

budget we have now in place, 3 to 4 percentage points less than we were spending just 15 years ago.

Now, why is that significant for Social Security? In order to pay for the long-run cost of Social Security, once the ratio of those working to those retired drops to about 2.2 to 1, we will need to shift resources out of our GDP into the Social Security program, because we have lowered spending. We will need to shift about 2.7 percent maximum of our total economy in order to fund the peak demands of the Social Security system after the baby-boomers fully retire.

Because we have adjusted spending, we have laid the basis, the foundation, for making that adjustment in the future, another way that we position ourselves to finally stand up to this problem, address the problem, rise to the opportunity, and it will be a shame if we blow this opportunity and do something else before we have saved and made Social Security solvent for the long run, because it is bedrock for 40 million Americans, and it will be bedrock for millions more before our work is done.

Mr. POMEROY. Reclaiming my time, and I want to direct a question to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), particularly given his expertise on the Committee on Appropriations, the other side maintains that their 1 percent across-the-board cut takes no spending out of the Social Security Trust Fund. Now, the Congressional Budget Office has said that is not true. In fact, it shows that they are into the Social Security Trust Fund to the tune of \$17 billion.

It says if they wanted to actually get that money down so it was not in the Social Security Trust Fund, rather than a 1 percent cut, it would be almost a 5 percent cut, and that is across the board.

Now, that would include wiping out the pay raise that we gave the men and women in our military. It would include wiping out the important additions we have made in veterans health, so that this Nation can continue its health commitment to its veterans.

If you take the Defense Department and you take veterans health off the table, you say well, we cannot cut that 4.8 percent, take that off the table, then you are talking almost an 11 percent, 10.8 percent across the board, in order to get Congress out of the Social Security surplus.

Would the gentleman on the Committee on Appropriations have any opinions in terms of whether or not this would be any way to run a country?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is exactly right. We can look back and say how much better it would have been, how much better off we all would be, had we had a realistic budget resolution 8 months ago, had we agreed not to engage in this budget gimmickry and this budget gamesmanship and had simply met our obligations.

Other speakers have said tonight there was the potential there, and I hope there still is, for considerable bipartisan agreement. We, after all, in 1997 came together on a Balanced Budget Act, and both parties are largely agreed or at least profess agreement that we ought to be using the Social Security surplus to buy down debt and to ensure the future of Social Security.

But what we have now at the end of this session is a confusing and convoluted process. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has referred to this directed scoring. All in the world that means is the Congress tells people who are supposed to be neutral, fair scorekeepers, tells them how to cook the books. Surely that is not what this budget process had in mind, the architects of this process.

Then all this emergency spending that is not really emergencies, and then this 1 percent across-the-board cut, which is out there I suppose for show, but, as the gentleman says, does not even come close to doing what the Republican majority has said that they intend to do.

So I do not know quite how we are going to resolve this congressional session; but I do know that we need to come together, we need to be honest with one another and with the American people, and we need heretofore to abide by the rules of the budget process and never again go through this kind of deceptive and convoluted end-of-session budget game.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to see us start as we push toward conclusion by at least being honest with the American people. Maybe they will agree with our side; maybe they will agree with that side, but we owe it to the people we are here to represent to at least be square with them, tell it like it is, and that is why I believe these budget gimmicks, two sets of books, emergency funding declarations, claiming you have not spent Social Security when you have spent Social Security, does such a terrible injustice to our efforts to try and resolve the differences and end this session.

Clearly, it is in nobody's interest to be lurching along from continuing resolution to continuing resolution. I think as we do that, we even raise the prospects of another Federal shutdown, something one of the speakers from the majority alleged tonight was not all that bad a result. Well, I surely would hope we would not go there and we would end this on budget numbers.

As we conclude this special order, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina for any concluding remarks he might have.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for calling this special order.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the gentleman bringing his expertise to the floor. It is a late hour here on the floor of the House of Representatives. I thank both gen-

tleman so much for the contributions each has made.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2389, COUNTY SCHOOLS FUNDING REVITALIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. POMEROY), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-437) on the resolution (H. Res. 352) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2389) to restore stability and predictability to the annual payments made to States and counties containing National Forest System lands and public domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management for use by the counties for the benefit of public schools, roads, and other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. POMEROY), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-438) on the resolution (H. Res. 353) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3194, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. POMEROY), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-439) on the resolution (H. Res. 354) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3194) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 900, FINANCIAL SERVICES MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. POMEROY), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-440) on the resolution (H. Res. 355) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the Senate bill (S. 900) to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, insurance companies, and other financial service providers, and for other purposes, which

was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 2130

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS AND AMERICA'S NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RILEY). 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, it is good to come to the floor again tonight to talk about a subject which I try to address the House on each Tuesday, if possible, but at least once a week, to come before the forefront of the House of Representatives and the American people what I have as a congressional responsibility, and that is the issue of illegal narcotics and our national drug control policy.

In this session of Congress, I have been responsible as chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources for helping to bring together a coherent national drug policy, and also carry forward a program started by the new majority to restart the war on drugs.

I will talk about what has happened with the so-called war on drugs in my remarks tonight. I will try to review a little bit of some of the current controversy concerning the war on drugs, and how to attack the problem of illegal narcotics and drugs, and then to trace some of the history and problems we were not able to get into last week, particularly on how we got ourselves into this situation with Colombia and the current situation with Panama that has made the news with many of our operations being closed down there, not only from a military standpoint, but also from the standpoint of trying to curtail illegal narcotics from their source from Panama as a forward operating location.

Tonight I feel a little bit caught between the left and the right on the issue of illegal narcotics. I took over the chairmanship and responsibility of trying to develop a policy that would be more effective, and inherited that responsibility, as I said before, from the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), who is now the Speaker of the House, who did a tremendous job in restarting our national effort to combat illegal narcotics.

I took on this responsibility without a whole lot of preconceived notions, but again, a philosophy that is probably on the tough side of the agenda in dealing with illegal narcotics. But I found myself again this week sort of attacked a little bit from the right and a little bit from the left on the issue, both by some national columnists and some local columnists.

We have done our best to provide an open, honest forum in our subcommittee hearings to intelligently discuss the options at hand and look at

things that we have done in the past relating to illegal narcotics and our approach, and see what went wrong and how we go forward, because this problem does have an incredible social cost.

As I have said, it is not just dollars and cents, but there is a human cost in tragedies across this Nation. There are hundreds of thousands of people, nearly 2 million Americans, in jail, and some 70 or 80 percent of them are there because of illegal narcotics crime activities. There have been 15,200-plus deaths, up almost 8 percent over the previous year, drug-induced deaths.

The social cost is estimated at a quarter of a trillion dollars, a tremendous social cost in the problem of drug abuse and illegal narcotics, and then the cost to our judicial system, our health care system, our economic system, with lost unemployment, not to mention lost opportunities for so many Americans.

But as I said, I am trapped a little bit tonight between the right and left. Some are saying that we have to learn to live with drugs, such as Ethan Nadelmann, who wrote this story which actually appears today in the Washington Post, I think it is a national column.

Mr. Nadelmann is director of the Lindesmith Center, a drug policy institute with offices in New York and Chicago. I am told he is funded by Mr. Soros and some others who have advocated a little bit more liberal drug policy approach.

He does attack the current approach to illegal narcotics, and he says in his article, "Let's start by dropping the 'zero tolerance' rhetoric and policies and the illusionary goal of drug-free societies."

I think we have only to look at comparing, and I have done this before, a zero tolerance tough enforcement approach versus a more liberal approach, *laissez-faire*, towards illegal narcotics. We have good examples in the United States, and I have cited them before.

One, of course, is Baltimore. I have had this chart up several times before. Baltimore adopted sometime ago a very *laissez-faire*, liberal drug approach, much as has been advocated by the administration in this budget battle that we have had in the past few weeks in funding the District of Columbia, one of the 13 appropriations measures we must pass to fund the government, and a Federal responsibility.

But tucked in within that legislation to fund the government were provisions to liberalize needle exchange, to liberalize some of the approaches to marijuana, and a more liberal approach towards what are now illegal narcotics.

We cite, again, a great example of Baltimore, which in 1996 had almost 39,000 drug addicts. This is the liberal approach. Now, they have gone from 39,000 in 1996 to somewhere in the range of 60,000 today. So today we have one in 10, and a city council person whom I have quoted before from Baltimore on the city council there has estimated

that the real figures may be closer to one in eight.

If we took this model, and we have a population of the United States we will say rounded off to 270 million, 280 million people, and if we had one in 10, our Nation, using this model, would have some 27 million to 28 million people addicted to drugs.

Not only do we have the problem of drug addiction, we have the continual problem of death and other incredible costs, social costs. Baltimore is one of the few major cities that did not have a reduction in deaths. In fact, it remained the same from 1997, and in 1998 the figures were 312 deaths in the city, for a liberal policy. So we had a huge increase in addiction with the liberalization. This is an example of that liberal policy.

The zero tolerance policy, which is bashed in Mr. Nadelmann's column today advocating, again, dropping this zero tolerance rhetoric, zero tolerance, Rudy Giuliani, the mayor of New York, has employed that, and it has worked very well. We have gone from over 2,200 deaths to 629 deaths. Again, think of Baltimore, which has a small population, 600,000, and 15 times that population in New York City, and half the deaths in Baltimore, 312 in one year versus 629 for a city of a multi-million population. This is the zero tolerance policy Mr. Nadelmann would like us to drop in his article today on the liberal side.

I think this is part of the flaw of his reasoning on this. Again, we have some pretty hard evidence here. He goes on, and I would like to also cite his article in today's Washington Post.

He says,

With some foresight today, drug policymakers might finally grasp that their relentless efforts to eradicate coca crops have little impact on availability, price, or use of cocaine anywhere in the world.

This is his statement today, November 2.

I just wanted to share with my colleagues and the American people the latest information I have today. This chart actually was provided to me this afternoon by the vice president of Bolivia, who was visiting Washington. He met with me this afternoon. He presented this chart, again, the same day this article appears. He says, ". . . the policymakers might finally grasp their relentless efforts to eradicate coca crops have little impact on the availability."

Well, here is a project that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) started several years ago when the Republicans gained control of the majority. As we can see in the early nineties, we saw some decrease. This is under the Bush administration, the end of the Bush administration. We see the beginning of the Clinton administration, where we see the increase in coca cultivation.

What happened here is that the international programs were cut by the Democrat majority. Now, they had a