

broadband Internet can solve so many of those problems.

We learned at that conference that there are children in my home State who start first grade with a 50-word vocabulary. Who go to school in the first grade knowing what a tomato looks like, but not knowing the word "tomato." Who know what a wagon does, but "wagon" is not in their vocabulary. Imagine those children connected to the Internet at home and all the sudden exposed to a worldwide view of information and learning. Connected to their teachers's web site at night to get help with homework and enlarge that vocabulary and give themselves a chance in the world.

Imagine if we do connect and we get high-speed services to a State like Louisiana what a difference it can make for the people of our State. And yet, those children today start with a 50-word vocabulary. Most children in America start with at least a 500-word vocabulary. Now, imagine if my State, or many parts of it, are left out of this high-speed digital revolution. Imagine if our children still start with that 50-word vocabulary and other kids in America connected to the broadband start instead with a 5,000-word vocabulary or 10,000-word vocabulary. Imagine how much further behind those kids become.

Imagine a small business in a rural town that is told because they do not have high-speed broadband Internet connectivity to the rest of the economy that their customers will not do business with them anymore. They are out of business unless they move to a high-speed Internet center somewhere. Imagine what it does to rural America, to poverty America, to minority centers in this country when they are told businesses cannot operate here because they are not connected and Washington never created a policy to ensure that they would be connected.

Imagine our company, our town, our school, our city, our hospital connected to a single monopoly provider unregulated by government. Imagine those conditions. We are not much better off than the one who is not connected at all. That is the world Legg Mason predicted for America in 3 years if we do not soon declare a new broadband policy for this country.

Mr. Speaker, when we come back to session early next year, I will be joined by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), former chairman of the Committee on Commerce and now ranking minority member. I will be joined by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER). The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) who serves on both the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Commerce and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) who is an esteemed and honorable member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

We will be joined on the floor by many other Members who will begin

talking about this issue and begin trying to elicit the help of Americans in create an interest here in Congress toward building a broadband Internet policy for this country that says no child will be left out, no one will be caught outside the digital divide, no one will be left behind as the high speed train leaves the station.

Recently, a book was published by a fellow named Tom Friedman called "The Lexus and the Olive Tree." In it he says in this new millennium there will not be a First World and Third World anymore. There will not be First World economies and Third World economies anymore. There will either be a fast world, part of this incredible high speed electronic commerce world where we all are connected and we all can reach each other and communicate and teach and learn and commerce with one another, or the slow world, left out, left behind.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to say tonight, and we will try to say next year in special order after special order, that America could not and should not let that happen to any citizen of our country. We cannot have half of America left behind. We cannot have a fourth of America totally locked out of this digital revolution. We cannot say that this is the land of opportunity for some but not for others.

Mr. Speaker, I will be back on the floor with my colleagues when we come back in January and we will burden you night after night because we will be on this floor talking about this digital divide, talking about the necessity to have real competition and real delivery of services to every citizen of this country in broadband Internet digital commerce, teaching, learning, medicine, and all the wonderful opportunities that those systems will bring.

THE PROBLEM OF ILLEGAL DRUG USE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor again tonight to talk about a subject that I have talked about many times on the floor of the House of Representatives, even last night until almost midnight, back here again tonight. But it is a topic of great personal concern to me and also one of my obligations as chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the House of Representatives. That is the problem of illegal narcotics and drug trafficking in the United States.

I left off last night talking a bit about the problem that we are facing with illegal narcotics. If I may tonight continue a bit of that discussion, and then for my colleagues I would also like to spend about half of the time that is devoted to me tonight to talking about another project that I have

been involved in and that is the United States Capitol Visitors' Center, a little bit different topic.

But first I would like to complete some of the information that I dealt with last night. That is again a continuation of my report on the status of both our efforts to curtail drugs coming into the United States and eradicate drugs at their source.

I have cited many times the scope of the problem that we face. It is monumental indeed for the Congress. The cost is a quarter of a trillion dollars a year to our economy. We have 1.8 million Americans behind bars and 70 percent of them are there because of drug-related offenses.

What is sad about the situation that we have, not only the tragedy and deaths, and I have reported the most recent statistics are that 15,973 deaths were reported from drug-induced causes in 1997, and that is compared to 11,703 in 1992. We have seen a dramatic increase in deaths due to illegal narcotics in our country. And, unfortunately, a lot of those statistics, the death statistics are disproportionate among our young people.

In my area in central Florida, we have a wonderful area, very prosperous. I represent the area from Orlando to Daytona Beach in central Florida. In Orlando, we have now had some 60 heroin overdose deaths in a little more than a year. Many of those, again, among young people. Taking the best of our young citizens and destroying their lives. It is a very tragic situation.

Headlines in our local newspaper recently blurted out that heroin overdose and drug deaths now exceed homicides in central Florida, a very sad commentary, and one unfortunately that is being repeated across the United States.

One of those, and I will cite the impact of illegal narcotics, but actually one of the groups in our society that suffers most are minorities. They bear an incredible brunt of terror that is rained by drug abuse on them. And I have some recent statistics that just came out from the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse. Drug use increased 5.8 percent in 1993 to 8.2 percent in 1998 among young African-Americans. So if we want to talk about the impact of illegal narcotics, the death and destruction I will describe, it starts, unfortunately, among some of those who can least afford that impact. And here with the African-American youth, drug abuse use has dramatically increased.

The 1998 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse also indicated drug use increased from 4.4 percent in 1993 to 6.1 percent in 1998 among young Hispanics. I also read some recent statistics about the dropout rates and those who drop out the highest from our schools, the recent information we have received show, of course, minorities, particularly black and Hispanics.

□ 1930

Then if we look at their history of drug use, whether it is marijuana, cocaine, or other drugs, they have unusually high percentages of drug use. So we see double tragedy.

What is also interesting is, not only the use, but also the arrests of traffickers. I have a recent report just out last week, and this is in the Dallas Morning News. It says, arrests of traffickers under age 18 are expected to climb to 512 this year, up 58 percent since 1997, according to the United States Customs Service.

So, not only do we have increased use, not only do we have increased deaths, but our traffickers now under the age of 18, this is a shocking statistic, are up 58 percent in 1 year, according to the United States Customs.

Now, one of the things that I have tried to do in helping to coordinate our national drug policy is to look at where illegal narcotics are coming from and then to see if we can stop those illegal narcotics from coming into the United States.

I have cited before that the war on drugs basically closed down in 1993 with the taking of office of President Clinton. He focused most of his efforts and resources on treatment, treatment expenditure, and dollars increased almost 40 percent from 1993 to current levels. Even in the new majority, we have increased treatment during the past several years of our majority.

But what happened again in 1993 is the Drug Czar's office was slashed from 120 to some 20 individuals working there. We now have that back up. It is probably in the 150 range.

I might say, one of the better things the President has done and probably the major accomplishment that he has achieved, and I will give him credit for that, is the appointment of General Barry McCaffrey, who has done an excellent job in restarting our war on drugs.

But basically, when one cuts interdiction, use of the military, use of the Coast Guard by some 50 percent in just a few years, which the Democrat majority did, when one cuts the source country programs that effectively stop the production and growth of drugs in their source, one has a serious problem when one sends the wrong message by appointing a national health officer like Joycelyn Elders, and one can almost trace the increase in drug use among our youth from those appointments and from those bad decisions.

Last night, I went through the history of some of the problems that we have had. I have done that before. I have also used this chart before. This chart shows, again, if one just wants to look at it, where illegal narcotics are coming from. They start in Colombia. Some 60 to 70 percent of the heroin and cocaine is now produced in Colombia. If one looked at 1992, 1993, most of the cocaine was produced in Peru and Bolivia. It is now coming from Colombia. It is actually being produced there.

In fact, the programs that have been initiated and the new majority has undertaken in Peru and Bolivia show about 60 percent decrease in coca production, cocaine production in Peru, and about 50 percent in Bolivia, and both of them making great strides to eradicate.

But the problem we have had is the policy of stopping information flowing to Colombia, stopping arms and assistance to the national police, who have undertaken the war on drugs there, stopping all U.S. aid for a period of time has left the production fields wide open.

Now since 1993, the country of Colombia has the distinction of, not only being the largest cocaine producer, and it was not on the charts some 6 or 7 years ago, hardly any opium was grown there, poppies grown there or opium produced, and now is producing some 65 to 70 percent of the heroin coming into the United States. We know that for a fact because we can trace it just almost as accurately as DNA practically to the fields where it is grown.

So this is the traffic pattern. Heroin and cocaine are being produced now in Colombia, coming through Mexico. In fact, the cartels, many cartels, not the same cartels, Medellin and others that we had in the past, are now operating with Mexican officials.

I will talk a little bit about the high level contact group that we had this morning, a meeting in Washington with officials, high officials of Mexico. I think this was the seventh meeting. We had the Attorney General of Mexico and the foreign minister of Mexico and other high ranking officials of Mexico meet with Members of Congress. I will get into that.

But this is basically our trafficking pattern. So we know that the two biggest sources of hard illegal narcotics, and I have talked about heroin and cocaine, are Colombia, Mexico.

Mexico also has the distinction of giving us another gift which is an incredible amount of methamphetamine. We have conducted hearings, and I cited this this morning to the visiting ministers that, indeed, showed that methamphetamine is coming from Mexico and entering our heartland.

We have had sheriffs and local law enforcement officials from Minnesota, Iowa, California, other areas that they could trace the methamphetamine which is now epidemic in some of those areas right back to Mexican dealers. But this is the traffic pattern. This is what we have to deal with.

First, let me talk a little bit, and I have touched briefly on this yesterday, about Colombia. I want to make certain that people know exactly what has gone on with Colombia.

I cited some general figures last night that were the result of a closed door meeting, the second one we have held in 2 weeks with officials of the United States Department of State, the Office of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Matters, and also

with the Department of Defense, both charged with executing the policy that the Congress has adopted and dealing with the appropriations and programs that we have authorized to deal with both Colombia and the trafficking situation of these hard narcotics coming into the United States.

Well, yesterday, I spoke in general terms, and we have now been able to look specifically at the money that has already been appropriated, both in the fiscal year from 1998, October 1, through September of this year, 1999. For that year, Colombia was appropriated \$321 million.

Many Members of Congress and the media have all cited Colombia as being now one of the top, after I think Israel and Egypt, maybe the third highest recipient of United States foreign assistance. That is the total figure that is bantered about. But, actually, it is \$321 million.

Part of our subcommittee's responsibility and Members of Congress' responsibility is to see if that money has been properly expended, if the money is expended, or obligated, and where the money was utilized.

My particular role as chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources is to review the progress that has been made. Now, there are some myths about the \$321 million.

First of all, \$30 million was in a regular appropriations for that year. The Congress knew that there were problems cropping up. This is, in fact, nothing new.

If I may, let me bring to the floor here just a sampling of some of the hearings that we have conducted. When I say we, the new majority which took over in 1995 on the international narcotics problems. We have conducted some 16 hearings. These are some of the transcripts of the hearings.

We knew there was a problem in Colombia. We knew the administration had a policy and a program that really would create difficulty for the United States, and we pay for those policy mistakes in the end. Four of these hearings specifically have dealt, since 1996, with Colombia. So we have carefully monitored this situation. We provided some \$321 million for Colombia to try to stop the disaster we saw looming there.

I might say that, when I came into office in 1993, from 1993 to 1995, there was one hearing done on national drug policy, one hearing in the first 2 years of the Clinton administration when the other side controlled the House, the Senate, and the Presidency, exactly one hearing. That was only conducted after I circulated a letter and I believe we had 130 Members of the House, Republicans and Democrats, requesting that we review the drug policy.

The drug policy at that time, as I said, was a disaster as adopted by the Congress again controlled by the other side, and was a disaster as far as the execution by the administration which

cut off assistance, resources going to Colombia, which has now turned into our major big problem.

But I do not want the American people or the Congress to think the new majority has not had their hand on the ball or been working on the issue. Here is part of the evidence.

In addition to hearings, we did put our money where our mouth is. I said this \$321 million. Thirty million dollars was a regular appropriation that we would have given in that regular fiscal year. Additionally, there was a supplemental of \$232 million. I want these figures that we have reached, for the RECORD, stated properly, \$232 million in a supplemental appropriation.

We knew the problem was coming. We were trying to stop it and cut it off at the pass. We also knew that aid had been kept by the administration from Colombia, and the problem was festering.

Of the \$232 million, in our closed door hearings, we found that we have, in fact, expended some \$40 million of those dollars, \$42 million to be exact, to Peru and Bolivia. If one subtracts \$42 million from \$232 million, we are down to \$190 million.

Now, again, this is from a \$321 million appropriation. Of the \$190 million that was to go to Colombia, our closed door meeting with the State Department and Department of Defense revealed that less than half of the money has actually gotten equipment or resources to Colombia. So we are down to \$190 million. We may be somewhere in the range of \$90 million to \$95 million in equipment that actually got to Colombia.

Now, for years, we have known that Colombia was becoming a producer of heroin, a producer of cocaine. They were actually growing it. It was not just a transit country where this stuff was produced somewhere else.

□ 1945

And we know that the most effective way to get the coca, which grows in higher altitudes, and poppies, was with helicopters and to spray that or to go after the narcotraffickers who circle and protect in Colombia the growth of these illegal crops.

It is unbelievable, but to date we still do not have in Colombia but three of the Blackhawk helicopters of the six that Congress authorized. And the funding for those helicopters, and these helicopters are about \$16 million apiece, assumed most of the \$90-some million, the three of six that were delivered. Now, this is unbelievable, but they confirmed to us yesterday that the three helicopters, the Blackhawks that have been delivered, basically cannot be used. They are not equipped with armor, and they do not have ammunition.

Of course, part of the \$90 million, and we are down from \$300 million that was supposed to get to Colombia, part of that was for ammunition. Helicopters are needed to fight and to eradicate;

and these helicopters, of course, need ammunition. We have been begging, we have pleaded, we have sent letters, we have tried to get ammunition to the Colombian National Police who are engaged in fighting the narcotraffickers and going after these illegal narcotics producers. It is absolutely unbelievable to report to the House of Representatives and the Congress and the American people that the ammunition and the many guns that we requested years ago, I am told, were delivered November 1. Today is November 10. Yesterday morning no one could confirm either from the State Department or the Department of Defense if the ammunition had arrived.

So we have, again, less than half of this smaller amount being made available to Colombia. In addition, we have other obligations, where we have requested helping in the rebuilding of narco bases, narcotrafficker bases, where we launch operations from, or the Colombians, rather, launch operations from. We still do not have contracts complete for construction of some of these bases, money that has been appropriated now for well over a year, money in the budget.

In fact, from 1998, we went back to see if equipment which had been promised to the Colombians out of our surplus accounts had been delivered. In 1998, about 90 percent has gotten to Colombia, 10 percent had not. In 1999, the President made a commitment to provide what is called Section 506, I believe it is, which is surplus equipment to Colombia. And we found that, with great fanfare, the administration was giving millions in surplus goods to Colombia to fight the war on drugs; yet to date, nothing has been delivered. And that is as of the end of the fiscal year which ended the end of September. We are now into the fiscal year 1999-2000.

This is a remarkable record of non-accomplishment. I know now why the administration has not formally brought a \$1.5 billion, somewhere between a \$1 billion and \$2 billion package to the Congress. First, I am sure they did not want to be embarrassed with this information being made public; that indeed they have missed the opportunity to get this situation under control with the resources that have already been allocated. So we have millions of dollars that have not been expended, and we have money that has been expended down there with equipment that is not capable of being utilized.

It is a very sad situation, a sad commentary on the ability of bureaucracy to move. I do not think it is purposeful at this point. I know it was purposeful in the past to block equipment and resources to Colombia, but the results are incredible. Over a million people have been displaced, 300,000 have been displaced, more than in Kosovo and more than in Bosnia. Three hundred thousand in one year, a million there, over 30,000 dead, over 4,000 Colombian

police, members of congress, members of their supreme court, and officials that have been slaughtered in the meantime. And the equipment still is not there. It is a very sad commentary.

The money that Congress appropriated and the House asked for these programs, again without direct involvement of U.S. military other than training, we have not provided what we said we were going to provide. And the situation continues to mushroom out of control, with this entire region being destabilized now, with incursions up into Panama. And, as I said before, this region of South America produces approximately 20 percent of our daily oil supplies.

When the administration wants to get our military equipment somewhere and they make their minds up to do it, it does not take them long. According to the Department of Defense, it took the Clinton administration 45 days to move 24 helicopters to Albania for an undeclared war. According to the Department of Defense, also, it has taken the Clinton administration over 3 years to get three Blackhawk helicopters to Colombia in a war we have all declared on drugs. And what is incredible is those three helicopters, which consumed most of the money that we have given to Colombia, those three helicopters are basically inoperable. They do not have protective armor, and they do not have the ammunition to engage in any type of counternarcotics activity, and they cannot confirm when that ammunition will arrive.

The Blackhawk helicopters were promised to the Colombian National Police in 1996, and they finally arrived in Colombia November of 1999. It is sort of a sad commentary, and this has had a dramatic impact on our society. Remember the 15,700 deaths in 1 year which are drug related, and there are thousands of others, tens of thousands of others, but those are the hard deaths we can attribute. From 1992 to 1999 we have lost between 80 and 100,000 Americans in an undeclared war on our people with narcotics coming from this region.

So that is a little bit of an update on the Colombian situation. There is a brighter figure just released yesterday, and I must applaud President Pastrana, because even though he has had a very difficult time in the peace process and also trying to bring this situation which he inherited last year as the new president of Colombia under control, he is trying to put words into action. I understand that their Senate voted just yesterday, or this week, to extradite one Jaime Orlando Lara, who is a major drug kingpin figure. He will be extradited to the United States, and I understand there may be another one to follow. So Colombia, even though it is under siege, is taking initiatives. And it is unfortunate that they have almost lost their country; but, indeed, they are taking continued action to bring this situation under control.

Some of my colleagues may have read that as many as 10 million Colombians took to the streets in the last few weeks to express their outrage about this war and the havoc that has reigned upon Colombia, and it is in our national interest, both because of the impact of the illegal narcotics, the death and destruction to our society, and also as an ally in this hemisphere to help. It is unfortunate, though, and it is almost unbelievable that the actions that Congress has taken in a positive fashion to assist this country are really stymied by bureaucracy, by inaction, by lack of will on the part of this administration.

So I guess it is fitting in this budget ending here, as we try to provide funding for all of our programs, that the administration sort of hides in a corner and does not bring this issue forth. I can see why. I can see it being very embarrassing for them to come in and ask for a billion dollars of taxpayer money and not have been a good steward of the \$321 million that was appropriated to get this situation under control. So it is sad indeed that we face this situation. Hopefully, through the hearing process, through Members on both sides of the aisle trying to prod the administration, we can get resources to turn this situation around.

I mentioned yesterday that this morning I would be attending a high-level working group of United States and Mexican officials. And as I said, this is about the seventh of these meetings. I took our subcommittee down to Mexico City; and we met, I believe it was in January or February, after taking the position of chair of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, and we met with some of these same officials in Mexico. I said at that meeting with the Mexican officials in Mexico City that I was very disappointed with the actions that they had taken to date, and speaking about the previous year, 1998, and a decrease in the seizures of heroin, a decrease in the seizures of cocaine, a lack of action on the signing of a maritime agreement, a lack of action on extraditing Mexican drug kingpins, a lack of action in allowing our DEA agents, a limited number, in protecting themselves in their country, and a lack of action in enforcing some of the laws that had been passed by the Mexican officials.

We had a rather testy meeting, and I must say that I asked them how they could sit idly by and watch their country be lost to drug traffickers and not do anything. I did not use exactly those words but, fortunately, that session was also behind closed doors. But I let them know our concern about the lack of action on those issues. And at the request of the Congress, we had passed resolutions asking for their assistance specifically on all of those items.

I must report again that this morning I did have a little bit more complimentary attitude toward Mexican

officials. They have begun the process of getting some of their act together, going after drug traffickers, cooperating more with U.S. officials. It is not a level of cooperation that I would like to see, but the seizures are up this year, and we must give credit where credit is due. They are good neighbors, have been good neighbors, and we have, I think, through our trade policy, extended incredible generosity with NAFTA, which has taken jobs out of the American market and provided jobs and opportunity to Mexico and Mexican citizens. When Mexico was in incredible financial shape we also helped Mexico, backing them up with loans, their country; and we backed them in international finance organizations.

So some progress has been made. I expressed concern in two areas this morning in our meetings. Several of those areas are as follows:

□ 2000

First of all, the latest information I have from our Drug Enforcement Agency is that heroin production, and we have had a problem of course with production in Colombia, the other country that we have had a problem with production, very limited production back into the 1980s, black tar heroin coming out of Mexico, which several years ago was at 14 percent of all the heroin seized in the United States we know came from Mexico. We know because of this signature heroin program we can do an analysis of the heroin and tell us almost to the field in the country where it came from.

So we know that several years ago we had 14 percent, up from a single digit to double digit, of heroin produced in America. What is scary is that within 1 year it has jumped from 14 percent to 17 percent, the latest information that I received this week. That is a 20 percent increase in production.

So I ask their cooperation and will reiterate requesting their cooperation in going after the production of heroin.

The other thing that we see of course is methamphetamine, methamphetamines that are in our country. And we have done that through our hearings and investigations right to Mexico. Mexico is now the leading producer of methamphetamines coming into the United States. We need their cooperation.

The other area in addition to those two big problem areas is the corruption of officials and cracking down on money laundering. If you can trace the money in illegal narcotics, you can find out who is involved.

Unfortunately, some of the information we have received is absolutely startling and I have cited on the House floor and we had in our subcommittee testimony from one former Customs agent that one Mexican general was attempting to invest in the United States 1.1 billion American dollars. And we know that is from drug profits.

We know that corruption has really destroyed families, officials in Mexico.

Former President Salinas and his brother Raoul Salinas were heavily involved, hundreds of millions of dollars transferred to banks. We know that money came from their complicity with and cooperation with drug lords.

If Mexico would cooperate with us rather than give us a hard time, as we had in operation Casa Blanca, which was a major Customs operation, the largest probably in the history of the U.S. Customs, hundreds of millions of dollars of money laundered with dozens of banks and bankers involved. And when we uncovered it and we had told Mexican officials, some that we could trust, about it, Mexican officials a year ago threatened to arrest our U.S. Customs officials and did not cooperate.

Some of that has changed. But until Mexico makes up its mind that it is going to get this situation under control, enforces laws that their national legislature has passed, they passed some good laws, but not enforced them, and then go after corruption.

I heard Senator SESSIONS from Alabama speak this morning. He was a former prosecutor and he said, "I put in jail local officials and judges and others in the United States who dealt in illegal narcotics and profiting from them," and he asked Mexican leaders to do the same. And until they get that corruption under control, we will continue to have that problem.

And still Mexico is the source of 50 to 60 percent of the cocaine coming into the United States, almost 300 metric tons of cocaine consumed in the United States. Fifty to 60 percent of that, as we know, comes from Mexico. We know now that Mexico is the source of 17 percent of the heroin seized last year by law enforcement. We know that Mexico is the leading smuggler of methamphetamine and also the base ingredient of methamphetamine, as well as marijuana.

Unfortunately, as I said, in 1988 heroin seizures were down some 56 percent, cocaine seizures were down 35 percent. But the latest statistics we have, the information is that those seizures are up due to cooperation with the United States officials.

So we still have lacking a maritime agreement, no progress on a maritime agreement, although some more cooperation with our maritime officials. But Mexico continues to be the source of so much of the illegal narcotics coming into the United States and the center of corruption.

The former DEA administrator came before our subcommittee and also had testified and stated publicly something that I think bears repeating tonight, and that is Tom Constantine. He has since left that office and been replaced just recently by Donny Marshall, a very capable assistant in the DEA office and I think a very good appointment who will do a good job in trying to follow in the footsteps of Tom Constantine.

But Tom Constantine, speaking about Mexico, said this, and let me

quote the former DEA administrator. "In my lifetime, I've never witnessed any group of criminals that has had such a terrible impact on so many individuals and communities in our nation."

He said that, despite promises by Mexico to wage "total war" on drug smugglers, no major drug traffickers had been indicted, drug seizures had dropped significantly, and the total number of arrests declined.

He cited part of the problems. To date, Mexico still has not extradited one major Mexican national drug kingpin. He cited what Colombia has done in the last few hours leading the way. Mexico needs to follow and show their drug traffickers what they fear the most, and that is extradition to face justice in the United States.

One of the issues that has come up in the high-level working group and concerns me is the question of replacing the United States certification process as provided by law.

Having been involved with Senator Hawkins and others in the development of this law back in the mid 1980s, and I have a copy of it here, the law is a simple law. It basically says that each year the President and the Department of State must certify what countries are doing to assist the United States in stopping in their own country and stopping the production and also the trafficking of illegal narcotics.

A certification must be made to the Congress that those actions are taking place, those cooperative actions. That is done to make those countries eligible for benefits of the United States.

It started out as foreign aid. If a country was in the cooperating, they were not to get foreign aid. And it seems natural to get a benefit if the United States foreign assistance, cash, that there should be some level of cooperation, especially when the inaction or lack of action or an ally's part or country's part results in death, destruction, devastation in the United States. A simple law, not very complicated.

We even provided a waiver such as in countries like Colombia where the administration had concerns about human rights, about other activities to grant a waiver.

Unfortunately, the administration has not properly applied this law. They should have decertified Mexico last year when they had a decrease in seizures, when they had a lack of cooperation, when they threatened to arrest our Customs officials. And they certified Mexico. They should have been decertified and granted a waiver in national interest.

In addition to foreign aid, these countries also get financial assistance, backing in international organizations. The law is quite clear that it says, under this law, if they are decertified, the executive director of each multilateral development bank will vote after March 1 of each year against any loan or utilization of funds.

Now, Mexico does not receive any foreign aid per se, but they receive tremendous trade and financial benefits by the United States. And it is unfortunate that now there is a move to destroy the certification process. And I was concerned and still am concerned that even officials from this administration would like to transfer that certification for being eligible for benefits of the United States to some third party or international group.

I will fight that with every breath here. I did not think anyone should have the ability to determine eligibility for United States benefits other than representatives of the sovereign United States, that being the Congress, the President, executive branch.

This concerns me about attempts to thwart the intent of the certification law. Let me tell my colleagues, they have never seen action in their life by any of these countries until they are faced with threat of decertification for not cooperating. Even in Mexico we saw incredible action just before the question of certification came before the administration and then before the Congress and we suddenly saw all this cooperation. And it has also been a good handle for the country to have on soliciting the support of these countries that are the producers of this deadly illegal narcotic substance.

□ 2015

Again, a little update on that issue, and we will continue to follow it; I will continue to oppose that.

Just in closing on the Mexico issue, I have a November 6 Reuters report about what death and destruction Mexico has experienced with this horrible situation that they have allowed to really get out of control. It said, this past week a lawyer for Mexico's most notorious drug cartel was shot to death by two gunmen who riddled his body with at least 43 bullets in the northwestern border town of Tijuana. This particular article says that Baez, I believe is his name, Mr. Baez became murder victim number 552 in Tijuana this year and that authorities believe that 65 percent of the killings have been drug related. This particular individual, Mr. Baez, became the third member of his family to be executed in the past 2 years following his sister, Yolanda Baez, and his nephew, Efrén Baez.

If Mexico does not get this situation under control in addition to losing the Baja Peninsula, the Yucatan Peninsula, they will lose their country and their sovereignty. Just ask anyone in Colombia who has seen the death, devastation, destruction, and displacement of people in that country, and now the situation with the United States and others trying to bail them out of their situation.

Mr. Speaker, from the subject of illegal narcotics which does not often put a smile on my face to the final 10 minutes, I wanted to first just pay a moment of tribute to veterans. I will not

be in the District in time for veterans celebration, but every American should pay particular attention and honor tomorrow, Veterans' Day. Veterans Day started out, I believe, at the end of World War I, on the 11th hour, the 11th day; and in my home communities from Daytona Beach to Orlando, we will have a series of wonderful ceremonies to honor veterans, at Woodlawn Cemetery in Orlando. David Christianson, the most decorated Vietnam hero, will be the featured speaker.

In Port Orange, one of the young high school groups there will be having a flag retiring ceremony. In De Land, a beautiful community, tomorrow afternoon at 3, they will be having a parade through the community to honor our veterans and so on throughout central Florida.

I would like to spend a moment to pay tribute to our veterans to whom we owe so much. I spent Monday on my way back to Washington visiting the Bill Chappell clinic in Daytona Beach and went around and talked to each of the veterans that was there on an unannounced visit to see how their care was and how they were being taken care of as far as patients in the veterans facility. I am pleased that almost all of them were very satisfied with the care.

I pay also particular tribute to those who do care for our veterans in our hospitals and clinics across the country. The most important responsibility under this Constitution is indeed our national security. The reason for which this country came together was for national security. We must pay honor and tribute and respect to those veterans who are among us and also who are not with us who we remember on Memorial Day, but tomorrow we remember those who again have served this Nation. So we salute all of our veterans, not only in Florida's Seventh Congressional District from Orlando to Daytona Beach, but across this great land. That is one little tribute that I wanted to pay.

The other item that I wanted to conclude with is some good news for the House of Representatives and the American people. Finally, after more than a decade, we have completed the first step in making a reality a visitors center for the American people when they visit our great Capitol. The Capitol has a rich history. It goes back to being located here in 1790 by an act of Congress. Congress was sort of vagon-bond before that, met in Philadelphia, New York, Annapolis, Harrisburg and a dozen different locations. Finally, in 1790, they decided to come here.

They decided to begin construction in 1793 of the Capitol and it was to be two wings, the Senate wing here, actually sort of turned out like most government projects, it was running behind schedule and overbudget; and they decided just to build this one wing which is the north wing towards Union Station. To get that done and to get the Congress here by 1800, which will be 200 years, they worked feverishly and

abandoned plans for the House wing. And then in 1800, in December, the House located here. In 1807, they built the second wing. They were connected actually in between by a trellis for a number of years. And then in 1827 they built the center rotunda and the Capitol looked a bit like this.

This is a pretty good picture. One of the oldest pictures, that first Capitol was designed first of all by Dr. Thornton who actually did not even get in the competition that the Congress had advertised for, came in late, but Thomas Jefferson and George Washington liked the design so much that they took his design even if it came in after the bids all closed. In 1827 we completed the Bullfinch Dome and the Capitol had these two wings and the rotunda in between.

Today, we have the Capitol with the dome which was added in 1863 and the wings, the House wing in 1857, the Senate wing, the north wing, in 1859. You can see the original first building, and then the House building, the connection, the changing of the center and the addition of this beautiful dome designed by Thomas Walters and the statue of freedom up on top, which was taken down recently, refurbished and put back, that was put up there in 1863.

The other addition to the Capitol is the east front was redone. It was crumbling in the late 1950s, 1958 to I think 1962, that was taken off and redone. So they extended the east front of the Capitol.

Not since that point have we enlarged the Capitol, and never to my knowledge have we really done anything specifically for the American people to accommodate them when they come to visit here. We have millions and millions of visitors who crowd the Capitol building.

I am very pleased that we have completed work and approval; I served as a member of the Capitol Preservation Commission, on a Capitol visitors center. This was not my idea. It was started in the 1980s, late 1980s. I believe Vic Fazio, a Congressman from California, initiated some of the proposals that got into a partisan conflict; and it was derailed, although a study was done in 1991 to create a visitors center.

This past week, the visitors center authorizing body, which is the Capitol Preservation Commission, 18 Members of the House and Senate authorized moving forward in the next phase the approval of some \$12 million for the center and reconfirmed that the visitors center will be in the east front, towards the Supreme Court and the Library of Congress.

Everything will be located underground. It will not change the view. There will be three stories underground, if I can get this up here quickly. Two stories will be exhibition space, solely for visitors. There will be three auditoriums, one 550-seat, two 250-seat. Right now we really do not even have a place to bring folks in. In fact, folks stand out in line in rain, snow, sleet, whatever, subject to the elements.

Two top stories will accommodate visitors, rest rooms, first aid facilities. Again, everything underground. It will not change any of the view of the Capitol building. The bottom level will be a service floor, goods and services will come in through a tunnel. The tunnel was planned sometime ago, and part of it exists now. Rather than having the trash and garbage and other service deliveries through the front door of the Capitol, that will all be done underground. Accommodations for our visitors trying to bring to life the Capitol, and also to make their visit more pleasant.

We are just about at capacity. Plus we do not have assistance for those who are disabled, handicapped and others to get around the Capitol. This is one of the most exciting improvements ever to our Nation's Capitol, the symbol of freedom for the entire world and, of course, our Nation. It will make visits for students, for adults, for elderly, for infirm so much more pleasant.

I am so pleased to have had the leadership of the House and Senate in this effort. I commend all those involved. It is an exciting project not only for the Congress but for the American people and the country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. DEGETTE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 3:30 p.m. on account of official business in the District.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SAXTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NETHERCUTT, for 5 minutes, November 11.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint res-

olutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 348. An act to authorize the construction of a monument to honor those who have served the Nation's civil defense and emergency management programs.

H.R. 915. An act to authorize a cost of living adjustment in the pay of administrative law judges.

H.R. 3061. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend for an additional 2 years the period for admission of an alien as a nonimmigrant under section 101(a)(15)(S) of such Act, and to authorize appropriations for the refugee assistance program under chapter 2 of title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution waiving certain enrollment requirements for the remainder of the first session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress with respect to any bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2000.

H.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION 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 and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3061. To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend for an additional 2 years the period for admission of an alien as a nonimmigrant under section 101(a)(15)(S) of such Act, and to authorize appropriations for the refugee assistance program under chapter 2 of title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 915. To authorize a cost of living adjustment in the pay of administrative law judges.

H.R. 348. To authorize the construction of a monument to honor those who have served the Nation's civil defense and emergency management programs.

H.J. Res. 76. Waiving certain enrollment requirements for the remainder of the first session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress with respect to any bill or joint resolution making general appropriations for fiscal year 2000.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 11, 1999, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5285. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Coordinated Acquisition Procedures Update [DFARS Case 99-D022] received November 8,