

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

THE NEWLY MINTED SACAJAWEA ONE-DOLLAR COIN

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the other night I spoke about the success of the new 50 States Commemorative Quarter program the U.S. Mint has instituted from legislation by Congress. The quarter program, under the supervision of Director Phillip Deel at the Mint, has been nothing short of extremely successful. The program, over a period of 10 years, will dedicate 5 States per year to have a State symbol of their choice minted on the back of the quarter dollar coin.

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers need to understand that coins actually are an incredible revenue money-maker for the Treasury. The reason is simple. All coins have a face value upon their creation, but the cost to the Mint to mint the coin is obviously far less than the face value of the coin.

For instance, the quarter costs the Mint about 5 cents to manufacture. Simple math says there is a 20 cent differential. This differential is called seigniorage, and at the end of every year the Treasury adds this differential to the budget. That is, it helps to pay for the spending that is necessary by the government.

Last year, the total made by all seigniorage made by the Treasury was a little over \$1 billion; yes, \$1 billion with a "B." Just think, last year the demand for quarters was a little over one billion quarters. This year it is estimated that the Mint will make over 5 billion quarters. From the quarter program alone, the Treasury stands to bring in an extra billion dollars per year, which will help lower the debt of our Nation.

Tonight I want to speak about another coin program. I met with representatives of the U.S. Mint today. The Mint will start production in March of 2000 on the new Sacajawea one-dollar coin. If we remember, the Susan B. Anthony dollar was not a huge success. The main criticism was that its appearance was too much like a quarter. The new coin will be gold in color, with a smooth edge, and on the face of the coin will be a picture of Sacajawea, the Native American woman who is remembered for many qualities, especially for her help to the Lewis and Clark expedition.

As I said earlier, the profit to the taxpayers on each quarter is around 20 cents but the profit on the new Sacajawea dollar coin will be almost 90 cents. Did the taxpayers hear that? Ninety cents seigniorage on every coin.

The Mint estimates about 700 million new dollar coins will be made in the year 2000. That means that in its first

year, the new dollar coin will return to the Treasury about \$600 million. This is one of the soundest reasons to maintain our coins and to understand the importance of increasing demand. Whether new designs or commemorative programs, the increase in demand means more revenue for the Treasury and less money taxpayers have to pay for government. It also will help battle our national debt, which still looms at over \$5 trillion.

As I talk on coins, new kinds of money systems are looming on the horizon with the advent of new technology. Whether they come in the form of smart cards, cyber cash, debit cards or electronic money wallets, remember one thing, when another medium of exchange is accepted, someone else, besides the U.S. Treasury, is getting the profit, and the taxpayers are not reaping the profit.

So here is to the new dollar. I believe it will be accepted by the public as a convenience, especially as the dollar coin machines come more into use.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

PUT YOUR MONEY WHERE YOUR MOUTH IS AND SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, before I begin I want it to be clear that I do not want to be associated with the remarks of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle pertaining to education and I want to be clear I am talking about the Republicans. Let us not

forget that in 1995 the Republicans repealed many of the educational programs that we were discussing here today. They voted to deny Pell grants to thousands of students. They voted to slash the safe and drug-free drug program. They voted to cut Head Start, deny thousands of children an early childhood education. They even voted to cut school lunch programs and they voted to cut food stamps for 14 million children.

My constituents do not understand how a program is saved by cutting it. They knew that when they sent me here that I would never understand that concept, either.

I come to the floor today to discuss another issue that is vital to the welfare of the citizens of the State of Florida. Currently, over 3 million Floridians are receiving Social Security benefits, including over 100,000 in my district. Ever since the Democrats, and let me repeat that, ever since the Democrats created Social Security in 1935, let me repeat that again, the Democrats created Social Security in 1935, not only has it been the centerpiece around which Americans planned their retirement but it has provided peace of mind and benefits to both the disabled workers and the children and sponsors of deceased beneficiaries.

This peace of mind is something few private insurance plans offer. Social Security is especially important to the millions of women who rely on Social Security to keep them out of poverty. Elderly women, including widows, get over 50 percent of their income from Social Security. Women tend to live longer and tend to have lower lifetime earnings than men. They spend an average of 11.5 years out of their careers to care for the family and are more likely to work part time than full-time, and when they do work full-time they earn an average of 70 cents of every dollar men earn. These women are either mothers, wives and daughters and we must save Social Security for them.

I am glad to see that after years of demonizing the Social Security program, Republicans are starting to realize how important this program is. Unfortunately for the American people, my Republican colleagues talk the talk but they do not walk the walk. While the President and the Democrats in Congress want to use the budget surplus to secure the Social Security program, Republicans want to give special interests and the wealthy a huge tax cut, over \$700 billion the last time I checked.

I recently had several young children visiting me here in Washington participating in the Voices Against Violence program. One of the first questions they asked me was whether or not Social Security would be there for them. I told them it would be there if we took this opportunity we now have to secure the program.

So I ask my colleagues to do the right thing for the kids and the thousands of children throughout the

United States who are wondering the same thing. Put your money where your mouth is and save Social Security.

□ 2320

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor late tonight to talk about a subject I often talk about, normally on Tuesday nights in a special order, but did not get that opportunity this week, so I am here tonight to talk about what I consider to be one of the most important social problems facing not only the Congress but the American people in almost every community and almost every family across our land, and that is the problem of illegal narcotics.

In the House of Representatives, I have the honor and privilege of chairing the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform. And in that subcommittee we have done our best to try to bring together every possible resource of the Congress and of the American government in an effort to combat illegal narcotics.

The ravages of illegal narcotics and its impact on our population I have spoken to many times on the floor of the House. I just mentioned last week that we now exceed 15,200 individuals who died last year, in 1998, from drug-induced deaths. This is up some nearly 8 percent over the previous year.

I have also talked on the floor of the House of Representatives and to my colleagues about some of the policies that were passed by the Clinton administration in 1993, when they controlled both the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the White House, all three bodies, and fairly large voting margins in the House of Representatives. So, basically, they could do whatever they wanted to do. Unfortunately, as is now history, they took a wrong turn in the effort to combat illegal narcotics.

They began by closing down the drug czar's office from some nearly 120 employees in that office to about two dozen employees in that office. They dismissed nearly all of the drug czar's staff. With the Republican Congress, and through the efforts of the former chairman of the oversight committee of drug policy, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), who is now Speaker of the House of Representatives, we have restored those cuts. We have manpower now in that office of nearly 150 individuals under the supervision of our drug czar, General Barry McCaffrey.

Under the Clinton administration, the source country programs to stop il-

legal narcotics at their source were stopped in 1993. They were slashed some 50 percent plus. This took the military out of the interdiction effort, which closed down much of the interdiction effort and having the Coast Guard work to secure some of our borders and our maritime areas. Those efforts were dramatically slashed. And, additionally, other cuts were made.

Changes in policy were made that were quite dramatic. The surgeon general, chief health officer of the United States, appointed by the President, was then Joycelyn Elders, and that individual sent the wrong message: Just say maybe. So we had the highest leadership in the land and we had the highest health officer developing a different policy, a policy that really failed us.

I have some dramatic charts here tonight that show exactly what happened. I had our subcommittee staff put these together to show the long-term trend and lifetime prevalence of drug use. We can see during the Reagan and Bush administration that the long-term trend in lifetime drug use was on a decline. And I have talked about this and sort of illustrated it by hand, but we have graphically detailed this from 1980, when President Reagan took office, on down to where President Clinton took office. I do not think there is anything that I have shown on the floor that can more dramatically illustrate the direct effects of that change in policy. And that policy, as we can see, had illegal narcotics going up.

What is interesting is we see a slight change here, and that is after the Republicans took control of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate and started to put, as I say, Humpty Dumpty back together again. Because we basically had no drug war here. If we want to call it a drug war, we have actually almost doubled the amount of money for treatment.

Now, just putting money on treatment of those afflicted by illegal narcotics, not having the equipment, the resources, the interdiction, the source country programs, is like conducting a war and just treating the wounded. Someone told me it is sort of like having a MASH unit and not giving the soldiers any ammunition or the ability to fight or conduct the war. And this is so dramatically revealed in this chart.

What is interesting, if we look at some other charts of specific narcotics, we see sort of a steady up-and-down trend, and a good trend down during the Bush administration in the long-term, lifetime prevalence in the use of heroin. In the Clinton administration, it practically shoots off the chart. And again, when we restarted our war on drugs, through the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), who chaired the subcommittee with this responsibility before me, and in this Republican-controlled Congress, there was a renewed emphasis, a change in policy, employing a multifaceted approach which again began attacking drugs at their source, again

employing interdiction, again trying to utilize every resource that we have in this effort. And it is a national responsibility to stop illegal narcotics at their source. And now here we see graphically displayed what has happened with heroin use.

What is absolutely startling is that some of this usage in this area, these dramatic increases, we had an 875 percent increase in teen use of heroin in that period of time that we see here with the Clinton administration. Eight hundred seventy-five percent. And we are experiencing dozens and dozens of deaths in my central Florida community from this heroin, because it is not the same heroin that was on the streets in the 1980s or the 1970s that had a purity of 6 and 7 percent. This is 80 and 90 percent pure. These young people take it and they die. And there are more and more of them using it.

But we have managed to begin to turn this around through the efforts, again, of a Republican-led Congress. And this shows, again, some dramatic change in usage. This is another absolutely startling chart that our staff has prepared. We traced the long-term trend in the prevalence of cocaine use. In the Reagan administration, we see here where we had a problem. And I remember as a staffer working with Senator Hawkins, who led some of the effort in the United States Senate back in the early 1980s, that they began the downturn. In the Bush administration, incredible progress was made. Back in the Clinton administration, we see again a rise of cocaine use and drug abuse. And this is basically where they closed down the war on drugs.

□ 2330

Now, what is very interesting is we are at a very important juncture here in the House of Representatives. We need 13 appropriations measures to fund the Government. And among the 13 appropriations measures, one of those is to fund and assist with the finance and operations of the District of Columbia.

Many people do not pay much attention to this. Some of the Members pay little attention to this. But I think that the situation with the District of Columbia is very important to talk about tonight as it relates to changes in drug policy.

We have to remember that one of the major issues of contention here between the Republican Congress and between the Democrat side of the aisle is a liberalization of drug policy. That manifests itself in two ways.

First, there is support on the other side of the aisle for a needle exchange program in the District. There is also an effort here to allow the medical use of marijuana and liberalization of some of the marijuana laws here, two policies with a liberal slant.

Now, let me say something about the liberal policies that have been tried. And I have used this chart before. Let me take this chart and put it up here.