Maloney (NY)	Stupak
Dooley	Manton	Tauscher
Doyle	Martinez	Thompson
Dreier	Mascara	Thornberry
Edwards	Matsui	Tierney
Ehlers	McCarthy (MO)	Torres
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Eshoo	McDermott	Turner
Farr	McGovern	Velazquez
Fattah	Meehan	Vento
Fazio	Menendez	Waters
Filner	Millender	Watt (NC)
Flake	McDonald	Waxman
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Wexler
Ford	Minge	Weygand
Frank (MA)	Mink	Wise
Frost	Moakley	Woolsey
Furse	Mollohan	Wynn
Gejdenson	Morella	Yates

NOT VOTING—7

Clayton	Kingston	Price (NC)
Conyers	McHugh	
Etheridge	McIntyre	

□ 1546

Mr. DICKS, and Mr. STRICKLAND changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAPERWORK ELIMINATION ACT OF 1997

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 88 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows: