

Family and Community Services, Jewish Children's Bureau and the Anti Defamation League, the rabbis and other leaders of the Jewish community in Chicago, particularly Mr. Michael Kotzin of the Jewish United Fund and the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago who showed such leadership, to join with them on the day after six Jewish men were shot to say that an attack on even one is an attack on all of us.

I wish to recognize the Jewish United Fund for opening a special fund to aid families affected by bigotry-related violence. The initial goal of the JUF Fund for Hate Crime Victims and Families will offer assistance to the family of Ricky Byrdsong for the children's higher education.

As the Sabbath came to a close last Saturday evening, we walked the streets of the Rogers Park neighborhood in solidarity. Rogers Park is the kind of community that haters hate the most. It is diverse, integrated, independent, peaceful and all-American. But in a perverse sense of Americanism during the 4th of July weekend a crazy person attempted to take that away, and he failed.

Our community is stronger than ever. We stood together at a time of great anxiety and grave danger. Now is the time for Congress to respond to the tragedies that took place on the 4th of July weekend and pass sensible gun safety legislation. Congress must act now to make it more difficult for individuals to obtain weapons in order to convert their hatred into terror and death.

Guns used by the assailant were bought from an illegal gun dealer. He recently purchased more than 60 guns for the sole purpose of selling them for a profit. Unfortunately, two of these guns were sold to a murderer, with complete disregard for the sanctity of life. We have a responsibility to protect the lives of our constituents. Congress must pass and the President must sign bills to limit the purchase of handguns to one per month and to require the registration of every handgun sold in the United States. Our constituents demand it, and our children deserve it, and we should also pass stronger hate crimes legislation so all of us will be safe in our communities.

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

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

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
HAILED AS LEADER IN ELECTRONIC INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, critics often hasten to draw attention to government agencies' failures, while ignoring successes if they notice them at all. Today I want to draw the House's attention to two prestigious awards and other accolades recently received by the Government Printing Office (GPO) for its leading role in electronic information dissemination through GPO Access, its acclaimed Internet information service (www.access.gpo.gov).

First, the Vice-President's National Partnership for Reinventing Government has honored the GPO and the Energy Department (DOE) jointly with a "Hammer Award" for the "Information Bridge," a project which makes available thousands of unclassified DOE scientific and technical reports in electronic format.

Using the World Wide Web, users enter the DOE electronic dissemination system through GPO Access, where they can view over 30,000 DOE reports already on-line, with more becoming available every day. The Information Bridge eliminates the need to disseminate these reports to depository libraries in printed form, thereby saving production and distribution costs to the government, and processing and storage costs to the libraries.

This is GPO's second "Hammer Award" for GPO Access; the first came in 1997 for re-engineering the Commerce Business Daily with the Commerce Department. In 1998 Vice-President GORE and Government Executive magazine named GPO Access one of the 15 "Best Feds on the Web."

In addition, the legal community has recently lauded GPO Access. Law Office Computing magazine's April/May issue named GPO Access one of the top 50 legal-research web sites for 1999. The magazine's top 50 web sites, which included only seven federal sites, were chosen as favorites of law librarians, attorneys and paralegals based on experience with the sites and their usability.

Further, the April 1999 issue of Chicago Lawyer magazine reports that the newsletter legal.online has selected GPO Access as both the "best research site for laws" and the "overall best Government site." Finally, the GPO just received the first American Association of Law Libraries' "Public Access to Government Information Award" as the "official, no-fee, one-stop public access point for the growing universe of web-based electronic Government information." These accolades follow GPO's selection in February by In-Plant Graphics magazine as the top in-plant operation in the country, and in March as a top technology innovator by PC Week magazine.

Public- and private-sector entities alike appreciate the leading role GPO is playing as we advance into the information age. Let's join in the applause for the dedicated professionals of the GPO.

COSTS THAT ILLEGAL NARCOTICS
IMPOSE ON OUR SOCIETY

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 as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor again tonight to discuss the issue of illegal narcotics and the tremendous cost to our Nation. Over and over again it is important that I think we repeat the message that I have with me here today, and that is a simple one, that drugs destroy lives. And I believe if every Member of Congress takes a few minutes to look at the impact of illegal narcotics they will be absolutely startled as to the damage that it does to our society, the cost to countless families across this Nation and also the tremendous responsibility cast upon the Congress to finance the social, the judicial and other costs that illegal narcotics impose upon our society.

Tonight I want to talk for a few minutes about some of those costs and tell the Congress and the American people that there are some very specific and direct costs to illegal narcotics and what they have done to this Nation and to, again, families and young people. In fact, during the past year over 14,000 Americans lost their lives as a direct result of the misuse or abuse of illegal narcotics in this Nation.

I come from a beautiful area in central Florida. My district is between Orlando and Daytona Beach, a very peaceful, affluent, high employment, high income area. Even my area has been plagued with countless deaths. In fact, a recent headline in Orlando Sentinel newspaper blasted out that in fact the number of drug-related deaths had now exceeded the number of homicides. Drug overdose deaths now exceed homicides in central Florida.

So the statistics are not only bad in my area but across the Nation, with more than 14,000, and again we do not count in all of those that are in traffic accidents or in suicides or other unreported deaths that may have some other report of the demise of the individual which is not included in this 14,000 figure.

In 1995, we had almost 532,000 drug-related emergencies which occurred across this Nation, and that figure has been on the upswing particularly among our young people, which should be of concern again to every Member of Congress. In 1995 we also have a figure that is reported of a retail value of the illicit drug business being over \$49 billion.

The cost goes on and on again to our society. Across the land tonight there are over 1.8 million, nearly 2 million, Americans incarcerated in our jails and prisons across the land. This is at incredible cost, the cost of the judicial system, the cost of the lost wages, the cost of social support for the families who have their loved ones incarcerated.

So the cost is not just 1.8 million people behind bars but in fact much greater cost. It is estimated out of the nearly 2 million in our jails, prisons and State facilities that 60 to 70 percent are there directly because of a drug-related offense, and these are not small offenses like possession of minor drugs, and these are not one time or misdemeanor occurrences or offenses. These are, in fact, we find from the hearings that we have conducted with our criminal justice drug policy subcommittee, these are, in fact, very serious felonies. And most of those people behind bars, again in studies, confirm this as recently as the hearings that we held today in our subcommittee, that these folks in most instances are violent offenders, that in fact those that are there because of drug-related crimes are there because they trafficked in drugs, they committed a murder, they committed a rape and an assault, a robbery while under the influence of illegal narcotics or in the pursuit of acquiring money or drugs.

□ 2030

So again, 2 million people behind bars is only the tip of the iceberg.

Drug-related illnesses in the United States and death and crime are estimated to cost Americans some \$67 billion plus a year in the United States. This translates into very specific costs to every American who has to pay \$1,000 a year to carry the costs of health care, extra law enforcement, car and automobile accidents, and crime and lost productivity due to drug abuse and use.

Eighteen percent of the 2,000 fatally injured drivers from seven States had drugs rather than alcohol in their systems when they died. Again, drugs do in fact destroy lives, and have a very specific cost impact to the American taxpayer, to every American citizen, in addition to just the incarceration cost and judicial cost.

Drug use and misuse and illegal narcotics also dramatically impact the productivity of America's workers. Seventy-one percent of all illicit drug users are 18 years of age or older, and they are also, interestingly enough, employed.

In a study by the U.S. Postal Service, the data collected showed that among drug users, absenteeism is 66 percent higher and health benefit utilization is 84 percent greater in dollar terms when compared against other workers. So in fact, the billions that we are talking about are only the tip of the iceberg when we translate this into lost productivity and absenteeism, and then the overutilization of our health benefit programs. Again, all of that does translate into extra costs for every citizen.

Again, drugs destroy lives, they cost us lives, and they cost every American in this Congress dearly.

Disciplinary actions are, interestingly, 90 percent higher for employees

who are drug users as opposed to nonusers of drugs, another high price tag to pay for those who are involved in illegal narcotics or in drug use.

Let me talk tonight about how some specific drugs impact our society and young people in this Nation, and what the effects of some of these drugs are.

First of all, let me talk about crack and cocaine. The use and abuse of crack and cocaine, which also destroys lives, has somewhat evened out among the adult population. That is only because now we have an incredible supply of heroin, we have an unbelievable supply of methamphetamine.

So, for example, my area has a very substantial increase in heroin use and abuse and deaths, and the Midwest and some other areas have been impacted by methamphetamine, so crack and cocaine has leveled out. The supply availability and price of other drugs such as methamphetamines and heroin is available.

Even first-time crack or cocaine users can be subject to heart attacks which can be fatal. We heard testimony today from a wonderful lady, Mrs. Bennett, who testified before our subcommittee. She lost her young son, a first-time cocaine user who suffered a fatal reaction and died at a very young age. She brought his picture to our subcommittee, which conducted a hearing on the question of decriminalization and legalization of illegal narcotics.

She will tell the Members that drugs in fact destroy lives. They destroyed the life of her son, and this report that I have tonight about the use of crack or cocaine adding to your incidence of seizures or heart attacks is in fact very real. Even one hit of crack or cocaine can in fact kill one, because it can cause heart attacks, strokes, or breathing problems. This has medically been proven.

Crack and cocaine use are also connected, and abuse, are connected to car crashes, to falls, burns, drowning, and suicide, and sometimes, again, these go unreported. But my point again is that illegal narcotics, hard drugs like crack and cocaine do destroy lives.

The addiction we have not talked about, but that can ruin the physical and mental health of so many individuals, and often is not counted into the statistics that we report here. So again, we have an instance of one drug which has a devastating impact on so many lives, and does in fact destroy lives.

The other drug I will talk about for a few minutes is heroin. Heroin users are getting younger and younger. Since 1993, the use of heroin among our teenage population has risen some 875 percent in the United States. We have a tremendous supply of heroin coming into the United States. We have a reduction in price.

I will talk in a few minutes about how we are getting that tremendous supply coming in. But in fact, the people who are most subjected to heroin's

deadly effects are our young people. Heroin users are getting younger. A recent survey indicates that kids are trying heroin at younger and younger ages.

For example, in 1995, this report that I have says that 141,000 people in America tried heroin for the first time. About a quarter of these first-time users were somewhere between the ages of 12 and 17. Even worse, more than half the people who were admitted to hospital emergency rooms for heroin-related problems were under age 18.

Again, the theme that we bring to the floor tonight is that drugs destroy lives, and drugs destroy young lives in an incredible number of instances. These statistics do indicate that we have a tremendous heroin abuse problem among our young people. Heroin is dangerous, and you have to be just totally irresponsible to put yourself using it.

We have also found in our studies and hearings that the heroin that is coming into the United States in 1998, 1999, today, is not the heroin that came in 10 or 15 years ago. The purity levels that were down in single digits are now 60, 70 percent pure. Young people and adults who try heroin have very deadly results, as I cited. Just in my local central Florida district and area, we now have heroin overdose deaths exceeding homicides. That picture is being repeated over and over across the land. In fact, we are now up to over 4,000 heroin deaths in the Nation, and the number is growing every year.

Most disturbingly, again, we see young people as the victims of heroin overdoses and heroin deaths. Drugs destroy lives. Again, let me cite some of the information that we found in our hearings on our Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources. Over half the crime in this country is committed by individuals under the influence of drugs.

In the hearing that we held today we had Tom Constantine, who is the immediate former director of our Drug Enforcement Agency of the United States, just retired in the last few days. He told us that over half of the individuals who had been arrested for Federal offenses are now testing positive for illegal narcotics.

We heard the sheriff of Plano County, the city of Plano and that area, testify before our subcommittee today. He also indicated that a very high number of those arrested for any offense in his jurisdiction also have some drug in their system.

The National Institute of Justice's ADAM, the drug testing program, it is referred to also as the Adam testing program, found that more than 60 percent of adult male arrestees tested positive for drugs.

It was interesting, in some of the information we obtained today, and this figure is very high for adult males, but I believe the figure was 71 percent of the women who were arrested tested positive for drugs, a startling statistic

that, although we have fewer female arrestees, that a greater percentage of them are involved with illegal narcotics and have them in their system when they are tested upon arrest.

In most cities, over half the young male arrestees are under the influence of marijuana. Importantly, the majority of these crimes result from the effects of the drug and did not result from the fact that the drugs are illegal.

According to a study of the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, 80 percent of the men and women behind bars, about 1.4 million inmates, are seriously involved with alcohol and other drug abuse. I am going to try to refer a little bit later, if we have time, to the results of that report from the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University.

This is an absolutely fascinating report just released this morning, and it talks about marijuana. It is the most comprehensive study ever conducted, that highlights the critical distinction between non-medical marijuana, medical uses of marijuana, and what is going on with those who abuse this substance, and some incredible statistics about, again, the effect on those individuals and how many of them are now in some type of a treatment program, and the problems that are related to this. We will talk more about that.

The former Secretary, I believe, of one of the administrations, Joe Califano, was involved, he was a former HEW Secretary, with this study. He is now president of that organization. We hope to have him testify at a future hearing on the results of their study.

Again, it is a dramatic study that does show that we have an incredible number of young people who are the victims of marijuana, which many try to tout as a soft drug or a non-harmful narcotic. But again, all the studies, the reports, the information lead us to one simple conclusion; again, that drugs destroy lives.

According to a study published in the Journal of the American Medical Association last year, non-drug users who lived in households where drugs, including marijuana, are used are 11 times as likely to be killed as those living in drug-free households. So if a young person or an individual comes from a house where drugs are being used, this study by the American Medical Association said they increase their chances of being killed by 11 times. So again, these are more statistics that confirm that drugs destroy lives.

Drug abuse in a home increased a woman's risk of being killed, according to this study, by a close relative, some 28 times. So those that are concerned, and we heard testimony today about spousal abuse, an incredible statistic, some 80 percent of the spousal abuse cases involved methamphetamines in one jurisdiction that was studied, and that would be abuse, battery, assault of a woman, a wife, a spouse.

But in a home that has drug use, a woman's risk of being killed is increased by 28 times, according to this AMA study.

Additionally, to confirm again the message we bring tonight that drugs destroy lives, I have a study by the Parent Resources and Drug Information Center. This is also referred to as PRIDE, the organization, and this PRIDE organization reported some of these facts.

Of high school students who reported having carried guns to school, and certainly there has been a great deal of talk about guns in this Congress on the floor of the House of Representatives, this said students who were reported having carried guns to school, 31 percent used cocaine, compared to 2 percent of the students who never carried guns to school.

□ 2045

The same relationship was found among junior high school. So more than likely, the school violence and those involved with carrying lethal weapons such as guns to school are much more likely to be drug abusers, drug users. Nineteen percent of gang members reported cocaine use compared to 2 percent among youths who were not in gangs. So whether it is someone carrying a gun to school or someone involved in a gang, drugs destroy their lives. And, in fact, drugs contribute to the crime disruption of our public school system and education. Again, drugs destroy lives.

Today, the subcommittee which I chair, the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, as I mentioned earlier, began another hearing to look into the question of drug legalization, drug decriminalization.

We heard from a number of witnesses, some on different sides of the issue. I try to always bring in a balanced approach. We heard one witness in particular in favor of legalization of marijuana, a representative from the NORMAL organization, it is called. We heard another individual report from a study who gave some of the comparisons that had been reviewed on marijuana use. And we heard from, again, a parent involved with a national organization. She had lost her son, as I mentioned, and was there testifying against decriminalization, against legalization.

We also heard from the police chief of Plano, Texas, also who spoke against legalization. We found also that we had some interesting testimony from our lead witness who was Tom Constantine, and as I mentioned he is the former head of the Drug Enforcement Agency. Mr. Constantine used several examples in his testimony to show how drugs drive demand.

A few years back, the Colombian drug cartels decided to enter the heroin market. Now 75 percent of the heroin sold in the United States is of Colombian origin.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about some of these narcotics and what Mr. Constantine brought up and what we heard today. If I can, I would like to take this down and have the chart on the drug Signature program.

All these illegal narcotics come from some place. And, in fact, we know today through scientific studies and through programs such as the heroin Signature program exactly where illegal narcotics originate. This is not a guessing game. This is today a science just like DNA. They can trace DNA to individuals; they can trace illegal narcotics back to their source.

Mr. Constantine, again, former DEA director, talked a little bit today about the heroin problem that we have. This 1997 study that he also presented to our subcommittee in a previous hearing shows exactly where heroin, one of the most deadly drugs, is coming from. And we know that 75 percent of the heroin is coming today from South America. We know that 14 percent is coming from Mexico. And then we have about 5 and 6 percent from Southwest and Southeast Asia. So we know very specifically that 89 percent of the heroin is coming from either Colombia or Mexico.

Some 6 years ago, this chart would be quite different. Most of the illegal narcotics were coming in from, in this case, heroin, was coming in from Southeast Asia and from other sources. In fact, 6 years ago, there was almost no heroin produced in Colombia.

How did we get to 75 percent, as Mr. Constantine testified and this chart documents? It is a simple thing. It is the policy of this administration.

Let me review for a moment, if I may, what took place and how we got into this situation. I have heard repeatedly, and I hear it over and over again, the war on drugs is a failure. I have heard it in the media, and I have heard it recast that the war on drugs is a failure. They would have the public and the Congress believe that the war on drugs is a failure.

In fact, since 1993, there has not been a war on drugs. In 1993, the Clinton administration basically closed down the war on drugs. What they did was they began very systematically. The first thing they cut was almost 90 percent of the drug czar's office and operations. So the drug czar's office was cut first, demoted, really. They brought in a drug czar who really ignored the problem, ignored promotion of any antinarcotics programs either before the Congress or with this administration.

What else did this administration do? The first thing they did was hire so many recent drug abusers in the White House that the Secret Service insisted on a program to do drug testing of White House employees. And I sat on the Committee on Government Operations and heard testimony to that effect.

But again, first they closed down the drug czar's office very nearly, then

began hiring people who had very recent illegal narcotics use, forcing the Secret Service to force the White House to institute a drug testing program.

Next thing they did was hire probably the worst Surgeon General, the highest health officer, that this Nation had ever had and that was Joycelyn Elders. She sent a message to our young people that said just say maybe. And the statistics I cited tonight about heroin, about marijuana, about cocaine and about the increase in incidence among our young people I think can be traced from the beginning point of that policy of that closedown, of that shutdown, that ending of the war on drugs with a chief health officer of the United States of America saying to our young people just say maybe.

Then, if I can get the smallest charts here, again this is repeated over and over that the war on drugs is a failure. Let me have these charts here. These charts do not lie. They tell the truth. And I do not know if my colleagues can see them, but this shows drug spending on international programs. Now, international would be stopping drugs at their source, probably the most effective utilization of taxpayer dollars.

We know that in 1993 and prior to that time that nearly 100 percent of the cocaine was coming from Peru and from Bolivia, a little tiny bit from Colombia. We knew where cocaine was coming from then and coca could only be grown at certain altitudes in a certain terrain. There are not many places. It cannot be grown in Florida or North Carolina, to my knowledge. It can be grown only in that area.

In 1993, the next thing the Clinton administration did, and we have to remember they controlled the White House, they controlled the other body, the United States Senate, and they controlled a big majority of the House of Representatives. The first thing they did was cut these international programs, the source country programs.

The slashes here are incredible. Again, back under President Bush we had 660, and this is millions of dollars. We are not talking billions. But they slashed them to less than half by 1995-1996. This is where the Republicans took over the Congress.

In the last 2, 3 years we have really begun to restart the war on drugs. I sat on the Committee on Government Operations during that period when Mr. Brown was the drug czar, the drug czar in name. Even though I had requests from 130-plus Members of the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle, only one hearing was held during the Democrat domination of the Congress and the White House. Only one hearing as I was a member of that committee, and that was for less than an hour. It was almost farcical. So the war on drugs was closed down and specifically the most cost-effective part of the war on drugs was closed down.

The other chart that I had here showed Colombia now producing 75 per-

cent of the heroin. Colombia was not even on the charts as producing heroin in 1992, 1993. This administration stopped funding, cut this in less than half the international program. So there was not funding to stop drugs at their source.

If we look at 1998 and 1999, and take that in 1991-1992 dollars, we are not even up to the levels of the end of the Bush administration. And again this is so cost effective because we know where the heroin is produced. We have the Signature programs that show us exactly where the heroin is produced.

Now in addition to cutting these programs, what this administration did through a very direct policy was to stop money going to Colombia. The results in Colombia are incredible. I read a Washington Post piece, which the reporter really did not research well, but if we go back and look at what this administration did with the cuts here, they totally cut off Colombia as far as receiving any resources, helicopters, assistance, because they were afraid that some of that money might be used to fight the Marxist guerrillas who were in the jungles there.

So what this administration's direct policy was, and it was in direct conflict with the requests for the last 4 years since we have taken over the House of Representatives with a new majority, we begged, we pleaded, we sent letters, get aid, get assistance, get resources to Colombia.

What has happened? Colombia now produces 75 percent of the heroin coming into the United States since we closed down that program effectively. Seventy-five percent of the heroin coming in. No heroin produced in 1992, 1993, not even on the charts. Additionally, we could talk about Mexico, which is up to 14 percent. We get 89 percent of the heroin from the two of them, and that is part of another failed Clinton policy in certifying Mexico as cooperating.

But think about Colombia and what this policy has done. Not only do we have the heroin which was not there in 1992-1993, coming in in unbelievable quantities at a quality that is as deadly as can be, that is what is killing the kids in Plano. That is what is killing the kids in Orlando, Florida. That is what is destroying the lives again by the thousands, deadly high-purity heroin coming in through this policy.

But what is interesting is in 1992, 1993, Colombia produced almost no cocaine. It did process coca and it was a big producer. The coca which was partially processed was brought into Colombia and processed there and shipped out either directly to the United States or with their buddies and network through Mexico.

What has happened since that time, 1992, 1993, the last administration, is that in fact Colombia again is deprived of any assistance. We cut this program on source country in half, plus we completely decimated Colombia. Colombia is now the biggest producer of cocaine

in the world. Tom Constantine testified today it is somewhere up in the 60 percent.

□ 2100

Fortunately, this new majority, under the leadership of first Mr. Zeff, who began restarting the war on drugs, a former Member, and the former chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice was the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT), who is now Speaker of the House was chair and was responsible for restarting the war on drugs. So that is why we see those figures going up here.

But even the funds that were put in last year, and I checked this, because, again, a recent story in the Washington Post and repeated across the land is that so much of our foreign assistance is going to Colombia. Well, that is bull, and that is nutso. That is not the truth.

This past year, we appropriated somewhere in the neighborhood of \$280 million for Colombia. My colleagues have got to remember, up to this date, almost no money went to Colombia in fighting illegal narcotics. In fact, this administration kept the resources, the helicopters, the ammunition from this country.

So I checked to see where the money is that we appropriated last year and that the press is talking about, saying the war on drugs is a failure, and that the third biggest foreign aid recipient after Israel and Egypt is Colombia. Well, that is true for this fiscal year that that money is appropriated. But so far, according to our staff investigation, somewhere between \$2 million and \$3 million has gotten to Colombia. So we have not had a war on drugs. This other side of the aisle has killed the war on drugs. They completely decimated the war on drugs.

This just international programs and, again, the dollars that were slashed, they were kept from Colombia. If my colleagues think that it is bad enough we have cocaine and heroin coming in in these incredible quantities through a direct failed policy of this administration and the other side of the aisle, what they did, stop and think about what is happening in Colombia.

Everybody gets upset about Kosovo. Over a million people have been displaced in Colombia by the Civil War, by the Marxist guerillas who are funded almost totally by illegal narcotics profits and illegal narcotics trafficking. Thirty-five thousand people have died in Colombia. Thousands of judges, thousands and thousands of policemen, elected officials have been murdered and slaughtered in Colombia. It has disseminated a great nation. The reason was we did not want any arms to get there.

Now, an area the size of Switzerland is in control, and the new president, and I have to admire him, is trying to

bring peace about, trying to negotiate with the guerillas. Some oppose that. Some of are in favor of it. But one cannot have a resolution to the problems with illegal narcotics which are funding the Marxist activities or a resolution of illegal narcotics transiting or being produced there, coming into the United States until we have peace plans.

So I have been supportive. I have met with President Pastrana. He has begged for our assistance. He has begged for our patience. He has begged for our understanding. He is trying to do anything.

He brought down the head of the New York Stock Exchange to talk to the guerillas to try to tell them that a free enterprise system is better than dogging it in the jungle and conducting war and slaughter of the Colombian people.

I say give peace a chance. I also say give a chance to restarting the war on drugs. These are the facts. What the newspapers have printed is bologna. It is not the truth about these international programs.

We have been able, through Speaker HASTERT, again, who chaired the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice, who had responsibility before my new Subcommittee of Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Relations inherited it, but the Speaker was successful.

I went down with him. We met with President Fujimori of Peru. We met with President Hugo Banzer of Bolivia. Those two presidents have cut drug production of cocaine with a little bit of help from their friend. We are only talking \$20 million, \$30 million out of billions and billions that we are spending on law enforcement, incarceration, and treatment. Those two presidents have acted with a little bit of help and the few dollars in the international programs which we have restarted and cut 50 percent of the cocaine production. That is why we see cocaine down and more difficult to get.

The latest figures I have is President Fujimori in Peru, through his hard line, through his assistance, through the small amount of dollars we have gotten there, has reduced 60 percent. Both of them have plans to eliminate that. So a little bit of help in these international programs can be so cost effective. Do not tell me any different. I have been there. I have seen it. These are the facts.

Again, we hear the comments that interdiction and the war on drugs does not work and that we are spending too much money on interdiction. Look at what the Clinton administration did. Again, during the last years of the Bush administration, we were in the \$2 billion on interdiction, in that range. The war on drugs was killed as far as interdicting drugs.

The second most cost effective way to get drugs is to stop them as they are coming in. Once they get passed the

borders, forget it, folks. It is harder and harder. Ask any policeman. Ask anyone who has dealt with law enforcement. It is tough.

But here is what they did. They killed the war on drugs. The Clinton administration, which does not like the military to begin with, took the military out of the war on drugs. Look. From 1991 to 1992, \$2 billion level down to about \$1 billion, cut in half.

This just shows the military. I have not brought up the Coast Guard which protects Puerto Rico, which protects our coast line. They slashed the budgets there.

So that is why we have Colombia as the major producer of heroin, we know where it is coming from, the major producer of cocaine. This is why we have a stream, a supply. That is simple economics. It is economics 101, my friends, that, in fact, as one has a tremendous supply, the price goes down, and it is available. It is available to who at a low price? Our young people.

That is why the statistics I quoted here tonight and the theme that I had here tonight that drugs destroy lives is so true. This is the policy. The war on drugs died in January of 1993 with this President, with this administration.

My colleagues can see that, in 1998, 1999, we are barely getting back to the level we were with the Bush administration. So we have not even been able to restart the war on drugs.

The next myth is that we have not spent enough money on treatment. I believe in treatment. I think anyone who has a problem, we should get treatment to them. We should spend whatever. If we could spend \$3 billion in Kosovo in a few months, we can certainly spend money on those who are addicted to illegal narcotics in the United States of America.

But, Mr. Speaker, here is the next point that I want to make. If we look back in 1991, 1992, we were spending \$1.8 billion, \$2.2 billion on treatment. 1999, it is not quite double. But in fact they have been putting their eggs in the treatment basket, and some of it has helped. But this also should destroy a myth that we have not increased money for treatment.

What is interesting is, since the Republicans took over the Congress, we can see some pretty dramatic increases in money for treatment. So, again, the myth that all the money is going into planes and to source country programs and interdiction equipment is just that, it is a myth. It is not the truth.

So that is a little bit of an update on how we got into this situation, where we are on the war on drugs. It is nice to come up here and talk about this. But I must say that, rather than just talk about it, we have tried to act. We have tried to act by putting our dollars into these programs. We have tried to look at those that are most cost effective.

Treatment. Again, we have no problem with treatment. Education basically was not on the charts. If we look

back here at the beginning of this administration, almost no money for education.

Under Speaker Gingrich and under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), who is now the Speaker, we put in \$195 million into an education program. It is relatively new. It has not completed its first year. But that money is matched by donations and by equal contributions. So we should have almost a half billion dollars in resources towards an education program.

It takes education. It takes treatment. It takes, as I said, most effectively, source country programs to eradicate drugs where they are grown and where they come from. Then it takes interdiction and also takes enforcement. So it takes all of these activities.

That is why, if we go back and look at the Bush administration and back to the Reagan administration when we had the beginning of the crack and the cocaine problem in the early 1980s, we saw an actual decrease in the number of individuals involved with illegal narcotics, or we saw some of the activity coming down where we saw the seizures going up and again some dramatic changes.

The most dramatic change that we have experienced, though, is the end of the war in drugs in January of 1993. It is so difficult to start that back up again.

In addition to providing an update on the war on drugs and where we are in the war on drugs, I also wanted to talk tonight, as I conclude, a little bit about some of the things that our subcommittee has been doing, our Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources.

Several weeks ago, we conducted a hearing at the request of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER). As my colleagues may know, I have been highly critical, and our subcommittee has held extensive hearings on the question of assistance in Mexico. Because if we look at Colombia and we have seen the results of what happens in our failed policy with Colombia, we see where illegal narcotics, the tough stuff like heroin, cocaine are coming from. If we looked at the rest of the picture to see where the rest of the drugs are coming from, probably the balance of the drugs and 60 to 70 percent of all the hard narcotics and marijuana and everything coming into the United States comes in through Mexico.

Mexico has not cooperated. This Congress asked over a year ago, 2 years ago now, for Mexico to extradite individuals, Mexican nationals, drug lords, those who have been indicted in the United States and for whom we are seeking extradition. They have not complied. I will talk a little bit more about that in just a second.

In addition, we asked Mexico to sign a maritime agreement. To date, they still have not signed a maritime agreement to cooperate in going after people

who are transiting and dealing in drugs in the high seas.

In addition, we asked Mexico to arm our DEA agents. They still have not allowed our DEA agents to protect themselves. My colleagues may say, why? Why? Because Enrique Camarena, one of our agents was tortured, an incredibly horrible death. We have a cap actually imposed by Mexico on the number of agents. We have a very small number. It is almost incredible for the size of the problem. But even so, those who are there are still put at risk, and Mexico still refused to help us.

□ 2115

Radar in the south. And I am getting some word that Mexico is beginning to cooperate in getting radar to the south so before the drugs come into Mexico, and we know they are coming from Colombia and Panama and other locations, that we could stop those illegal narcotics. But that is still not in place.

And then enforcing the laws that are passed. Now, we have gotten Mexico to pass some laws, and the laws are on the books, but there is not the enforcement. They have a corrupt judicial system; they have a corrupt law enforcement system from the guy on the beat or the gal on the beat all the way to the President's office. And that has been documented with the former President Salinas and his family, with those in incredible positions of power, with incredible amounts of money that they have skimmed off of the drug trade, including one Mexican general who tried to place \$1.1 billion that he had gotten. We know he had gotten it through illegal narcotics proceeds, and he tried to place it in legitimate financial institutions. But we have not had cooperation.

I started with extradition. And let me say that several weeks ago, as I began to mention, our subcommittee, at the request of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), conducted a hearing on one of the 275 extradition requests that we have. This was a case relating to the murder of Mrs. Bellush, a young mother of about five or six young children in Florida in Sarasota who was murdered several years ago. She was shot and then stabbed to death and left to die, with her young baby children left in the pool of her blood until the family members came home and found her.

We held a hearing to protest and to look into and investigate why Mexico had refused to extradite Mr. Del Toro.

Mr. Del Toro was not a Hispanic citizen. He was a citizen of the United States, born in the United States to parents who are United States citizens; and he helped commit this incredibly horrible crime and then fled to Mexico and has for the past several years used the Mexican judicial system to avoid coming back and facing justice in the United States. Thank goodness last night the Attorney General called me and said that the Mexican Supreme Court had ruled in favor of extradition

and Mr. Del Toro is on his way back to face justice.

It is small compensation, small condolence to the Bellush family, but it is one extradition. Unfortunately, there are 274 other extradition requests on some 40 major drug dealers, Mexican nationals, who have been involved in illegal narcotics. Now, I believe we have had one Mexican national who has been extradited, but I have brought to the floor again some of the mugshots of these individuals.

Agustin Vasquez-Mendoza. He is wanted on conspiracy to commit armed robbery and highly involved in illegal narcotics trafficking and kidnapping and aggravated assault. He is a fugitive, has not been arrested and one of the individuals who we are trying to get back to the United States. Again I bring up the Amezcua brothers, who we also would like extradited to face justice in the United States.

So we have succeeded in one small case. We have some 200-plus requests for extradition of these individuals. I do not believe that Mexico, who has always been a close ally, and we have millions of Mexican-Americans in the United States, I do not believe these friends that we have had or Mexican-Americans agree with Mexico's current stance to thumb their nose at the United States and refuse to extradite these individuals who have been involved in murder, illegal narcotics, and trafficking.

So we will continue to put pressure on Mexico, which is now a major producer of heroin, but also the source of 60 to 70 percent of the illegal narcotics transiting into the United States. We will do everything possible.

We did introduce, just before we went into recess, a resolution which we hope to bring up on the floor which does praise Mexico for some of the small steps that they have taken, but also holds Mexico's feet to the fire to produce on extradition, to produce on a maritime agreement, to produce on assisting our DEA agents, to produce on enforcing the laws that they have passed rather than thumbing their nose at the United States.

So until we start working with the programs that do work, that are cost effective and at the source, in cooperation with these countries and as a cooperative partner, getting them the resources through these programs, we will not be successful.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I am pleased to sum up tonight with the message that I started out with and that is that drugs destroy lives. Over 14,000 Americans lost their lives last year, almost 100,000 since the beginning of the end of the drug war, which was January 1993. And again the statistics show and the facts show and prove that the war on drugs ended with the beginning of this administration, and it is so difficult to start it up and that there has been so much damage to our Nation, to our young people, and so many families across this land.

Mr. Speaker, since I have some time left, I would like to provide a little update as to what is going on as far as narcotics around the world. If my colleagues think the United States is tough, the headlines in one of the recent newspapers is, "Three Beheaded in Saudi Arabia For Drug Trafficking."

This is a report of Friday, May 8. "Three convicted drug traffickers were beheaded in Saudi Arabia on Friday. Saudi Arabia's Islamic courts imposed death sentences for murder, rape and drug trafficking. So far this year, 21 people have been executed, 29 put to death."

"China executes 58 to mark world anti-narcotics day." In China, they have a different approach to illegal narcotics. "China marked world anti-narcotics day by executing 58 drug traffickers." So just a little update on the news in China and how they treat drug traffickers.

Then this report from today's Financial Times. "Caribbean court will speed hangings." And this deals with drug trafficking which has prompted crimes. Let me read from this: "Many islands have witnessed rapid increases in murders and other violent crime over the past decade. Murders in Jamaica last year averaged 2.6 a day, twice the level of 10 years ago. Murders have doubled in Trinidad and Tobago over the past 5 years, with many of those linked to narcotics smuggling, say officials."

So they have a treatment, and the treatment really cuts down on recidivism, and that is hanging, which is being demanded by these nations that have also felt this scourge of illegal narcotics.

Mr. Speaker, I like to provide Members of Congress and the American people with little updates on what is going on in the war on drugs and how others from time to time approach this serious problem. Not that I recommend any of these procedures or remedies that I have reported here tonight. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their indulgence, and I will return again next week.

TITLE IX AND WOMEN'S SPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the most exciting sporting events of all time took place in Pasadena's famed Rose Bowl. Over 90,000 spectators, a record attendance for a women's sports contest, saw the United States women's soccer team defeat China on penalty kicks. Many millions more around the world saw this thrilling match on television. In this country television ratings were higher than for the National Hockey League finals and most of the National Basketball Association playoffs.

I congratulate all the wonderful young women who participated, not just those from the victorious U.S.