money, but the reality is what they want to do, the Republican plan is a sneak attack, it is reckless, it is shortsighted and it is irresponsible. It is a raid on the Social Security trust fund. It spends the so-called surplus that does not exist and it endangers the retirement security of future generations.

We have a clear responsibility. Save Social Security first. We need to strengthen the Social Security system. It is the only sensible and responsible course of action.

I encourage my colleagues to be opposed to anything that will dip in and raid the Social Security surplus in order to provide the program that they are advocating.

WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I have had the chance to visit a number of schools in my district. After one visit, I was surprised by one of the teachers who told me that she appreciated the welfare reform that this Congress passed back in 1996. So I asked her to tell me about that. And she said, well, there was this boy in her class, she said, let us call him Johnny. All of a sudden Johnny started to behave better. He had a better attitude, he was a better student. Everything about Johnny was better. Finally she asked Johnny, ''Is there something different at your house?'' And Johnny responded, ''Yeah, my dad got a job.''

Mr. Speaker, a job is more than the way you earn your living. A job helps to define your very life. Despite what some of our liberal friends claim, the real purpose of welfare reform was not so much to save money. It was about saving people. It was about saving families. It was about saving children from one more generation of poverty, dependency and despair. It has certainly made a difference in Johnny's life.

Mr. Speaker, what a difference a Republican Congress has made.

SOCIAL SECURITY

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, Social Security, the most successful domestic program in our Nation's history, is under attack. Sadly, this attack is coming from within. It is a sneak attack, coming from the Republican leadership, under the guise of tax cuts. Two-thirds of our country's elderly depend on Social Security for over half of their income. The Republican sneak attack will take $80 billion that we need to shore up the Social Security trust fund. They would rob the Social Security surplus. We cannot allow a sneak attack on Social Security while the Nation is preoccupied. That is what the Republican leadership is hoping for. We cannot let them get away with it.

Democrats support tax cuts, but tax cuts should not come from the Social Security trust fund. Our Nation's elderly depend on Social Security. Our children depend on it. Working families depend on Social Security. The $80 billion sneak attack will hurt all of them.

Mr. Speaker, let us save Social Security first.

STAND FIRM AGAINST TERRORISM

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the Administration ought to be commended for taking strong action against Osama bin Laden and his many followers who are behind the recent terrorist attacks on American embassies in Tanzania and Kenya. Osama bin Laden is a traitor to Islam, and he has betrayed the commandments of his faith.

Chapter VI, verse 151 of the Koran states, ''Take not life, which God hath made sacred, except by way of justice and law.''

Terrorist attacks on our embassies have taken the lives of hundreds of innocent people, Americans and non-Americans alike. Osama bin Laden, like all terrorists, has engaged in a cowardly act and he does violence to the very religious principles he invokes. He offends the millions of devout followers of Islam who do not believe that the killing of innocent people has any role in a civilized society.

The Administration should stand firm against terrorism and strike back against the cowardly murderers who are a threat to free peoples everywhere.

SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, when I came to this House 10 years ago, the Republicans spent a lot of time telling us that we used the Social Security money to balance the budget. They said, ''You're masking the deficit by moving that money over and using it to balance the budget.''

Under President Clinton's leadership, we have brought the budget back into balance and there appears to be some surplus on the horizon. What do the Republicans want to do now? They want to take that money, not pay back Social Security but give it away in tax relief.

Now, when the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means tomorrow rolls out this three walnuts game that you see at the county fair, where is the pea, the American people are going to watch their Social Security moved around so fast in two different bills, it will be designed to confuse them. They will put out a bill that says we want to put lots of money into balancing the Social Security, and then we just want this little teeny bit out here for a tax cut.

The first money that we have in surplus should go to pay for Social Security.

WE NEED ANTIMISSILE DEFENSE

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman fails to remember that it was the Democrats that increased the tax on Social Security in 1993 and it was the Republicans that saved us from dipping out of the trust fund so it would not go bankrupt.

But I am here to talk about the missile that North Korea fired and its importance. Most of the press reports that the missile can reach the United States, some 3,300 miles. That is true. But tactically the THAAD and the Upper Tier, the Upper Tier is the Navy antimissile defense program, THAAD with the Air Force, any time we have a ship, say if South Korea is invaded, we cannot bring our carriers north of Cheju which is on the southern tip. That means they can be hit. Our forces deploy out of Japan and Taiwan. They can be hit there as well. So it is not just the threat of a missile reaching the United States. It can reach all of the ports to where we deploy against any country. That is important. That is another reason why we need antimissile defense.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4104, TREASURY, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4104) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, have the conferees been appointed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Not quite yet.

Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KOLBE, WOLF and ISTOOK, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Messrs. ADERHOLT, LIVINGSTON, MCDADE and HOYER, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. OBEY.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. HOYER

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman from Maryland offering a motion at this time?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOYER moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill, H.R. 4104, be instructed to insist on the House position providing $2,828,000 for forensic and related support of investigations into missing and exploited children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I apparently had two motions in my hand. That is the incorrect motion.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the incorrect motion and to offer the correct motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman withdraws the motion. The Clerk will report the second motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOYER moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill, H.R. 4104, be instructed to insist on the Senate position providing $3,250,000,000 for emergency expenses relating to Year 2000 conversion of Federal information technology systems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland to offer this motion to instruct?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object at this point, under my reservation, Mr. Speaker, we have gone through a little bit of backing and forthing on this motion. I was quite prepared on the last one, which is one that we had had some discussion about, to accept that.

□ 1030

But I am not inclined to accept a unanimous consent agreement on this particular motion. I would be willing to, on the one that was previously offered, to accept a unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield under his reservation of objection?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman reaches that conclusion, I would urge him to consult with the central office of the committee. I have been asked routinely to approve unanimous-consent requests to facilitate the needs of the majority and have given that unanimous consent on numerous instances, sometimes over the objections or at least in the teeth of concern of our own party leadership. We can rapidly have that kind of cooperation come to an end, if that is what the other side prefers.

Mr. KOLBE. Reclaiming my time and further reserving the right to object, I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that I appreciate the assistance that the minority has given in facilitating our consideration of the appropriation bills and the motions to instruct conferees and to get us moving to conference as quick as possible, but I do not think that is the question that we have here. The motion was not made in a timely fashion, it is one that I object to, and it is not one, is not our position, does not represent our position.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that just yesterday I agreed to a motion to roll a number of votes in order to facilitate the Republican conference. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) was in our conference. We have a rather serious issue before this House, and I think it is understandable that people be pulled in different directions. But if procedural cooperation is going to break down on a minor matter like this, we are going to have a terrible time getting to the right conclusion on appropriation bills before October 1.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), with all due respect, obviously I had two papers in front of me, thought I had picked up this motion, and very frankly I want to tell my friend he thought that I was offering the motion there now.

Mr. KOLBE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOYER. And, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona did not offer objection. I made a mistake in picking up the wrong piece of paper, having thought the staff had already handed it to the desk, the proper motion. When the incorrect motion, the motion the gentleman and I also discussed, was read, my staff pointed out that I had handed the incorrect paper.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell my friend I understand his problem. But I also want to tell my friend that we are now cutting a very fine point in terms of knowing full well that I had talked to the gentleman about the motion, I picked up the wrong piece of paper, and I would hope my friend would not put me in a position or the House in a position of an inadvertent picking up of the wrong piece of paper puts us in a position where procedurally we will now be, I think, responding in a way that I think is not going to facilitate the work of the House.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time under my reservation of objection, the gentleman is correct. Only moments, not even minutes, almost seconds before we began this discussion we got the revised or the new motion to instruct, and it was obviously different than we have been led to believe earlier. And it is true that when the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) went down with the piece of paper I did think it was going to be the revised motion to instruct, however I was considering at that moment whether I should object to that. I did not. This gives me another opportunity to at least raise this.

I would like to at least ask either the gentleman from Maryland or the gentleman from Wisconsin about whether or not we would be able, if we are going to use this motion, this revised motion dealing with Y2K, whether we would be able to expedite the discussion on this so that we would not require a lot of time here on the floor this morning.

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

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, although I have not consulted with our ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) I think I speak for Mr. OBEY, and he is here, he can speak for himself obviously, but it is not our intention to debate this at any length. Very frankly, we think this issue is known to the House, known to the Senate, and we believe this ought to be done very quickly.

Am I correct?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have not even yet seen the motion of the gentleman from Maryland. I trust his judgment on it, and I understand the thrust of it, and I agree with it. But there are some other fairly important issues that all of us have to tend to these days, and I think we all need to give each other a little bit of running room on these questions.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I would agree with that, and I think that is what I want to accommodate and I am trying to accommodate here, and if there is an understanding that we can expedite this discussion making, and we had a full discussion on this, I might add, on the floor during the debate on the bill on this exact issue, and if we can understand that there would not be the gentleman's suggestions of other procedural road blocks being thrown up at this point, then I would withdraw my objection if that is agreeable with both sides.

Does that understanding conform to the gentleman from Wisconsin as well?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, and I appreciate the gentleman's removal of his objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOYER moves that the managers on the part of the House at the Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 4104 be instructed to insist on the Senate position providing $3,250,000,000 for emergency expenses relating to Year 2000 conversion of Federal information technology systems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for his consideration. Frankly, I did not stand up in time, we all know that, and that was my fault. But the issue that has been raised is a serious one. The gentleman is correct, we have discussed it at length. There is an emergency situation as it relates to making sure that in the year 2000 that our computers in the Federal Government whether they be FAA comptrollers or whatever else they may be, are ready to make that transition from this century to the next. The Senate has obviously tried to accommodate that and ensure that both the Defense Department and all other departments of government have sufficient resources to accomplish that objective. We believe the Senate was correct, and we would urge the House to agree with the Senate's position and so instruct the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to instruct and that I might include tabular and extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the.

There was no objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that this issue was completely debated on the floor of the House when our bill was considered in July. It is, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has suggested, an extraordinarily important issue. When we say ''Y2K'' we are talking about the transition of our electronic and computer systems to the new millennium. We have shortened that terminology to an acronym, Y2K. I tell you this so that those who are listening or reading this debate at a later time might understand what we mean when we say ''Y2K''.

There is no question that the debate over how we handle Y2K is extraordinarily important. It is also a difficult issue for the Federal Government and for the private sector. I think that we have much on our side to commend itself. The United States is probably well ahead of where many other countries are. We are behind in government efforts compared to the private sector, particularly the banking industry. But we are ahead of the efforts of other governments.

On the other hand, we get constant revisions in the amount of money that is going to be required for this program. Let me just review for my colleagues the estimates the Office of Management and Budget, which has the overall responsibility for this problem. Here is what they have estimated, going back, not very far, to May of last year. In their first quarterly report in May of 1997 they said the fix was going to take about $2.8 billion. They revised that the next quarter, in August, to $3.8 billion; that was an increase of 1 billion. They revised that in the third quarter, in November, to 3.9 billion; that was an increase of only $100 million. They revised it in the fourth quarter to $4.7 billion, an increase of 800 million. They revised that in the fifth quarterly report, in May of this year, to $5 billion. Now we saw an increase of another $300 million. And now we have in this sixth quarterly report an estimate of $5.6 billion, another $460 million increase.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would just point out that we have a lot of money that is involved in this issue. What we have decided, what the Republican leadership has decided, I think wisely so, is to include this with all of the other issues dealing with emergency supplemental appropriations. I know the gentleman from Maryland was with us yesterday when the Members of the House Committee on Appropriations listened to the State Department talk about the requirements for embassy security. So, we have funds for embassy security facing us as an emergency supplemental. Then, we also have farm aid as a possible emergency appropriations, we have Bosnia, and then we have the Y2K. So all of these issues are clearly going to have to be dealt with before this Congress adjourns, before the 105th Congress becomes history.

We have begun those discussions with the Senate, with our counterparts in the Senate at the subcommittee level. Discussions are occurring at the chairmanship level, and it is happening at the leadership level. We know this matter must be dealt with. We recognize it is something that must be dealt with, but we also believe that it ought to be dealt with in an emergency supplemental that is separate from this appropriation bill so that we can look at these issues separately.

So I would just urge my colleagues to defeat this motion with a full understanding that none of us, none of us, are making light of the seriousness of this matter. Indeed some of us have made it very clear that we believe the Office of Management and Budget and the White House has not given this matter the consideration that it deserves, and we have been urging them to give it more attention.

But I do not believe that this motion to instruct helps us to move along the path where we need to get in order to have a resolution of this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think the chairman has articulated the issue very well. I explained it as well. The reason this motion is being offered at this time, however, is fairly straightforward.

The reason is that we had this debate in July. That is now some 2 months ago, 60 days ago. We were told that this matter was going to be resolved and that agencies would have appropriately the expectation they would have sufficient resources to meet this challenge.

I tell my friend that this is not solved. The Senate has tried to solve it, but we have not solved it on this side, and we are 60 days later, some 2½ weeks or 3 weeks with I guess about 12 legislative days left in this session supposedly, at least until we adjourn subject, perhaps, to the call of the Chair. We are only a few short legislative days from adjournment.

This matter must be resolved. We must address it. The Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman's subcommittee, Mr. Speaker, and the full committee recommended that we resolve it in exactly the way that the Senate has proposed. Exactly. It is my understanding the Republican leadership, the chairman of our committee and our subcommittee took this action. This is exactly what we proposed.

Now I say to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona, A, I appreciate his allowing us to move forward on this issue, but B, that it is time for us to ensure that this objective is accomplished. If it is not, the losers will be the American public, and the reason we have offered this motion is because contrary to the intention that I think was a good-faith intention expressed by the majority leader on the floor that this would be resolved before the August break, it was not, and we must resolve it.

I would hope the Members of this House, therefore, would approve this motion and that in committee and in conference, Mr. Speaker, we could exceed to the Senate position, which is, I believe, the responsible position to meet this emergency.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The gentleman from

Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has the right to close.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think I just did, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE DRUG ELIMINATION ACT

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 537 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 537

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4300) to support enhanced drug interdiction efforts in the major transit countries and support a comprehensive supply eradication and crop substitution program in source countries. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative Hastert of Illinois, and a Member opposed to the bill. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule for a period not to exceed three hours. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record and numbered 1 pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendments, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instruction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the rule makes in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 1, and considers it as read.

The rule waives clause 7 of rule XVI, prohibiting nongermane amendments, against the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Yesterday, the Committee on Rules met and granted a modified open rule for H.R. 4300, the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) or his designee, and a Member opposed to the bill. The rule provides a 3-hour time limit on the amendment process.

The rule permits the Chair to accord priority and recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and considers them as read.

The rule allows the Chair to postpone recorded votes and reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed votes, provided voting time on the first series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, teenage drug use in this country is now a national crisis. Since 1993, drug use among teenagers has doubled in the United States. Among high school seniors, marijuana use is up 80 percent, cocaine use is up 80 percent, and heroin use is up 100 percent. It is time our country made this drug crisis a national priority. As the mayor of Charlotte, North Carolina, I attended far too many funerals for children who were killed by drug violence. I do not want to attend another one.

This week, we will continue this Congress's serious campaign to win the war on drugs. We have committed to win this drug war in 4 years, like we won World War II in 4 years. This week, we will consider several pieces of legislation to both reduce the domestic demand for drugs and to stop the flow of drugs into the country.

The Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act will beef up our drug interdiction efforts by providing for the purchase of additional planes and ships to stop drugs at the borders. In addition, the bill provides anti-drug assistance to the Governments of Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, and Mexico. If they have our help, they have been proven to do a good job in giving the support necessary to stop those drugs from leaving their country.

H.R. 4300 is a good, noncontroversial bill. It will reduce the supply of drugs in America, it will drive up the price, making it harder for teenagers to buy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support the underlying legislation. This is an open rule with a generous time cap on amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD a statement of the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCOLLUM), who is also very active in this work.

Mr. Speaker, this is the statement of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM):

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee,

he is speaking regarding a bill introduced by he and his colleagues on the Speaker's Task Force for a Drug-Free America.

The purpose of H.R. 4300 is to supply a comprehensive supply eradication and crop substitution program in the narcotics source countries of Colombia, Peru and Bolivia, as well as to fund enhanced drug interdiction efforts in the transit countries in the Caribbean, Central and South America.

H.R. 4300 was introduced on July 22 of 1998. It was referred to the Committee on International Relations; in addition, the bill was referred to the Committees on Ways and Means, Judiciary, National Security, and Transportation. The respective chairmen of all of these committees, as well as the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, have sent waiver letters to the Speaker on H.R. 4300. Substantial efforts have been made in developing H.R. 4300 with the full and informed participation of committee staff from each of the six affected committees, as well as the Task Force for a Drug Free America led by Chairman Hastert.

The Congressional Budget Office has conducted a preliminary assessment in coordination with the House Budget Committee and has determined that there are no pay-as-you-go issues contained within H.R. 4300. We expect a full written assessment from CBO on the costs associated with the bill by the end of the week.

Some of the major provisions of H.R. 4300:

It provides approximately $2.3 billion through the fiscal years of 1999, 2000 and 2001.

It significantly expands U.S. aircraft, maritime and radar coverage and operations in drug source and transit zones.

It substantially enhances the counter-narcotics capabilities of the Customs Service, the Coast Guard and the DEA in terms of personnel, equipment and training.

It funds increased drug eradication assistance to Colombia, Peru, Bolivia and Mexico.

It funds increased drug interdiction assistance to Brazil, Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, the Caribbean and Central America.

It encourages the use of new technologies to detect narcotics in transit and to destroy coca and opium poppy in the source zones.

It funds alternative crop development in Colombia, Peru and Bolivia.

It supports the establishment of international law enforcement academies for Latin America and the Caribbean, Asia and Africa under the auspices of the Justice Department.