

my academic knowledge, my ability to communicate." This is the person who has chosen to test his influence against the Republican Party. He does not describe his actions as those of a man moved by grubby ambition; he sees it as a calling.

POLITICS AND PROPHECY

Dobson was once positioned to be a more conservative version of Joyce Brothers. "If I had simply stayed on those [family] themes, I could have moved with ease through all denominations in both political parties. But I care about the moral tone of the nation, I care about right and wrong. I have very deep convictions about absolute truth."

His sense of political urgency has come in stages. Convinced that his and his followers' views were not being given voice in Washington, he created in 1982 an advocacy group, the Family Research Council. But it was purposely designed to keep him one step removed from direct political involvement. Gary Bauer, a key aide in Ronald Reagan's White House, now runs the group, and he is supposed to be the partisan lightning rod, allowing Dobson to focus, as it were, on the family.

But Dobson, in the past several months, has become so dissatisfied with conservatives' performance in Congress that he wants to become more directly and personally involved in politics. "He has watched the manipulation of the religious right for the last decade," argues his close friend Charles Colson. "He feels a sense of betrayal and responsibility for stewardship of the great silent majority."

He is particularly intolerant of those who share his views but not his driving sense of urgency. So he has developed a habit of targeting allies with footnoted letters showing that Dobson can at times slip over the line between righteousness and self-righteousness. When Ralph Reed, then the head of the Christian Coalition, was insufficiently critical during the last election of Colin Powell for his support of abortion rights, Dobson wrote to Reed: "Gary Bauer and I have discussed your recent statements and considered the need to distance ourselves from you. . . . Some of the politicians with whom you have made common cause . . . would seal the fate of [unborn children] and sacrifice millions more in years to come. I will fight that evil as long as there is breath within my body." Commenting on Dobson's tendency to attack allies, conservative columnist Cal Thomas argues, "You begin to marginalize yourself, saying, I am the only true believer. Soon you are left only with your wife, then you begin to look at her funny. All of a sudden, you're Ross Perot." When confronted with the charge, Dobson responds: "I guess it irritates me when people who know what is right put self-preservation and power ahead of moral principle. That is more offensive to me, in some ways, than what Bill Clinton does with interns at the White House."

Dobson is not the kind of traditional conservative who has a keen appreciation of the limits and complexities of politics. He is a moralist and a populist, demanding rapid, immediate progress to fit a flaming moral vision: "If you look at the cultural war that's going on, most of what those who disagree with us represent leads to death—abortion, euthanasia, promiscuity in heterosexuality, promiscuity in homosexuality, legalization of drugs. There are only two choices. It really is that clear. It's either God's way, or it is the way of social disintegration."

Some conservatives dismiss this as an impractical philosophy for a governing party since progress emerges by small steps. Other conservative critics fear that Dobson's in-

creased partisanship might undermine the generally nonpartisan good works of Focus on the Family. Still others warn that his walkout strategy will only result in the election of Democrat Dick Gephardt as House speaker. Dobson's response: "It is never wrong to do what's right. And you stand for what's right whether it is strategic or not."

The fact that Dobson has struck a chord among conservative activists may be signaling an important shift of political styles in evangelicalism. There are at least three of those tendencies to be considered: priest, kingmaker, prophet. From the 1950s to the 1970s, Billy Graham performed a priestly function as minister to the ministers of state. His role was to legitimize power and to use his access to present the Christian Gospel, which was his primary goal. Personal contact and influence were paramount. In the 1980s, culminating in the rise of Pat Robertson and the Christian Coalition, the goal shifted from legitimizing power to exercising power—the role of kingmaker. Robertson, the son of a senator, understood the give and take of coalition building and the need for a place at the table.

But the pragmatism of the religious right is under serious question, particularly in the wake of the coalition's embrace of Republican Bob Dole in the last presidential election, which many in the movement argue was a compromise too far. University of Akron's Green compares Dobson to an Old Testament prophet "speaking truth to power." It is a designation Dobson accepts: "I really do feel that the prophetic role is part of what God gave me to do."

And that frames the questions for his supporters: Do Christian activists want to be players or prophets? Insiders who accept inevitable compromises, or outsiders who hold on to higher standards?

THE NEXT MOVE

Dobson has rejected the idea of becoming a political candidate himself or trying to create a third party. This leaves him with two options. The conventional choice is for Dobson to intervene directly in Republican primaries on the side of social conservatives. This would require, in Dobson's words, "periodic leaves of absence" to protect the nonprofit status of Focus on the Family. Bauer's political action committee has already scouted 40 races where Dobson might throw his weight on the side of a candidate. After the congressional elections, Dobson would determine how to have the maximum impact in the 2000 presidential campaign. Bauer himself is considering a presidential run and covets Dobson's endorsement.

But Dobson is also actively considering "going nuclear" against the GOP leadership. Instead of working through primaries in the summer, Dobson would urge social conservatives to abandon Republicans in November—to stay at home or vote for third parties—with the goal of ending the GOP majority in Congress. "It doesn't take that many votes to do it. You just look how many people are there by just a hair, [who won their last election by] 51 percent to 49 percent, and they have a 10- or 11-vote majority, I told [House Majority Whip] Tom DeLay, 'I really hope you guys don't make me try to prove it, because I will.'" One senior Republican official says he has identified six districts in which Dobson could "turn the tide" against the GOP candidate, Dobson muses about delivering this message by "getting a stadium with 50,000 seats and having Chuck Colson and Phyllis Schlafly and Alan Keyes and Gary Bauer and myself fill it at a strategic times. That get the attention of Republican leaders."

Some Republican insiders believe the effect of either approach—working within the

party or working against it—would be much the same. Bauer's political action committee's fervent support for a conservative candidate in a recent California congressional special election helped elevate the abortion issue. Party leaders believe this allowed Democrat Lois Capps to win in the moderate district. They fear that if Dobson intervenes on behalf of social conservatives in other contests, similar results will follow. As for the nuclear option, the mood of many Republicans is frustrated resignation that Dobson will always be on the attack against the GOP. "It wouldn't matter how many hoops of fire we jump through, it is never enough for him," complains one party official. That strategist and others say majority parties have a responsibility to govern, and that means muting ideological fervor at times. It is hard to imagine this official and Jim Dobson in the same party—and it may be increasingly hard for Dobson to imagine that as well.

SCOURGE OF ILLEGAL DRUGS AGAIN UNDER ATTACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma is once again to be commended for his leadership on this issue. There is no doubt that the number one fundamental problem in this country is the breakdown of character, the breakdown of the value system, the principled foundations of this country and the resultant breakdown partly, directly, the two things go in tandem, of families as well.

The number one outgrowth that we are seeing in this country is the problem of drug abuse: drugs of all types, marijuana, cocaine, heroin, alcohol, tobacco, but in particular what we have been focusing on is this explosion among our youth of the narcotics, of marijuana, heroin, cocaine, crack, methamphetamines and other artificial stimulants. Tonight we are going to spend some time discussing this issue.

It is a relatively historic night. Tomorrow we are going to have our first pieces of legislation, what will be a comprehensive multi-week, hopefully multi-month, year and up to three years extended start of a battle on drugs. We have done piecemeal legislation over the last few years but we have not had the concentrated effort that we will see starting as of tomorrow.

We have a needles bill in front of us tomorrow to ban the use of giving free needles to heroin addicts with taxpayer dollars. We have in the higher education bill an amendment relating to taking back student loans if students abuse drugs while they are on a government subsidized loan requiring them to go into treatment programs, and I have a second amendment on drug testing. It is the start.

We are also having announcement of a major initiative and Republican effort later this week. The number one person behind this is our Speaker.

Speaker NEWT GINGRICH is committed to having an all-fronts war.

I am going to yield now to my friend the gentleman from Florida who has been a leader in this. Many of us have been involved in this, not just now but for many years. Congressman MICA and myself both were staffers before we became Members of Congress. He was elected in the class before I was, but he was also on the hill before I was working over as Senate chief of staff. I also worked in the House and Senate before I got elected to Congress. Both of us have had experience in working with drug legislation before we were elected to Congress.

This is not a new issue. These things go in tides. Right now we are at a high tide level again and we need to up our efforts. He is to be commended for his leadership. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida to fill us in on some of the battles that he has been watching, some of the background, and particularly a lot of what has happened in Orlando and Florida which has been at the epicenter of it, kind of backed off, and now you have another wave, which is exactly what is happening in this country.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I certainly thank him for his leadership on the drug issue and also on so many other issues before the Congress.

We do have the privilege of serving together on the Government Reform and Oversight Committee and on the subcommittee that deals with our national drug policy, and that is the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice. The gentleman from Indiana has brought tremendous leadership and, again from his tremendous experience both as a staffer and a Member of Congress and someone who cares about this issue, cares about his constituents and also is very compassionate towards what illegal narcotics are doing, and drug abuse, to the children of our Nation.

Tonight I want to take a few minutes, if I may, and review a little bit of the history of how we got ourselves into this situation. As the gentleman from Indiana said, I was a staffer back in the early 1980s on the U.S. Senate side working with Senator Hawkins from Florida. You have also heard and understand, I think, that no State probably has been more severely impacted historically by illegal narcotics trafficking than the State of Florida.

When Senator Hawkins was elected, the streets of Miami were overrun with illegal narcotics trafficking, we had unprecedented amounts of illegal drugs coming in and transiting through Florida and into our Nation, and for the first time we saw record drug abuse in our State and Nation. The question was what should we do and what could we do at that time.

We were fortunate to have the tremendous leadership of a new President who brought a vision, who brought in-

tegrity, who brought honesty, who brought vision to the White House. His job, and Senator Hawkins and others who served in the new Senate majority at that time, was to get a handle on this situation. In fact they did, even joined by the First Lady who initiated a program of saying "Just Say No."

I do remember and recall how the new Republican majority in the Senate began an Andean strategy. As a staffer I helped develop the certification law that requires that countries that get United States foreign assistance or trade assistance or financial assistance are certified each year for their eligibility for United States largesse by a review of their efforts to eradicate drug trafficking and illegal narcotics. That was another product of that era. There was tough enforcement.

What we saw in the 1980s under the Reagan Administration and the Bush Administration, I am not sure if this will show up to my colleagues watching C-SPAN, but in fact teenage drug use declined dramatically in the early 1980s, and not until 1992-1993 did we see that trend reverse. In 1992 I was elected to the Congress. History now records George Bush being defeated and the Democrats controlling the White House, the United States Senate and the House of Representatives.

One of the first acts that President Clinton took, and I would like to review this historically because I think it is important for the record of what took place and what the results of those actions are today, one of President Clinton's first actions on taking office was in fact to gut the Office of National Drug Control Policy. In fact, President Clinton gutted the staff of the Drug Czar's office by 80 percent. The facts are, it was slashed from 146 staff members to 25 staff members. Also in his first year, President Clinton cut \$200 million in drug interdiction efforts in the Caribbean and another \$200 million from alternate crop production and drug eradication in Mexico and the Andean drug-producing countries.

Back in the 1980s we thought that the most cost-effective means of stopping drugs was at its source, where it is grown, where just a few pesos or a few dollars is given for the product at its source. It seemed to make a tremendous amount of sense. Rather than try to catch drugs when they entered our borders or when they entered our streets or were disbursed through our communities and our schools and trying to cut off drugs at that point, we felt then, we believe now, that interdiction, eradication, crop substitution programs at the source countries are the most effective means of stopping drug trafficking. You stop it right at its source, in its heels.

These programs were gutted by this administration. These are the facts. The facts speak for themselves. We have seen, again, the results. In 1993, President Clinton dropped the war on drugs from 3rd to 29th in the national security list. The President produces a

national security priority list. It was his action that dropped the war on drugs to 29th as a national priority.

To date, he has continued to allow the State Department to let counter-narcotics issues lag far behind other priorities in our relations with other countries. Only recently have we heard the Secretary of State begin to speak out because the problem has reached such tremendous proportion and the cost and effect in our communities is so dramatic.

The number of individuals, and this again is fact, I cite only fact here tonight, the number of individuals prosecuted for Federal drug violations fell from 25,033 in 1992 to 21,900 in 1994, a 12 percent drop in just 2 years. So there was a deemphasis of prosecution at the Federal level. Again, the results are very clear of what we see.

It is interesting to note this, because with the election of Rudy Giuliani as Mayor of the City of New York, he introduced a zero crime tolerance policy, he introduced a tough prosecution policy, and there has been as high a drop recorded as 30 percent in crime, a dramatic drop in drug trafficking in that community of New York City. We have seen that tough enforcement, tough prosecution works.

And we see the results at the Federal level of what has happened with a decrease in Federal prosecutions, again citing only the facts in this case. From 1992 to 1995, again when the other party controlled the House, the Senate and the White House, 227 agent positions were eliminated from the Drug Enforcement Agency, and Clinton's fiscal year 1995 budget proposed cutting 621 drug enforcement positions from the DEA, the FBI, the INS, the United States Customs Service and the Coast Guard.

□ 2200

In fact, my community, and I represent central Florida, probably one of the more affluent, more prosperous areas, one of the vibrant areas of our State and Nation, a great community of people who are law abiding but who nonetheless have been inundated by a flow of illegal narcotics. An investigation of this issue found that, in fact, a tremendous quantity of drugs is coming in through Puerto Rico; and some people blame the Puerto Rican State Governor and others, the Commonwealth, for not really taking a lead on the issue.

What we found, and our subcommittee went down and held a hearing on a Coast Guard cutter on San Juan Bay, was that, in fact, this administration had cut the Coast Guard resources by nearly 50 percent. The Coast Guard, United States Coast Guard, in fact, since Puerto Rico is a Commonwealth and does not have its own armed forces, relies on the United States Coast Guard for coastal protection. That, again, that protection was cut by this administration by 50 percent, and

those drugs came in in incredible quantities into Puerto Rico in transit for Florida and the United States.

Those are the results. They are documented. We have seen this, and we have seen what this type of policy has provided as a legacy for our Nation and our children.

The President, in fact, has not substantially increased funding for accountable youth prevention programs but instead has nearly doubled the amount of funding. His policy was to promote a doubling of funding for drug treatment programs, and this has been described sort of as treating the wounded in a battle and not addressing the fight itself or just approaching it from sort of the most demoralized end of the game with the least potential for success.

Then, of course, President Clinton recently certified Mexico, and again no nation has been more responsible for the influx and transit of hard drugs into our Nation than Mexico, again another slap in the face of the American citizenry.

I have not brought up other instances of incredible misjudgment on the part of this administration and this President, but I must when you appoint a surgeon general such as Jocelyn Elders, who adopted a program that said to our children, just say maybe, maybe it is okay. Then you had echoed by the President of the United States, a figure that every child looks to in this Nation, and his comments which I have heard over and over on various television programs and news broadcasts: If I had it to do over again, I would inhale.

Now what kind of a message does that send to our young people? In fact, we know what the message has done. The message has, and this is entitled Trends In Youthful Drug Use, Ages 12 to 17. We have seen from that reduction I showed you under Reagan and Bush, the just say no to just say maybe, a skyrocketing of youthful drug use in this country.

We are talking about not only marijuana in incredible amounts and a more dangerous marijuana than we saw in the streets in the 1960s, we are talking about cocaine, we are talking about methamphetamines, we are talking about heroin.

Again, I come from a community, and my community is one of the most rock solid in Florida, fairly prosperous, as I said, and economically doing well, and I have this headline from our local newspaper, the Orlando Sentinel. It says: Long out of sight, heroin is back killing teens.

My community in central Florida, again a peaceful community, was a victim of this policy, letting down the guard and gut slashing the budget, which they did when they controlled this body, the Senate and the White House. The guard around Puerto Rico in heroin came down not only through that country and hurting that territory of the United States but into our

country and into our State and into our neighborhood so that our particular situation has been that in the last few years central Florida has seen heroin deaths on a par with other major metropolitan areas like Detroit, like New York, like Los Angeles.

So this is the legacy that we have inherited through this policy. It is clear. It is documented.

One of the other things that I wanted to mention tonight was that my colleague has mentioned that we took over the Congress in, what was it, 36, 40 short months ago. We have been able to bring some of our Nation's finances into balance, but we are trying to focus as leaders in this new majority with the leadership of Speaker GINGRICH in addressing some of the social problems. And if drug abuse and misuse is not a problem, I do not know what is a problem. Two million Americans are behind bars.

We held a hearing, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and others came into our State. They heard our local officials. One of my local sheriffs said 80 percent of those behind bars in his county jail, that went through his jail, were there because of drug abuse or drug related crime. This has an unbelievable effect on our communities and on our children. And, again, this drug problem is not relegated to the poor, to the ghettos, to the across-the-railroad-track neighborhoods. This is hitting every neighborhood, every level of society, and we must do something about it.

So our committee, under the leadership of the Speaker, under the leadership of Chairman HASTERT, have begun a program of restoring the funds in these programs that were cut. We have got the military back into the war on drugs, and the Speaker and others are committed to make certain that they have the resources to conduct a real war on drugs. We have restored the cuts in the Coast Guard and other protective agencies, Customs and DEA, to make certain that they have the tools and the resources and the financial capability to conduct a real war on drugs.

And what we are doing this week is launching, in fact, a concerted effort to see that we have the laws in place, that we have the tough enforcement in place and that these individuals who are charged in our Federal Government with this new policy have every resource to see that it, in fact, is accomplished.

So that is the purpose of our coming together tonight, is to announce this policy. We have seen some terrible mistakes in the past when we did not have control of the Congress, when we had leadership in the White House that, in fact, strayed. And maybe they were well-intended, but the results, in fact, are just devastating to our young people and our communities and the social cost involved.

But we are determined again to turn this around, and whatever resources it takes we are going to devote full meas-

ure effort, whatever, again, finances the Congress can muster to make certain that we bring this under control so that the people who we represent, those who are trying to raise their children in communities, get them through schools, those who are retired trying to live in peace in their communities, young people.

I met a young lady the other day in one of the local department stores working, going to college, and she told me she could not go to school at night, and it was difficult for her to work and earn enough money because she was afraid to be out at the bus stop at night because of a potential for crime. And, again, 80 percent of the crime in my community is drug abuse related, and that is a pretty pitiful statement.

So for those people who we represent, their children and those trying to make a living or gain an education or live in peace and retirement, we owe them this effort, and we are going to see it through. And indeed it will succeed because we have the commitment, this new majority, and we hope we have the support of every one of my colleagues who are listening.

I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) for yielding to me, and I am pleased also to join him tomorrow as we pass a resolution making certain that a needle exchange program which almost came into effect was stopped at the last minute through the efforts of the new drug czar, General McCaffrey, and others who know this is the wrong policy. It sends the wrong message. It is not the way to go. And if we are concerned about the minority communities, young black men and women who have been killed, we should be applauding that decision not to fund this.

I am speaking tonight at the United States Capitol in Washington, D.C., the District of Columbia. No jurisdiction in our Nation has been more oppressed by drugs. No segment of our communities in this Nation have been more devastated. Since I have been coming to Washington over the last 18 years, almost every year between 300 and 400 young black males between the age of 14 and 40 have been slaughtered on the streets within view of this Capitol building, a travesty which surpasses the casualty in many of our international conflicts just here in Washington, D.C.

So, if the Black Caucus, if other Members are concerned about policy that will turn this situation around and save some of these young people's lives and not destroy the great young men, the young black citizens of our nation's capital who have just had their lives snuffed out, then they should be here joining with us to see if we can turn this situation around.

We know what has been done, and what was done by this administration did not work. We see the results. These are not abstract or manufactured statistics. This is what has taken place from a failed policy, and we need to turn that around and give these people a chance.

So I am pleased again to join with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) tonight and others as we launch a program to bring a meaningful war on drugs, a war against drug abuse and a public awareness to our young people and to our citizens that we must realize the consequences of illegal narcotics and drugs.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida once again for his leadership and for his compassion and heart for those who have been abused, shot, lives wrecked and ruined by the terrible scourge of drugs in this country, and it has been a consistent, complete support.

One of the things I want to do, too, is a supplement to what the gentleman from Florida has done, is to lay out a little bit what is happening here in the past and where we are headed and what we have been doing as we head into this major effort for the Members who are sitting in their office doing mail, for the dedicated C-Span junkies, to those who just will look through the RECORD later. Because some may say, where did the issue come from? Why all of a sudden is Speaker NEWT GINGRICH talking about drugs? Where did this pop in? Did they do some kind of poll? People are going to say, well, we have not seen what is all this action.

I want to establish that there are a number of logical things that have led to the development of this big push you are going to see. Too often, we have approached the drug issue as we approached the Vietnam war, and that is we devote just enough resources to not quite win, and so we keep falling further and further behind in a war we can ill afford to lose.

What has happened here is that the grassroots, every one of us, know, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) detailed what we heard in central Florida. We are hearing from prosecutors, we are hearing from sheriffs, we are hearing from all sorts of law enforcement officials that 70 to 85 percent of all crime in every jurisdiction has some relationship to drug and alcohol.

□ 2215

They are either stealing to fund a habit, they are high on the drugs or alcohol, and that leads to 70 to 85 percent of all crime. Child abuse, spouse abuse, not just robbery, rape, pillaging, automobile wrecks when it is reckless driving; all of these types of things have as its source one common problem. The average person knows this, the communities know this, but it has been very difficult to tackle this on a national level.

General McCaffrey argues that it is a cancer; many of us argue that it is a war. It is both a cancer and a war. That means that we will work to eliminate it as much as possible, but quite frankly, as long as there is sin, we are likely to have some drug abuse there. It is a question of how we are going to control it. It is also a war. People are dying on the streets of America, people are

dying around this world fighting this drug war.

This is a dinner table issue. One of the criteria that the Speaker looks for when we are going to have a major focus is, is this what people talk about at their dinner table? Is this what parents are concerned about at night when their kids are not there? Is this what parents are concerned about in the schools? Is this something that actually resonates with the people as opposed to being kind of an inside-the-Beltway Washington concern or a concern of a special interest that is lobbying because they have lots of funds, or of some other reason in the ways we deal with legislation? This is what strikes at the hearts and homes of American people, and that is why he is leading.

Mr. Speaker, it did not just come out of the blue. If we have been following this carefully, it has been kind of strange. Why did former Senator Bob Dole, our Presidential contender, talk about drugs during the campaign? It did not light a fire, it was not a hot media issue, but he was out there talking about it. So was the Speaker. People thought, this is kind of unusual. Why are they talking about drugs? Everybody in Washington is talking about the budget, and they are talking about taxes and so on. These people were talking about this early.

One of the things is when we took over Congress, the figures that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) was looking at were highlighted by then Congressman Bill Zeff, who headed our subcommittee, and he got the ear of our Presidential candidate, Bob Dole, and our Speaker and said, look, there is a huge problem here. We need to start concentrating on this.

This is not something that we came up with last week; this is something that our committee, I am not sure whether we have had 30 or 40 hearings in the Committee on National Security and Justice Oversight Committee, which, in addition to having jurisdiction over the State and defense and the Justice Department, also has the drug czar legislation that moves through it and some very broad jurisdiction, and we have been concentrating on this. In addition, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), who is the senior Republican on the former Select Committee on Narcotics, has been focusing on the international issue. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) has been focusing on judiciary-related issues in his Subcommittee on Crime. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) has been a leader in community efforts.

It is not as though we have been silent. It is that we have not gotten a lot of news media coverage. There is a difference. For example, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and I are on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight where we have been doing the investigations into the kind of "gate" of the week of the adminis-

tration, whether it is Filegate or Whitewatergate or whatever, Greg Livingstonegate I guess, whatever the variation is, and people say, is that all you guys do? We have done less on that than we have done on drugs. But drugs is not quite as sexy to put on the evening news as talking about some kind of finance scandal.

It is not that I am concerned and humiliated about the influence of the Federal Government on possible illegal influence of foreign contributions and campaign finance, but the fact is we work on a lot of other issues, too, but they do not necessarily hit on the front page.

We have had many oversight hearings; we have been in Indiana, Illinois and Michigan; we have been down in Florida multiple times and California multiple times and Arizona, up in New England; we have been around the country in Plano, Texas, where we had kids die of heroin overdoses in the district of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), just like they have done in Orlando.

I have been to South America three times now in the last 3 years, where there is an actual war going on. We have been over in Asia and the Middle East trying to meet with foreign countries where the heroin, cocaine, marijuana and other drugs are coming in. We have had hearings on Hollywood and the movies and their impact on the culture. We have had hearings on the music industry and the impact on the culture and what we can do related to that.

This is not something we invented yesterday. This is something we have been working on almost from the month we took over Congress. Everybody was focused on the Contract With America, but, in fact, Congressman Zeff and this subcommittee were starting on the drug issue not very many days after we got here, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and I know that because both of us are on the subcommittee, and we were up and running. Furthermore, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) had been objecting for years that the Democratic leadership of that subcommittee had not been focusing on it, so when we got in control, we started to move on this issue.

Now, what we heard in these hearings were from young people who talked, and I remember one at the Orlando hearing where a young man was there with his dad. It was a tough day for them because they were there together and going public, and his dad was fairly well-known. But he said how he started with marijuana and how he saw that his parents did not realize it, and then he started moving to harder drugs, and he started stealing, and his dad, as he said, really did not want to confront his son, did not really understand all of that, wishes now that he had been more involved. His son did not understand why his father did not get involved. They saw his grades dropping. It was very touching.

Every young person we have heard from, whether it is in Texas, whether it is in California, whether it is in Florida, say, I started with marijuana, and then I moved to cocaine. I robbed to support my habit. My grades went down, my life was wrecked, and then I was spared. And we looked at this type of thing.

We heard from one lady in Texas who talked about how her husband would get high on cocaine; how she and her daughter were hiding out because they knew he was going to kill them if the drug habit did not kill him first. She was living in terror, and what are we going to do about this? That is what we have heard about it.

We have heard how the administration's budget cuts have had an inverse effect. When they cut the interdiction efforts, when they cut the source country efforts, what we saw was supply go up, driving price down, and for competitive purposes, the purity and the potency of the marijuana and cocaine and heroin we have on our street is far greater. It is not like the 1960s and 1970s. The marijuana is more like the hard drugs of those eras, and the hard drugs are fatal today.

We had signals out of the administration, which the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) has delineated very well, that we have kids' use going up. Even though we see in some adult sectors cocaine usage and others going down, the terrible news is it is soaring among kids.

I want to talk briefly about the international problem. The cocaine comes from basically three places in the world. We can chase it all over America and all over the world, but there is three countries, Bolivia, Peru and Colombia, where the stuff comes from. And thanks to the policies in Bolivia and Peru, it has mostly now shifted to Colombia. Initially the coca leaves were grown in Peru and Bolivia, and then Peru and Colombia were doing the transfer in the making cocaine, and the Colombia was the cartels. And now most has gone to Colombia, and it is a narcoterrorism threatening the very democracy and the stability of the nation of Colombia.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting point the gentleman raises about what had developed as an Andean strategy to stop in a very cost-effective manner; we only spent about \$200 million out of \$16 billion on this whole drug effort, but we spent about \$200 million down there. It has been pretty much tightened up because of the efforts of President Fujimori, who we met with when we went down there, and also because of Bolivia's effort, but we learned some interesting things in this experience.

We learned first that, and we had a knock-down, drag-out fight with this administration when they destroyed

the shoot-down policy. We had a policy established under the Reagan administration that, given fair warning over these air spaces, in fact, in Peru and Bolivia and Colombia, the drug dealers would be shot down, and they, in fact, were until a liberal in the Clinton administration moved from the Department of Justice, I think, to DOD, and then turned this policy upside down, and we saw a lot of these drugs coming back. I will say the other side worked with us on this to get the attention of the President, but we had to reverse that. That did a great deal of damage.

Then when we visited the jungles down there, we learned from some of our agents that overflights that had been conducted in that region had, in fact, been diverted, I believe, to Alaska by the administration to look for other problems, I think environmental problems as opposed to the drug problem flights. Then we, in fact, learned that our DEA agents in the jungles were dipping into their own pockets in some cases to keep programs alive, because money had been shifted from drug enforcement and from those programs and strategies, and I think I heard the figure of \$40 million was put into Haiti for that incredibly failed program where we wasted almost \$3 billion to date. So each of these attempts by the administration to destroy the program did not succeed.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) has also outlined how since we took over the Congress, and in fact, I served on the subcommittee and the committee before, the Democrats held one hearing of any substance relating to national drug policy while all of this was being done, in spite of my circulating a bipartisan letter of 132 Members requesting hearings on our policy. And the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) has said we are not Johnny-come-latelies in that, and in fact, we have held over 40 hearings.

They may not be interesting to the media; they may not want to cover them. They may want to spend more time on tobacco and some of the outlandish figures that have been brought out as a diversionary tactic by this administration while the country is going down the path of ruin with illegal narcotics and drug abuse, and 100,000 dying in our streets. And the social costs being absolutely astronomical, in addition to, of course, medical costs and the families that are destroyed.

But this is what we have learned, this is what we have done, and in fact, we have taken these actions, as Mr. Souder has outlined, and now we are faced with a dilemma in Colombia. The administration again, with another failed policy, the Colombian failed policy. We begged, we pleaded, we have sent letters. We passed, I believe, a resolution on the floor of this Congress.

Mr. SOUDER. A law, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MICA. To get aid to Colombia, which is now where there is an incredible production of heroin. The heroin, when we went down there, they told us

they are producing 10,000 hectares which will make heroin as cheap on the streets of the United States, and it is getting there very quickly, and a much stronger, much more potent heroin, because of our policy. We failed to provide the equipment.

The Congress directed the equipment, the funds, that spare parts be given down there to fight this war on drugs, and in the meantime this administration has denied those requests. Even of late when they have decertified Colombia with a waiver, the goods and the materiel and the resources to fight that war on drugs still have not reached Colombia, and Colombian military are being slaughtered. The national police chief Seranno has been here and begged us for assistance, and we still ignore it, and we have an incredible amount of drugs, as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) just described, coming in now, not only transiting, but they are now mass producers of heroin. They are even into the cocaine business, because this administration has made it profitable for them to succeed.

I can tell my colleagues, there is nothing more effective as far as use of taxpayer dollars. Out of \$16 billion we are spending this money on treatment and programs that do not work. We talk about losing a Vietnam War. This would be just like putting all of our resources in a war and just treating the wounded, and that is what this administration's policy has been, and that is why it has failed.

We have to have tough enforcement. We have to have tough and effective education. We have to have treatment. We have to have interdiction, and all of these elements coming together in a concentrated effort to make this thing work.

□ 2230

And that is what we are hopefully going to do. But the gentleman from Indiana has, in fact, outlined the failed South American strategy, and we could go on more about Mexico.

Mr. SOUDER. I would like to make some additional comments on Colombia. We were just down there again this past week as we went down to the Summit for Americas. I had an amendment that passed and was held in conference committee that three Blackhawk helicopters were supposed to be sent to Colombia. If this administration had followed the law, those Blackhawk helicopters would be down there and they would be able to get in the areas and eradicate the heroin. They cannot get up there with the Hueys. They do not get up to that altitude.

Furthermore, there is a shooting war where people are dying in Colombia, while we stand here fiddling in Washington trying to decide what to do, while we have grounded because of mechanical failure every Huey helicopter that they have. They have nothing with which to fight. They have lost 40

percent of Colombia, the effective control of the rural countryside.

For those who do not understand the significance of this, understand that we have troops in Haiti. We have troops in Bosnia. The national interest is a little unclear, even in the Middle East, where we are spending \$1.5 billion about every nine months right now, where the gentleman from Florida and I just visited last fall and heard skepticism from our own armed forces leaders that we need to be at that level given the direct threat there.

And even arguing that the Middle East has multiple reasons of our national interest, including our friendship with Israel, our friendships with the potentially threatened Arab States and the oil supply, let us look at Colombia. If it is supplying the cocaine and heroin to this country where people are dying in my hometown of Fort Wayne and throughout northeastern Indiana and all over America, the drugs alone is enough to have national interest be a priority there. But it is more than just that.

Along the Panamanian border they have lost effective control of that. The drug dealers and control has spread into that section of Panama, the Darien area. We are about to abandon Panama. I am very concerned that not only are we going to pull out militarily, but that our efforts to get an antinarcotics center there could be kiboshed.

That is extremely critical, as we just heard earlier from Congressman MICA about the shutdown policy. They need the AWACS. If we send those AWACS up to the United States and they have an hour-and-a-half transit time to get down there, we are going to dramatically reduce our airtime for surveillance, and we are going to have even more drugs at cheaper prices on our streets, threatening our kids and families. We need to make sure we have at least an antinarcotics center in Panama as we leave.

Because Colombian narcotics drug lords are prepared to move in through Panama. On the other side they control about half the Venezuelan border where the jungle is. And control, in a guerrilla war they do not have to have forts and troops and lines. Particularly in the jungle they can move around. We have to have at least four times the effective troops and an operative military defending ground or we in effect lose control because they get to pick and choose where they want to fight.

We have lost half the Venezuelan border. It is not the Middle East that is our number one supplier of oil, it is Venezuela. Seventeen percent of our oil comes from Venezuela. In oil by-products, Colombia is our number one supplier. Talk about energy threat, the energy threat is in Colombia. It is not in the Middle East. The Canal and the trade threat is in Panama, and we have all the drugs.

And what is our response? We will not send them the three helicopters

that we were requiring them to send by law, and they are saying, well, they need 20 helicopters. You know what, three is better than zero. If we need to send them three more, we would not be arguing, maybe six, if we had sent them the three last year, then we could get them the three more this year. Frankly, they need the Blackhawks and more Huey IIs.

The alternative is American troops. Here we have a country, Colombia, where they are willing to fight and die partly because of our consumption here in America. Thousands and thousands of police officers, and we were just down there in Colombia and we visited a hospital, and we visited a number of Colombian national police who have been shot down trying to eradicate the cocaine so that it does not hit our streets. And what is our reaction? We will not give them the weapons with which to do it. Apparently we are not going to do it until we have to send troops down there.

This hat belonged to Colonel Gallego, the head of the DANTE, the antinarcotics subforce of the Colombian National Police. General Serrano and Colonel Gallego signed this for me. If anybody saw "Clear and Present Danger," it was a fictionalized account. The former ambassador who went with us on one of the trips, I asked him if it was an accurate movie and he said, "Not completely. I died in the movie." It is a pretty accurate picture of the fight they are facing in Colombia.

Colonel Gallego is the man who took down Pablo Escobar of the famous Medellin Cartel. He is known as the lab buster. He has a \$3.5 million price on his head. General Serrano has an \$8 million price on his head. They want him dead.

These people, there is no blood on this hat, but there are thousands of police officers and military forces who have died in Colombia fighting our battle. I do not want to have American men and women. I want to help the people who are fighting the war so that they at least have a fighting chance to win and drive back the narcotics, the FARC and others. I do not know that they will, but we ought to at least give them the chance. We are the ones with our national security interest directly threatened here.

I want to move on to a couple of other issues here in the last remaining minutes. I touched some on foreign policy, but I want to say that we are also approaching this comprehensively and domestically in treatment. It is clear that unless we can get the hard core addicts, and every hard core addict we get off, we have a dramatic reduction in the abuse of heroin and cocaine in particular.

Now we also know that, let us just say, that treatment programs are very erratic in their effectiveness. There are different measures to use. Obviously there is going to be a high recidivism rate, and obviously if people at least

abuse it less than before, that is some kind of progress. But there are a couple of basic principles here and we will be putting these in as we move through the treatment question.

If we do not do drug testing, how do we know in fact if the treatment program worked? One of the basic principles is that we ought to have measurements in treatment programs and we ought to have monitoring. It is only the most kindhearted and compassionate thing we can do for an abuser, and that is hold them accountable for their behavior. Do not let them fall back in, particularly after we use taxpayers' dollars to try to get them out. Let us monitor and follow through.

It is absurd to give out free needles to heroin addicts. They argue that, well, they will be clean. They will not get AIDS. They will just die of drug overdose. They will not die of AIDS and they will not spread it. This would be the equivalent of going into the American schools and saying these kids are going to smoke anyway, why not give them low-tar cigarettes paid for by taxpayer dollars?

Why would we use taxpayers' dollars to sustain somebody in a habit that is going to kill them, destroy them, wreck their families? If they are a dad or a mom, it is abandonment of their children, and we are going to give them clean needles? It is absurd. We should have gone further than banning direct government money. We should have gotten the fungible money where it is transferred from one place to another.

Furthermore, we should be looking into people like George Soras who is funding a lot of these programs and also funding the medicinal marijuana, the back-door legalization of marijuana. There are legitimate cases, but they are few and far between.

Anybody who watched the special that focused on a lot of these kind of drug clubs for the medicinal uses of marijuana in California, it is appalling. Sit around and pass the pot. It is just like in the 1960s on the college campuses, only this time it is under legitimate government approval funded by George Soras and two friends in State after State. There are basically three people with one person at their head funding this, and we need to look into that question.

We need to also look at prevention programs. A lot of the drug-free school money, while well-intentioned, has been frittered away. We need to find particularly effective programs for those most at risk. A lot of times it seems that these programs are mostly aimed at kids who are not really high risk. We have to figure out those kids who are most at risk and we need to try to get them off.

I remember at one school where I went around the district and talked through these issues with high school kids at about 17 high schools in my congressional district in northeast Indiana, and one student came up and said that he had just gone clean the

day before because his friend had gotten high and committed suicide. And he said, "I don't want to do that." He said, "I'm scared. I hope I can get off." And he said, "I wish my friend was still here."

When are we going to try to identify these high-risk kids and try to help them, as opposed to sometimes it seems we are more concerned about giving out little rulers or having a skit than actually tackling the very hard cases of the prevention.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was a leader in passing legislation which we now have, in northeast Indiana almost every county now has a community-based group that is trying to pull the different organizations together. Sometimes schools feel like there are 23 different groups hitting them up to try to do anti-drug programs. We need community-wide organized efforts and we are trying to stimulate some of that through the Portman bill.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) has an amendment that we have in the Higher Education Act that says that if students want a subsidized student loan, then they have an obligation to stay clean. If they do not stay clean for one year, the first time they are suspended from their student loan and they have to go into treatment.

And I want to offer tomorrow an amendment that also says that drug testing be included to make sure they are clean for two years, then they can get reinstated. The second offense, they are off for two years. Definitely, three strikes and they are out. We do not want to have high-risk people not have the opportunity to get an education. Self-esteem and education are critical to keeping them off of drugs. But at the same time, taxpayers should not have to fund behavior that is contrary to the law.

There needs to be a give-and-take with this, and we want to encourage people to get clean. The best thing we can do for them, the college education is a waste of money if they are on drugs. We have to get them clean. If they sold, it is a suspension of two years for first offense and indefinitely for second offense. So this will be up tomorrow.

The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) who has been a leader in the needles issue, along with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be working with that. We will work aggressively on prevention and treatment.

Let me reiterate, the difference that is seen here is a concentrated effort, not a dribbling of a bill here and a bill there. I am willing to criticize the Speaker when I have disagreements, and I want to make sure I praise him when I think he has taken the commendable leadership in this, as has the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) along with his cochairs, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN)

with the anti-drug task force. I think we are going to see a difference.

Mr. Speaker, we need this administration to join with us. This needs to be a bipartisan effort. This cannot be divided and have a bunch of people on the other side posturing with this. This needs to be a joint effort, a drumbeat from every source saying this is unacceptable.

As a goal we ought to say by the Year 2000 we are going to have a 50 percent reduction, and the President of the United States and others should join with us and say we are going to have a 50 percent reduction. A 50 percent reduction in two years sounds like a lot, but that would only take us to the place where we were when this President took office.

Mr. Speaker, the least he could do is, when he leaves, get it back to the level of when he came. Then we can start to get rid of the drug abuse that we had which was already there when he got here. We need his help so that when he exits, we are at least back to the level that it was when he came. He owes that to the American people, and hopefully we can work together with that.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his comments, and again for his dedication to this subject. I honestly cannot think of any other issue before the Congress as far as the social impact on our Nation. We have been successful in the last 36 or 40 months getting our finances in order, but now the number one priority must be to tackle the illegal narcotics problem, the crime that it does rain upon this country.

This week we have launched another stage in the battle, a new offensive. It is going to take both Democrats and Republicans working together to get that passed.

But we I think also tonight have documented that the policy from this point, 1993, when he took office, to 1995, did not work. It was a failed policy. The results are dramatic. Since 1992 drug use among teens has skyrocketed, the latest statistics indicate by 70 percent. Half of the high school seniors in a recent survey think it is easy to obtain cocaine and LSD; and now eighth graders, where drug use has increased by 150 percent since 1992. These are the latest statistics. One in four high school seniors is a current user of illegal drugs.

This has had a dramatic impact on our young people. If we took out the areas of tough enforcement such as Mr. Giuliani in New York, and some of the other areas where some tough enforcement and prosecution and zero tolerance has taken place, we can see that we still have a very dramatic problem with tremendous cost to the taxpayers of this Nation, not to mention the insecurity of individuals who fear going from their car to the supermarket, from their community, from street to street at night, or even in the daylight being accosted by someone who is on

□ 2245

Or the loss in our community just within the last 24 hours, as I left one of the communities, Oviedo, where a young woman was found dead, 21 years old, who worked in a local bank, either of an overdose of cocaine or heroin, just again within the last 24 hours in my community.

The incident we had in my community and the college reunion festivities over the weekend in Daytona Beach, the young man from Orlando who attacked the police with a gun was a habitual drug user and had a record of cocaine use.

Almost every incident of crime, of social problem that we see today is drug related, so we are committed to launch this campaign this week. We have not just spoken in the past 36 months but also acted in putting back together the pieces of an effective multifaceted war on drugs. You can call it whatever you want, but it is going to be indeed a national effort.

We beg the administration to get the resources to Colombia, to other programs that are effective, to treatment programs that work. We are not against treatment, but when you have them come before our committee and testify, folks testify that these are failed programs, and then you learn that sometimes the religious or faith-based programs are the most effective, or the private sector, non-Federally or publicly funded programs are most effective, you begin to wonder. We have been spending more and more in treating these wounded.

So today we take up arms, and this week I know I will be joined by everyone on this side of the aisle, and I know we will have many from the other side of the aisle, to make a meaningful effort to turn around this situation in our country, and again the dramatic cost to young people and citizens of every age, race, and color across our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) again for his leadership in taking time tonight. I know he and I would rather be with our families at home, but this is such an important issue. It is not to be made light of.

It will not be on the front page of tomorrow's paper, except it will be there in the obituary page and the page of abuse, the page of murders and crimes in our community, and the social costs and disruption to each of our communities throughout this land. So that is part of our agenda. It is part of our program. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BATEMAN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.