

here in the United States, but around the world.

And the real tragedy is we are pitted against each other, we are arguing against each other, when at the end of the day the simple fact about agriculture in America today is this: We cannot eat all that we can grow. The only way that we can increase real farm income is become aggressive in world markets. But while we are spending all of our energy arguing with each other, we are losing tremendous market opportunities whether it be in Asia, China, Japan, Central America, South America, Europe, other parts of the world who really, if we can just show them what we can produce, I think we can get a bigger and bigger market share and increase the size of the pie rather than arguing about who gets the largest slice.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. If the gentleman would yield, is not another loser in this the American consumer as well?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Yes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Are not people who buy milk paying higher prices because of this system?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Well, that is an argument that the consumer groups and now even some of the people against government waste and some of the other taxpayer groups have weighed in and begun to say particularly in the larger cities, that they are paying artificially higher prices for dairy products, that if we had a more market based reform along the lines of what Secretary Glickman has proposed that they would see lower prices, and this would benefit poorer people, and frankly, we believe, in the long run, would increase consumption.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. So not only are we talking about hurting upper Midwest dairy farmers, it is just not a regional clash, we are talking about poor inner city parents who are trying to provide for their children with a lot of single, we have the illegitimacy rate in the inner city is as high as 70 percent in this country in inner city America. We are talking about these mothers, these young mothers in many cases, trying to raise their babies and their children, to try and nurture them with dairy products, and they are paying a higher price for these products because of this?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Artificially higher prices, yes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Because of this government mandate?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would yield to the gentleman from Illinois and then we are going to yield back our time.

Mr. MANZULLO. I would ask for leave to attach this letter from Dean Food Company and be part of the RECORD:

DEAN FOODS COMPANY,
Franklin Park, IL, May 19, 1999.

Hon. DON MANZULLO,

U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: I am writing on behalf of Dean Foods Company with whom, we hope, you are quite familiar. Dean

operates five plants and our technical research center, all in your district.

Please, enough is enough already! Is the House ever going to tire of introducing dairy legislation and allow us to run our business? First, we had the 1996 Fair Act, which mandated Federal Order Reform, provided for the discontinuance of the Price Support Program, and promised more reliance on the market. That process has resulted in USDA releasing its Final Rule on Federal Order Reform which is to take effect on October 1, 1999 and required two years of industry work to complete.

No sooner was the Final Rule released than more legislation has been proposed in the House; HR 1402 to mandate Class I Differentials, HR 1535 which would extend the Dairy Price Support Program and now the most onerous of all HR 1604 which provides for the creation of dairy compacts. Does the House have nothing else to do but micro-manage the dairy industry from Washington? There is no industry in which Congress interjects itself daily except the dairy industry.

Reject dairy compacts; they represent socialism at its finest. We cannot live with a system that picks a price "out of the air" with no basis in supply/demand fundamentals. The Soviet Union tried it for four decades; it was a miserable failure, and it will fail in the U.S.

While we view compacts as the total antithesis of the American system of free enterprise, we are just as concerned that Congress feels the need to continue promulgating dairy legislation without waiting to observe the impact of legislation previously passed. We cannot make sound business decisions if you continually change the rules.

We are totally exasperated at the House's continual effort to micro-manage our industry from Washington. Below is a key to our offices; you might as well come run our business directly rather than try from D.C. Then maybe you can feel the same frustration we experience in having our business turned upside down regularly through congressional intervention.

Let the 1996 Fair Act have a chance to work. Stand by the promise of the 1996 Farm Bill to deliver a dairy policy that is more market oriented and consumer friendly. Please vote "NO" on HR 1604; we do not need this narrow economic self-interest piece of legislation burdening our industry.

Sincerely,

GARY CORBETT,
Vice President, Governmental and
Dairy Industry Relations.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I would also just like to ask, mention to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), and thank him for his leadership. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) has provided excellent leadership here in Congress on this issue. I want to thank him on behalf of the dairy farmers of Wisconsin for his leadership on this issue, and I also thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO). Our districts butt up against each other. He has the Wisconsin border, I have the Illinois order, and hopefully we can fight together on behalf of the dairy farmers in our areas along and with the leadership of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) to try to get resolve to this, to make sure that we can stop what is going on here in Congress. So the USDA, the train can leave the station toward the market so we can go down the road of getting a market-based sys-

tem, and I want to just thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his leadership.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Well, I thank the gentleman, and I just, in summing up, one of the expressions that I think every farm State legislator, whoever represents a farm area, this expression they all understand, we all understand, and that is that a deal is a deal and a bargain is a bargain, and you know, out in farm country they sell a \$100,000 combine on a handshake, they trade their grain on a phone call.

We have very few written contracts because everybody understands the principle that a deal is a deal and a bargain is a bargain, and 2 years ago and then again last year we made a deal, we made a bargain, to allow the Secretary to go forward with market-oriented ag reforms, dairy reforms, that would move us to a fairer, simpler system. That was the deal, that was the bargain, that is what we shook hands on, that is what we expect, and as far as I am concerned, I do not care how many cosponsors they may have in the House, I am going to continue fighting, arguing, making the case, sharing the facts with the Members, with the American public because at the end of the day a deal is a deal, a bargain is a bargain. We ought to have market-based reform as far as dairy products, and as far as I am concerned, we will not stop until we get them. I thank my colleagues for joining me.

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS AND THEIR IMPACT ON OUR SOCIETY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor again to talk about the subject of illegal narcotics and its impact on our society, and tonight I would like to start with a small tribute, first of all, to our Drug Enforcement Administration administrator Tom Constantine who will be feted tomorrow upon his retirement, and I would like to first pay tribute to his tremendous service. Next month, in just a few days, Tom Constantine, the administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, will retire and return to Schenectady in New York where he lived prior to moving to Washington, D.C. and serving this administration.

Tom Constantine has been the administrator for DEA for the past 5 years, and he had a very long and distinguished career before he came to our Nation's capital. Mr. Constantine began his career as a deputy sheriff in Erie County in New York in 1960 and became a State trooper in 1962. In 1986, he was named superintendent of the New York State Police, and he served in that position with great honor and recognition. Since Tom Constantine has taken over the DEA in 1994, the agency has added 1,200 new agents, and

he is overseeing the revamping and the modernization of the agency's intelligence operations.

During his tenure, he has initiated new programs to foster closer cooperation which is so important with our State and local law enforcement agencies and to enhance their ability to fight violent crime caused by drugs. Recently Tom Constantine opened a \$29 million training academy for the agents of DEA and also for our foreign, State and local police that they participate in with training. The facility which can house 250 trainees is located in Quantico, VA.

Mr. Constantine also was one of only 19 people ever to be named as an honorary FBI Agent, and for anyone aware of the longstanding rivalry between DEA and FBI, they really can know and appreciate the significance of this award and recognition. Over the past few years, Administrator Constantine and the FBI Director, Mr. Louis Freeh, bridged the gap between those two Department of Justice law enforcement agencies, and I believe they increased the effectiveness of our law enforcement efforts against major drug trafficking organizations.

□ 2215

Mr. Constantine believed that if Mexican authorities wanted to hurt the drug trade, then they could hunt down and arrest their country's top smugglers and major drug lords and send them to the United States for trial, and we know how many of them have been requested for extradition from that country.

As he stated in testimony before our subcommittee, the one I chair, which is the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, there are 15 to 25 key drug traffickers who are primarily responsible for the drug trade. Cases have been prepared against them. They have been indicted in the United States, and arrest warrants have been issued, but they still have not been extradited.

Tom Constantine, I believe, is one of the finest examples of law enforcement professionals to ever serve at any level in our law enforcement agencies, whether it be local, State or national. His service to the safety and the well-being of our Nation should be noted, and I know that I join many other of my colleagues tonight on the eve of his being recognized on his retirement in saluting his fine work to both the Drug Enforcement Administration and to every citizen in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, in addition to that small tribute to a great leader in the war on drugs, Mr. Tom Constantine, I would like to provide, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and the American people with an update since my last speech last week on the floor on the topic of illegal narcotics and talk about the impact, some of the happenings and some of the tragedies that have faced our Nation and even our Nation's capital in the last week since I last talked on this subject.

Then I would also like to talk about a Geraldo Rivera report which was aired, a very lengthy report, some of it accurate, some of it inaccurate, but since we have raised the question of legalization, since we have raised the question of decriminalization, since this topic is now very much in vogue in talk shows and special programs and in news reports, I think that it is important that we deal with the facts, and I would like to talk about those facts tonight.

The first thing, in the update of some of the news, the news relating to the war on drugs and the situation relating to crime that emanates from illegal narcotics continues to be bad.

Just in today's Washington Post, I would like to read from an editorial that said, and I will quote, the headline is, Shot, 5 months old. The latest stray gunfire victim may be the most innocent of all, a 5-month-old baby boy. He was seated with his mother and a man on an apartment stoop in southeast Washington on Friday, this past Friday, when they were shot in an attack by two masked gunmen. The man, apparently the intended victim, is dead. The mother is hospitalized. The baby, guiltless as a lamb, is in critical condition. As with hundreds of other children caught in the city's violence, the wounded baby did not elect to enter this world. Neither did he choose to live in a neighborhood where drugs, gangs or gun battles flourish.

I think if we look at our Nation's capital as an example, and what a tragic example, the last week with death and mayhem in the streets of our Nation's capital, even critically wounding a 5-month-old, we see the roots of some of the problem in drug trafficking and illegal narcotics.

Last week, the Nation's capital, Congress, anyone with any sensibility, was absolutely distraught by what took place with the death and killing of a 55-year-old grandmother in the District of Columbia. We saw, those of us who serve in Washington, our Nation's capital and the local residents in this area, saw the funeral and the tragedy of, again, this slaying. I thought I would read a little bit, this is from the Washington Times, about that tragedy and the root of that problem.

Tuesday night, police charged Derek Terrell Jackson, age 19, with first degree murder while armed in the shooting death of Mrs. Foster-El, 55, a grandmother who was shot in the back while shielding children from gunfire. D.C. police said the cause of the southeast shooting is unusual. In drug-ravaged areas of the city, rival gangs normally shoot each other in turf wars. An open air drug market has operated for years only a block away from Ms. Foster-El's backyard in the 100 block of 56th Place, Southeast. Again, headline, a tragedy and a neighborhood filled with drugs, crime, violence.

Today's Washington Post gives us a story under the crime and justice heading of Maryland, and if they are not

killing each other, they are killing innocent folks with guns. This is an account from Maryland in today's paper. A 16-year-old Gaithersburg youth pleaded guilty yesterday to first degree murder in the slaying of a 15-year-old who was beaten and stabbed to death after being blamed for a bad drug deal, prosecutors said.

This goes on to say that the individual charged struck the teenager in the head with a large rock and stabbed him repeatedly after he begged for his life, prosecutors said. Another tragedy in the area of our Nation's capital, a 16-year-old first bludgeoning a 15-year-old and then stabbing him to death.

Another report, on the Tuinei death, this is from an Associated Press story in McKinney, Texas. Former Dallas Cowboy offensive tackle, Mark Tuinei died of a lethal combination of heroin and a form of drug called ecstasy, according to autopsy results released Tuesday.

I spoke in a previous special order about the tragedy possibly being linked to illegal narcotics, and here we see that deadly combination of heroin and ecstasy. We find high purity heroin coming in from Colombia and also from Mexico, and young people and even strong athletes do not realize the deadly potential of heroin just by itself, and then to mix it with some other drug proves to be fatal, not only in Texas but as I cited in my own central Florida area where we now have the number of drug overdose deaths in central Florida exceeding the number of homicides.

Further update on the news, I spoke last week of an article relating to Plano, Texas, which has also been ravaged by drug deaths. Tonight there is a story that was published, I believe, over the weekend, 6-27-99, by Tracy Eaton in the Dallas Morning News, a rather large story about the region's heroin supply and this would be the Texas region, linked to deaths in Plano. The headline says, Mexican production driving economy in the Mexican area.

The story goes on and talks about the fields now of poppies. Again, part of this administration's policy did not serve us well in certifying Mexico, and Congress must also take the blame for certifying Mexico with fully cooperating while it is increasing dramatically the production of illegal narcotics, particularly black tar deadly heroin.

Let me read a little bit from this story in the Dallas Morning News. Over the past 3 years, and I think I cited this last week, 18 young people from Plano or with ties to the city have died of heroin overdoses. Plano, with its wholesome reputation and all-American city status, is not the only spot that has been hit. Oklahoma City, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Seattle, Boston and Atlanta have all seen tragic strings of heroin-related deaths as part of what United States officials call a national epidemic.

Let me quote, and this is a quote, the world is awash in heroin. It is really a nightmare, said retired Army General Barry McCaffrey. He is director of the White House Policy on Drug Control and our Nation's drug czar. He goes on to say, and let me quote Barry McCaffrey, he says, ask our eighth graders are they fearful of using heroin, and around 50 percent say no. It is crazy, that is what Barry McCaffrey said, our drug czar.

The article goes on to cite an interesting report this news reporter had obtained, and let me read a little bit further. It says, a confidential U.S. intelligent report obtained by the Dallas Morning News calls heroin, and again this is a confidential report that the news folks have that we do not have it, but it calls heroin, and this is in quotes, a growing national threat. An increased supply of heroin is causing prices to drop and encouraging traffickers to develop new markets. This, in turn, leads to a new generation of consumers.

That is the end of this confidential report. Maybe the administration does not want this to get out.

Many of these new customers are in small towns and communities, the report read, and let me read again a quote from the report. Suburban consumers age 12—now listen to this. Suburban consumers age 12 to 25 have been one of the fastest-growing user groups, the report read. Then it goes on to another quote, heroin use among women of all ages has increased significantly.

So the most vulnerable in our society, our young people, age 12 to 25, are becoming our leading consumers. They go on to cite how heroin deaths nationwide have nearly doubled since this administration took office, according to the latest government statistics.

I always quote the absolutely startling statistic since 1992/1993, again with the institution of this administration's drug policy, heroin use among our teenage population has soared 875 percent.

This is a story today in the Dallas Morning News that I thought would be of interest and provide, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues with a little update.

Let me talk a little bit more about the impact of illegal narcotics and drug deaths and what is happening. Again, a sampling, just a recent case. Just in the past few months there has been a distressing number of drug-related deaths. This is in New York. For example, heroin users in the East Village of New York City have been overdosing at an alarming pace this year, according to a report. One local expert estimates that more than 30 people have died from heroin overdoses since mid-May. It is suspected that the high purity levels are poisoning people who are not prepared for its strength. And I spoke about the Tuinei case, a very strong athlete who died from a heroin ecstasy overdose.

In Orlando last March, a heroin overdose victim was left to die as his

friends watched him turn blue from suffocation. The victim was left sitting on a toilet for 8 hours after he was found semi-conscious in his bathroom.

□ 2230

He was then moved to a bedroom where he stayed for 4 hours before someone called 911. At least one of his friends played video games while his friend died in the next room.

Two roommates in San Francisco died of a so-called flesh-eating bacteria, this is recently, after injecting themselves with Mexican black tar heroin. This should be good news for the heroin users out there, that this flesh-eating bacteria is now a special surprise from the Mexican heroin producers. Two others were hospitalized with the infection. The bacteria suspected in the deaths produces toxin that degrade human tissue. It is suspected that the bacteria may be in the dirt that adheres to the drug in the processing facilities in Mexico.

Another report, and this is also from my area in Sanford, Florida, central Florida, a gentleman there plowed into a car driven by a pregnant woman, which caused the premature delivery and death of her twin sons. He had cocaine, Valium, and methadone in his system. The concentrations found in his blood indicated that he had probably taken one dose of each of the three drugs within 24 hours of the crash.

The pregnant woman was 7 months pregnant at the time. The crash pinned her in the car. Once freed she was flown to the hospital, where doctors delivered the boys 13 weeks premature. One of the boys died the day of the crash and the other the next day.

This is an example, again, that I cite time and time again of drug-related deaths. These two premature babies may not be counted in the 14,000-plus that were killed last year because of drug-related deaths. Those who were on our highways and in highway fatalities may or may not be counted. Those who were suicides may or may not be counted. Those who again have died in some other fashion may or may not be counted.

Here is an example of several more lives snuffed out by illegal narcotics in probably the biggest social problem that we have facing our Nation.

This month a former nurse accused of holding 2 women hostage for nearly 3 days in a hospital, then killing one and critically injuring another, had struggled with a heroin problem for more than 15 years. How will those deaths be recorded? How will those injuries be recorded?

In Texas last week, a man convicted of beating his girlfriend's 4-year-old daughter to death because babysitting kept him from buying drugs was sentenced to death by lethal injection.

In a murder that shocked Mexico early this month, and I think I cited this death before, and it takes quite an incident to shock Mexico, but early

this month a prominent TV and radio celebrity, Francisco Stanley, was gunned down in broad daylight by two men who sprayed the victim's car with automatic fire. Mr. Stanley was carrying credentials provided by the Ministry of Interior identifying him as a Federal agent.

Additionally, autopsy results indicate that he was a cocaine user. Mexican media reports have stated that he may have dealt cocaine in the show business world. The way the killing occurred has led investigators to suspect that in fact, this, too, was the work of drug traffickers.

That is a little bit on some of the recent news and an update on some of the cases I have cited before. This past week our Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources conducted a hearing on the topic of the del Toro case, in particular, and the subject that we posed and the title of the hearing was "Getting Away With Murder: Is Mexico a Safe Haven for Killers or Drug Dealers," and in particular, the del Toro case.

The del Toro case is an absolutely heinous crime that was committed by a United States citizen. Even though his name is del Toro, he was born in the United States. He was not a Mexican national. He was born to U.S. citizens.

There is no question from the testimony we had or from what law enforcement has made public that on November 7, 1997, Sheila Belush was found murdered in her home in Sarasota, Florida. She was murdered while her young children, some of them just babies, were left with her, with the body. This is a particularly heinous crime, as I said. She was shot, then she was finished off with a kitchen knife, stabbed in her own home in Sarasota. Her husband testified before our subcommittee asking for justice.

Jose Luis del Toro fled to Mexico, and has used the Mexican corrupt judicial system to flee from justice from the United States. We have asked for his extradition and it has been refused. Again, the system which is so corrupt which we heard about in this hearing denied justice to Mr. Belush and the children that she left behind.

This is not the only case of an extradition request being ignored by the Mexican government. It is one of dozens and dozens. In fact, in the last 10 years there have been 275 requests of extradition, and in particular, relating to murders and illegal drug dealers, drug lords. We have some 30 or 40 requests of these major traffickers and murderers that have been ignored.

To date, not one Mexican national has been extradited to the United States. Only after complete disruption caused by Members of Congress and by others have we received one American. A Mr. Martin was returned several weeks ago. But this committee or this subcommittee showed that justice is not being done in the del Toro case, that the Mexican judicial system is becoming a haven for murderers and drug

dealers, and that that country is not complying with simple requests for extradition.

Anyone who heard the testimony of this father, this husband, and the details of how this crime was committed against his family, and to hear the pain he has suffered and they have suffered in losing the wife and mother of these children, would cry out also for justice.

Again, this is not the only case. Tonight I might cite a couple of cases just for information of the Congress, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, first of all, I often refer to Mexico as a haven for drug dealers. Certainly one of our major wanted individuals is Rafael Caro-Quintero. He is a drug lord who is wanted for the kidnapping and killing of our United States DEA agent, Special Agent Enrique Camarena, 14 years ago. Unfortunately, justice has not prevailed in the del Toro case, in the murder of Sheila Belush. Justice has not prevailed in the just incredible, again, heinous torture death of Enrique Camareno, who was tortured to death, and Rafael Caro-Quintero has been convicted of kidnapping and killing our United States agent.

Special Agent Camareno was kidnapped and tortured by this individual and his cohorts. His cohorts, I might say, included, and we have evidence of this, scores of Mexican police and Mexican government accomplices who participated in, again, the murder and torture of our drug enforcement agent some 14 years ago. Caro-Quintero ordered the killing because raids organized by Camareno, our agent, were disrupting his drug operations.

The United States would like this individual extradited so that justice can be served in the United States in the Camareno death. Again, at least this individual was responsible for organizing the death and mayhem committed against our DEA agent. This is one individual.

Tonight we also have with us an individual, another individual who is a drug dealer. This is Agustin Vasquez-Mendoza. Mr. Vasquez-Mendoza is believed to be responsible for the 1994 murder of another United States DEA agent, and that is DEA Special Agent Richard Fahs. Vasquez-Mendoza is not believed to have been the actual trigger man, but he was the criminal mastermind behind the murder of Special Agent Fahs.

Our special agent, DEA agent, was fatally wounded by Vasquez-Mendoza's henchmen during an undercover drug buy in Glendale, Arizona. After the murder, Vasquez-Mendoza fled to Mexico, where he is still believed to be hiding. We have indicted this individual. We have also requested the Mexican government to extradite that individual so that he also can meet justice in the United States and under our system, where we know he would be tried fairly and where we have the evidence to convict that individual.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, there is a \$2.2 million award for information

leading to the arrest or conviction of this fugitive. Again, his name is Agustin Vasquez-Mendoza, and the date of birth is March 23, 1974, and he is suspected of being in Mexico. There will be \$2.2 million for return of this individual, and also having this individual, Agustin Vasquez-Mendoza, brought to justice.

Those are a couple of points I wanted to make, and bring folks up to date relating to news in the drug war and also the hearing that we conducted in our subcommittee on the question of extradition, and two of our unfortunately numerous cast of individuals who have been indicted and we have requests that have been ignored by the Mexican government for extradition to see justice in the United States.

Additionally, tonight I wanted to spend some time, as I said earlier, talking about a report that aired on television. I saw it over the weekend. Geraldo Rivera had over the weekend at least a 1-hour story. There was a series of stories. He called it "Drug Bust, the Longest War," and he had some information that was correct and he had some information in it that was way off base.

I thought it would be important to set the record straight, particularly since so many Members of Congress and the general public watch some of these shows and obtain information about what is going on in the war on drugs from these reports.

□ 2245

I think it is critical, again, to correct information that came out.

First of all, I think Geraldo Rivera did a fairly accurate job describing the situation in Mexico, the corruption that exists, the drug lords running rampant, the problem with no extradition, the interviews relating to, again, corrupt activities and drug activities in Mexico being conducted in a routine manner and very few people being brought to justice.

I think also the report did summarize that part of the problem was that the Congress, and also the administration, we must say, did not bring Mexico to task, and that has been a difficulty in trying to get Members of Congress to pay attention to this problem. The major source of illegal narcotics, some 60 to 70 percent of the hard drugs coming into the United States, heroin, cocaine, methamphetamines, come from and through Mexico. As I cited, Mexico is now a major producer, producing 14 percent of all the heroin coming into the United States.

I think the report was on target about some of the problems. Also on target that this Congress has not responded, and this administration has not responded, in appropriately decertifying Mexico for trade and for financial benefits because the dollar has reigned supreme here, and both Members of Congress and the administration are afraid in any way to impact that trade, that business, that finance.

That is unfortunate, that we have allowed our neighbors to the south to become close to a narco-trafficking state. It is not at the stage of a Colombia, but, if it continues, the whole system of justice, the entire governmental process, could be lost, and it could become a narco-terrorist state. That is not that far-fetched.

Mr. Rivera had in his report some statements that I believe need correction. He went on to talk about waging the war on drugs and said that the war on drugs is basically a failure. In fact, I have a transcript of his report. Let me read a little bit of it. It says, "We have always made waging the war the top priority. If only we could get more boats, more planes, more soldiers, we could win this fight."

Then his second sentence here is, "Drug treatment has always been a distant second place."

Now, first of all, we have to deal with the facts. Now, I know Mr. Geraldo Rivera is not noted for always dealing with the facts, but I thought it would be an interesting approach to try to bring some of the facts out tonight that he spoke about. First of all, he thinks that the emphasis during this administration has been on getting more boats, more planes and more soldiers.

Well, Mr. Rivera is wrong. In fact, I had our staff pull up, subcommittee staff, pull up drug spending for interdiction, and this would be the account under which we would get more planes, more boats, more soldiers, the military spending.

If we could trace this chart before 1991, maybe we could focus on this chart here, but you would see from early 1980 when President Reagan took office a steady increase in expenditures for interdiction. This would be using the military and other sources, getting to drugs just as they came out of their source, interdicting them before they come to our borders. That certainly has to be a Federal responsibility. You would see that all the way up to 1992 with President Bush, and that was his policy.

In 1993, and, again, you have to remember the Democrats controlled the White House, the Senate and the House of Representatives by overwhelming majorities in the legislative bodies, and, of course, the executive agency, the presidency. They began a steady decline, and it went right to 1995, in expenditures. In fact, there are some absolutely incredible figures, and let me see if I can dig those up here, about the cuts that were made.

Well, you can see right here, for example, just in military spending on the war on drugs there was a 50 percent cut during that period. Then the other part of this would be what about what is going on now?

Well, I put this little cover on here to show that with the Republicans taking over Congress, we have restarted the war on drugs. The war on drugs basically ended in January of 1993 when

this President took office. We restarted the war on drugs, and you can see from this period in here where the new majority took over to here, we have just begun to get back to the point where we were, and we still are not there. Even this shows a projection for 1999 to get beyond where we were. But, again, this chart shows the actual spending on boats, planes and soldiers.

Now, of course, this is also shown in 1999 dollars, and we began in 1991 dollars, so we actually have a net decrease in spending.

The war on drugs was closed down by this administration in the area of international programs. Now, international programs, in this category, again, if we looked at what this does, this is stopping drugs at their source.

While this program dealing with the military was in the several billion dollar range, again, the military is still operating, they are operating in the Caribbean, they are operating around the world, they have been operating in Panama, they have been operating from our bases, and they have a military mission, so it is slightly different. I would have to even argue about that being a total cost. It is something that they are given as an additional mission.

This budget deals with Federal drug spending for the international work. That would be at the source country. This is in the millions of dollars. Back with President Reagan and President Bush, we would have seen the same curve from the early eighties to 1992 with President Bush in office.

Then we saw basically again a close-down in the war on drugs. This chart shows exactly what took place. On January 1, 1993, this President took office, closed down the war on drugs. This is particularly significant because this is stopping drugs at their source.

Now, if you took cocaine, for example, 100 percent of the cocaine was grown with coca in Peru and Bolivia. This is the 1992-1993 era. We knew exactly where the cocaine was, and it can only grow at certain altitudes in the coca bush, et cetera. They closed this down. We saw huge increases in production.

What happens here is when we stop spending money closest to where the drugs are produced, you have greater production, and we will talk about that in just a second. But this is the most effective way. If you could stop drugs, for example, we have been able, if you look when the Republicans took over here, working with Speaker HASTERT, who was then chairman of the National Security International Affairs Criminal Justice Subcommittee which had oversight over drug policy in the prior Congress, this is where we restarted this program, and this is where we achieved in two countries that we would operate with that we had permission from the administration to operate with, Peru and Bolivia, we have now cut their production by 50 percent of cocaine.

Actually, where the administration had a terrible policy in Colombia, Colombia has now become in the last six years the major producer of cocaine. They are actually growing it and producing it, processing it, the largest producer in the world. So our program in these two areas has been significant in cutting 50 percent of the supply.

The administration stopped military assistance, helicopters, supplies, equipment, on sort of a human rights basis, and I could spend the rest of the evening talking about that bogus position, which has now turned Colombia into the major cocaine and heroine producing country.

In 1993 there was no heroin produced really to speak of in Columbia. Now Colombia is, again, through the policy of this administration, not getting the guns, boats and ammunition to that country, the direct policy of this administration, and is now becoming the major producer.

I also put a little cover on this to show what we have done in the last year to try to get us back up to the levels, because stopping illegal narcotics is far less costly, and, again, this is only in the millions of dollars as opposed to the billions of dollars on the other charts. If we can stop the supply, we can, at its source, eliminate a lot of the interdiction costs and the law enforcement costs.

What is absolutely fascinating is staff produced this little graph, and this graph is very interesting, because it shows that 12th grade drug use among our young people actually mirrored the spending patterns of this administration. When they decreased the amount for international programs and interdiction, what happened is the supply increased, the price went down, it was available, and when heroin can be bought for the price of marijuana or cocaine you have developed a nice market and a young audience and consumer group that we have heard about that, again, begins using this hard stuff coming in. This is an incredible graph, because it absolutely mirrors the pattern of failure that this administration adopted.

Now, again, Mr. Rivera said here, "Drug treatment has always been a distant second place." This is not something I made up. I am quoting from the text which we obtained of his program.

Another myth, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rivera made, and that is borne out by this chart. This chart shows at the bottom the actual amount of dollars expended on drug treatment. If we go back to 1991 and we compare it with 1999, we see that in fact drug treatment expenditures have gone up almost every single year. There is one year in here, 1996, where it did not go up, but we have actually doubled the amount of money-plus on drug treatment. So it is not taking "a distant second place." And this is the policy also adopted in 1993 by this administration, to spend more money on treatment, cut the

interdiction, the source country programs, and put emphasis here.

So this policy and liberalization policy which we have pointed out not only gives us more spending for treatment, but more people to treat, and we use Baltimore as a great example. It has now risen to 39,900 heroin addicts in the City of Baltimore through a liberal policy. Again, this debunks some of the statements that were made by Mr. Rivera in his recent account.

It is interesting too that in today's Washington Post, and possibly in other publications across the country, our drug czar, Barry McCaffrey, made an opinion editorial piece that was published, and let me read from that and what he says.

□ 2300

First of all, let me pick up on the part about the effectiveness of some of these programs. Drug use in this country has declined by half since 1979. The number of users dropped from 25 million in 1979 to 13 million in 1996. Again, this does not coincide with what the report of Mr. Rivera said.

And again this is according to our drug czar. "You would think that under the Republican administration there might be less spent on drug treatment." And again I'm quoting from Barry McCaffrey, the head of our Office of Drug Policy under the Clinton administration, and this is his quote in this op-ed today, "In the past 4 years the administration increased spending." I have to beg to differ with him, but the Republican majority increased spending on prevention by 55 percent, while spending on treatment rose 25 percent.

So treatment and prevention, in fact, have risen dramatically under this Republican-controlled Congress, contrary to Mr. Rivera's statement that drug treatment has always been a distant second place.

Additionally, the liberal policies we found actually create a bigger dependent population. I thought it was interesting what Mr. McCaffrey said about who commits crime and who is responsible for the disproportionate share of our Nation's violence that we hear about, and these are his words: "Drug dependent individuals are responsible for a disproportionate percentage of our Nation's violent and income-generating crimes, such as robbery, burglary or theft. The National Institute of Justice surveys consistently find that between one-half and three-quarters of all arrestees have drugs in their system at the time of the arrest. In 1997, a third of State prisoners and about one in five Federal prisoners said they had committed the crimes that led to incarceration while under the influence of drugs." This is, again, part of the op-ed of General McCaffrey.

Then the myth about liberalization and that we should allow more folks to become addicts and hooked on hard drugs and that this is harmless, and this is what Barry McCaffrey says in

today's op-ed. "Injection drug users place themselves at great risk. A University of Pennsylvania study of Philadelphia injection drug users found that four times as many addicts died from overdose, homicide, heart disease, renal failure and liver disease as did from causes associated with HIV disease."

Dr. James Curtis, Director of Addiction Services at Harlem Hospital Center, explains, and this is a quote from him, "It is false, misleading and unethical to give addicts the idea that they can be intervenous drug abusers without suffering serious injury."

So, in fact, the myth that we have folks behind bars, and again I appreciate the sensationalism that Mr. Geraldo Rivera tries to provide, and some of it is entertaining, but we must deal with facts, particularly on such a serious subject as what is happening in our society as a result of illegal narcotics trafficking.

Mr. Rivera in his piece cited, and again from his transcripts, two women, and one with tears in her eyes testified that she had only been arrested this one time on drug trafficking and, in fact, I think she said she was duped, she claimed, into carrying a package of cocaine for a drug dealer. That was one case. The second lady, who had received a mandatory sentence, was there because she was dealing with four ounces of cocaine.

He also cited that most of the people in Federal prison were nonviolent offenders. Well, the facts are a little bit different, and I have cited this study, but a study just out from the New York State Commissioner of Criminal Justice reports that, in 1996, 87 percent of the 22,000 people in jail in New York for drug crimes were in for selling drugs or intent to sell. Of the 13 percent doing time for possession, 76 percent were arrested for selling drugs and pleading down to possession. The study further shows that the most convicted first-time drug offenders end up on probation or in treatment, again contrary to what this national report by Geraldo Rivera tried to portray. It just does not hold water.

In fact, at a recent hearing we held in the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, the drug czar from Florida, Mr. Jim McDonough, testified that in a thousand cases they looked at, only 14 out of the total were there for possession and, in fact, some of that may have been also watered down for other offenses.

The facts are that, in fact, virtually all convicted criminals who go to prison are violent offenders, repeat offenders or violent repeat offenders. It is simply a myth that our prison cells are filled with people who do not belong there or that we would somehow be safer if fewer people were in prison. A scientific survey of State prisoners conducted by the U.S. Department of Justice found that 62 percent of the prison population had a history of vio-

lence and that 94 percent of the State prisoners had committed one or more violent crimes or served a previous sentence of incarceration or probation.

The New York study that we cited last week and again tonight was interesting. It was a rather in-depth study, and it showed that in New York, for example, one really had to work at it to be incarcerated in prison, and that no one was there just for a minor offense or for even for a first-time felony.

In California, the 1994 prison population rose to 125,000 inmates. Numerous experts and journalists insisted the State's prisons were overflowing with first-time offenders and harmless parole violators. The results of another study, this California Department of Corrections analysis of randomly selected felony offenders admitted to the state's prison and classified as nonviolent, reveals that 88.5 percent of these offenders had one or more prior adult convictions. The average number of prior convictions was 4.7. A fifth of these so-called nonviolent felons had been committed to prison once or twice before.

There is study after study to refute what Geraldo Rivera would try to lead the American people and the Congress to believe. A 1996 study of individuals in prison in Wisconsin found that about 91 percent of the prisoners had a current or prior adult juvenile conviction for a violent crime. About 7 percent of the prisoners were in for drug trafficking. None were sentenced solely for possession or as a drug user, and fewer than 2 percent were first-time drug or property offenders. Prisoners served less than half their sentence time behind bars, and 82 percent were eligible for discretionary parole within a few years.

So the facts are not as presented, again sensationally, by Geraldo Rivera. They do show a different picture, if we just take a few minutes to look at them.

According to a study published in the Journal of American Medical Association last year, nondrug users who live in households where drugs, including marijuana, are used, are 11 times as likely to be killed as those living in drug-free households. Drug abuse in a home increased a woman's risk of being killed by a close relative some 28 times.

So, again, the myths that were portrayed in this presentation tried to make us feel warm and fuzzy about releasing folks into the population.

□ 2310

I do not want to say that we do not need to treat folks in prison and I think a very good case could be made for that, but we must have effective treatment programs, not only in prison but also for other individuals, such as those portrayed, those individuals such as the young woman who was on drugs, as a young man who went back to drugs. We must work together to find solutions to this incredible problem

facing our society but we must also not just listen to the Geraldo Riveras but to the facts about drugs and illegal narcotics and their impact on our society.

CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 50 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, by the end of July, the Congress will again vote on most-favored-nation status, that is, granting this special status to the People's Republic of China. This is the 11th year in which I will have voted on this issue, and this time, however, it will be called, instead of MFN, most-favored-nation status, it will be called NTR, normal trade relations.

Every year, as the Communist Chinese refuse to lower their huge tariffs on American exports, goods that in fact make it impossible for us to have a trade balance with them and we end up with, every year, even though we vote most-favored-nation status, they keep those huge tariffs on our goods while their goods can flood into our country at very low tariffs and thus we end up every year with a huge deficit in our trade balance with the Communist Chinese and they have a huge surplus, 60, \$70 billion worth of surplus.

So what are we doing? Why are we doing this year after year after year when the final result is always that they maintain high tariffs against our products while we permit their products to flood into our markets? What is going on here? Is that something that is good for the United States of America? Is it good for us to have an unfair trading relationship with the world's worst human rights abuser? Of course we are being told that if we do this, other things will happen, like, for example, not only will they lower their tariffs eventually, but eventually they will liberalize their country and become more democratic.

Of course, we have not seen any evidence of that at all. There has been no evidence that they are reforming in terms of opening up their markets to our people who would like to sell our products there and there is no evidence that they are becoming more liberal or that there is less oppression in Communist China.

The difference between this year's vote and past years when we voted on this will be that Congress is voting most-favored-nation status, or, I should say, normal trade relations status and we are granting that to the Communist Chinese, not only knowing that it is not lowering their tariffs and their trade barriers to our products coming in while they exploit our own, putting our people out of work with cheap products, of course, again knowing that it is not having any impact on liberalization, in fact it is more repressive now in Communist China than it