

Since then, politics has had more to say to the siting of high-level nuclear waste than the science. After Members of Congress from the Northeast began to openly oppose placing the dump in the Northeast, the Department of Energy unilaterally decided to take them off the list. When placing the dump in the southeastern part of the country came up as a campaign issue in 1984, President Reagan unilaterally decided to take the southeastern part of the country off the list.

These decisions were not based on science, Mr. Speaker. They were based on politics. Then in 1987, the so-called "screw Nevada" bill was passed into law. This bill made the most political of decisions, to designate one site, Yucca Mountain, as the only site, excluding any other consideration from any other region in the country. So if I begin to question the claims of science from the supporters of dumping nuclear waste in Nevada, it is because I have learned to question from the history of this issue.

Fast forward to the mid 1990s. Nearly a decade has gone by since the "screw Nevada" bill and the scientific evidence against Yucca Mountain is growing. It has become scandalously obvious that Yucca Mountain was the wrong mountain to bet on. It is in an earthquake zone, it is in an underground flooding zone, it is in a volcanic eruption zone, for crying out loud.

On top of that we find out that the rocks at Yucca Mountain cannot contain radiation like the politicians had hoped. So back to the drawing boards to find another way to screw Nevada.

By 1995, illogical legislation took a new direction, something called a temporary storage site in Nevada. The nuclear industry figured they could build a temporary site because it would not have to meet the strict standards of a permanent dump, and once the waste was in Nevada, it would never leave.

But a funny thing happened on the way to a temporary dump. President Clinton promised to veto it and that threat, coupled with the hard work of some Members of the House and the Senate, has frozen the temporary concept for half of a decade.

But now, given that the temporary dump will not fly, we see S. 1287. This is nothing but a transparent effort to throw out radiation standards and sneak the date several years closer for shipping nuclear waste to Nevada. This is nothing but a temporary dump proposal in disguise. The President recognizes that and will veto S. 1287, and the Senate vote already proves the veto will be sustained.

Can we get off this act of futility and move on to worrying about the important issues that confront this Congress, that confront this country, education, health care, Social Security, and campaign finance reform? This is what our constituents want.

□ 1945

That is what the people of Nevada want. We will not stand for 1287, and I

ask my colleagues to join with me to stand up and oppose this onerous, ridiculous piece of legislation.

JUST SAY NO TO FUNDS FOR COLOMBIA

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, we are about to spend almost \$2 billion to escalate the war on drugs in Colombia, while here in the United States 26 million American addicts and alcoholics go untreated.

We have already spent over \$600 million to eradicate drugs at their source in Colombia. And what has happened? Both cocaine and heroin production in Colombia have more than doubled.

Colombia is now the source of 80 percent of the cocaine and 75 percent of the heroin in the United States. Let us face it, our supply-side efforts have been a colossal failure.

Congress and the President need to wake up and face reality. Over the last 10 years, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has spent \$150 billion to combat the supply of illegal drugs. Yet the cocaine market is glutted, as always, and heroin is readily available at record high purities. The number of hard-core addicts continues to increase every day.

Our drug eradication and interdiction efforts have also been a costly failure. As a former United States Navy Commander who led such efforts in Colombia for 3 years said recently, quote, "The \$1.7 billion being proposed on drug-fighting efforts in Colombia is good money thrown after bad."

Retired Navy Lieutenant Commander Sylvester Salcedo also said, and I am quoting again, "We cannot make any progress on this drug issue by escalating our presence in Colombia. Instead, we should confront the issue of demand in the United States by providing treatment services to our addicted population."

Mr. Speaker, we need to listen to this veteran of the war on drugs who added, "Washington should spend its money not on helicopters and trainers but on treatment for addicts."

The \$400 million cost of helicopters alone for Colombia would provide treatment for 200,000 Americans addicted to drugs.

Mr. Speaker, this is crazy. This is wrong. We are about to spend \$2 billion on Colombia for drug eradication and interdiction while most of the 26 million addicts and alcoholics in the United States are unable to access treatment. We are about to spend \$2 billion on Colombia even though treatment has been proven to be 23 times more cost effective than eradication of crops and 11 times more cost effective than interdiction.

When will Congress and the President wake up to the basic fact that our Na-

tion's supply-side strategy does not attack the underlying problem of addiction? It is the addiction that causes people to crave and demand drugs.

When President Richard Nixon declared war on drugs in 1971, he directed 60 percent of the funding to treatment. Now we are down to 18 percent of the funding for treatment. That is a big reason, Mr. Speaker, that fully one half of the treatment beds are gone that were available here in America 10 years ago. The other reason is that we allow insurance companies to discriminate against the disease of addiction by limiting access to treatment.

Mr. Speaker, this is a defining moment in the 30-year effort to curb illegal drug use in the United States. We can keep pumping money into that supply-side cesspool or we can shift our focus to the drug addiction problem here at home. We will never stop the drug epidemic unless we cut off the insatiable demand for drugs in our Nation.

It is time to reject the \$2 billion for the failed policy in Colombia. It is time to redirect those resources to providing access to drug treatment here at home.

Mr. Speaker, the American people literally, literally, cannot afford to wait any longer for Congress to get real about addiction in America, the number one public health and public safety problem in our Nation.

I hope and pray my fellow colleagues will just say no to funds for Colombia.

TODAY UNITED STATES SETS AN ALL-TIME RECORD DEFICIT IN TRADE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the United States set another record today. Unfortunately, it is not a record of which we can be proud as a nation or certainly not as one of the policy-makers that helps set our trade policy in this country.

We set a record deficit, an all-time record deficit, in trade. \$338.9 billion trade deficit, a 50 percent increase from the 1998 level of \$220.6 billion. Now, what does that mean? Well, let us think about it for a minute. Where is all that money coming from and where is it going?

Well, since trade policy in this country is pretty much dictated to the Members of Congress, this Member excepted but most of my colleagues, or a majority, and to the White House downtown, no matter it seems which party is sitting there, by multinational corporations, they do not really care what the impact is on the United States of America, its workers or our economic future. But guess what? We are piling up a huge mound of international debt and some day that debt is going to be called and it is going to wreak havoc with the economy of our country.

According to most recent statistics, our international debt, because of this huge and growing trade deficit, will reach \$1.9 trillion when it is added up for last year, and they are expecting it will double to \$3.8 trillion, trillion dollars, by the year 2005.

Interest payments, money going overseas for money borrowed from overseas by financiers, governments, multinational corporations, whatever, \$86 billion this year and it will be \$166 billion by 2005. That is jobs that are not created here, capital that is not available here, threats to the future economic prosperity of our country.

Now, there are two parts of the trade deficit we ought to take a special close look at. One is the trade deficit due to the OPEC nations. Now, people have just started to pay attention to OPEC again recently, but they have been there all along. They have been a very large part of our trade deficit, but they are getting bigger.

Last month, our trade deficit to the OPEC nations, because of their price fixing, was \$2.671 billion. That means at that rate we will run a \$31 billion trade deficit with OPEC.

Now, everybody around here loves free trade, the World Trade Organization, with the exception of a few of us who think that that is not working very well for the people of this Nation. Well, the WTO has rules. Guess what? They have rules. It is a rules-based trade. The President loves rules-based trade, and one of the rules is that member nations cannot constrain production for goods produced for export unless it is for conservation purposes.

Nobody in the OPEC nations pretends that they are conserving their oil for conservation purposes. They are real up front about it. They are price gouging. They are creating an artificial shortage. Why then will the President and the administration not file a complaint in the WTO that they love so much? Why will the majority party who loves the WTO so much not force the President to file a complaint?

I expect they will not allow my amendment to the legislation tomorrow that would resolve that the Congress wants the President to file a complaint in the WTO against the OPEC nations.

Now there is another aspect to this that is very large, even bigger than OPEC. China, our trade deficit with China close to \$70 billion this last year, an increase of 15 percent, the most unfair trading nation on earth. And yet what is this Congress proposing to do, pushed by the Republican leaders and the President? That is to give China everything they ever wanted, to give up any tools that this body holds to hold over China in the future to get them to behave in international trade, to get them to behave in human rights, to get them to behave in nonproliferation of nuclear weapons or dealing weapons to terrorist countries, to give them permanent most favored nation status.

Well, the estimates are, by our own international trade commission, saying that if the U.S. gets China into the WTO and if the U.S. grants them permanent most favored nation status, that they expect, according to their model, that our trade deficit with China will grow for the next 60 years to \$649 billion. Something stinks about the trade policy in this country and it is time that it changes.

WE HAVE OUR GREAT LAKES BACK BUT WE ARE NOW FACING A NEW THREAT

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, just 30 years ago, the Great Lakes had been all but pronounced dead. Lake Erie was filled with garbage, and rotting fish regularly washed up on the beach. The Cuyahoga River, which flows into Lake Erie, was so polluted that in 1969 it caught fire. Lake trout in Lake Michigan and Lake Huron were all but wiped out. The Federal Government even banned the consumption of walleye because of the high levels of toxic mercury.

Today, however, we can say that through dedication and hard work, the Great Lakes are one of environmentalism's most dramatic success stories. Lake Michigan's fish population has recovered with steelhead, salmon, and brown trout. Lake trout and lower Huron and Superior are recovering rapidly as well. We have our Great Lakes back, but now we are facing a new threat.

Water scarcity is becoming a worldwide problem. Over 166 million people in 18 countries are suffering from water shortages. Almost 270 million more in 11 additional countries are considered water stressed. Experts predict that by 2025, one-fourth of the world will suffer from lack of water. Given the pressures of population increase and dropping water tables, present-day water usage cannot be sustained. Some are trying to change fresh water from a resource to a commodity.

Given these disturbing statistics, it is not surprising that there are now proposals to withdraw bulk quantities of water from the Great Lakes Basin. After all, the Great Lakes comprise one-fifth of the earth's fresh water resources, but we still do not know the effects that bulk water exports would have on the Great Lakes system.

In an effort to examine the environmental, economic, and social impact of bulk water removals from the Great Lakes, the United States and Canadian governments asked the International Joint Commission to report on this matter. Last week, the IJC released its final report.

The IJC reported that removals of water from the Great Lakes basin could reduce the resilience of the system and its capacity to cope with fu-

ture and unpredictable stresses. Despite its vastness, over 6 quadrillion gallons of water, the system is also extremely vulnerable to disruption. Any hydrological changes to the water system, even small changes, could have devastating ecological consequences.

Due to these environmental concerns, the IJC recommended a moratorium on such exports should be imposed for 2 years, to give the Great Lakes governors time to collect further data and assess the environmental impact of such removals. Most importantly, the IJC recommended that decisions regarding bulk exports should remain in the hands of those that are closest to this great resource, the State governments of the Great Lakes Region.

I grew up in Michigan and I know firsthand how important these lakes are to the States around them. They are not just a water resource. They are a way of life; from shipping to hydro power to tourism and recreation. Our Great Lakes communities rely on these water resources to support vital sectors of their economy. That is why I have introduced legislation, H.R. 2973, to not only protect our Great Lakes but also to ensure that those with the most vested interest in their future, the people who live in the Great Lakes States, are the ones who make the decisions about how they are managed.

For the past 15 years, the governors of the Great Lakes States, in consultation with the Canadian premiers, have effectively managed the basin. What we need to do now, and what my legislation will do, is impose a moratorium on bulk exports to give the governors the time that they need to effectively evaluate how and if any bulk exports from the Great Lakes basin should proceed.

We do not want to transfer management of the Great Lakes from the governors to the Federal Government. That is not the direction we should take.

Lake levels are at an all-time low. The Washington Post recently reported that Lake Superior is at 9 inches below its long-term average. Michigan and Huron were 18 inches below average. Erie was 9 inches below and Ontario was 5 inches low.

Now is the time to act on this matter. Prudent management of our natural resources means looking ahead and planning for the future. As we begin this century, we must be responsible stewards of our environment, to ensure that our children are not denied the resources that we did are able to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members of the Great Lakes States and all Members of Congress to join me in following the IJC's report and enacting H.R. 2973.