

The number of people who die each year in Iowa from smoking is almost 5,000. The number of Iowa kids alive today who will die from smoking is 53,000.

It annually costs Iowa \$610 million to take care of diseases directly related to tobacco use. The Iowa government Medicaid payments directly related to tobacco use are \$70 million.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on with a whole bunch of statistics, but the reason that we are talking about this is that 3 weeks ago the Supreme Court by a 5 to 4 decision said Congress must authorize the Food and Drug Administration to regulate tobacco.

□ 2230

I can read from Sandra Day O'Connor's closing statement. The Supreme Court said that because there are implications for other regulatory agencies. But that did not mean that they did not think that Congress should do that, and they certainly did not think or give any indications that there would be anything unconstitutional with Congress giving the FDA that authority.

Here is what Sandra Day O'Connor said:

"By no means do we question the seriousness of the problem that the FDA has sought to address. The agency has amply demonstrated that tobacco use, particularly among children and adolescents, poses perhaps the single most significant threat to public health in the United States." Justice O'Connor is practically begging Congress to grant the FDA authority to regulate tobacco.

So last week I introduced, along with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), a bill that would do that. The bill simply says that the FDA has authority to regulate tobacco; that the 1996 FDA regulations would be law.

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a tax bill. There would be no increases in the price of cigarettes with this bill. This is not a liability bill. This does not confer any legal immunity to tobacco companies.

This is not a prohibition bill. I have in this bill a provision that says that the FDA does not need to ban this substance. All of the health groups agree that we cannot just cold turkey all of the addicted smokers out there. After all, this is a very strong addiction.

The bill has nothing to do with the tobacco settlement.

This bill simply recognizes the facts: Tobacco and nicotine are addicting. Tobacco kills over 400,000 people in this country each year. Tobacco companies have and are targeting children to make them addicted to smoking. The FDA should have congressional authority to regulate this drug and, as they put it, the "delivery devices." That is in the tobacco companies' words, those cigarettes are drug delivery devices.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to call on my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation. This is H.R. 4207. As I said, I in-

troduced this with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). Here are some of the people who are currently already cosponsors:

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), another physician, just like the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON), the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), Mr. BARRETT, the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLIVER), the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the gentlemen from California, Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. HUNTER, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

These are just cosponsors. Many others are looking at this bill. This is a very, very important issue that Congress should address. We need cosponsors for this. It will not be easy to get an FDA tobacco authority bill to the floor. But the more people that we have sign up for this, the better the chances are that we will have to address the number one public health problem in the country today, and especially for children.

Once again, I call on my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join in a bipartisan effort to do the right thing. As I said, this is not a tax bill. This is not a liability bill. This bill would allow the FDA to regulate tobacco, especially as it is marketed and targeted to children, and it would allow the 1996 regulations to go into effect.

These are the regulations that the FDA put out that said, tobacco companies cannot market kids. They cannot put billboards up by schools, they cannot put tobacco enticement ads into children's magazines. Vending machines, cigarette vending machines, need to be in adults-only places so kids cannot just go and get cigarettes, and that kids should be carded to make

sure they are the proper age before they can receive cigarettes. Those are reasonable regulations.

Also, we ought to have full disclosure on the contents of tobacco products as well, not proprietary trade secrets.

THE PROBLEM OF ILLEGAL NARCOTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). 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 am pleased to come to the floor again tonight to talk about the subject I usually attempt to address on Tuesday night before the House when we have these Special Orders to call to attention to the House of Representatives, my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, and the American people, one of the most serious social problems we are facing as a Nation. That is the problem of illegal narcotics, their disastrous impact on the United States, our economy, on families across this Nation, the tremendous toll it takes on our judicial system, and the loss of lives.

In fact, in the last recorded year, 1998, some 15,973 Americans lost their lives as a direct result of illegal narcotics. If we take in all of the other figures that are not reported, our national drug czar, the director of our Office of National Drug Control Policy, Barry McCaffrey, has testified before our Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources that the toll exceeds some 50,000 each year in the United States.

That is truly a devastating number when we consider that we have incarcerated nearly 2 million Americans, and that some 70 percent of them are there because of drug-related offenses or committing crimes, in most cases two and three felonies on their record, under the influence of illegal narcotics and substance abuse, and we know that something is seriously wrong and something needs our attention, not only as a Congress but as a people who care about people and should care about their fate.

Unfortunately, the toll continues to mount, the tremendous impact illegal narcotics have had again on our Nation. Tonight I wanted to cite just some of the most recent statistics we have, and how some of the people who are most at risk in our national population are some of the highest victims as far as percentage, again in this terrible conflict with illegal narcotics.

According to the 1998 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, drug use increased from 5.8 percent in 1993 to 8.2 percent in 1998 among young African-Americans; again, the victims of illegal narcotics and drug use, in particular the minority population, and in this case not quite doubling but a dramatic increase for African-Americans.

Also, according to this 1998 survey on drug abuse, drug use increased from 4.4

percent in 1993 to 6.1 percent in 1998 among young Hispanics. The Hispanic minority in this country, and particularly the youth, have been tremendously impacted by illegal narcotics. If we look at the population in our prisons, if we look at the population in our detention facilities and jails across this Nation, we would see a disproportionate number of minorities incarcerated in those facilities, and many of them there because of drug-related problems.

We hear a great deal about legacies at this time of year, especially after a 7-year administration. I do not have blow-ups of these particular charts tonight, but certainly when history records the legacy of the Clinton administration, some of these charts must be included in the pages of that history.

These were recently given to me by the director of our agency called SAMHA, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Agency, Dr. Chavez. Dr. Chavez presented me with these charts that show from 1992 problems relating to amphetamine and methamphetamine use, and these are admission rates for abuse treatment from 1992 to 1997.

If we look at these charts we see dramatic increases, almost turning entirely dark on this chart here in the numbers that are now required for treatment and addiction to methamphetamine. This is particularly among our young people, but also among our adult population.

In fact, we get to the Midwest and the West and we have methamphetamines in epidemic proportion and use. I am going to talk about methamphetamine in a hearing that I did in California just several weeks ago, and again, what has taken place in this particular area.

If we look at heroin substance abuse treatment, again, this chart is not very big, but we can barely see some coloring here in 1992, up to some solid coloring in 1997. My own State of Florida is not darkened in, but in my area and Central Florida, heroin substance abuse and use of heroin has so dramatically increased that now last year the headlines blurted out in what is really tranquil Central Florida, the greater Orlando area, that heroin drug overdoses now exceed homicides; again, part of what has not been done to address a very serious problem and growing problem across our land.

The marijuana chart is even more revealing. We barely see any severity in admission rates or high admission rates in 1992 for marijuana substance abuse and admissions, particularly young people addicted to the marijuana. And it is not the marijuana of the sixties and seventies, with the low purity and low toxicity level. We see now again areas almost totally darkened in from a policy of "Just say maybe," or "If I had it to do all over again, I would inhale." Certainly that type of policy, those statements, have

an impact, particularly among our young people, a legacy for substance abuse that again I think is part of the failure of this administration to address this.

In fact, with the President we can count on probably two hands the number of times that he has talked about drug abuse at any length. Even in his last speech before the State of the Union, and only less than a sentence, a passing note, did the President address this problem again that has incredible social impact across our land.

The results are pretty dramatic. It may not be talked about. We did spend several days of debate just in the last 2 weeks here because of the crisis in Colombia, because of the sheer amount and volume of illegal narcotics now pouring into our country because some of the guards that we have traditionally had in place, such as Panama, which was a forward operating surveillance operation for all of our drug operations in the Caribbean and over South America, had been dismantled, again with the Clinton administration's failure to negotiate a treaty to allow even our drug surveillance operations to continue in Panama.

With that closed down we have lost most of our surveillance capability, and now have cobbled together in Ecuador and the Dutch Antilles some minor coverage, but there is a huge gap that allows heroin or cocaine and other illegal narcotics to pour in almost unabated.

It certainly must be one of the primary responsibilities of this Congress to see that illegal substances and substances that harm our population, and particularly when we have this number of people incarcerated, when we have somewhere in the area of a quarter of a trillion dollars of damages to our economy and to our country every year with illegal narcotics, and some close to 16,000 direct deaths in just one year, that is 1998, the last recorded, and some 50,000 total, certainly it is incumbent upon the representatives of this Nation to do something about that problem.

□ 2245

The Federal portion of that problem certainly is to interdict and stop those illegal substances from coming onto our shores before they even reach our borders, but that, in fact, has not been the policy of this administration. It has been a policy of changing the emphasis on taking apart successful programs of the Reagan and Bush administrations, where we had drug abuse on a steady decline and drug use on a steady decline, and have it now skyrocketing as these charts so aptly describe.

I spoke for a few minutes about methamphetamine and the national epidemic that we have. We have held several hearings on the subject of methamphetamine, both here in Washington and field hearings. I was shocked to find the incredible impact that methamphetamines have had in

the West, also, of course, in the Midwest, rural areas like Iowa, other tranquil areas like Minnesota, where we heard testimony at our hearings here in Washington of incredible amounts of Mexican methamphetamine coming in to those areas, and the action of the individuals who consume methamphetamine is as bizarre, as strange and damaging as anything we had in the crack cocaine epidemic of the 1980s, in fact probably even more of a detrimental impact on families and individuals.

One hearing that I conducted at the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) was in his district, which encompasses part of the capital city of California, which is Sacramento. Testimony that we had in Sacramento by one caregiver there was particularly revealing, something that even shocked me and I have heard testimony from a number of witnesses that is quite moving, but this individual who testified put together a program in Butte County, and Butte County is a small county in California compared to others, I think it is in the 200,000 population range, and this witness testified that since 1993 they created a drug endangered children's program which was established and actually allowed the program to detain 601 children from drug houses.

Now, again, we have to think of this as a small county, but 601 children were rescued from drug houses. One hundred sixty-two of those children were detained from methamphetamine labs so these children actually lived where their parents or guardians who were producing methamphetamine. This all came about as a result of an L.A. newspaper staff reporter, I believe his name was Don Winkle, who began writing a story after three children were left to burn to death by their mother when a methamphetamine lab exploded in Los Angeles. His story brought him to Butte County, and there this particular reporter reviewed the program that had been put in place. The testimony by this social worker was most revealing, and of course we hear on the news from time to time the very attention-getting child killing child with a gun case, and I have also cited both of the most recent cases where a 6-year-old child killed a 6-year-old child, brought in a gun and a horrible crime and everyone focused on the gun but very few in the media and others took time to reveal to the public or discuss that the child came, in fact, from a crack house, from a cocaine-infested home, if it could be called that. The father, I believe, was in jail and had been involved in illegal narcotics charges, but again the focus was on the gun but not on the setting.

Many of the other children who I will talk about here have not been publicized. This one particular case, where 3 of these children died in Los Angeles, again illustrates some of the problems that we face from illegal narcotics; in this case, from methamphetamines. The 601 children that this care worker

talked about, she went on to describe in her testimony to us and let me read a little bit of what she said. The 601 children's names and faces are different but each case and story is the same. One would think that 9 years later, with hundreds of suspects arrested, countless doors kicked in and the writing of thousands of reports that I would grow callous, but upon entering the bad guy's house again and seeing those small, round, innocent eyes looking up at me, finally someone came to save me, I turn a marshmallow. I do not have to make up stories or use the same photographs or tell the worst of the worst. They are all bad.

Her testimony went on, and let me describe this, if I may, the yard is covered with garbage, old bicycles, toys and rusted car parts. Three or four dogs run under the house or aggressively approach. Inside the house it is dark with no electricity. The stench of rotten food, animal urine and feces and soiled diapers permeate the house. Chemical odors irritate my eyes and nose. We fumble down hallways into bedrooms stepping on filthy clothing and debris. The children are startled when a flashlight shines in their way. They are sleeping on soiled mattresses with no sheets or blankets. They sleep in clothes for the third day in a row. They have not had a bath in days and cannot remember when they last ate. They rarely attend school due to lice infestation and cockroaches have become their pets. The soiled food stored in an ice chest is moldy. There is no running water and the methamphetamine laboratory is all over the kitchen. The children draw pictures for me of mommy with a methamphetamine pipe and show me bruises where mom's boyfriend hit them. The oldest child comforts the younger sibling as obviously trying to parent. None of the kids cry or, for that matter, show any emotion at all. They all exhibit a classic attachment disorder. Domestic violence is obvious with the holes kicked in the doors and the walls. A loaded firearm is found next to the couch and another under the bed, both where children have access.

Again she goes on, a description of what she sees in this house and it is unfortunately very typical. She told us that she saw these scenes over and over and over again. She said these children were lucky. We rescued them before they were injured, maimed or killed.

The newspaper clippings I collected from all over the State and even a few other States tell more horrific stories. These are some of the clippings that she provided our subcommittee and stories: Fifteen month overdoses on methamphetamine; five month old tests positive for methamphetamine and succumbs to death with 12 rib fractures, a burned leg and scarred feet by a methamphetamine addict in Los Angeles; 13 month old dies of heart trauma, broken spine and neck by methamphetamine addict. She was also raped and sodomized.

Twenty-five month old Oregon toddler overdoses on methamphetamine; a 2 year old dies with methamphetamine in the system, San Jose, California; a 2 year old eats methamphetamine from a baby food jar in Twenty-Nine Palms, California; a 14 month old drinks lye in water from a parent's methamphetamine laboratory, hospitalized permanently with severe organ damage; new baby dies from mother breast milk laced with methamphetamine in Orange County; 8 week old, 11 pound boy dies from methamphetamine poisoning found inside baby bottle in Orange County; an 8 year old watches and hears mom die in a methamphetamine laboratory in Oroville, California; a 6 month old overdoses semi-comatose seizing, hospitalized, drank methamphetamine, also in Oroville, California; a 4 year old tests positive for methamphetamine, beaten and hair pulled out by mom and boyfriend, Chico, California; 8 children exposed to methamphetamine laboratory in day care center in southern California; and mom on methamphetamine and her addicted boyfriend drown a 2 year old in a bathtub in Sacramento.

This is just a sampling of the death, destruction and mayhem that was provided to us by this one witness from one county in California.

Most people do not know much about methamphetamines, and the addiction and epidemic is limited at this point to the Midwest and to the far West, but spreading across the country. We had Dr. Leshner, who is head of NIDA, National Institute of Drug Abuse, come and testify before our subcommittee and give us the latest information on what methamphetamines do to people. Most people who are involved in taking methamphetamine really do not know that they are setting themselves up for brain damage and destruction. We found also that the damage that is done to the brain causes such bizarre behavior that parents abandon their children.

In California, we were told where they attempted to return 35 of these children to their parents, only 5 parents were capable or willing, after being on methamphetamines, to take their children back. We were told of one parent on methamphetamine who tortured their child and then finished the child off by boiling the child alive.

This is the type of bizarre behavior that methamphetamine produces in the brain in individuals who take methamphetamine.

This is the scientific data that Dr. Leshner provided our subcommittee. This first slice of brain and this view of the brain shows dopamine, with normal dopamine levels that are required for an active, healthy brain. The second and third illustration here is a gradual reduction in dopamine levels in the brain due to methamphetamine uses. The fourth illustration here that has been provided is a brain from an individual who suffers from Parkinson's disease, and we can see the deteriora-

tion of methamphetamine from a normal brain into various stages of methamphetamine, the most severe stage, this happens to be Parkinson's but also mirrors methamphetamine. So this is what this wonderful drug has done for one county in California, what it can do for an individual, and again the damage that can be imposed on individuals. It really is shocking and I do not think most people who get hooked on methamphetamines have any idea what they are doing to themselves or the potential damage they can do to their family or their children.

The cases we have are just unbelievable.

□ 2300

Again, I do not want to go into any more of them tonight, but I will be glad to provide Members upon request additional information on what our subcommittee has found relating to methamphetamine and its horrible impact.

The other chart that I showed is heroin. I showed how heroin has now caused tremendous problems across the United States. We have a heroin epidemic in many regions of the country, including the area that I represent, which is central Florida. Heroin use and abuse is up dramatically.

Heroin is not the heroin of the 1960s, 1970s, or even 1980s. The purity in those days was in the low percentile, single digits, a 9 percent pure. The heroin that we are getting in from South America and Mexico is now running 70, 80 percent pure. That is why we have an incredible death rate in Central Florida and around the country.

Young people and others are taking heroin. They are mixing it with some other substance, alcohol or some other drug. Or even first-time users are hit with this high 70 percent pure heroin, go into convulsions, and die.

Now, I think that many people would believe that heroin has been glorified by Hollywood, and heroin is the type of drug that the stars and others in important places use. Most people do not realize the severe consequence of heroin.

Unfortunately, I am one Representative that has heard more about the tragedy of heroin than many of my colleagues. As I said, in Central Florida, our heroin overdose deaths, particularly among our young people, now exceed our rate of homicides.

One of the parents provided me with the permission to show the effects of heroin. This is particularly a gruesome depiction of the end of the life of this constituent's death, a young man in Central Florida. This is how the coroner placed the body before the body was removed.

Now, again, I know young people and many people across this land think that heroin use is somewhat glamorous. The picture I am about to show is her son as the coroner found him in Orlando, a rather gruesome picture. I show it only to show what the potential holds for using this high purity

heroin. This young man died a horrible death. His mother told me. The autopsy would reveal that.

This is not glamor. This is not celebrity status. This is death by heroin. The pure deadly heroin that suffocates one to death, causes one's blood vessels to burst. It causes one to go into uncontrollable seizures and then die one of the most horrible deaths imaginable.

Time and time again, in Central Florida, this has happened and happened in record numbers again this last year. This is only one victim. But people must understand what is happening with heroin and what heroin, what methamphetamines, and some of these other narcotics can do to their lives and their bodies. One ends up being taken out by the coroner in this fashion. These pictures end up as the last reminder your parents have of you or your family has of you.

Unfortunately, I have met many of the parents of young men and women in my district whose child has or loved one has ended up in that condition. That is one reason why I come to the floor every Tuesday night, why I continue to hammer away to get the attention of the House of Representatives, the Congress, and the American people on what is taking place with illegal narcotics. We should not have one more person fall victim as we have had in Central Florida.

Some of the most disturbing news I received is during a recent recess when I was home and talking with our law enforcement officials. They told me that we have, in fact, more drug-related deaths in Central Florida, particularly heroin. Again, there is an unabated flow coming in from Colombia, from Central and South America.

Tomorrow, we are going to focus a hearing on some of that trafficking pattern, particularly as it relates to Haiti. We have focused on the major source of production which is Colombia, which produced the heroin that killed the young man whose picture I showed just a few minutes ago.

But what is particularly sad about all of this is that, in fact, we could prevent much more of this death and destruction. We could stop a great deal more of the hard narcotics coming into this country. Certainly we have a responsibility to stop illegal narcotics coming into this country.

Unfortunately, the Clinton administration in 1993 dramatically changed the policy that kept some of these illegal narcotics from coming into our borders.

In fact, we were making good progress. Heroin was dramatically down. Cocaine was dramatically down. As my colleagues saw from the charts I presented earlier, methamphetamines were not even on the charts in 1992.

Unfortunately, this administration made a complete reversal in policy. They decided to put all of their eggs in the treatment basket.

Since 1993, we have nearly doubled the amount of money in treatment. In

fact, we have also, through Republican efforts, added another billion dollars in money for education. But it has been the focus, particularly treatment, treating the wounded in this battle, rather than conducting a war on drugs as we had in the 1980s under the Bush and the Reagan administration.

The results are most telling. The Clinton administration slashed the international programs, the programs of stopping drugs at their source in the source countries by some 50 percent beginning in 1993 when they controlled the House, the White House, and the other body.

Next they slashed the interdiction programs. Interdiction is also cost effective in that it stops illegal narcotics before they get to our borders. The most expensive way to go after illegal narcotics is once it gets into our streets and communities. It requires us to put massive police forces and massive resources in law enforcement to keep up with the sheer volume that spreads and is diffused among our communities and our streets and our schools throughout our society.

But a very serious mistake was made in 1993 in cutting the source country programs and cutting the interdiction programs and use of the military for surveillance. The military never has and never will, because of our laws, become involved in enforcement. They merely provide intelligence and surveillance and information, particularly to source countries, so they could go after both the production of illegal narcotics, the trafficking of illegal narcotics, and the transit of illegal narcotics out of their country. A very effective strategy because, again, we had dramatic decreases in drug use and drug trafficking and the sheer availability of hard narcotics.

The results again are devastating. We are seeing, particularly in the last few years, huge, huge volumes of heroin coming in.

□ 2310

In 1993, there was almost zero, almost no heroin produced in Colombia. Almost none. Since 1993, again through a policy that really has been a policy of failure, the Clinton administration has managed to turn Colombia into the major source of heroin coming into the United States.

This is hard to believe, but in 1993, there was almost no coca, no cocaine produced in Colombia. There was transit from Peru and Bolivia, and some processing and transshipment from Colombia, but it was not the source of growth of coca and production. Today, Colombia is now the source of some 80 percent of the cocaine coming into the United States. And, again, a much more deadly and purer form of cocaine that is reaching our shores and killing our population.

It was not easy for the Clinton administration to make Colombia the largest producer and transiter in some 6 or 7 years, but they did manage to do

it. And it has been in spite of protests by the Republican majority, in spite of direct legislative actions, in spite of appropriations trying to get resources to Colombia.

The fiasco started in 1994, when the Clinton administration stopped information sharing to Colombia and stopped intelligence exchanges with that country and some of the other source countries. It took us several years to straighten out that fiasco. And, again, in the last 2 years, the Clinton administration is now repeating the fiasco. And we see where we have been able to decrease the production of cocaine in Peru by some 66 percent, in Bolivia by some 55 percent. For the first time in just the last few months some increase in production in Peru, again because the Clinton administration has shut down some of the exchange of intelligence.

That is all documented in a report that was provided to me by GAO. I asked this independent agency to conduct a review of what is taking place. This report was produced by the General Accounting Office. It says Drug Control Assets DOD Contributes to Reducing the Illegal Drug Supply Have Declined. This is a documentation and information of what has taken place.

In fact, even the President's own ambassador to Peru cautioned that the United States should not drop its surveillance information being provided to Peru because a successful program of the information sharing was reducing the production of illegal narcotics and transiting of illegal narcotics in that country. So we have even the representative of the President speaking out against the administration's change in policy, a second disastrous change after the 1994 fiasco.

Then we have documentation here that, in fact, the DOD assets as far as flight times have dramatically decreased; that, in fact, flying hours dedicated to tracking suspect shipments in transit to the United States declined from 46,264 to 14,770, or a 68 percent decline in flight time.

So, basically, when they closed down the war on drugs, they did a very effective job not only with flight surveillance but also with the maritime shipments. This report also indicates a 62 percent decrease in maritime tracking of illegal narcotics shipments. Again, documentation of a policy that has failed and steps, including the decertification of Colombia without a national interest waiver, which would have allowed resources to get to Colombia to fight illegal narcotics.

So, basically, for the last number of years, they have allowed Colombia no assistance. Aid even appropriated and designated by this Congress has been denied to that country. And that is what has brought us to the situation we currently find ourselves in requesting the President coming forward, with a region in disarray, with 35,000 people being killed in Colombia, with complete disruption of that important and

strategic region of our hemisphere, the President coming forward at the last minute with a request for a billion dollar-plus aid package. We have passed that in the House. We hope that the Senate will take action on that.

That is a little bit of the history of where we are and how we have gotten ourselves into this situation with Colombia and also with the tide of illegal narcotics coming into the United States. We know the programs we have put in place, where we have been allowed to in Peru and Bolivia, will work if properly resourced, and with very little money, very few funds in comparison to a \$17.8 billion drug budget having gone to the source country programs or to alternative crop substitution programs or stopping drugs at their source or before they get to our border.

The other thing that I wanted to address tonight is the attack on some of the zero tolerance policies. We know that zero tolerance policies have worked very well across the landscape where they have been instituted. Probably the most successful example of a zero tolerance drug policy in the United States has been that of New York City and that devised by the current mayor, Rudy Giuliani.

I know that Rudy Giuliani has been attacked recently for some of the problems that they have had with their enforcement of some of the laws in that community. And to watch television and to hear the liberal media, one would think that New York City police are out of control and that, in fact, a zero tolerance policy somehow is a policy of intolerance and a policy that would abuse the rights of individuals.

A story by, and I guess an editorial piece by columnist Judy Mann in the Friday March 24 Washington Post really set me off, and I spoke before about this, but the title of her liberal piece was *The War on Drugs Can't Help But Run Amuck*. She's a very determined liberal and she has used the case of Patrick Dorismond, who was shot in New York City, as a case in point for a zero tolerance drug policy that has run amuck; a war on drugs that cannot work.

She went on in her article saying that the attempted drug buy that led to Dorismond's death was part of Giuliani's latest scheme to reduce the rising homicide rate in the city.

□ 2320

This liberal reporter would have you believe that murders and homicides are up under Mayor Giuliani. Our subcommittee called Mr. Giuliani in last January, we have updated some of this information.

Before Mayor Giuliani came into office in New York, there were actually over 2,000 murders per year in New York City. In 1998, it was 629, and it rose slightly to about 670 in 1999, last year, which we do not have on the chart. Does this in any way show an increase in murder? In fact, if we had

stayed at the same rate, we would be killing some 1,300 to 1,400 per year under this policy.

Now, this liberal columnist would also have you believe, and she says so, civil liberties have been another casualty on the war on drugs. This is the type of liberal nonsense that she spews out.

In fact, we looked at New York City from our subcommittee research, and we found the latest statistics revealed that crime is down 57.6 percent overall for major crimes. Murder is down 58.3 percent. Rape is down 31 percent under the Giuliani plan. Robbery is down some 62.1 percent. Felony assaults are down 35.4 percent. Burglary in New York City is down 61.7 percent. Grand larceny is down some 41.9 percent. Grand larceny auto is down some 68.8 percent.

Now, Ms. Mann and the liberals on the other side of the aisle here would have you believe that the Giuliani policy is a failure. These happen to be the facts. Now, of course, the liberals do not like to deal with facts. The facts only confuse the situation. These are the facts about crime in New York City under a zero tolerance policy.

Now, Ms. Mann and the liberals and the media out there would have you believe that there is some type of intolerance, their loss of civil liberties, or that the New York City Police department or Mayor Giuliani is in some way out of control, and that there are these rampant shootings by police officers and abuse by police officers.

The facts are, and we checked this carefully, our subcommittee did, for example, the number of fatal shootings by police officers in 1999, 11 was the lowest any year since 1973. What is absolutely more amazing is Mayor Giuliani increased the police force by 25 percent. Now, that may sound like just a small figure, or a minor figure, but New York went from 30,000 to 40,000 police, a 25 percent, 10,000 increase in police officers, and the lowest number of fatal shootings by police officers since 1993.

This zero tolerance policy that is so offensive to the liberal population, it has probably saved thousands and thousands of lives, people that would have been murdered. And we cannot even calculate the number of people that would have been raped, robbed, victims of felony assault, burglary, grand larceny or auto larceny.

Now, they go on. They would have you believe that, in fact, this drug policy and zero tolerance policy enforcement would take its toll in some other way. I wonder where Ms. Mann and the liberals were when Mayor Giuliani was not in office back in 1990, under that administration in the city. In 1990, 41 police killings took place with a fewer number of police. Moreover, the number of rounds intentionally fired by police declined 50.6 percent since 1993.

This is tough policy that is so impossible for the liberals to deal with, and the facts relating to what has taken

place in New York City and the number of intentional shootings, incidents by police dropped 66.5 percent, while the number of officers actually increased during that period some 37.9 percent.

In the last 5 years alone, there were 159 cases in which police were fired upon and did not return fire, 42 officers were wounded and 6 killed in those incidents. There is probably not a more restrained-on an incident basis or population basis, police or law enforcement agency in the United States of America.

Now, where were the liberals when David Dinkins was in office? There were 62 percent more shootings by police officers per capita in the last year of David Dinkins' administration than last year under Mayor Giuliani. Specifically in 1993, there were 212 incidents involving police officers in intentional shootings; in 1994, there were 167; in 1998, under Mayor Giuliani, there were 111.

It is terrible when the liberals have to deal with fact. Heaven forbid Ms. Mann should ever research fact. Heaven forbid she should ever look at the actual statistics relating to New York City and what Mayor Giuliani has done, but she can slam a zero tolerance enforcement policy, a zero tolerance on drug policy. She can slam and try to twist facts that murders have somehow increased.

These listed are the seven major felony categories from 1993 to 1998 from 429,000 down to 212,000. I am not great at math, but I think that is about half, 50 percent reduction. Ms. Mann and the liberals would want you to be confused and make you think that zero tolerance and tough law enforcement is done in some harmful way.

These, in fact, are the facts. These, in fact, are the statistics. I always liked to contrast them, and I will close tonight, contrast with the liberal policies, the hero of the liberal side, try those drugs, folks, they are fine for you. Go ahead, let your kids use them. God forbid we should have any enforcement.

Baltimore, Maryland is the example. Thank heavens Mayor Schmoke is gone. Thank heavens we have a new mayor, Mayor O'Malley. We conducted a subcommittee hearing there a little over a week ago, the best thing that came from that hearing, I believe the mayor fired the police chief, and we have hired in Baltimore one of the prime developers of the New York City's zero enforcement policy, but this is the record of Baltimore, where Mayor Schmoke said we are not going to enforce.

I was stunned at the hearing to find out that HIDTM, high intensity drug traffic money, made available by the Federal Government for tough enforcement in Baltimore, the police chief, who again was removed, told me that they did not use those funds to go after major open drug markets. These are the results, the deaths in 1998, 212; 1999, 300.

In the last 8, 10 years under this policy, probably 3,000 young people in Baltimore were slaughtered. These are the constant kinds of numbers that we have seen in Baltimore.

□ 2330

What was more stunning with this liberal policy that the other side embraces that Ms. Mann thinks is the way to go in Baltimore is now, from the chart that we have here that was provided by DEA, Baltimore has gone from some 39,000 drug addicts to somewhere between 60,000 and 80,000 drug addicts in just the City of Baltimore. It is absolutely incredible, the damage that has been done to Baltimore through this liberal policy. In fact, one of the City Council Members, Councilwoman Ricki Spector, said it is more like 1 in 8 is now a drug addict in Baltimore.

The former Mayor Schموke's non-enforcement liberal policy provided these things for Baltimore. In 1996, Baltimore led the Nation in drug-related emergency admissions, 785 per 100,000 population. Of 20 cities analyzed by NITA, or the National Institute of Drug Abuse, Baltimore ranked second in heroin emergency admissions. Baltimore accounted for 63 percent of all of Maryland's drug overdoses.

This is the policy that the other side is advocating, along with the liberal commentators. This is just a health problem. The tough enforcement will harm people, their civil rights will be violated, there will be shootings, that there will be some type of harmful enforcement.

This is the harm, an addicted city population, dead in incredible numbers. Remember the numbers in New York City, which is 20 to 30 times the population of Baltimore, is just about double this figure, and that is a reduction of some 60 percent since Mayor Giuliani took office.

So these are the facts, these are the options. Tomorrow our subcommittee will focus on the emerging drug threat from Haiti, part of the Clinton Administration's failed foreign policy no one likes to focus on, but a policy in which we spent nearly \$4 billion in taxpayer money in nation building, primarily to support a law enforcement and judiciary which is now in charge of the biggest drug trafficking operation in the Caribbean and probably the source of more transit of illegal hard narcotics into the United States from across Haiti through the Dominican Republic up through Puerto Rico and the Caribbean into Florida and other parts of the United States, and then into our streets and schools, and their gift to our children, after spending so much of the money of American taxpayers in that nation in an effort to rebuild it.

Tomorrow we will hear that failed story, and we will find out where the Clinton Administration intends to go from here, and, hopefully, we can develop a better policy, learn by the mistakes, learn by the failures of this administration, and not repeat them. To

do otherwise would be an injustice to the American people and to the next generation.

Mr. Speaker, I know my time is about to expire and I will not return until after the break for one of these, when we will provide another update, but I do appreciate your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, and the staff, who stayed to this late hour. But this is an important message. It needs to be repeated over and over again, until we have action by the Congress, until we have interest by the American people, and that we turn this deadly situation and plague on our population around.

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. BOUCHER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BAIRD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CARSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mrs. KELLY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, for 5 minutes, April 12.

Mr. PORTER, for 5 minutes, April 12.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, April 12.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROYCE, for 5 minutes, April 12.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1287 An act to provide for the storage of spent nuclear fuel pending completion of the nuclear waste repository, 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 34 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 12, 2000, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

7051. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendment: Requirements for Preparation, Adoption, and Submittal of State Implementation Plans [FRL-6540-1] received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7052. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Volatile Organic Compound Emission Standards for Architectural Coatings [AD-FRL-6539-2] (RIN: 2060-AE55) received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7053. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Tennessee: Approval of 111(d) Plan for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills in Knox County [TN-227-1-200001a; FRL-6539-8] received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7054. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Tennessee: Approval of 111(d) Plan for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills in Chattanooga-Hamilton County [TN-219-2-200008a; FRL-6539-6] received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7055. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Annual Program Performance Report for the fiscal year 1999, required by the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7056. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the two-volume Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7057. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters Inc. Model 500N and 600N Helicopters [Docket No. 99-SW-71-AD; Amendment 39-11564; AD 99-25-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7058. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SE 3130, SA 3180, SE 313B, SA 318B, and SA 318C Helicopters [Docket No. 98-SW-65-AD; Amendment 39-11563; AD 2000-03-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7059. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211-524H-36 Series Turboprop Engines [Docket No. 2000-NE-01-AD; Amendment 39-11565; AD 2000-03-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7060. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Partenavia Costruzioni Aeronautics S.p.A. Models AP68TP 300 "Spartacus" and AP68TP 600