

Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of this House, I ask you, have we fulfilled our side of the employment contract with Air Force Sergeant Earl Terrell? The answer is unequivocally no. We have a bill pending in the House and Senate that will meet our promises to those who have borne the battle, H.R. 3573.

Sergeant and Mrs. Terrell would be given the same FEHBP plan as our retired Federal civilian workers, at no cost. That means they regain their \$14,000 a year retirement pay, still below the poverty line but at least what they were promised.

At last check, the majority of the Members of this House from both parties have cosponsored this bill, The Keep Our Promises to America's Military Retirees Act. Mr. Speaker, let us try to do the right thing and let America keep her word and her honor and pass H.R. 3573 into law before this Congress ends.

IN OPPOSITION TO S. 1287, THE NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2000

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1983, President Reagan signed into law the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. The new law began with a reasonable scientific approach. The country would search all over the Nation looking for geological formations which were capable of burying high-level nuclear waste. The new law would also consider three sites so as to provide some regional equity to the burden of storing the waste. One site would be in the northeastern part of the country, one site would be in the southeastern United States, and one site would be in the West. These three sites would be studied and then presented to the President of the United States for a decision.

Since then, politics has had more to say to the siting of high-level nuclear waste than the science. After Members of Congress from the Northeast began to openly oppose placing the dump in the Northeast, the Department of Energy unilaterally decided to take them off the list. When placing the dump in the southeastern part of the country came up as a campaign issue in 1984, President Reagan unilaterally decided to take the southeastern part of the country off the list.

These decisions were not based on science, Mr. Speaker. They were based on politics. Then in 1987, the so-called "screw Nevada" bill was passed into law. This bill made the most political of decisions, to designate one site, Yucca Mountain, as the only site, excluding any other consideration from any other region in the country. So if I begin to question the claims of

science from the supporters of dumping nuclear waste in Nevada, it is because I have learned to question from the history of this issue.

Fast forward to the mid 1990s. Nearly a decade has gone by since the "screw Nevada" bill and the scientific evidence against Yucca Mountain is growing. It has become scandalously obvious that Yucca Mountain was the wrong mountain to bet on. It is in an earthquake zone, it is in an underground flooding zone, it is in a volcanic eruption zone, for crying out loud.

On top of that we find out that the rocks at Yucca Mountain cannot contain radiation like the politicians had hoped. So back to the drawing boards to find another way to screw Nevada.

By 1995, illogical legislation took a new direction, something called a temporary storage site in Nevada. The nuclear industry figured they could build a temporary site because it would not have to meet the strict standards of a permanent dump, and once the waste was in Nevada, it would never leave.

But a funny thing happened on the way to a temporary dump. President Clinton promised to veto it and that threat, coupled with the hard work of some Members of the House and the Senate, has frozen the temporary concept for half of a decade.

But now, given that the temporary dump will not fly, we see S. 1287. This is nothing but a transparent effort to throw out radiation standards and sneak the date several years closer for shipping nuclear waste to Nevada. This is nothing but a temporary dump proposal in disguise. The President recognizes that and will veto S. 1287, and the Senate vote already proves the veto will be sustained.

Can we get off this act of futility and move on to worrying about the important issues that confront this Congress, that confront this country, education, health care, Social Security, and campaign finance reform? This is what our constituents want.

□ 1945

That is what the people of Nevada want. We will not stand for 1287, and I ask my colleagues to join with me to stand up and oppose this onerous, ridiculous piece of legislation.

JUST SAY NO TO FUNDS FOR COLUMBIA

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, we are about to spend almost \$2 billion to escalate the war on drugs in Colombia, while here in the United States 26 million American addicts and alcoholics go untreated.

We have already spent over \$600 million to eradicate drugs at their source

in Colombia. And what has happened? Both cocaine and heroin production in Colombia have more than doubled.

Colombia is now the source of 80 percent of the cocaine and 75 percent of the heroin in the United States. Let us face it, our supply-side efforts have been a colossal failure.

Congress and the President need to wake up and face reality. Over the last 10 years, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has spent \$150 billion to combat the supply of illegal drugs. Yet the cocaine market is glutted, as always, and heroin is readily available at record high purities. The number of hard-core addicts continues to increase every day.

Our drug eradication and interdiction efforts have also been a costly failure. As a former United States Navy Commander who led such efforts in Colombia for 3 years said recently, quote, "The \$1.7 billion being proposed on drug-fighting efforts in Colombia is good money thrown after bad."

Retired Navy Lieutenant Commander Sylvester Salcedo also said, and I am quoting again, "We cannot make any progress on this drug issue by escalating our presence in Colombia. Instead, we should confront the issue of demand in the United States by providing treatment services to our addicted population."

Mr. Speaker, we need to listen to this veteran of the war on drugs who added, "Washington should spend its money not on helicopters and trainers but on treatment for addicts."

The \$400 million cost of helicopters alone for Colombia would provide treatment for 200,000 Americans addicted to drugs.

Mr. Speaker, this is crazy. This is wrong. We are about to spend \$2 billion on Colombia for drug eradication and interdiction while most of the 26 million addicts and alcoholics in the United States are unable to access treatment. We are about to spend \$2 billion on Colombia even though treatment has been proven to be 23 times more cost effective than eradication of crops and 11 times more cost effective than interdiction.

When will Congress and the President wake up to the basic fact that our Nation's supply-side strategy does not attack the underlying problem of addiction? It is the addiction that causes people to crave and demand drugs.

When President Richard Nixon declared war on drugs in 1971, he directed 60 percent of the funding to treatment. Now we are down to 18 percent of the funding for treatment. That is a big reason, Mr. Speaker, that fully one-half of the treatment beds are gone that were available here in America 10 years ago. The other reason is that we allow insurance companies to discriminate against the disease of addiction by limiting access to treatment.

Mr. Speaker, this is a defining moment in the 30-year effort to curb illegal drug use in the United States. We