performs 90 percent of the duties required by the Chief Financial Officers Act.

The chairman has worked constructively with the minority and with the administration to perfect this bill and has committed to continue working in a bipartisan manner to address any remaining concerns in report language. I support H.R. 1962 and urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentlewoman from New York for her helpful comments in rounding out this legislation.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, this legislation, when we talk about the Executive Office of the President, currently includes the White House Office, the executive residence of the White House, the Office of the Vice President, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Council on Environmental Quality, the National Security Council, the Office of Administration, the Office of Management and Budget, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the Office of Policy Development, the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and the Office of United States Trade Representative.

The current structure of the White House first began with Franklin Roosevelt in 1939, after the Brownlow committee report, which gave the President really the first staff and support system in this particular century. Now, different Presidents, either by Executive order or Congress, by statute on the recommendation of the President, has set up various offices over time to help the Presidency in terms of legislation, budget, policy development of one sort or the other, and this chief financial officer would be available to the President for various special assignments having to do with fiscal affairs, as it is for the normal use that comes under the Chief Financial Officers Act. And I believe that we have had very strong support from all people that have looked at this from the standpoint of government organization.

Mr. Speaker, I provide for the RECORD a document from the Congressional Budget Office on H.R. 1962.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

H.R. 1962—Presidential and Executive Office Financial Accountability Act of 1997

CBO estimates that, subject to the availability of appropriated funds, enacting H.R. 1962 would increase cost of the Office of Administration (OA) within the Executive Office of the President (EOP) by no more than $250,000 a year. The bill would not affect direct spending or receipts; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. H.R. 1962 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

H.R. 1962 would require the President to appoint a chief financial officer (CFO) for the 12 agencies and offices that comprise the EOP. The bill would require the CFO to comply with those provisions of the CFO Act that the President determines to be appropriate and in the interest of the United States. Based on information provided by the Office of Management and Budget and the Office of Administration, CBO expects that the President would appoint as CFO someone within the OA, which already provides centralized financial management and accounting services to the EOP. As a result of enacting H.R. 1962, the OA might require an additional employee or two to coordinate activities within the EOP. In addition, the OA would need to contact with a private firm to audit the consolidated annual financial statements of the EOP. We estimate that the annual audit would cost around $100,000.

In total, assuming no major problems exist in the financial management and systems of the EOP, CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 1962, would increase annual cost of the OA by no more than $250,000. In addition, it is possible that by improving financial systems and communication within the EOP, the legislation could lead to a reduction in losses from waste and abuse, buy CBO cannot estimate and amount of such potential savings.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is John R. Righter, who can be reached at 226–2860. The estimate was approved by Robert A. Sunshine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1962, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

NATIONAL NARCOTICS LEADERSHIP ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1997

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2610) to amend the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 to extend the authorization for the Office of National Drug Control Policy until September 30, 1999, to expand the responsibilities and powers of the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2610

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; AMENDMENT REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''National Narcotics Leadership Act Amendments of 1997''.

(b) AMENDMENT REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

SEC. 2. DEPUTY DIRECTORS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 1002 (21 U.S.C. 1501) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) There shall be in the Office of National Drug Control Policy a Deputy Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, a Deputy Director for Demand Reduction, a Deputy Director for Supply Reduction, a Deputy Director for State and Local Affairs, and a Deputy Director of Intelligence.''; and

(B) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) The Deputy Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the Deputy Director for Demand Reduction, the Deputy Director for Supply Reduction, the Deputy Director for State and Local Affairs, and the Deputy Director of Intelligence shall assist the Director in carrying out the responsibilities of the Director under this Act.''; and

(2) by amending subsection (c)(2) to read as follows:

''(2) The Deputy Director for State and Local Affairs shall be the head of the Bureau of State and Local Affairs.''.

(b) APPOINTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1003(a) (21 U.S.C. 1502(a)) is amended—

(A) in each of paragraphs (1) and (2), by inserting ''the Deputy Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy,' after ''The Director,'';

(B) in each of paragraphs (1) and (2), by striking ''and the Associate Director for National Drug Control Policy'' and inserting ''the Deputy Director for State and Local Affairs, and the Deputy Director of Intelligence''; and

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking '', a Deputy Director, or Associate Director'' and inserting ''or as a Deputy Director''.

(2) DEADLINE FOR NOMINATION.—The President shall submit to the Senate nominations of individuals for appointment as the Deputy Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the Deputy Director for Demand Reduction, the Deputy Director for Supply Reduction, the Deputy Director for State and Local Affairs, and the Deputy Director of Intelligence of the Office of National Drug Control Policy by not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) CONTINUED SERVICE OF ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR.—The individual serving on the date of the enactment of this Act as Associate Director for National Drug Control Policy may act as the Deputy Director for State and Local Affairs until such time as an individual is appointed to that position in accordance with the amendments made by this Act.

(4) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The heading of section 1003 (21 U.S.C. 1502) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1003. APPOINTMENT AND DUTIES OF DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTORS.''.

(c) COMPENSATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 5314, by inserting after the item relating to the Deputy Director for Supply Reduction, Office of National Drug Control Policy, the following:

''Deputy Director for State and Local Affairs, Office of National Drug Control Policy.

''Deputy Director of Intelligence, Office of National Drug Control Policy.'';

(B) in section 5313, by adding at the end the following:

''Deputy Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.''; and

(C) in section 5315, by striking the item relating to the Associate Director for National Drug Control Policy, Office of National Drug Control Policy.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 1003(a) (21 U.S.C. 1502(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (4)(C).

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF RESPONSIBILITIES OF DIRECTOR.

(a) EXPANSION OF RESPONSIBILITIES.—Section 1003(b) (21 U.S.C. 1502(b)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) establish Federal policies, objectives, goals, priorities, and performance measures (including specific annual agency targets expressed in terms of precise percentages) for the National Drug Control Program and for each National Drug Control Program agency, which include targets for the following:

''(A) reduction of unlawful drug use to 3 percent of the population of the United States or less by December 31, 2001 (as measured in terms of overall illicit drug use during the past 30 days by the National Household Survey), and achievement of at least 25 percent of such reduction during each of 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001;

''(B) reduction of adolescent unlawful drug use (as measured in terms of illicit drug use during the past 30 days by the Monitoring the Future Survey of the University of Michigan or the National PRIDE Survey conducted by the National Parents' Resource Institute for Drug Education) to 3 percent of the adolescent population of the United States or less by December 31, 2001, and achievement of at least 25 percent of such reduction during each of 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001;

''(C) reduction of the availability of cocaine, heroin, marijuana, and methamphetamine in the United States by 80 percent by December 31, 2001;

''(D) reduction of the respective nationwide average street purity levels for cocaine, heroin, marijuana, and methamphetamine (as estimated by the interagency drug flows assessment led by the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and based on statistics collected by the Drug Enforcement Administration and other National Drug Control Program agencies identified as relevant by the Director) by 60 percent by December 31, 2001, and achievement of at least 25 percent of each such reduction during each of 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001;

''(E) reduction of drug-related crime in the United States by 50 percent by December 31, 2001, and achievement of at least 25 percent of such reduction during each of 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001, including—

''(i) reduction of State and Federal unlawful drug trafficking and distribution;

''(ii) reduction of State and Federal crimes committed by persons under the influence of unlawful drugs; and

''(iii) reduction of State and Federal crimes committed for the purpose of obtaining unlawful drugs or obtaining property that is intended to be used for the purchase of unlawful drugs; and

''(F) reduction of drug-related emergency room incidents in the United States (as measured by data of the Drug Abuse Warning Network on illicit drug abuse), including incidents involving gunshot wounds and automobile accidents in which illicit drugs are identified in the bloodstream of the victim, by 50 percent by December 31, 2001;'';

(2) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) coordinate, oversee, and evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of the policies, objectives, goals, performance measures, and priorities established under paragraph (1) and the fulfillment of the responsibilities of the National Drug Control Program agencies under the National Drug Control Strategy;'';

(3) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''and nongovernmental entities involved in demand reduction'' after ''governments'';

(4) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (7);

(5) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting a semicolon; and

(6) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(9) require each National Drug Control Program agency to submit to the Director on a semi-annual basis (beginning with the first 6 months of 1998) an evaluation of progress by the agency with respect to drug control program goals using the performance measures referred to in paragraph (1), including progress with respect to—

''(A) success in reducing domestic and foreign sources of illegal drugs;

''(B) success in protecting the borders of the United States (and in particular the Southwestern border of the United States) from penetration by illegal narcotics;

''(C) success in reducing violent crime associated with drug use in the United States;

''(D) success in reducing the negative health and social consequences of drug use in the United States; and

''(E) implementation of drug treatment and prevention programs in the United States and improvements in the adequacy and effectiveness of such programs;

''(10) submit to Congress on a semi-annual basis, not later than 60 days after the date of the last day of the applicable 6-month period, a summary of—

''(A) each of the evaluations received by the Director under paragraph (9); and

''(B) the progress of each National Drug Control Program agency toward the drug control program goals of the agency using the performance measures described in paragraph (1);

''(11) require the National Drug Control Program agencies to submit to the Director not later than February 1 of each year a detailed accounting of all funds expended by the agencies for National Drug Control Program activities during the previous fiscal year, and require such accounting to be authenticated by the Inspector General for each agency prior to submission to the Director;

''(12) submit to Congress not later than April 1 of each year the information submitted to the Director under paragraph (11);

''(13) submit to Congress not later than August 1 of each year a report including—

''(A) the budget guidance provided by the Director to each National Drug Control Program agency for the fiscal year in which the report is submitted and for the other fiscal years within the applicable five-year budget plan relating to such fiscal year; and

''(B) a summary of the request of each National Drug Control Program agency to the Director under this Act (prior to review of the request by the Office of Management and Budget) for the resources required to achieve the targets of the agency under this Act;

''(14) act as a representative of the President before Congress on all aspects of the National Drug Control Program;

''(15) act as the primary spokesperson of the President on drug issues;

''(16) make recommendations to National Drug Control Program agency heads with respect to implementation of Federal counterdrug programs;

''(17) take such actions as necessary to oppose any attempt to legalize the use of a substance (in any form) that—

''(A) is listed in schedule I of section 202 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812); and

''(B) has not been approved for use for medical purposes by the Food and Drug Administration; and

''(18) ensure that drug prevention and drug treatment research and information is effectively disseminated by National Drug Control Program agencies to State and local governments and nongovernmental entities involved in demand reduction by—

''(A) encouraging formal consultation between any such agency that conducts or sponsors research, and any such agency that disseminates information in developing research and information product development agendas;

''(B) encouraging such agencies (as appropriate) to develop and implement dissemination plans that specifically target State and local governments and nongovernmental entities involved in demand reduction; and

''(C) developing a single interagency clearinghouse for the dissemination of research and information by such agencies to State and local governments and nongovernmental agencies involved in demand reduction.''.

(b) SURVEY OF DRUG USE.—(1) The University of Michigan shall not be prohibited under any law from conducting the survey of drug use among young people in the United States known as the Monitoring the Future Survey.

(2) The National Parents' Resource Institute for Drug Education in Atlanta, Georgia, shall not be prohibited under any law from conducting the survey of drug use among young people in the United States known as the National PRIDE Survey.

SEC. 4. EXPANSION OF POWERS OF DIRECTOR.

Section 1003(d) (21 U.S.C. 1502(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(10) require the heads of National Drug Control Program agencies to provide the Director with statistics, studies, reports, and any other information regarding Federal control of drug abuse;

''(11) require the heads of National Drug Control Program agencies to provide the Director with information regarding any position (before an individual is nominated for such position) that—

''(A) relates to the National Drug Control Program;

''(B) is at or above the level of Deputy Assistant Secretary; and

''(C) involves responsibility for Federal counternarcotics or anti-drug programs; and

''(12) make recommendations to the National Drug Intelligence Center on the specific projects that the Director determines will enhance the effectiveness of implementation of the National Drug Control Strategy.''.

SEC. 5. SUBMISSION OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1005(a) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (2)(A) to read as follows:

''(A) include comprehensive, research-based, specific, long-range goals and performance measures (including specific annual targets expressed in terms of precise percentages) for reducing drug abuse and the consequences of drug abuse in the United States;'';

(2) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (2)(C);

(3) by striking paragraph (2)(D);

(4) by adding at the end of paragraph (2) the following new paragraphs:

''(D) include 4-year projections for National Drug Control Program priorities (including budget priorities); and

''(E) review international, Federal, State, local, and private sector drug control activities to ensure that the United States pursues well-coordinated and effective drug control at all levels of government.'';

(5) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking clauses (iv) and (v) and inserting the following:

''(iv) private citizens and organizations with experience and expertise in demand reduction;

''(v) private citizens and organizations with experience and expertise in supply reduction; and

''(vi) appropriate representatives of foreign governments.'';

(6) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by amending clauses (i) through (vi) to read as follows:

''(i) the quantities of cocaine, heroin, marijuana, methamphetamine, ecstasy, and rohypnol available for consumption in the United States;

''(ii) the amount of cocaine, heroin, marijuana, ecstasy, rohypnol, methamphetamine, and precursor chemicals entering the United States;

''(iii) the number of hectares of marijuana, poppy, and coca cultivated and destroyed domestically and in other countries;

''(iv) the number of metric tons of marijuana, cocaine, heroin, and methamphetamine seized;

''(v) the number of cocaine and methamphetamine processing labs destroyed domestically and in other countries;

''(vi) changes in the price and purity of heroin and cocaine, changes in price of methamphetamine, and changes in tetrahydrocannabinol level of marijuana;'';

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (C);

(C) by striking the period at the end subparagraph (D) and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) assessment of the cultivation of illegal drugs in the United States.''; and

(7) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''February 1, 1995'' and inserting ''February 1, 1998'';

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''second'';

(C) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (C);

(D) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting ''; and''; and

(E) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) a description of the National Drug Control Program performance measures described in subsection (a)(2)(A).''.

(b) GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY.—Section 1005(b) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking '', OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES'' and inserting ''AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES'';

(2) in the matter after the heading, by inserting ''(1)'' before ''Each National Drug Control Strategy'';

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (6) as subparagraphs (A) through (F);

(4) in subparagraph (A) (as redesignated by paragraph (3)), by striking ''and priorities'' and inserting ''and performance measures'';

(5) in subparagraph (C) (as redesignated by paragraph (3)), by striking ''3-year projections'' and inserting ''4-year projections''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) In establishing the performance measures required by this subsection, the Director shall—

''(A) establish performance measures and targets expressed in terms of precise percentages for each National Drug Control Strategy goal and objective;

''(B) revise such performance measures and targets as necessary, and reflect such performance measures and targets in the National Drug Control Program budget submitted to Congress;

''(C) consult with affected National Drug Control Program agencies;

''(D) identify programs and activities of National Drug Control Program agencies that support the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy;

''(E) evaluate in detail the implementation by each National Drug Control Program agency of program activities supporting the National Drug Control Strategy;

''(F) monitor consistency between the drug-related goals of the National Drug Control Program agencies and ensure that drug control agency goals and budgets fully support, and are fully consistent with, the National Drug Control Strategy;

''(G) coordinate the development and implementation of national drug control data collection and reporting systems to support Federal policy formulation and performance measurement;

''(H) ensure that no Federal drug control funds are expended for any study or contract relating to the legalization (for a medical use or any other use) of a substance listed in schedule I of section 202 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812); and

''(I) ensure that no Federal funds appropriated for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Program are expended for the expansion of drug treatment programs.''.

SEC. 6. REPORT ON DESIGNATION OF HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS.

Section 1005(c)(3) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) Not later than March 1 of each year, the Director shall submit to Congress a report—

''(A) on the effectiveness of, and need for, the designation of areas under this subsection as high intensity drug trafficking areas; and

''(B) that includes any recommendations of the Director for legislative action with respect to such designation.''.

SEC. 7. REPROGRAMMING AND TRANSFER OF FUNDS.

(a) EXPANSION OF TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Section 1003(d)(8) (21 U.S.C. 1502(d)(8)) is amended to read as follows:

''(8) except to the extent that the Director's authority under this paragraph is limited in an annual appropriations Act, and with the concurrence of the head of the affected agency and upon advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations and the authorizing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, transfer funds appropriated to a National Drug Control Program agency program, activity, or function designated by the Director pursuant to subsection (c) to a different National Drug Control Program agency program, activity, or function designated by the Director pursuant to such subsection in an amount that does not exceed 5 percent of the amount appropriated to either program, activity, or function;''.

(b) REPORT.—Section 1003(c)(7) (21 U.S.C. 1502(c)(7)) is amended to read as follows:

''(7)(A) The Director shall report to Congress on a quarterly basis (beginning with the first quarter of 1998) on—

''(i) the need for any reprogramming or transfer of funds appropriated for National Drug Control Program activities; and

''(ii) any funds appropriated for National Drug Control Program activities that were reprogrammed or transferred during the quarter covered by the report.

''(B) The Director shall report to Congress as required by paragraph (A) not later than 30 days after the last day of each applicable quarter.''.

SEC. 8. LONG-TERM PLAN FOR REDUCTION OF DRUG USE.

Section 1003 (21 U.S.C. 1502) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) LONG-TERM PLAN FOR REDUCTION OF DRUG USE.—Not later than March 1, 1998, the Director shall submit to Congress a long-term plan for reducing the population of illegal drug users in the United States by December 31, 2001, to 3 percent of the population of the United States or less. Such plan shall include—

''(1) a request for funds and other resources necessary to achieve such reduction within the guidelines of the balanced budget agreement of 1997; and

''(2) the justifications for each such request.''.

SEC. 9. DRUG POLICY COUNCIL.

The National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end of chapter 1 the following new section:

''SEC. 1013. DRUG POLICY COUNCIL.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Executive Office of the President a Drug Policy Council, which shall be composed of the members of the President's cabinet, and the purpose of which shall be to make cabinet-level decisions regarding national drug policy.

''(b) CHAIRMAN.—The President shall be the Chairman of the Drug Policy Council established by subsection (a).

''(c) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall be the Executive Director of the Drug Policy Council established by subsection (a).''.

SEC. 10. DEFINITION OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAM AGENCY.

Section 1010(6) (21 U.S.C. 1507(6)) is amended to read as follows:

''(6) the term 'National Drug Control Program agency' means any agency that is responsible for implementing any aspect of the National Drug Control Strategy, including any agency that receives Federal funds to implement any aspect of the National Drug Control Strategy;''.

SEC. 11. EXTENSION OF DATE FOR TERMINATION OF OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY.

Section 1009 is amended by striking ''September 30, 1997'' and inserting ''September 30, 1999''.

SEC. 12. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 1011 is amended by striking ''8 succeeding fiscal years'' and inserting ''10 succeeding fiscal years''.

SEC. 13. REPORT REQUIRED.

Not later than November 1, 1997, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress a report including—

(1) proposed goals, targets, performance measures (as described in section 1003(b)(1) of the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1502(b)(1)), and specific initiatives with respect to the National Drug Control Program, including the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Program; and

(2) proposals to coordinate the efforts of all National Drug Control Program agencies.

SEC. 14. APPOINTMENT OF TEMPORARY ADMINISTRATOR FOR DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES SUPPORT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1031(c) (21 U.S.C. 1531(c)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(c) ADMINISTRATION.—''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The Director shall appoint an individual to act as Administrator until such time as an individual is appointed to such position under paragraph (1).''.

(b) DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.—The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall appoint an individual to act as Administrator of the Drug-Free Communities Support Program under section 1031(c)(2) of the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 (as added by subsection (a)) not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 15. CONSISTENCY WITH NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947.

Section 1004 (21 U.S.C. 1503) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''(1)'';

(B) by striking ''(2)(A)'' and inserting ''(b) CONSISTENCY WITH NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947.—(1)'';

(C) by striking ''(B)'' and inserting ''(2)''; and

(D) by striking ''subparagraph (A)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)''; and

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d) respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT].

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2610 amends the National Narcotics Leadership Act to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy and fundamentally restructure the way the drug war is fought.

In many ways, this is the most significant antidrug bill since the original authorization of the drug czar in 1988, with the possible exception of the Drug-Free Communities Act, which Congress passed earlier this year.

This bill is built around one basic goal, a virtual drug-free America by the year 2001. To achieve this goal, the bill has two basic points: First, it empowers the Nation's drug czar to improve interagency coordination; second, it adds significant accountability mechanisms to ensure that the American taxpayer is getting maximum results from the drug czar's office and all of the national drug control policy program agencies.

H.R. 2610 includes additions from both Democrats and Republicans. Although we do not agree on everything, I believe the basic concern for America's future, especially our shared interest in achieving a virtually drug-free America, is certainly a bipartisan goal.

I thank my colleague across the aisle, the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. BARRETT], and the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], for being an original cosponsor of the bill, as well as my Republican colleagues, the gentlemen from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SESSIONS], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] for their cosponsorship.

I will briefly summarize the major provisions. First, H.R. 2610 gives new coordination authority to the White House drug czar's office, including allowing the drug czar to shift up to 5 percent of the counternarcotics funding among the national drug control program agencies upon concurrence of the agency head. It also requires that performance measures be established to give Congress a way to test the effectiveness of each and every drug control program.

Additionally, agencies are asked to identify precisely where each dollar of the $16 billion drug budget is going.

Other new powers include: Requiring the director to review agency budgets prior to OMB approval in order to find out the real needs of our agencies; acting as the President's chief spokesman on drug policy; and monitoring consistency between agency budgets, performance measures, and results.

This bill also creates deputy directors for intelligence coordination and for State and local affairs, both of which are badly needed.

At the request of the ONDCP, we also included a deputy for the office to facilitate transitions in the absence of a director.

To assure the utmost accountability in our war on drugs, this bill sets forth, for the first time ever, hard targets and goals and precise percentages to be achieved by the year 2001. They are premised on a collection of Federal, State, and private studies and hearing testimony dating back to 1995.

These goals are expected to form the basis of a growing national expectation that the drug war must be well coordinated and the national drug control agencies be held accountable for meeting the ONDCP's performance measures. The aim of this bill also is to establish the ONDCP, through semiannual reporting, as a central coordinating entity in the drug war and not as a mere bully pulpit or paper tiger.

Finally, this bill contains a manager's amendment, the purpose of which is to reaffirm that the authorities conferred on the Office on National Drug Control Policy, and its director, by this act shall be exercised in a manner consistent with the provisions of the National Security Act of 1947.

In the end, there are certain to be differences of opinion about how high or how low the bar should be set in this fundamentally reengineered approach to our national drug control policy, but the important point about this bill is that for the first time ever Congress is actually setting a standard, a bar, and empowering the drug czar's office to promulgate aggressive performance measures for the agencies which will provide results.

In closing, let me say that we reauthorized the Office of National Drug Control Policy for 2 years, the midpoint between now and the year 2001, which will allow a review of the foregoing innovations 2 years into the 4-year goals.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. Although it is named the National Narcotics Leadership Act Amendments of 1997, it would be more appropriately called the Drug Control Failure Act for the year 2000.

I say failure because this bill has never been designed to give the Office of National Drug Control Policy the tools and direction to succeed, rather the bill establishes unattainable drug control targets, requires the administration to report twice yearly on its failure to meet those targets, and provides for only a 2-year authorization requiring reauthorization during a Presidential campaign.

Judging by its major provisions, the bill appears designed to achieve political advantage in the 1998 and 2000 elections, all at a cost to ONDCP and its efforts to fight drugs at the Federal level.

In case there is any doubt about this, the bill is opposed by the administration, and General McCaffrey, the drug czar, has stated he has serious reservations about the bill.

I have had the pleasure of working and serving with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice. I know of his commitment to the fight against drugs in this country, a commitment shared by all members of the subcommittee, and I am sure by all Members of this House. It is because of this commitment and because of the hard work we have done on a broad range of drug-related issues that I am dismayed by this bill and the process leading up to its consideration today.

Although the subcommittee has held many hearings on a variety of drug-related topics, we have not conducted a single hearing on this piece of legislation, either in subcommittee or full committee. General McCaffrey gave testimony on the administration's proposed bill, but neither he nor any other administration official has had the opportunity to testify about this bill or any of its major provisions.

Although the majority in committee made vague references to statistics from various sources, there is not a single study or report from any source, government or private sector, that recommends or even directly supports the targets set forth in this bill. In view of ONDCP, which has spent thousands of hours developing performance measures and drug control objectives, these targets are arbitrary and flatly unattainable by the year 2001.

The target for overall drug use is illustrative. The bill establishes an arbitrary target to reduce drug use from the current level of 6.1 percent to 3 percent by year 2001, a goal we all share. However, this would require ONDCP to reduce drug use to a rate 60-percent lower than at any time in the last three decades. The greatest reduction in drug use ever recorded in this country was from 14.1 percent in 1979 to 5.8 percent in 1992.

□ 1545

That was a 59 percent reduction and it took 13 years. The other targets in this bill are similarly unrealistic and unsupported by any scientific evidence. The point here is to make the administration fail and to embarrass Democratic candidates in the 1998 and 2000 elections.

Madam Speaker, if this were a serious bill and not an exercise in partisan politics, we would take our example from the other body. There Democrats and Republicans are working together on a 4-year authorization that supports ONDCP's extensive work on performance measures and targets. This bill, which authorizes ONDCP for only 2 years, takes the agency only halfway in time to the very goals that it seeks to establish. It also falls woefully short of the 10-year plan outlined in the 1997 National Drug Control Strategy.

Finally, I would only note that despite its willingness to establish arbitrary and unrealistic drug control targets, this House appears unwilling to put its money where its mouth is. A review of appropriations bills in the House shows drug control budgets significantly below the President's request in several key areas:

In education, appropriations fall short by $68 million. Sixty-four million dollars of this is for safe and drug-free school grants. Appropriations for drug courts fall $45 million below the President's request. Appropriations for the U.S. Customs Service will likely fall by $18 million, resulting in a significant reduction in interdiction efforts along the southwest border. And appropriations for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms are likely to fall by $17 million. About 40 percent of ATF's programs are related to drug enforcement.

Madam Speaker, instead of setting up ONDCP for failure, we should act responsibly and in a bipartisan way to give General McCaffrey the tools and the flexibility he needs to get this job done. I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill on suspension so that we may have a full debate and an opportunity to offer amendments.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. Madam Speaker, I have worked with the gentleman from Wisconsin for a number of years and certainly appreciate his hard work. The fact is that we have had over 40 hearings on the ONDCP and the drug czar. We have had a dozen hearings this year. We have had General McCaffrey up on the Hill himself. We have talked about these issues.

The fact is we are setting goals for this country and for the drug czar to wipe out one of the most dreaded things that can approach this country and our children, and that is drug addiction. We want to make sure that we significantly reduce it and we want to be sure by the year 2001 that we have significantly reduced it to a point that it is not a threat in this country anymore. I do not think that is partisan. It was never set up to be partisan. We want to win this fight against drugs. We have to take an extraordinary effort to get it done. The fact is the drug czar has gotten 7 of the 8 things that he wanted in this bill. He got the flexibility that he needs.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me the time. Despite a decade of steady progress in combating drug use and drug abuse during the 1980's, the situation appears to have taken somewhat of a dramatic turn for the worse since the early 1990's, and that is why we are here.

In my view, that is because the administration has accepted stalemate in the war on drugs rather than pressing on for the victory that everybody in America wants. So now Congress is going to take charge. We are going to set some tough goals for the Office of National Drug Control Policy. I am very concerned and I know many parents and all Americans are concerned about the permissive attitude toward drug use that once again seems to be spreading out across our country. We need to have leadership that says drugs are not cool, drug use is not acceptable, it will not be tolerated.

That is what this bill is about. We set some performance measures to judge the success of the administration's efforts. Let me ask, if we are willing to set performance measures for our kids in schools, why are we reluctant to set performance measures for how well the bureaucrats are doing on the war on drugs? It seems to me to be a curious question.

By 2001 under our program, we expect drug use to be at 3 percent of the population or lower. We expect an 80 percent reduction in the supply of illegal drugs. We expect a reduction of 50 percent in drug-related crime and drug-related emergency room visits. And we expect drug use by young people to be down to 3 percent, because one of the most effective strategies for decreasing the overall use of drugs is to convince young people to disapprove of them. The war on drugs has many facets, as we all know, treatment, prevention, law enforcement, interdiction. ONDCP was created to develop an overall strategy, coordinate Federal efforts and channel resources. That was a good idea.

While this bill will improve the drug czar's ability to effectively manage and win the drug war, we are not giving him a blank check. There are certain very strict reporting requirements that go along with this, so we know what is working and what is not.

I am also very pleased to be able, through the efforts of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] to be able to provide ONDCP with new tools without upsetting the balance that now exists between ONDCP and the intelligence community. It took a lot of workout and compromise to get that done. I urge Members to support this bill. It is time we had a plan to win the war. This is a good one.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this bill in its current form. This bill is anything but noncontroversial. This bill deals with one of the great issues of our day, what type of drug policy will we have.

Any effective drug policy in America or any nation must include at least 3 components: Treatment, education, and prevention. This bill does not include in a real way these 3 components.

An effective drug control policy must embody the principle of treatment because through treatment people are healed of their addictions. Through treatment we can reduce the number of addicts. However, this bill prohibits the use of HIDTA funds for treatment of people who are chemically dependent. In fact, this bill provides no real ideas for treatment strategies. This is the first reason it should be rejected.

The second principle that must be a part of any effective drug control policy is education. Education gives people an opportunity to understand how to move away from that which they are using. However, this bill does not provide any real component of education. It sets up grandiose targets for reductions in drug use that are unrealistic and unachievable. This bill lacks the serious components of education and therefore must be opposed for that reason.

Finally, the third principle that must be a part of any effective drug control strategy is prevention. An ounce of prevention goes a long way toward reducing the number of people addicted to drugs. Prevention comes in many forms. It could be a job, it could be hope for someone who was hopeless, it could be interdiction, reducing the supply. This bill provides no real prevention strategies other than the old ''lock them up, throw away the key,'' which we already know does not, will not, and cannot work.

This bill is too important to not debate. I urge that we oppose it on the

suspension calendar and have a full debate so that we can really get at the issues.

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. To my good friend from Chicago, I just want to say that we devote $2 billion on treatment to HHS and initially $90, $100 million to Justice. We also add and allow $3 million for treatment out of the $140 million for HIDTA's, something that is happening now, especially in areas like Baltimore. And we are strong on prevention. We even have $195 million for media prevention and passed the prevention act this year. So I beg to differ with the gentleman from Chicago but that is the fact.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Back in 1988 I was one of the prime sponsors, along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and others, that worked so hard in this area of drug prevention of the original so-called drug czar bill, which was then watered down considerably in conference. This would reestablish much of the power that many of us back then, in a very bipartisan way, were supporting in order to try to get a handle on this Nation's growing drug problem.

What has happened in the last 10 years? In the last 10 years we have spent $103 billion on the war on drugs. I will tell my colleagues that in the last 10 years, we have seen a bipartisan failure in the war on drugs. Neither party can say that they have been successful.

Now, what are we doing with this bill? We are setting up expectations. We are setting up goals. We are setting up flexibility. We are setting up more power within the drug czar's office. We are doing all of the right things in order to try to get to what we all want to accomplish, both Democrats and Republicans, and that is to finally start winning some battles in the war against drugs.

This country has had absolutely no resolve. Our war on drugs has been a blueprint for failure. We have not actually gone to war with the objective of winning. We have gone to the war on drugs with a Vietnam mentality, and that is the status quo. We talk about putting more resources, even more than this bill does, in education and in treatment. Sure, that is necessary. But if that is all you are going to talk about, it is like bailing the boat out and not plugging the hole, and that is ridiculous.

This bill finally sets accountability and responsibility. I personally have a great deal of faith in the present drug czar, General McCaffrey. But if he cannot do it, then step aside and let somebody in that can do it. It is about time that we set our resolve to winning the war on drugs. The greatest possible gift that we can give to the next century, and the President is always talking about the bridge into the next century, the biggest gift that we can give is to cut back addiction in this country, to cut the supply of illegal drugs coming into this country, and to at last, get a grip on this thing that is absolutely killing neighborhoods. It is creating poverty, it is a disaster, it is a national disgrace. This bill fires a shot and it is not just a shot across the bow, this is real progress. I would hope that we do get a bipartisan vote on this, and I hope we get some speakers up on the Democrat side to speak in favor of this bill. It is a good bill and it is the way to go.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the fine gentleman from Baltimore, MD [Mr. CUMMINGS].

(Mr. CUMMINGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I first of all want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his leadership as the ranking member of our subcommittee. I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation. This bill is indeed controversial. A number of amendments, including one that was offered by myself, was offered by Democratic Members but rejected by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. This bill should not be on the suspension calendar. At the very least it should be placed on the House calendar and be considered under regular order where issues surrounding the reauthorization can be debated.

I object to a provision within the bill that does not allow high intensity drug treatment areas, HIDTA's, to expand their drug treatment programs. The Washington-Baltimore HIDTA is the only 1 of 17 federally funded HIDTA projects nationwide that uses drug treatment as one of its strategies. The success of the Baltimore-Washington HIDTA treatment program has been remarkable. Analysts have found that arrest rates plunge for drug-addicted nonviolent criminal offenders when they are forced to participate in sanctions-based drug treatment programs. After 9 months of experience in the treatment programs, only 12 percent of HIDTA's clients were rearrested. Only 13 percent of HIDTA's clients tested positive for illegal substances in a typical month. This should be contrasted with the fact that 100 percent tested positive prior to entering the HIDTA program.

□ 1600

The Washington-Baltimore HIDTA is the only HIDTA that operates a program of this kind, and it should serve as a model for the remaining 16.

Under this bill, the expansion of this successful program approach is not possible. The bill sets a series of unrealistic and unworkable goals to reduce drug use. According to Barry McCaffrey, the requirements in this bill are arbitrary targets, goals and timetables, and contain unachievable goals.

I agree with the gentleman from Illinois, Chairman HASTERT, that the HIDTA's primary focus should be law enforcement. However, I firmly believe there should be a partnership with a proven drug treatment program, which the Baltimore-Washington HIDTA drug treatment program provides. I regret this bill hamstrings the HIDTA drug treatment program.

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I have been pleased to work with my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], in this vital battle against illicit drugs. He has given new meaning to the term ''war on drugs.'' I share his desire and that of many others in the Congress to get greater accountability from this administration in its less-than-effective efforts in the battle, our battle, against illicit drugs.

We surely need accountability from the drug czar now, more than ever, as our youth use soars. We also have 141,000 new heroin addicts in 1995, and those statistics keep growing. Heroin use among the young has reached historic levels.

I was distressed last week that not one piece of equipment or supplies to the Colombian National Police or military had been delivered under date under the President's 614 waiver of last August. We are losing that nation to narcoguerrillas. Witness the attacks on both their Joint Chiefs of Staff and the killings and executions of 17 National Police. More soldiers and judges are being killed or maimed as a result of their war.

The income for these narcoguerrillas is nearly $1 billion a year, and we are asking our friends in the CMP to fight this war on the cheap. ONDCP's reauthorization is a good legislative vehicle for reform and accountability for these shortcomings.

I fully support the efforts of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT]. I was pleased the gentleman was able to accommodate my concerns about section VII of the bill entitled, ''Reprogramming and Transfer of Funds.'' ONDCP now has reprogramming or transfer authority of over 2 percent of all the Governments and antidrug budgets, for example, the FBI's and DEA's.

The transfer authority has long created fear that substantial funds from law enforcement or interdiction could not be moved and later be used by this administration for treatment or media campaigns to the detriment of these equally important enforcement efforts.

To raise the ONDCP Director's transfer authority even higher to up to 5 percent of the budget of these agencies needs more counterbalance, checks and controls.

By providing the authorizing committees' as well as the appropriations

committees' approval for any such reprogramming, we built in strong protections, and I am pleased that the bill now provides for notice of approval under this provision to the Committee on International Relations, for example. We and other authorizing committees could then have some real meaningful input.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. KILPATRICK].

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member from Wisconsin for this opportunity to address the House.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation, primarily because I am not a member of the committee that reported this, and, as a result, because it is on the suspension calendar, I do not have an opportunity to offer amendments.

How can we put on the suspension calendar a bill so important to this Nation as the one before us this afternoon? Did you know that 850 tons of drugs leave Mexico, Peru, Colombia, and a couple other places in this world, destined to America, and that 600 tons of those drugs get into our country?

Drugs are the cancer of America. It is creating a cancer in our families and our communities and across this Nation. How then can we put this legislation on the suspension calendar and not allow 435 elected Representatives to debate the issue?

I oppose this legislation, mainly on that ground. I have a HIDTA in my district, high intensity drug trafficking area. I work with the community and the people who are part of that in my district.

But what we found in HIDTA is, yes, it is good on law enforcement, but it is poor on community input. It is poor on having proven programs participate in the HIDTA. The board of the HIDTA is law enforcement.

Yes, we need law enforcement, but we also need community input into the cancerous drug trade hampering America, and which, in my opinion, will really restrict America from being the fine country we have been as we move to the 21st century.

There have been no hearings on this legislation. How can a cancer such as drugs, 600 tons of it into our country, come before this Congress, with no hearings, and then be put on the suspension calendar?

I urge my colleagues to vote against this. Let it go to the Committee on Rules. Let it be debated before the full House of Representatives. We can cure this program, I am convinced of that, but not when we try to hoodwink Americans, not when we do not give our communities the support that they need.

This bill must go to the Committee on Rules. It must come on the Floor for open debate, so we can all debate it and amend it, and then send it on to the President.

I urge the defeat of this legislation. Let us come back and debate it. Until we deal with the drug problem in America, our seniors are not safe, our children have no opportunity, and this Congress will not be as effective as it ought to be.

Please defeat this legislation.

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I would enlighten the previous speaker and just indicate that there have been extensive hearings on this legislation, as there should have been, with regard to reauthorizing such a major component of our war against drugs, the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

The vote on this bill, H.R. 2610, is very simple: Any Member who is serious about getting tough in the war against drugs should vote for it. Anybody satisfied with the status quo or desiring to move backwards should vote against it. It is that simple.

The legislation did not all of a sudden develop. It was the result of extensive negotiations with the executive branch, both parties in this Congress, and the Senate. It reflects very extensive hearings that were held, including hearings with the GAO.

The GAO, which is a nonpartisan watchdog agency of our Government, has told us that long study has indicated to it that the current drug policy under the leadership of the ONDCP is not clear, it is not coordinated, it is not comprehensive, and it is not consistent. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that it has been largely ineffective.

This legislation, on the other hand, is clear, it is coordinated, it is comprehensive, and it is consistent; in short, a recipe for success where we have had failure in the past.

This is perhaps the most important vote to come before this body with regard to coordinating our war against mind-altering drugs since the original enabling legislation setting up the Office of National Drug Control Policy was passed in 1988.

Every Member here who is serious and wants to put their vote where their words are should vote for this piece of legislation. It is the by-product of extensive hearings, extensive material, and it will work.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I would say I reject the simplistic choices set forth by the gentleman from Georgia. They are not, in fact, the choices that are being made. I regret the gentleman is not listening to me, but to set up such a simplistic choice between A and B, and with the hypothesis if you are not for this bill, you are not for the drug fight, is absolutely incorrect. The gentleman is still not listening to me. C'est la guerre.

Madam Speaker, as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government, I rise to urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2610. This bill does not simply reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy, an office I strongly support, headed by Gen. Barry McCaffrey, who I think is doing an outstanding job. And we need to do more. There is no doubt about it, and he would be the first to say so.

It does, however, contain several controversial provisions affecting national drug policy. My colleague from Michigan is correct, we should have had an opportunity to offer amendments to this critically important legislation. Therefore, it should not be on the suspension calendar.

I want to address one provision, Madam Speaker, which would undermine the effectiveness of the high intensity drug trafficking areas. H.R. 2610 would prohibit the use of HIDTA funds to expand drug treatment programs.

There is not a law enforcement official I have talked to in the United States of America, and I would imagine the U.S. attorney from Georgia at one point in time did not have a law enforcement official that did not say if we could not get people off drugs, we are not going to win this war, period. That is the bottom line, and every law enforcement official I have talked to agrees with that.

The Washington-Baltimore HIDTA, created in 1994, is one of the most successful in the Nation. Check the statistics, one of the most successful in the Nation. One important reason is the program's tough sanctions-based drug treatment component.

Last year, that component caused the rearrest rate for drug-addicted notviolent offenders to plummet 38 percent below the national HIDTA average. Hear me, it is the only one that has the drug prevention, and it is 38 percent better in preventing recidivism than any other HIDTA program in America.

The program forces addicts into treatment, holds them responsible for staying clean, and continually checks their state of sobriety.

Madam Speaker, I would hope we would not defeat this bill. I would hope that temporarily we send it back to commit, give us the opportunity to address the shortcomings in this bill. Obviously, there is a lot of good in this bill. But in its current state, I will be unable to support it and would urge my colleagues not to support it in its current state.

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to address the gentleman from Maryland.

Madam Speaker, there is $2.9 billion dedicated to treatment and an extra $1

billion more than there were 3 years ago. The Baltimore-Washington HIDTA will continue. It is there. It can still coordinate that treatment. We have made sure that that treatment will flow into that area.

Madam Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

(Mr. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I rise in strong support of this bill. I think it is a tremendous improvement over current law and a reauthorization for the next 2 years of the National Drug Policy Office. I think, Madam Speaker, that we are not only not winning the war on drugs, we do not even have a war on drugs, not in the sense that most Americans would believe. We have not set up the kind of goals and missions and objectives that the military would fight if they were fighting a war.

This bill tries to go to some measure to do that. I think General McCaffrey has discussed doing it, is working on doing it. I would like to believe much of what is in here he would embrace and will ultimately do so. But we are charged as legislators with the responsibility of setting goals and objectives, and we are charged with putting this war on drugs on a real wartime footing, and that is what this bill does.

First of all, yes, there is 600 metric tons of cocaine coming into this country every year, and because of that, thousands of more young people's lives are being damaged by that result. The drugs that are coming in are purer and cheaper than ever.

In order to stop that, we have to have a balanced approach. We have to have interdiction, we have to have drug treatment, we have to have a supply and demand, education, all those things. But on the interdiction side alone, I would like to point out this bill sets a goal of interdicting at least 80 percent of the cocaine coming into this country every year.

We do not have a goal right now. They tell us that at least 60 percent has to be interdicted before the price will be driven up. If you drive the price of the cocaine up on the streets, far fewer kids are going to get the narcotics. That is the way it was 5 or 6 years ago. We were driving the price up, interdicting enough.

Now we are interdicting at best estimates 20 to 30 percent of the cocaine coming our way, not anywhere near the 60 percent. So the bill sets, among other things, a goal of 80 percent interdiction; 80 percent is a real goal. We then should know from the Drug Policy Office in a short duration what are the requirements to achieve that. What does it take? How many planes, how many ships, how much military involvement? Where do we draw the line? How do we proceed, and then this Congress should come back and provide whatever assistance it takes to do that, to win the war on drugs. I urge a yes vote for this bill. It is a good bill.

□ 1615

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

It is with a great deal of regret that I come to the floor to oppose this bill. It has never been a partisan issue to fight against drugs in this country. But the Republican majority is politicizing this whole effort, and by this legislation today, the essence of it, it is a political one and it is a partisan one. Let me explain it on two grounds.

First of all, there were no hearings in the committee on this legislation. There were not discussions with the administration to try to work out the bill that is now being presented to us. There were no processes where we could offer amendments on the floor today. This is being put on the suspension calendar to preclude any amendments to the bill.

Second, this takes an agency that struggled to stay out of partisan politics and imposes upon it a standard which dooms it to failure, sets it up for ridicule during the election cycle in the year 2000. The bill has targets for drug reduction. I am not against targets. But the targets have to be realistic, and the targets in this legislation are doomed to failure because the targets are set so unrealistically.

The bill requires the drug office to reduce adolescent drug use by 90 percent in 4 years. This chart that is before me shows that the largest reduction in teen use achieved in any 4-year period in the past was just 33 percent, not the 90 percent required in this bill.

What happens if we do not get a 90 percent reduction? Nothing, except the Republicans in the election year for President can say, look at the failure to achieve a 90 percent reduction in drug use by kids.

I would suppose that when we get to the tobacco issue my Republican colleague will support a 90 percent reduction in tobacco use in 4 years. There we have an easier time to deal with the problem, because we have a domestic manufacturer we can hold accountable. They control the distribution of their product. But I do not think anybody would say a 90 percent reduction is going to be achieved in illicit drugs in 4 years when it is so diffuse, it is so illegal, and with all the ramifications of distribution and use.

I feel that what we have here is a bill that is so unrealistic that we are being set up on a partisan basis for a failure, and then to politicize the effort by trying to have the Republicans attack the Democrats for that failure, this has never happened in the Congress before. We have always had opposition to drugs, the illicit traffic in drugs, opposition to drug use on a bipartisan basis, after hearings, after discussions, after votes, where amendments were offered and agreed to.

So I regret this, and urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation, and to insist that we go back to the regular order and have a realistic appraisal of what ought to be in a bipartisan effort to stamp out drug use.

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from California, I am dismayed at what he has said. This is not a partisan issue. It should never be a partisan issue, and we should not try to put up a partisan smoke screen to say this is why we should vote against this bill.

We had more than a dozen meetings with the White House. We had the drug czar's office included, and two personal meetings with the drug czar. We asked and complied with the drug czar on seven out of eight requests. The only request that he wanted is a 12-year reauthorization. We said, that is too long, nobody is responsible for 12 years, because the drug czars especially are not here for 12 years.

We are saying, let us look at 2 years and then go another 2 years, and let us get the job done. Let us hold ourselves and this administration and the law enforcement and treatment to tough standards in this country. Let us say that we are going to do this, we are going to cut teenage drug use in half. Is that too much? The 20,000 kids who die in this country in hospitals because of ODing and on street corners because of drug violence, to cut drug use in half in 4 years, is that too much? I do not think so.

An example, in 1985 to 1992 we cut by 79 percent the amount of cocaine used in this country. Why can we not cut by 50 percent by the year 2000, so we can start in the 21st century with less than we have now, half the amount of kids on drugs? This deserves a yes vote, and I ask for Members' support.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Madam Speaker, this reminds me of a press conference where there is a new football coach hired, and there is a lot of hoopla where they say, this coach is going to bring us to the Superbowl in 4 years. We are going to give him the tools to do it. Then the question is, how long is his contract? And the answer is 2 years. No one thinks they are serious. No one can say this is a serious attempt to end drug usage in this country, if you are not going to give General McCaffrey the time he needs to do it.

Madam Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] is recognized for 1 minute.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I deeply believe we have to do much better in the antidrug area, much better. I have spent, I think, more time in my district on this issue than any other, working with coalitions. If any issue needs a bipartisan approach, it is this one. This bill violates that, violates it. It extends the office tenure for only a couple of years. General McCaffrey does not support this bill. We should be working with him. Goals are set without relationship to what the office thinks is realistic. Let us not make this into a political football. Let us work together on this issue. Give us a chance to debate this on the floor with amendments, where we can improve it.

I urge a no vote, not so that we stop this bill but so that we can amend it, debate it, and pass it with the seriousness this problem deeply deserves.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2610, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2610, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2204, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1997

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 265 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 265

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. 2204) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. 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 recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 or rule XVI or section 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, 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 fifteen 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 of any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. 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 instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 265 is an open rule providing for the consideration of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1997. The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the activities and the programs of the Coast Guard for fiscal years 1998 and 1999.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation. The rule also contains a minor waiver of the Budget Act, waiving section 401 of the Budget Act of 1974 against consideration of the bill.

Section 401 prohibits consideration of legislation providing new entitlement authority which becomes effective during the current fiscal year. This waiver is needed because the bill removes the cap on severance pay for Coast Guard and warrant officers. The provision is meant to conform the Coast Guard with the other services; no other Coast Guard officer or other service's warrant officer has a cap on severance pay.

The rule also makes in order the Committee on Transportation's amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, which shall be considered as read.

There are two minor waivers needed for the committee substitute. The rule waives clause 7 of rule XVI relating to germaneness, and section 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The germaneness waiver is needed for an amendment adopted during full committee consideration of the bill which recognizes the community of Grand Haven, MI as Coast Guard City, U.S.A., and the budget waiver is needed because the committee substitute retains the severance pay cap removal that is in the original bill.

Further, the Chair, Madam Speaker, is authorized to grant priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In addition, the rule allows for the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce votes to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote. In addition, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

The Coast Guard is the primary Federal agency with maritime authority for the United States. It is a complex organization of ships, aircraft, boats, and shore stations. Title 14 of the United States Code provides that the Coast Guard is at all times an armed force of the United States.

I believe the Coast Guard has a very difficult task in carrying out its main missions of law enforcement, maritime safety, marine environmental protection, and national security. An average day for the Coast Guard includes, among other things, saving 32 lives, assisting 308 people, saving $8 million in property value, conducting 142 search and rescue missions, responding to 34 oil or hazardous chemical spills, conducting 128 maritime law enforcement boardings, identifying 97 violations of law, seizing 84 pounds of marijuana, and 148 pounds of cocaine. That is an average day for the Coast Guard.

The Committee on Rules hearing on this bill I think was extremely cordial. It was bipartisan. I am told that that is an accurate reflection, Madam Speaker, of the manner in which the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure handled the legislation, as well.

The bill was reported to the House by voice vote, as was the rule. I would like to commend both the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT], for their hard work on the bill.