

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.

This is the policy of Baltimore which Baltimore adopted some 10 years ago. Baltimore has a needle exchange program. That needle exchange program has resulted in 1996 in 38,900, according to DEA at that time, drug addicts.

So they started a needle exchange program, they lost population, and they gained dramatic increase in drug addiction, particularly heroin addiction.

Now, this is the chart from 1996. I have a Time Magazine article from September 6, and it says, and this is not my quote, it is a quote from this article, it says one in every 10 citizens is a drug addict. And that is more to what the representative from Maryland in that particular area has told me.

However, listen to this: Government officials dispute the last claim. Here is a quote, and it is not my quote. "It is more like one in eight," says veteran City Councilwoman Rikki Spector, "and we have probably lost count."

So a liberal policy that this House of Representatives' Democrat representation wants for Washington, that this President wants for Washington has been tried in Baltimore. This is the result.

I also will illustrate what has taken place in New York City with the murder decline. In New York City, you have Mayor Rudy Giuliani who has adopted a zero tolerance, no-nonsense, get tough and the opposite of a liberal policy but a tough policy. From the 2000 mark, they are down to the 600 level. In other words, in Baltimore, Baltimore in 1997, and I checked the figures, had 312 murders. In 1998, they had 312 murders. No decline, static, and with a liberal policy.

Here is a tough policy, and we see a dramatic decrease. It is almost a 70-percent decrease in murders. I think if you look at these murders in both of these cities you will find that they are drug and illegal narcotics related.

So the question before the Congress and the question before us tonight is really do we adopt a liberal policy?

Now, we have been there, and we have done that. I came to this Congress in 1992 and watched how with the other side controlling the House, the Senate, and the White House what they did. They had 40 years of control of this body and over policy of the District of Columbia. We have had a little more than 4 years. This is what we inherited. We inherited almost three-quarters of a billion dollar deficit that they were running here.

Here are some of the statistics about what had happened in Washington, and I will read these from The Washington Post and some other articles. They are not my quotes or statements. But the facts are, although the District of Columbia was 19th in size among American cities, its full-time employee population then was 48,000. We have got it down to some 33,000 kicking and screaming. It was only exceeded by New York and Los Angeles when we inherited that responsibility.

So we had a liberal policy which gave us one of the highest debts of any local government in the Nation, one of the highest number of employees. And the question was, was enough revenue coming in.

D.C. also had revenues per capita of \$7,289, which at that time was the highest in the Nation. We have managed in a little over 4 years to balance the budget in this budget that is being presented, that is being vetoed and the D.C. appropriations measure, that is being vetoed has been vetoed by the President.

The debt that the average citizen had was one of the highest figures in the United States at \$6,354. And that is what we inherited here. The other side is always concerned about how policies affect people. The Republicans inherited the District of Columbia. This is an article from 1995 when we inherited it of the impending cutbacks at D.C. General, this is the hospital, make it apparently inevitable that Washington's own public hospital will close its trauma center. And who would be hurt the hardest? This article says that thousands of poor and expensive-to-treat patients would be those who were hurt. This is what we inherited.

Now we have gotten this in order, and the question is do we want to go back to those liberal policies and high-spending, high-taxing policies?

Here is a great story. Talk about helping children. After 6 months in the District bureaucratic trenches, this is a woman who came from Guam and was a welfare specialist and this is quoted from 1995 in The Washington Post. This lady quit. Saddened and shocked, she said, by a foster care system so bad that it actually compounds the problems of neglected children and their families.

She said she came here from Guam, she worked in Guam, and she said then to come here and see one of the worst situations, it is depressing. This is what the Republican majority inherited, and this is what the other side would like to go back to with again their liberal policies, their tax policies.

Here is an article that I saved from 1996. "Ghost payrolls ought to determine dead retirees in District getting pensions." Again, a system out of control. Again, the question of responsibility and education. This is what we inherited in 1995. Currently, we have 20 condemned boilers in the schools, 103 of 230 buses are non-operational because of the budget crisis. And at that time again they were spending three-quarters of a billion over their budget.

And very sadly, I recall and I saved this article. It says, "With past due, St. Elizabeth skimps on children's meals."

They want to go back to those wonderful days of yesteryear when they controlled the District of Columbia for some 40 years. This is what they did for those people that they supposedly care about after taxing them nearly to death, running business, running population out.

□ 2340

This is a quote:

"Some mentally ill children at the District's St. Elizabeths Hospital have been fed little more than rice, jello and chicken for the last month after some suppliers refused to make deliveries because they haven't been paid." And they had not been paid even with running a supplement from the taxpayers across the United States of three-quarters of a billion dollars running in debt.

The housing program in the District of Columbia, again to return to those wonderful days of yesteryear when they controlled the House of Representatives, the Senate and the White House, this is 1995. According to a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development rating system, the District subsidized housing program achieved the lowest ranking of any urban public housing agency in the Nation. On a scale where a score below 60 places an agency in the troubled category, the District's rating plunged from 37 in 1991 to 19 in 1993. They ran it into the ground and now they want to do it again.

What is interesting is, I had another chart here that I wanted to show, but I will not have time tonight. I will try to get back to it next Tuesday when we continue our effort to show why we should not go to a liberal policy on narcotics, on spending, on taxation that is being proposed by the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, do I have any time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). There being no designee of the minority leader, the gentleman may proceed until midnight.

Mr. MICA. In that case, Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue tonight rather than wait until next Tuesday night, again with some information that I think is very important.

I talked about the situation with Baltimore and with Washington and the inclination of the other side of the aisle to go now to a liberal drug policy with needle exchange. Many people say, well, if you adopt a needle exchange, it will help cut down on HIV infections, it will help drug users. Let me just quote a program that was tried, a needle exchange program report that was given to our subcommittee, and tell a little bit about what took place with that particular needle exchange program which now I believe the President and the other side of the aisle would like to protect with the President's veto of the D.C. appropriations measure.

A 1997, Vancouver study reported that when their needle exchange program started in 1988, HIV prevalence in IV drug addicts was only 1 to 2 percent. It is now 23 percent.

We see that when they started out with a needle exchange program, at the very beginning they only had 1 to 2 percent infection rate. Now it jumped to 23 percent. The study found that 40 percent of HIV-positive addicts had

lent their used syringe in the previous 6 months. So the very intent of not having needles being exchanged and spreading HIV was actually increased by giving out these free needles. Again, this is the results of a needle exchange program study in Vancouver in 1998.

Additionally, the study found that 39 percent of the HIV negative addicts had borrowed a used syringe in the previous 6 months.

A Montreal study showed that HIV addicts who used needle exchange programs were more than twice likely to become infected with HIV as HIV addicts who did not use the needle exchange program. That is another study in Montreal.

The American Journal of Epidemiology in 1990 reported on a study that was entitled "Syringe Exchange and Risk of Infection With Hepatitis B and C Viruses." In this study there was no indication of a protective effect of syringe exchange against HBV or HCV infection. Indeed, the highest incidence of infection occurred among current users in the needle exchange program.

If it was not more conflicting than anything to have the administration, the President, veto the D.C. measure and also again the liberal side of the aisle here encourage and fight over adoption of a more liberal drug policy and a needle exchange policy, even the administration's own head of the Office of Drug Policy, General Barry McCaffrey, who is respected on both sides of the aisle has said, and let me quote from him, "By handing out needles, we encourage drug use. Such a message would be inconsistent with the tenor of our national youth-oriented antidrug campaign." That is again a quote by General McCaffrey.

So we have a choice of really going back to, as I said, the days of yesterday when we had the housing programs in the District of Columbia in default, we had the emergency medical services and the hospitals closing down or not able to operate. I have cited before on the House floor a story that I read in the Washington Post back again with the other side controlling the District budget, with the other side letting the funding of the District budget run amuck, with the other side letting a liberal policy of spending and taxation prevail in the District, I cited this report in the Washington Post where in fact it was said by a reporter that at that time you could dial 911 for emergency services or you could dial for a pizza to be delivered and you would get the pizza sometimes quicker than you could get the emergency medical services.

Again, the other side had 40 years to run this body and also to oversee the operations under the Constitution, and it is a specific constitutional mandate that the Congress do conduct oversight and is responsible for the District of Columbia. The question again before us is whether we want to return to the liberal policies and the failed policies of the past.

In addition to some of the areas that I cited that we inherited in the District for responsibility were also the prisons. The other side spent a fortune on the prisons. We ended up with inheriting a prison system that was basically out of control. In fact, it was so bad we basically had to close down the Lorton prison. The prisoners had taken over the prison.

Another story that was reported here in the Washington Post was the water system. Sometimes you could not drink the water in the District and basically the system was broken down and had to be renovated. The District office building, which was the seat of government, basically looked like a third world country capital headquarters. Air conditioners were falling out of the windows. I ask anyone to drive by the District office building now and see the refurbishing that is going on. It would make you very proud of the District of Columbia. That again is something we have been able to do in a little over 4 years, and they let go into default in some 40 years of their stewardship.

So do we want to return to that time of high spending, high taxes, of liberal policies? When I came to the District of Columbia some 7 years ago, the murder rate and most of the murders here are black-on-black murders and young males between the ages of 14 and 40, and we still have horrendous deaths here, but even in the District of Columbia through oversight of this new Republican majority, I think we have been able to bring down some of those deaths, to straighten out the law enforcement activities in the District which also were hurt tremendously by the liberal policies of spending and taxation that almost ruined our Nation's capital.

So we had a capital that was hemorrhaging, a capital that indeed had so many problems, I could probably spend the rest of the night citing article after article about the waste and abuse that we inherited here.

□ 2350

Again we are at a critical juncture in this appropriations process. The question is: Do we return again to those spending tendencies, and just because they spent more did not mean people got less. You heard what happened to the critically ill, you heard what happened to those children who were cares and wards of the city and the District of Columbia, you heard those who relied on public housing had a defunct public housing, the water system, the prison system.

So this is a real challenge, and it really magnifies what is going on with the rest of these appropriations bills, whether it is education that we discussed here today. Education system, and again in Washington they were spending more per capita and their students were performing at lower levels. Spend more; get a lower result, and regulate and administer in a very expensive fashion.

That is similar to some of the conflict that we face in these spending and appropriation bills. I call it the RAD approach, Regulate, Administer and Dictate, and that is what has happened in Washington, and that is what we are trying to fight as we try to pass 13 appropriations measures.

The real easy thing for the new majority, although we took a tremendous amount of guff for it, and people called us names and said that the sliced bread, as we know it, would no longer exist, and accused of all kind of things. We did bring our Nation's finances into order just as we brought the District of Columbia's finances into order, and it was a fairly simple thing. What you do is limit your expenditures. We did not have huge increases in these programs. Just like I cited the District of Columbia, we did not have huge increases. We moderated the increases. We were able to balance the budget.

Sometimes I think that was the easy part, even though we got a lot of grief for it.

The tough part is now in trying to take these programs like education that we have brought power and authority and programs to Washington so that a teacher cannot teach, so that there is not authority at the local level, so that there is not discipline in the classroom, so that the emphasis, again, is on creating regulations from Washington, administering from Washington and keeping the power in Washington as opposed to out there.

So now we are engaged, and even today we have been spending incredible amounts of money for young people and their education, and yet they have not performed well, and particularly those young people who are the most disadvantaged in our society and our schools and communities. So, programs like title I that are so important, we need to revisit; Head Start programs, we need to revisit; not eliminate, not destroy, not cut out, but make them work so that every dollar is effectively applied and that those young people have the best opportunity ever.

So this is what the debate is about, 13 appropriations measures. The President has vetoed the District bill and several other bills. He is holding several bills hostage. We have passed several this afternoon. We passed an Interior appropriations measure, and we must fund the government.

The hard work, as I said, is taking each of these programs together, whether it is Department of Interior, Education, Commerce, defense bills and making them work. My responsibility is a small responsibility, and that is trying to take the drug war that was closed down in 1993 by the Clinton administration, the drug policy which destroyed our ability to stop drugs cost effectively at their source or interdict them before they got to their borders. Once they get past our borders, it becomes almost an impossible task for our law enforcement, local communities and families to deal with that.

So we have seen an incredible increase in the supply of hard narcotics coming in with our guard let down with a doubling, in fact, of the money on treatment, and I have no problem with spending two or three times what we are spending on treatment as long as it is effective. But it must also be part of a multi-faceted program, a program of interdiction, eradication at source countries, a strong program of enforcement.

As I cited, the New York experience, zero tolerance does work. The liberal policy they tried in Baltimore and some other communities does not work. We could take Los Angeles and other communities that have had tough crack-down policies, and these figures and statistics from zero tolerance and tough enforcement are so dramatic they have affected our national crime rate.

And then of course education, and under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) who chaired this responsibility before me we initiated and launched the largest effort, a media campaign effort, ever by, I think, any government in probably the history of America or any government in getting an anti-narcotics message, a billion-dollars campaign over 5 years. We are now a little over a year into it. Last week our subcommittee held a hearing on where we are, how that money has been spent, is it being spent effectively.

So that is another part of this puzzle that we need to put back together, a part that really was not even there even in the Bush and Reagan administration and even through the Clinton administration. That money, that billion dollars we put up in taxpayer money, is matched by an equal or an amount in excess of that Federal contribution by a donation, so we think we are seeing again, and I will be glad to put the charts up again, see the beginning of a downturn. But it takes all of those efforts, not closing down the War on Drugs, and there was not a War on Drugs after 1993 to 1995, and it has taken us several years to get that back on track, to put, as I say Humpty Dumpty back together again.

So we have learned some lessons. Liberal policies, they just do not work.

The District is a very, a very, very exact case, and we can cite it agency after agency. We look at our federal bureaucracy, and we have the same thing, big spending, spend more get less. That is not the answer. But we need to make these programs less. If we need to spend more, I do not think there are folks here on our side of the aisle that would not adequately fund programs, but we want to see results. We do not want to return to a destroyed District of Columbia with the high spending, with the high taxes, with the agency after agency defunct with people who need help and people who need government to work, have it actually work against them, as it did here in the District of Columbia and

now does in some programs which we have not been able to change because of opposition, because of name calling and trying to hold on to the vestiges of the liberal past policies that do not work.

So tonight is not a full hour, and we will return next week with more information about our efforts to get our drug policy back on track and to make some of these programs work, but we certainly will stay here, will endure ve-toes by the President and slings and arrows from the other side, but we are going to make these things work, and we are going to make them work effectively and stay on track even though it is a difficult path.

So, with those comments, Mr. Speaker, and almost at the appointed hour of recess I am pleased to yield back.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MASCARA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 8:00 p.m. on account of medical reasons.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 2:00 p.m. on account of family matters.

Mr. CAMP (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of the birth of his daughter.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. KASICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NETHERCUTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today and October 22.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported

that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1663. An act to recognize National Medal of Honor sites in California, Indiana, and South Carolina.

H.R. 2670. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

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

H.R. 1663. To recognize National Medal of Honor sites in California, Indiana, and South Carolina.

H.R. 2841. To amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for greater fiscal autonomy consistent with other United States jurisdictions, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 25, 1999, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4863. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition to Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 99-033-2] received October 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4864. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Overseas Use of the Purchase Card [DFARS Case 99-D002] received October 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4865. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the retirement and advancement to the grade of lieutenant general of Lieutenant General William J. Bolt; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4866. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Introduction to FHA Programs—received October 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4867. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation Program; Executing or Terminating Leases on Moderate