THE LEAHY LAW (VETTED UNITS)

The Leahy Amendment requires that all foreign units receiving U.S. economic assistance must be ''vetted'' for past or current human rights violations.

Leahy still applies—no U.S. aid will be provided to any Colombian military unit where there is ''credible evidence'' of serious human rights violations.

Supplemental funding supports Colombian military human rights training and ombudsmen, as well as security protection for human rights monitors. Personnel vetting includes the use of lie detector tests and NGO monitoring.

COMMITMENT AND IMPROVEMENTS BY THE COLOMBIAN GOVERNMENT

President Pastrana and his government are committed to reducing human rights violations whether conducted by the paramilitaries, narco-querillas, or Colombia security forces. He fired four military generals with ties to the paramilitaries and involvement in human rights violations.

Defense Minister Tapias has taken dramatic steps to deal with the human rights allegations. The Colombian military is undergoing a transformation into a more professional organization. The annual human rights report has documented a steady decline in human rights violations by the Colombian military.

President Pastrana has publicly acknowledged the importance of deploying properly vetted units as a condition of U.S. aid.

BLANCED AID TO THE MILITARY AND THE COLOMBIAN NATIONAL POLICE

The current Administration's proposal is heavily weighed toward assistance to the Colombian military. However, it does include $96 million for the CNP (the 1999 drug supplemental was heavily weighted toward the CNP).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. STABENOW 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 gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DOOLEY of California 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 gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

H–1B VISAS A RENEGING ON THE PROMISE TO AMERICAN WORKERS

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on some of the things that we have heard over these last few 5-minute Special Orders. I hope the American people who were listening understand what H–1B Visas are all about. We had several Members come down to the well and talk in glorious terms how important H–1B Visas are and about how we are going to give jobs, 200,000 jobs, to people who are the first string picks from overseas.

No, I am sorry, I would like to have 200,000 Americans have those jobs. H–1B Visas is nothing more than a reneging on the promise to the American worker that, when supply and demand means that their wages will go up, that we will, instead, import people from overseas to keep their wages down.

□ 1645

We do not need to import people into this country for high-tech jobs. We need to make sure our high-tech industries, which are making a whopping profit right now, spend that profit in training Americans for those jobs rather than giving them to 200,000 Pakistanis or Indians or others who will work for $25,000 a year and taking those jobs away from Americans who would be earning $75,000 a year. So H–1B visas are no gift to the American people.

I hope those people listening to the arguments that were just presented understand who is getting ripped off and who is being attacked here and who is being rewarded. Big business is being rewarded so they can keep their wages low, and the American worker is getting shafted with these H–1B visas.

Now, as far as human rights, which is something that we heard about today, and the President's visit to the subcontinent, let me just say that this administration has the worst human rights record of any administration in the history of this country. And it will be underscored again when the President visits the subcontinent and also underscored, of course, by the President's ongoing policy towards China.

First, let us look at China. The President is now lobbying this body to provide China with permanent WTO status, meaning a membership in the WTO and giving it permanent normal trade relations with the United States of America. Again, a shafting of the American working people in order to grovel before a dictatorship that uses slave labor overseas.

Yet Beijing, while the President is lobbying us, saying, oh, this will make the Chinese better and a nicer regime, more hospitable to human rights and democracy, they are in the midst of a campaign designed to eradicate a small religious sect based on yoga and meditation, the Falun Gong sect. They are also in the midst of threats and bluster and arming themselves to the teeth in order to commit forceful action against the little democracy on Taiwan. This, the world's worst human rights abuser and belligerent country is now, what, the country that this President wants us to give permanent normal trade relations to, to make them part of the WTO. Again, an undermining of democracy.

When the President goes to the subcontinent, yes, there are a lot of issues to be had. It was a wrong decision on the President's part to visit Pakistan when we had just had a military clique overthrowing a democratic government in Pakistan. That in itself is a horrible message around the world to democracies that are struggling and in societies where the military might be inclined to take over that government. So at least the President should skip Pakistan until they have made a commitment to return to democratic government. Yet that will not happen.

And when he goes to India, the President will not, I am sure, mention the problem in Kashmir. Because although my colleagues in the well a few minutes ago ignored that issue, the Indian government is involved with massive human rights abuses in Kashmir. The problem is not terrorism in Kashmir; the problem is the fact that India will not permit the people of Kashmir to have a plebiscite, which was mandated by the United Nations 40 years ago, and give them an alternative to solve their problem through the ballot box as to what country they would like to be part of. Instead, India controls Kashmir with an iron fist.

So we have a President ignoring human rights and democracy, visiting Southeast Asia, undermining the very fundamentals that will make this world a better place. It will not be a better place by ignoring Communist Chinese violations of human rights and democracy. It will not be a better place if the President goes to South Asia and ignores the military takeover of a democratic government in Pakistan. And it will not be a better place when the President goes to India and ignores the human rights violations in Kashmir.

THE 2000 CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, census day, April 1, may be 17 days away, but the census has begun. Almost 100 million questionnaires have been delivered by the postal service this week, and 22 million more are being delivered by the Census Bureau in rural areas. I received mine the other day, and I urge all Americans to fill out their questionnaires and mail them back. It is the civic responsibility of every American to participate in the census.

The news on preparations for the census is good. Things are going well. So far, over 2.4 million people have returned their forms to the Census Bureau, and they have actually processed over 1.5 million forms already. On Monday alone the census questionnaire assistance phone handled 636,000 calls, 636,000 calls in 1 day; and they handled

434,000 yesterday. That is over a million calls in 2 days.

All 520 local census offices are up and open, computers and phones are operating, and the major data capture centers are tested and are already working. Though there are localized problems, recruiting is already ahead of schedule nationwide, at about 80 percent of the total needed. Given the prosperity of our Nation, it is very impressive, with this historically low unemployment, that the recruitment is going so well.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues here, the number that Members can give to their constituents who are interested in working for the Census Bureau is 1–888–325–7733. I urge all of my colleagues to share this number with any constituent who may want full- or part-time work helping to obtain an accurate count.

While the most labor-intensive phases of the census are yet to come, it is important as well to take note of the successful operational elements of the 2000 census which have already been completed.

The paid advertising campaign is in its most active phase; and I, for one, feel that the quality of that effort has been tremendously effective. Other promotional activities include the census road tour vehicles. There are 12 of them moving through our Nation's cities and neighborhoods. The master address file of 120 million addresses may be the most complete ever, due to some improved processes, including the LUCA, Local Update of Census Addresses, today and new construction programs.

One of my favorite initiatives, the census in the schools program, has exceeded its original goals and sent over 1.5 million teaching kits to schools around the Nation. Particularly noteworthy is a new USA Today-CNN Gallop poll, one just the other day which came out and said that 96 percent of the respondents say they will mail back their questionnaires. I doubt that it will be that high, but it is certainly an important indicator of the all-important mail response rate and Americans' willingness to participate in the census. And all of this is very good news.

As the GAO indicated in a hearing before the Subcommittee on Census yesterday, in the final analysis it is the American people who will determine whether we have a successful census or not. It all comes down to filling out and mailing back the form. A year ago, many prophets of doom questioned the likely success of the 2000 census. While we are far from done, I think we can all take pride in the excellent work of the career professionals at the Census Bureau in successfully meeting the milestones to date.

As Census Director Ken Prewitt has emphasized, unexpected problems could develop tomorrow. In any massive operation there will be problems. But as of today, the census, as a whole, is running well and it is on track.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER), who is the former chair of the Subcommittee on Census.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the opportunity to speak today, and I thank her for her leadership in bringing this issue repeatedly to the floor during the time of her oversight responsibilities in preparation for this largest peace-time undertaking of the American government. But most of all, I thank her for the work that is going to lie ahead in the course of the summer.

The truth of the matter is that the conduct of the census is probably the closest thing to war in terms of undertaking a huge initiative with all kinds of planning ahead of time, but with the recognition that what is being done is being done in real-time. It is enormous. There will be slippage. It will be imperfect. And we need to understand that the work that we are doing will proceed and that the goal is indisputable: as complete and accurate a count as possible.

That really brings us to the $64,000 question. Can we conduct, in 2000, the census using the same design that we did in 1990 or 1980 or even 1970 and still expect to produce a useful and better outcome? The answer, quite clearly and quite simply, is no. That is the reason that census design over the decades, over the centuries, has changed as this Nation has changed.

The truth is there are no traditional methods in our history of census taking. There never has been a pure head count of the population. And reliability, sometimes called into question, is not a matter of opinion but is a mathematically measurable standard, not a political judgment.

The first census in 1790 took place on horseback. It took 9½ months to finish and visit a half million households and another year to compile the results. As the country grew, the methods changed. In the 1800s, people essentially would enumerate themselves by filling in schedules posted in town squares. And the country grew so fast after the Civil War, about a quarter per decade, 24 percent, that by 1880 census workers could not keep pace with the amount of information collected. It took 7 years to tabulate the results of that census. And that is why in the next decade, a young census employee, a graduate student from Columbia University, Herman Hollerith, developed the punch card system of tabulating data. It was that system that went on to lead to his founding of IBM.

The truth is that those kinds of changes have taken place in this century as well. In the 1920s and 1930s, W. Edwards Demming pioneered his now world-famous methods of statistical quality control at the Census Bureau. These same census methods will see wide application this year, after 7 decades of limited, growing, and now proven application.

The problem is that by 1990, the last census, the alarming drop in civic engagement that has plagued the electoral process also affected the census. Instead of the 78 percent return rate that we saw initially, or the 75 percent that took place in 1980, it fell to 65 percent of households nationwide. But even more tellingly, it fell to between 30 and 40 percent in the hardest-to-count neighborhoods. Not only had the holes in the census grown, the holes became larger than the fabric itself.

Costs skyrocketed in the 1990 census, not as a product of any failure of execution but a failure of design; and it earned the unenviable distinction of being the first census that was less accurate than its predecessor. That is why in the course of this decade so much effort has been made to combine the direct counting methods of the past with long proven scientific sampling techniques. Both techniques will be used in this decade. And it is important for us to understand that the result of that will be our ability to measure and control the quality of the count in ways that will help guide and inform policy for the next decade.

There is a lot that can go wrong in the course of a census. My colleagues heard the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) talk about some of the things that are going right. Those are important measures of success. But the kinds of things that happen in any large undertaking are going to happen this year. We are going to have some household somewhere that gets a dozen or a score or maybe 100 forms, and it is not a sign of a failure of the census. We are going to have some enumerator who falls asleep on somebody's front porch, and it is not a sign of a failure in the census.

□ 1700

We are going to have a whole city block who never got their forms and had to be remailed. And it is not a sign of failure. It is the kind of thing that happens in large and complex undertakings. The kind of things that we need to watch throughout this year are the kind of things that the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is looking at through the oversight process in a responsible way, staying out of the way of excuses but understanding what is going on, watching the mail return rates.

Those will be a critical measure of the kinds of adjustments that need to be made in the course of the conduct of the census. The length of time consumed in responding to nonresponsive households and to follow up to make sure that they are counted. The longer the length of time that that takes, the more the quality of data deteriorates.

Finally, and perhaps the most important, the personnel retention and turnover rates that are a critical part of this huge human enterprise.

I join my colleague from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) in thanking the career professionals at the Census Bureau and Ken Pruitt and his leadership team for the work that they have done. I wish

them the very best in the conduct of this enormously important national undertaking, and I thank all in this Congress who have been actively involved in our local communities to make sure that everyone has the opportunity to be counted. Because every one of us needs to count.

I thank my colleague for this opportunity to join with her today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank my colleague for his consistent outstanding work and commitment to getting an accurate count.

Our goal in this body has been to get the most accurate census possible, conduct it using the most up-to-date methods as recommended by the National Academy of Sciences and the vast majority of the professional scientific community.

It is very important that we get an accurate count because the census has a real impact on the lives of real people. Information gathered in the census is used by States and local governments to plan schools and highways by the Federal Government, to distribute funds for health care and other programs, and by businesses in deciding where to build new stores and factories and provide new services.

We are pleased to have the gentleman from Patterson, New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) with us, a former mayor, and he has firsthand knowledge of conducting a census which was conducted during the time that he was mayor. I thank him for joining us today, and I yield to him.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed to hear that the Republican candidate for President is opposed to use the sampling methodologies for the 2000 Census. That methodology has been certified by the National Academy of Sciences, which is the body which determines scientific methodology with regards to medicine, the environment, biology, etcetera.

I am alarmed because these studies that I have just defined have shown that this is the only true way to obtain an effective count of our population. There is no such thing as a perfect count regardless of which methodology we use. But certainly the least perfect, the one which brings us further away from the number, is to believe that we can count noses by counting noses. It just does not work that way.

In particular, members of the population that have been historically undercounted are ethnic minorities and immigrants where there is a tremendous mobility in domicile from month to month, from year to year.

That decision by the Republican candidate for President casts serious doubt on the claim that he wants to reach out to the minority communities of America.

The beauty of the census is that it has no barriers due to education, background, citizenship, income, or heritage. It is, in fact, one of the most democratic events we undertake in our Nation.

There is no anecdotal data reflecting any breach of confidentiality in the history of the United States census. I think that is quite a record. We would only hope that other agencies in Government had that record. We have debated it on this floor.

Unfortunately, entire communities are not counted each decennial due to inherent flaws in the process of traditional head counts. Sampling is the way to correct this. I know from experience how important sampling is.

In 1995, the Census Bureau spent $3.3 million to test the use of statistical methods in making the census more accurate. My hometown, a town where I was the mayor, Patterson, New Jersey, was one of these cities; and the results are staggering. Through this technique, we found that the 1990 Census had missed 8,000 people in one city alone in only one part of that city. Imagine what that means for other towns, large and small, across this greatest of all nations.

As a result of that undercount, that county within which Patterson sits lost over $60 million in those 9 years. Since much of Federal funding is distributed by many items, yes, but one of those items being population, that is an amazing number. It is almost $10,000 per uncounted person, this phantom population.

An independent study by PriceWaterhouseCoopers estimates that in the 2000 Census, the one in which we just sent out the forms, the questionnaires, one in every six gets the long form, the rest of us get the short form, in that census undergoing right now in New Jersey, we will be undercounted in New Jersey by 72,000 people. That should be unacceptable to all of us regardless of which side of the aisle we sit on. If it happens, this undercount would result in tremendous underfunding of Federal dollars.

To disenfranchise millions of Americans, disproportionately minorities, children and the poor, and prevent them from getting their fair share of resources for priorities like schools, hospitals and roads, that is not compassionate. That is not conservative. Indeed, it is not fair.

So what we are asking for is there has been a hiatus since the Supreme Court decision and we will, now that the questionnaires will be returned and the enumerators are being sent out, that we not get back into the partisan battles of 1998 and 1999, that we work together to make sure that sampling becomes a major part without defying the Supreme Court position.

Mr. Speaker, this is a critical issue for America. The Constitution mandates a count. The Constitution does not mandate how that count will take place. Hopefully, we will not have the undercount that we have had since 1960 and 1970 and 1980 and 1990. This, hopefully, will be a different census.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his comments. I agree completely that the census is about people, it is not about politics, it is about getting the most accurate count possible. Because the census is so important, we must do everything we can to ensure that everyone is included in the count.

We know that previous censuses overlooked millions of Americans, especially children and minorities. That is not fair, it is not accurate, and it is not acceptable. We are determined to do better.

One of the programs that the Census Bureau has initiated is one called Partnerships With Community Groups and the formation of Complete Count Committees that work in the neighborhoods to help work with the Census Bureau to make people aware of the census, encourage them to fill out their forms, and to improve the counting of all Americans.

Our next speaker, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), is the chair of the Baltimore City Complete Count Committee. He is also one of the most active members on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight on which the Census Subcommittee resides. I thank him for his work on the subcommittee and for taking a leadership role in his community, and I thank him for being here tonight.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) on behalf of the Congress and all the people of this great United States of America for all of her hard work. And she has worked hard. She has been working on this issue for a long time and we thank her. Because a lot of the things that were talked about a little bit earlier, the program that she just talked about and others, are because she was in there and she was fighting and she continues to fight. And we thank her, we really do, all of us.

I also want to take a moment to thank Ken Pruitt. He visited my district about 2 weeks ago and met with some young children at one of our elementary schools encouraging them to go home and remind their parents to make sure that they filled out the form and sent it off into the mail and make sure that it got back. And that shows how sensitive the Census Bureau is that he would come and spend an hour and a half with elementary schoolchildren and sending them as messengers back to their homes to make sure that these forms were properly filled out and returned.

But, Mr. Speaker, I take the time tonight because I believe that all Americans regardless of race, ethnicity and socio-economic status deserve livable communities. All must share equitably in this great American dream.

In Baltimore, people work hard. They do not ask for a lot, but they deserve to have communities that are safe and healthy, communities where children can obtain quality educations. Creating livable communities for our Nation's residents greatly depends upon a complete and accurate census count.

I recently learned that Governor Bush has sided with the Republican majority in Congress that has objected to the use of modern scientific methods to provide accurate census data. As a candidate for the presidency of these diverse United States of America, his opposition to using modern scientific methods casts very serious doubts on his efforts to reach out to minority communities.

It is so unfortunate, but not surprising, that the compassionate conservatism does not include the community I represent. Use of modern scientific methods ensure that those communities traditionally missed will be counted.

In 1990, approximately 23,000 citizens, let me repeat that, 23,000 citizens, in Baltimore City were missed. The City lost as much as $650 million in critical Federal grants and loans. However, an accurate count is not just about the money, it is also about quality of life.

Census information impacts programs like Childcare and Development Block Grant, a program that enables low-income families to obtain child care while they are at work or obtaining a job or obtaining job training or going to school.

The Labor Department uses census estimates in support of the Workforce Investment Act to prepare young people and adults facing serious impediments to employment by providing jobs and skilled training.

The Department of Education uses census data to identify school districts and allocate funds under title I program, helping to provide extra help in basic education to students most in need, particularly communities and schools with high concentrations of children in low-income families.

□ 1715

The Treasury Department uses census data for the Community Reinvestment Act to help determine whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minorities and low- and moderate-income areas.

As the honorary chair of Baltimore City's Complete Count Committee, my focus has been on the most difficult groups to enumerate; and the gentleman from Baltimore, Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), has joined me in those efforts.

We have worked hard to make sure that we reached the African American male population between 18 and 30 years old, children under 5 years old, undocumented residents, Hispanics, and native Americans. Using Governor Bush's method, even our best efforts will not ensure that these groups are counted. A complete and accurate Census 2000 will ensure that education, accessible health care, child care, access to jobs, and the protection of civil rights are the foundation of livable communities. Our citizens deserve no less.

I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for yielding.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to really elaborate on a tremendous threat to an accurate count which has been brought up by some of my colleagues. At a press conference from Oakland on March 5, 2000, Governor George W. Bush finally revealed what we, many of us, suspected all along.

He has no intention of helping minorities, children and even the people of Texas by supporting the use of modern statistical methods for the census.

Let me read directly from the transcript. A reporter asked Governor Bush, and I quote, ''Governor, you mentioned the similarities between California and Texas. One of the issues in the minority community in California is regarding the census and an undercount that they experienced 10 years ago and can expect to experience again. What is your position on the idea of using sampling methods which would count minority communities more fully? Your party is against it,'' end quote.

Governor Bush responded, and I quote, ''Yeah, so am I. I think we need to count, an actual count. I think we need to spend the money, make the effort and work hard to get an actual count,'' end quote.

That was a very telling exchange. Governor Bush is willing to put his party's position ahead of what is right for the American people. Governor Bush sided with those in Congress who believe their partisan political power is best served by pretending that minority voters do not exist.

Why is this important to the presidential race if the census is now, if the census is this year? Let me say why. Under the plan that the professionals at the Census Bureau have devised, the more accurate data will correct the historical undercount of minorities. This will not be available until the beginning of the term of the next President.

The next President, if he should choose, could try to stop the numbers from being released to the States. This is exactly what President Bush did 10 years ago. That is why his statement from last week cast serious doubt on Governor Bush's claim that he wants to reach out to minority communities. The Bush census plan would effectively disenfranchise millions of Americans, disproportionately minorities, children, and the poor, and prevent them from getting their fair share of resources for priorities in their neighbors like schools, hospitals, and roads.

That is not compassionate. That is not conservative. That is not fair.

This decision puts Governor Bush at odds with the entire scientific community; from the National Academy of Sciences and the American Statistical Association to current Census Bureau professionals and even Dr. Barbara Bryant, former President Bush Census Bureau director.

All of these individuals and organizations agree that millions of Americans, disproportionately minorities, children and the poor, will again be missed if corrected numbers are not released. That is why a fair and accurate census is a priority for the civil rights community and groups like the Children's Defense Fund. Many civil rights communities have called getting the use of modern scientific methods to correct for the undercount the most important civil rights issue of the decade.

The governor's remarks remind me of something former Speaker Gingrich said in his book, Lessons Learned the Hard Way. Speaker Gingrich wrote about the error he made in holding the 1997 flood bill hostage in his effort to stop modern scientific methods. In explaining his actions, he said he stopped the flood bill because preventing a fair and accurate census was an issue, and I quote, ''of great importance to our party,'' end quote.

Still it seems that Governor Bush did not always share the party's view on the census. Like our former speaker, who used to support modern statistical methods, the Texas Office of State Federal Relations under Governor Bush's leadership used to be in agreement with the scientific community on this issue. I quote from the 1997 Texas State Federal Relations Office priorities, and I quote,

> All sides in the census debate concede that traditional methods of calculation which seek to identify and count each individual resident will never provide a full and accurate portrait of the U.S. population. At issue is how to correct that so that everyone can acknowledge it is an undercount and specifically an undercount of certain populations, most often urban minorities. This issue is important to Texas, because many Federal funding distributions are made according to census results. Most Texans do not realize that well over one-third of the State budget is derived from Federal sources, and all of these Federal sources are tied to census numbers. Consequently, the accuracy of the census is vitally important to the State, and even members of his own State.

end quote.

This is a tremendously important issue. There was a report that was issued earlier last week by PriceWaterhouseCoopers and it was based on the impact of an accurate census data across the Nation; but on my city it stated that New York City stands to lose approximately $2.3 billion during the next decade if the Census Bureau is blocked from releasing the most accurate population data; $2.3 billion over 10 years. That is a lot of teachers; that is a lot of police officers, roads, bridges. It is important that we get an accurate count. It means a great deal to the people of America.

I have with me the next speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA). He is a first-term Congressman, a former Senator and he has direct knowledge of the problem of the undercount in his State.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), for giving me the opportunity to speak on this important issue. I appreciate the leadership that she has taken on this issue, especially urging and demanding an accurate count on the 2000 Census.

This is not about political wedges. This is about improving the quality of life. That is what this issue is about. It is not about political wedges. It is about improving the quality of life. This issue affects all Americans. This issue affects every man in America. This issue affects every woman in America. This issue affects every child in America.

During the census of 1990, nearly 18,000 residents of my congressional district were not counted. I state 18,000 residents of my congressional district were not counted. The undercount resulted in a loss of Federal dollars and funds that would have benefited, nearly $50 million in revenue, that would have gone over the past 10 years. Because we failed to do an accurate count, we lost $50 million over the last 10 years.

$50 million could have gone a long ways in providing much needed resources to my congressional district. $50 million would have brought the Inland Empire roads and infrastructure. $50 million could have brought the Inland Empire housing programs and projects and educational services, law enforcement for cities, parks and recreation, senior citizen services, youth centers, educational services. Overall, the State of California has lost out on more than 2.2 billion Federal dollars, and I state overall the State of California has lost out on more than 2.2 billion Federal dollars due to the 1990 census undercount.

Last week, the lieutenant governor of California, Cruz Bustamante, warned that our State could lose $5 billion, and I state $5 billion, in Federal funding if the undercount this year is similar to the 1990 undercount. That is why I commend our colleague from New York for urging for an accurate count and demanding an accurate count, not only what it means to my State but what it means to many other States across the Nation.

As Lieutenant Governor Cruz Bustamante said, we will have less than we deserve, and I state we will have less than what we deserve. This is not just a matter of loss of Federal dollars. People are being overlooked. Millions of Americans are being overlooked. It is a shame that California will not get its fair share of dollars if we do not do an accurate count. That is why it is important that we do an accurate count, not only for California but for others.

Ten years ago, millions of Americans were not included in the census count, a count that would have placed them equally alongside each and every other American. In 1990, 2.7 percent of people of California were not counted, 2.7 percent. 2.7 percent. That means one out of every 37 people in California were not counted. Yet our population continues to grow.

We have 34 million people or more in the State of California. It would be a shame if California did not have an accurate count and it did not receive its fair share of dollars back into our State.

The census undercount does not affect all Americans in the same way. Again, during the 1990 census, 7.6 percent of the black population was overlooked in that counting; I state, 7.6 percent. That means one out of every 13 black residents of California were not being counted.

Also, during the 1990 Census, 4.9 percent of Hispanic residents of California were not counted. That is 4.9 percent. That means 4.9, roughly one out of every 20 Latinos in California were not being counted. Imagine what it is going to be like this year if we do not do an accurate count. It is a shame if we do not do that. It is a shame that the leadership on the other side does not want to do an accurate count.

I am appalled that Governor Bush does not want to do an accurate count. I think it is important that we all do it in the State of California, that we do it in every State. I am truly appalled. 4.9 percent equals nearly 400,000 Latinos in California not counted the last 10 years. 400,000 is more than the population of Fresno, California; 400,000 is more than the population of Sacramento. It is more than the population of Oakland. 400,000 people not being counted is 400,000 too many.

However, it is not just a matter of blacks and Latinos not being counted. Millions of children also were overlooked over the last 10 years. Nationwide, more than 2 million children were not counted 10 years ago.

In California alone, 342,000 children were not counted in the 1990 Census. That is 342,000 children. Imagine the services that could have gone back to our schools, to our communities, to our State. This represents 4.2 percent of the children of California not being counted in 1990. This represents nearly one of every 24 children in California not being counted.

I join my colleagues here on the floor this evening in urging all Americans to stand up and be counted this year. I join with those who have been undercounted in the past in stressing the importance of being counted during the year 2000 Census. All Americans should be counted this year. If we do not do an accurate count, the Federal dollars do not come in and the taxpayers will have to pay for the services that we want and deserve.

I urge all of us to stand up and be counted. Whether we are white or whether we are American Indians, African Americans, Hispanic, Asian Americans, we should all stand up together and be counted. We are one Nation, a great Nation; and we are one people together unified and inclusive, and I state inclusive, and that is important that we are all included in this process and that every one of us is counted.

Filling out the forms and mailing them back is important. As the Chair indicated that April 1, everyone has received it, we urge everyone to return those back and to participate in the process. It is the responsibility of a partnership between all of us. It is not just the legislature's responsibility. It is a partnership for the total community, for businesses, for schools, for churches, for our communities to come together and do what is necessary for our States. If we come together collectively, we will put our political wedges aside and we will do what is good for America. We will do what is good for our country. We will do what is good for our State.

I thank my colleague for providing me the opportunity to speak on this important issue, and I yield the balance of my time back to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), who has done an outstanding job, who is a true fighter and a true leader leading us in this important issue that is affecting all Americans.

□ 1730

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, our next speaker is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), an outstanding and consistent leader on this issue and others. He is the Chair of the Latino Caucus's Task Force on the Census and Civil Rights.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman's efforts. It is a great honor to serve with her.

Mr. Speaker, it is of great importance. It is just not a matter of partisan politics. It is just not a matter of Latino politics. I am very privileged to be the Chair of the Hispanic Caucus's Task Force on Civil Rights and the Census, but they really are one and the same. That is what I want to talk about this evening.

It is brief, but it is going to be very important. I am going to digress from the Federal funding aspect of what happens when we have inaccurate numbers. Not that that is not important, and I will give you a couple of examples why it is so important to Texas and for my district.

The 1990 census resulted in half a million Texans being missed, not counted. That is astounding. What was more astounding though is that 330,000 of those that were not counted were Hispanic or African Americans. That is something that we cannot tolerate and should not tolerate.

But, you may ask, why is it a civil rights issue? Because when the census misses people, it is not missing all people equally. The reality is that the people undercounted in the census are disproportionately Hispanics, African Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and all other American minorities.

The unquestionable result of undercounting American minorities is not only a reduction in Federal funds for services in minority communities, which are in the greatest need, obviously; it is a blatantly unjust reduction in the political voice of those communities. This is indeed a political fight. It is a fight for the political representational rights of millions of Americans.

Based on these numbers we will be redrawing all lines. What do I mean by that? I mean we will be setting up what comprises school districts, city council districts, county commissioner districts in the State of Texas, State representative and State senators, as well as Congressional districts. Minorities will be underrepresented. They will not be counted. They will not exist for the purposes of making sure that they are represented when they draw those lines in the State legislatures.

We cannot start a new millennium with inaccurate numbers. This is not 1990. We have the ability; we have the science; we have the method; and it is there at our disposal, only if we use it.

Think of it, a new millennium; and we start it off with an inaccurate census that does not count everyone, and for 10 years going into the next century, we live with these inaccurate numbers, at great cost to the quality of life of our fellow Americans. That will not be tolerated, that should not be tolerated, and that is why I come here tonight to join my colleague from New York in a single voice to say that we are here to remind the American public, whether they be Republican, Democrat or Independents, that we must join together and use the best method to have an accurate census, because it truly impacts all of us.

The old quote, ''For whom does the bell toll,'' well, it tolls for you and me, because we are all Americans in this great country. If one American goes without a voice, then all Americans are without a voice. This is not what this great country has been built on all these years. This is not what we have fought great wars over. This is a representational democracy, and we can never achieve that if we do not have an accurate census and if we do not utilize proven scientific methods, such as sampling.

So I beseech and implore everyone out there that has any questions about it, they can come and talk to us. We will be happy to have a dialogue. But let us not let this be reduced to some petty partisan squabble, where the only end game and end product will be some sort of perceived political advantage. There is much more at stake here.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), a member of the Census Subcommittee, who has been our most consistent advocate for an accurate count and a strong voice for civil rights and social justice and all scientific methods to correct the undercount.

I thank the gentleman for all of his hard work and leadership this year. We all appreciate it.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want, first of all, to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), who has done such an outstanding job of providing leadership on this issue over the past 2 years and more. As a matter of fact, the gentlewoman has been all across the country looking at different approaches, methods, techniques, talking to as many people as she possibly could, trying to get the message out; and I think all of America owes the gentlewoman a tremendous debt of gratitude for her unselfish efforts in trying to make sure that we do in fact have an accurate count. I certainly want to thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, an accurate census is in the best interests of our Nation. In less than 22 days the Census Bureau will undertake the enormous task of counting the entire population. It is an exercise that has been done since 1790 when the first census was commissioned.

Unfortunately, during the first census, not everyone was counted. As a matter of fact, Africans in America were considered three-fifths of a person. Since 1790, we have evolved as a Nation to include at least on paper women and minorities as equal citizens of this democracy.

However, the proposed methods of counting the population by many in the Republican Party, including its most likely presidential nominee, Governor George Bush, could lead to a serious undercount of our citizens. This is tantamount to moving backwards instead of going forward.

The constituents of my district, the Seventh District of Illinois, deserve and demand an accurate count of the entire population. They realize, as many others do, that too much is at stake to get less than an accurate count.

In 1990, for example, we lost millions of dollars in Chicago in Federal funds because of a census undercount. According to the Census Bureau, at least 10 million people, at least 113,831 in the State of Illinois, 81,000 in Cook County, and 68,000 in the City of Chicago, were not counted in the 1990 census. Many of those missed were children and women who live in minority communities, people who are in need of Federal programs to assist them in their daily living.

Because the 1990 census miscounted thousands of people in Chicago, every one of our residents were shortchanged on money to repair roads and streets. They were shortchanged on money for mass transit and senior citizen programs. They were shortchanged on money for schools, parks and job training.

Perhaps the most egregious shortchange was that of political representation. In a democracy, representation is essential to having a voice in local, State and Federal Government, and when those in powerful positions fail to do what is right, America loses. It is unfortunate that the census has become so political that those in power would ignore the voices of the National Academy of Sciences and others who have said that strict enumeration could result in millions more people being missed by the census.

I often say that when elephants rumble, it is the ground that gets trampled. In this case, it is the rights of those in rural and urban America, the rights of the poor, the rights of the needy, who will be abridged if they are not counted.

Perhaps Lincoln said it best when he said that you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

So I am pleased to join with my colleagues in urging that those in powerful positions to lead do so, and not follow what many predict is a flawed way of counting our citizens. The essence of leadership requires that one do what is right and not politically expedient.

This is a great opportunity for Governor Bush to show that he is concerned about women, children and minorities in urban and rural communities. I urge him to reconsider his position on the census question and do the right thing, to make sure that every citizen is counted, because, if you are not counted, then truly you do not count.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge all citizens of this country, and especially residents of the State of Illinois, to make sure that when you get the form, that you too do the right thing: Fill it out, complete it, send it in.

Again I say to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), I commend her for being a stalwart, a true trooper, a real soldier, as one might say, of the cause, carrying the message throughout all America that if you are not counted, then you truly do not count. I tell the gentlewoman, she counts in the hearts of millions of Americans who know the great work that she has done, and we all appreciate it.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very, very much for those kind statements and his professional statements.

Mr. Speaker, our next speaker is the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Vice Chair of the Democratic Caucus, who has been a leader on this issue and many other issues that are important to our country. I thank the gentleman for coming tonight.

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman for organizing this special order this evening to speak to one of the most important peacetime activities that take place in our country, which is the census, and for

her leadership as the ranking Democrat on the committee of jurisdiction that has dealt with the census. The gentlewoman has done a fantastic job in ensuring that the census be as full and as accurate as every American I think wants it to be, and we salute the gentlewoman for her work.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that as Americans throughout the country get that census form in the mail, this is, again, one of the most important peacetime activities that we will conduct, because the census is about over 100 programs, with $150 billion every year, that in a great part are determined by the demographic information, the statistical information that the census derives.

So it is about schools, it is about seniors and home health care, it is about transportation dollars, it is about community-oriented policing, it is about housing, it is about every imaginable thing that we face in our communities, and the census dictates, to a large degree, the resources of Federal and State governments in the context of that information.

It is also about representation. This is more than a snapshot about who we are at a given time, although that is important throughout our country, for us to know who we as Americans are. But it is also about representation, because from Congressional districts in our various States, to legislative districts in our respective States, to even our local council people who may run a ward or district across the entire spectrum of the political landscape, the question of who represents us will be determined again by the census and its demographic information.

Lastly, it is about private sector decisions, which in fact make billions of dollars in decisions. Am I going to market to this part of the country? Am I going to open up my corporate headquarters in this part of the country? Am I going to open up a regional headquarters in this part of the country? Is this where I am going to put some of our stores?

Mr. Speaker, the repercussions are enormous, and that decision is made to a large degree by the demographic information in the census. In essence, democracy requires demography. That is why the census is so important.

For each one us who does not get counted, this is not about, well, I did the right thing, I sent my census form in. This is about being our brother's keeper.

□ 1745

It is about making sure that our family and our friends and everyone else that we know, our neighbors, make sure that their census form goes in, because when they do not get counted, each and every one of us is diminished. I am a New Jerseyan. When a New Jerseyan does not get counted, all New Jerseyans suffer. When someone from my community where I live does not get counted, all of the residents of my community suffer, because each person has actually a value. Roughly, that is about $1,000 per person for 10 years. For each individual person who does not get counted, roughly about $10,000, multiply that by the numbers of people undercounted and it is enormous. That means less opportunities for our children, for our grandparents, for our communities, for a better way of life.

Now, that is why we Democrats have been fighting to ensure that we have the most accurate census possible in this millennium year. This fight began with an agreement within the scientific community that the use of modern scientific methods, which we call statistical sampling, would greatly improve the accuracy of the 2000 Census. But despite the evidence from the scientific community, Republicans have persistently opposed an accurate census that includes that scientific determination to have a sampling.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Labor Department puts out labor statistics and we see what the unemployment rate is and Wall Street reacts to that and other businesses react to that, that is a statistical sample. It is in essence what scientists have said we can use and we already use that in the government. Why should we not use it for the census to ensure that we have the best possible count?

I am really concerned when I see that one of the two Presidential candidates, George W. Bush, falling in lockstep with his Republican congressional leadership, has made his true intentions known that he does not support what scientists say makes sound science, which is a full and accurate count by using modern statistical sampling methods. When he takes that position, which came about only after various caucuses in the Congress wrote to him and said, what is your position? We have heard the position of GORE on this. What is your position on the question of the census and sampling? He finally came forth and said, I do not support sampling. Therefore, I do not support good science. But more importantly, when he fails to support sampling, he fails to support having every citizen ultimately counted. He has no interest in an accurate census, he has no interest in a fair and full representation for all Americans, and he has no interest in ensuring that my constituents in New Jersey, much less his constituents in Texas, receive the Federal funds their communities are entitled to receive.

Mr. Speaker, let me give an example of that. In the 1990 census, for example, more than 486,000 Texans were missed in the 1990 census. This translated into a loss of $1 billion, $1 billion in Federal funds to the State of Texas during this past decade. Now, George W. Bush's decision earlier this month to oppose the use of modern statistical methods and thus oppose an accurate census demonstrates that he is not committed to correcting a problem.

But it is not just about affecting the Texans. It affects my constituents in New Jersey. Because when we fail to use statistical sampling, we fail in every State that has realized an undercount to realize for those citizens their full potential and the resources that they deserve.

So this decision actually means double trouble for Texans in the next decade. Estimates indicate that an undercount in 2000 similar to the one in 1990 could mean a loss of $2 billion in Federal funding for the State of Texas over the next decade, twice the amount in 1990. Now, usually when we identify a problem, common sense dictates that we try to solve it, I say to the gentlewoman; and so that ultimately is what we are trying to do here.

Ultimately, what the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is trying to do, what we are trying to do is to ensure an accurate count. In my own district, over 20,000 people were not counted in 1990. The State of New Jersey lost $231 million in Federal funding in that time period because of the undercount. That, and also lastly, because Hispanic Americans and other minorities who are among the greatest people who were undercounted, I hear all of these candidates talking about how they are reaching out to this community to ensure that, in fact, they vote for them. Well, if they want us to be counted on election day, they need to count on us in the census.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman and all of the other speakers tonight. I urge my colleagues and all Americans to support and participate in the census, to fill out their forms and mail them in and finally to urge this House to let the professionals at the Census Bureau do their job so that the 2000 Census will be the most accurate and inclusive ever.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the Census, as we are all aware, is important to our nation for a host of serious reasons. Not only is the decennial census the largest peace-time mobilization of American resources and personnel, it is a great day for civic participation and engagement! This is perhaps one of the most important features of the Census.

The day the Census is taken is the one day in which everyone has the opportunity to make their presence known! On April 1st, everyone is equal—every response is equally important to the nation; to states and local communities.

In this great melting-pot we call the United States, the significance of Census participation cannot and should not be understated. Everyone—every citizen in this nation counts—and everyone should be counted—as the implications of the Census count are critical to each and everyone of us.

The Census count influences the manner in which billions of federal dollars are allocated to states and local governments. This affects all of us—rich and poor alike—as these funds are used for our roadways, educational systems, hospitals, health care and for so many other important initiatives.

That is why, I am dismayed with those who oppose using modern statistical methods to provide a more accurate Census count.

We now know with certainty that the undercount of minorities is well-documented.

For example, the 1990 census missed 8.4 million people. The majority of those overlooked were children, the poor and people of color. The 1990 census missed: 4.4 percent of African Americans; 5 percent Hispanics; 2.3 percent of Asians and Pacific Islanders; and over 12 percent of Native Americans.

The 1990 census missed 7 percent of Black children, 5 percent of Hispanic children, and over 6 percent of Native American children.

What is compassionate and logical is to guarantee the right of each and every American to both accurate and fair political representation and a fair share—a fair share—of federal funds for education, health care and transportation and the like.

I am committed to ensuring that all Americans are counted and that all Americans receive their fair share of political representation and federal funds to which they are entitled.

In my District, the devastation caused by Hurricane Floyd has displaced many residents of eastern North Carolina. My staff and I, as well as numerous Census officials have taken steps to ensure that displaced citizens are informed about how to participate in the Census.

It is clear that Census 2000 is a civil rights issue. As such, it affects every citizen. Each of us is concerned with one or more of the following: Medicare; Medicaid; special education preschool programs; job training programs; disabled veterans outreach programs; adult education programs; bilingual education programs; child care programs and education programs; and Voting Rights Act.

This list could continue because the Census count affects a wide-range of programs and persons. However, what is fundamental regarding the significance of obtaining an accurate Census count is fair political representation and a fair distribution of federal funds.

The Census Bureau will provide us with two sets of numbers for the 2000 Census—an actual count and a statistically adjusted count. The Supreme Court ruled that statistically-based figures cannot be used for the reapportionment of U.S. House seats. However, states have the discretion as to which set they may use.

I encourage everyone to seriously consider the implications of obtaining an accurate Census count—one that reflects the U.S. population in its totality and diversity. I am quite cognizant of the fact that all Americans count, that is why I am committed to ensuring that every American gets counted!

CONGRESS NEEDS TO FACE FACTS ABOUT AMERICA'S WAR ON DRUGS

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, every day politicians talk about a drug-free America. Now, the Clinton administration is proposing to spend another $1.6 billion for drug eradication in Colombia so that we can become ''drug-free America.''

Mr. Speaker, let us get real. We have already spent $600 million to eradicate drugs at their source in Colombia, and what has happened? Both cocaine and heroin production in Colombia have skyrocketed. Despite eradication efforts, cocaine production in Colombia has more than doubled since 1995.

Colombia is now the source of 80 percent of the cocaine that comes into America, 75 percent of the heroin; and there is absolutely no sign Colombia's government can stop it or even make a dent in the problem any time soon, even with additional American dollars.

Let us face it. Our supply-side efforts have been a colossal failure. When will Congress and the President wake up and face reality?

Over the last 10 years, the Federal Government has spent over $150 billion to combat the supply of illegal drugs. Yet, the cocaine market is glutted, as always; and heroin is readily available at record-high purities. While the number of casual drug users may have declined slightly, the number of hard-core addicts has not.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the war on drugs by the United States Government has been a costly failure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a soldier in that war is saying just that, telling it like it is, and Congress should listen to him. We should listen to retired Navy Lieutenant Commander Sylvester Salcedo, who served 3 years as a United States intelligence officer working closely with law enforcement officers and agencies doing antidrug work. As Lieutenant Commander Salcedo put it, quote, ''The $1.6 billion being proposed on drug-fighting efforts in Colombia is good money thrown after bad.''

Lieutenant Commander Salcedo also said recently that the stated goal of the aid package that is to disrupt the production and exports of drugs into our country is unrealistic and unrealizable. In fact, the lieutenant commander was so upset by the proposal, he wanted to return a Navy medal he received for his work with the Defense Department's Joint Task Force 6.

Rather than spend more money in Colombia, we should confront the issue of demand here at home in the United States, providing treatment services to the addicted population.

Mr. Speaker, this veteran of the drug war is absolutely correct. The lieutenant commander's stated goal, to get us to focus on our own drug addiction problem here in America, should be our goal as a Congress and as a country. As the lieutenant commander put it, quote, ''Washington should spend its money not on helicopters and trainers, but on prevention programs and treatment for addicts.''

Mr. Speaker, the cost of helicopters alone for Colombia would provide treatment for 200,000 American addicts. We are about to spend almost $2 billion, with a B, $2 billion on Colombia, while here at home we have 26 million addicts and alcoholics and most are unable to get into treatment.

When President Richard Nixon declared war on drugs in 1971, he directed 60 percent of the funding into treatment. Today, we are down to 18 percent.

The evidence is clear. We have had a misguided use of resources to put the emphasis on interdiction, crop eradication, border surveillance, more helicopters to fly into Colombia. We will never even come close, Mr. Speaker, to a drug-free America until we knock down the barriers to chemical dependency treatment right now for 26 million Americans already addicted to drugs and/or alcohol. That is right, 26 million addicts in the United States today, most unable to access treatment.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, 150,000 Americans died from the disease of addiction. Mr. Speaker, 150,000 of our fellow Americans died. We spent $246 billion in economic terms, lost productivity, absenteeism from work, more jail cells, social service costs, Ritalin for kids from families of addicts. American taxpayers paid over $150 billion for criminal and medical costs alone last year. That is more than we spent on education, transportation, agriculture, energy, space, and foreign aid combined; and 80 percent of our 2 million prisoners are in prison tonight because of drugs and/or alcohol.

How much evidence do we need here in Congress that we have a national epidemic of addiction crying out for more treatment, not more of the same, not more supply side?

Mr. Speaker, let us pass substance abuse parity, knock down the discriminatory barriers to treatment. Let us get real about addiction.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just another public policy issue; this is a life or death issue for 26 million chemically-dependent Americans. If we can pass parity legislation, provide the necessary treatment, then some day we can honestly talk and realistically talk about a drug-free America.

Mr. Speaker, every day, politicians talk about the goal of a ''drug-free America.'' and now the Clinton Administration is proposing to spend another $1.6 billion for drug eradication in Colombia so we can become ''drug-free America.''

Mr. Speaker, let's get real! We've already spent $600 million to eradicate drugs at their source in Colombia and what's happened? Both cocaine and heroin production in Colombia have skyrocketed. Despite eradication efforts, cocaine production in Colombia has more than doubled since 1995.

Colombia is now the source of 80 percent of the cocaine and 75 percent of the heroin coming into the United States. And there's absolutely no sign Colombia's government can stop it or even make a dent in the problem any time soon, even with additional American aid.

Let's face it! Our supply-side efforts have been a colossal failure! When will Congress and the President wake up and face reality?

Over the last 10 years, the federal government has spent over $150 billion to combat the supply of illegal drugs, yet the cocaine market is glutted as always, and heroin is readily available at record-high purities. And while the number of casual drug users may have slightly declined, the number of hard-core addicts has not.

In short, the war on drugs by the U.S. government has been a costly failure.