

a physical element to it. But then they spend their time dealing with marine resources, specialty courses on oceanography and various aspects of marine resources. There are similar schools that have been set up on a county level for other purposes like that, whether it is sciences, or there is talk now with regard to arts programs.

I think the schools individually could not do that, but if they get together with some kind of consortium either through the county, the State or whatever, then they can set up something like that. Then again, that is the innovative idea. It is public. These are public school dollars that are being used to set up specialty type schools. I know this type of thing is a very important part of the gentleman's agenda, as well.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. The gentleman is absolutely correct, Mr. Speaker. What that does is open up for young people. We want them to be well-grounded in the basic foundation, but children learn a whole lot more earlier than we can have any idea, and have interests. That is how we get our astronauts, how we get our scientists.

With schools working together in consortia, or really outside the school, with various groups, there may be resources in the community they can pull in. Many schools are doing that in some areas, but they are doing it where they have substantial business interests who are putting the dollars in. But in some areas where those resources are lacking in terms of the tax base of the community or the school, and they do not have the business support because it is virtually nonexistent, then those children deserve the same opportunity. They deserve the same opportunity. They are just as talented.

I would venture to say if we take a sampling or checked every Member who serves in this United States Congress and in the Senate, we are going to find a lot of people serving in this body that came from Small Town, U.S.A. There are a lot of children today out in rural areas in Small Town, U.S.A., who can make major contributions if we give them that opportunity.

That is what the consortia is about, allow them to work together, because they do not have the money. They may not have the resources for all the Internet pieces they need. They may want to have a math high school. That is available in a lot of places and it works.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the other thing, too, when we talk about innovative programs like that where we get schools together on a county level or whatever to do something innovative, it is often difficult to get the local board of education to contribute dollars to something like that because they are locally based, and they figure it is taking it away, and so on. So that is a perfect example of where the Federal dollars become very attractive, and become a tool to provide excellence and to improve and provide more opportunities for public education.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, it is a lot like the farmer that seeded the ground and put some water on, because that local board, in many cases those dollars are allocated. It gets back to the issue you raised earlier as it relates to vouchers. It is not like taking new money. We are taking money away from the students who were out there, whether they be in the poorest community, the wealthiest suburban community, and the rural community. Ultimately, all children have less money, because you are funding a source that was not there before, because we have a lot of children who are not in the public schools.

That is their choice. I will say today that I will fight for their right to have that choice, but I will not support their right to take tax money and make that choice, because I do not think it is in the interests of all of our children. I do not think that is ever what was designed or intended when we talk about public education in this country. It is not taking public dollars and carrying it for private support.

Mr. PALLONE. The point is, we like to provide more alternatives, more choices, as the gentleman stated, but within the context of public education. We do not want the dollars taken away from public education. If we want to use the money to start some innovative programs at the existing schools, or to send kids in some sort of consortium, that is fine.

I know there have been a lot of experiments within, say, one school district, say it is a city and there are many elementary schools, in providing parents choices within the public school system. They can go to one school or another. But that is public dollars. That is still public education. There is a big difference between that and a voucher program that takes those dollars and uses it for private education.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Absolutely. I get a little frustrated at times, people talk about how schools have too much money, and some will say that. I do not know where they get that information.

I would say to them, anyone who feels schools have more money than they need, go talk to those PTA presidents, those PTA moms and dads who are out there selling candy and selling subscriptions to books and working at ball games in the evening, and taking the money from the concession and buying things schools need, that their children need.

That happens all across America. It is not restricted to urban areas, and not restricted to suburban areas, and it is certainly not restricted to rural areas. It is all across the country. Because that to me is the fact that parents want what is best for their children, and they are willing to go the extra mile to make sure that their children get that opportunity. When they do it and they spend those dollars and that time, it is not selfishly, for

just their child, it is for all those children in that public school.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to thank the gentleman again for his participation. I think this is what we have to do, exactly what the gentleman has done, which is to show how in various districts around the country efforts have been made to improve the public schools, whether it is basic skills or some of the other things we discussed tonight, and that is the direction in which this Congress and this House of Representatives should be going, clearly, not in the direction of taking the resources away for vouchers or other types of plans.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. He is absolutely right, that this country is what it is today because we have been able to stand on the shoulders of those who have given so much for so long in our public schools, under some very tough situations.

I am very happy tonight to be part of showing some success stories. I hope we will be about that in this body on both sides of the aisle, talking about the successes of our teachers and children, because if we criticize our schools, we are criticizing our children and teachers. I hope I am never guilty of that. I thank the gentleman for helping organize this.

THE WAR ON DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Pappas) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, the war on drugs is just that, a war. What I and a number of our colleagues will be talking about over the next 60 minutes or so is the war on drugs.

□ 1900

In my opinion, there are few issues that are facing the people of our country as important as that. And this dialogue that we are going to be having tonight is really a continuation of what has been going on around the country for many years now; unfortunately, many decades.

Mr. Speaker, each of us represents approximately 600,000 people in this House and unfortunately what had been a problem in maybe just certain urban settings 20, 30 years ago has now spread throughout suburbia and even into the rural areas of our country.

Each of us here took the oath of office to serve the people that elected us and the majority of the issues that we deal with seem to be about national defense, about our balanced budget plan, about providing for tax relief for the people of our country. Yet there is a generation that is growing up that is facing, in my opinion, a very uncertain future because of the drug culture that is so rampant throughout our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I want us to focus on a couple of things here tonight, something that we have debated here in this Chamber just recently, and that is what should our goal be? Is it, in fact, realistic to try to see our young people focus on something else other than drugs?

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] has asked us to focus upon a goal: Reducing the usage of drugs by teenagers from 6 percent to 2 percent by the year 2001.

Unfortunately, there were some Members in this Chamber just a few days ago that spoke about that as being unrealistic, one that was, as I understand their statements, meant to set the national drug czar's office up for failure. I know that that was not the intent. I think it was to set a goal that is important that we focus upon to try to see that become a reality.

In my district in central New Jersey, I have undertaken certain initiatives to try to speak out about this, use the small bully pulpit that I have been fortunate enough to have to challenge the young people of my district, and here challenge the young people throughout our country, to enter a poster in an essay contest. I wrote to each of the principals of the schools throughout the 67 towns in my district, and I asked them if they would give the young people in their schools an opportunity to participate. The theme is this: "What I can say yes to instead of drugs?"

We all know that back in the 1980s when Ronald Reagan was President, the First Lady, Nancy Reagan, undertook a "Just Say No to Drugs" campaign, and some were critical or somewhat cynical of that rather simple message, but it was very successful. This I would like to think is the next step, trying to focus on a positive aspect of the future possibilities that face our young people.

I believe that we as Members of Congress need to do whatever we can to focus our constituencies' attention to challenge not just people in education that are very dedicated to try to see young people get a good education, but to challenge people from all walks of life that we all have a stake in this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just mention a few statistics. I see I am joined by my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP], who I would like to yield to in a moment, but first I will list some statistics that were very sobering. This was from a report from Columbia University. They conducted a study that states 41 percent of high school students say they can get drugs easier in schools than on the streets. By the time the average teenager reaches the age of 17, 68 percent can buy marijuana within one day; 62 percent have friends who use marijuana; 58 percent have personally been solicited to buy marijuana; 43 percent personally know someone with a serious drug problem; 42 percent say that they can buy marijuana easier than beer and cigarettes.

That means youngsters throughout our country can purchase a banned, il-

legal and dangerous substance easier than they can purchase something freely that is sold in a store or any market. That should cause us all to be very concerned.

The efforts that I have described, this drug and poster contest, some people may make light of it, but based on the initial reaction that we have gotten just the other day, in fact, Congressman HASTERT and I held a hearing in Freehold Borough High School, which is the county seat in one of the counties that I represent. The gentleman from Illinois has been going all around the country holding these hearings to hear from the people on the front lines, the educators, people in law enforcement, people who are from community-based organization or religious institutions who are dealing with people struggling with this most important problem and hearing from them; hearing about local solutions to a national problem.

Mr. Speaker, that is something as someone who has served as a town council member, as a mayor, as a member of my town governing body, I am a great believer in local solutions to national problems. I believe that some of the most innovative ideas come from people in our communities and not from here in Washington, D.C., and not to be critical of our State governments, but maybe not even our State capitals, but from our communities, from our places of worship, and from our students.

We even had four schools participate in this hearing. Eight students wanted to speak, ask questions, or just express their positions, and I will get into that a little bit later.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP].

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding, and commend him and the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Pennsylvania for spending this time to focus on this issue. To the gentleman from New Jersey I will say they are on the way, there will be several speaking because this issue does not receive enough airtime in America today, this issue of drug and alcohol abuse.

This is an interesting fall, Mr. Speaker, because on the heels of an unprecedented bipartisan agreement to balance the Federal budget between the President and the Congress, the sea of public opinion is relatively calm. As a matter of fact, we heard two weeks ago national bipartisan surveys that indicated that there were no real issues that jumped off the page in surveys in the double digits when asked: What is the number one problem in America? Three issues were at 9 percent, but for the first time in many years the economy is good and people are relatively comfortable, so the sea of public opinion is relatively calm.

But let me say this, Mr. Speaker. I believe that what lurks underneath

that calm sea of public opinion today is extremely dangerous and we need to spend some time focusing on it and we need to raise the awareness of the American people, because as we face the turn of this great American century into what I hope and pray is another great American century, the 21st century, we need to recognize that the grandchildren of the baby boomers are becoming teenagers.

I served, Mr. Speaker, on the Bipartisan Task Force, and the gentleman from New Jersey spoke of the work of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT]. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] cochair a bipartisan working group here in the Congress on drug and alcohol abuse. We had a briefing a few months ago from Louis Freeh, the head of the FBI, who talked about numbers of teenagers. Because while violent crime and drug abuse is on the decline among grown people, it is on the increase among our teenagers and herein lies the problem.

We are on a collision course through the turn of the century. More and more teenagers, as a matter of fact, the bell curve in 2005 is the highest concentration of teenagers that we have had in the history of our country, we are told, more teenagers as a percent of our population than we have ever had. That is wonderful in a sense. It is the grandchildren of the baby boomers. But when suicide, violent crime and drug abuse is on the incline, and the number of teenagers is on the incline, and families are breaking down at unprecedented rates, it is a recipe for disaster and we must once again as a Nation come together at every level and recognize what this problem really is.

Mr. Speaker, we are told the common denominator of violent crime among teenagers in America, the most common denominator is fatherlessness. People without fathers as they are growing up have a much higher propensity to commit a violent crime. The number two common denominator is alcohol abuse. Drug and alcohol abuse is destroying our country.

Now, I know today things are relatively comfortable and many people might not recognize that, but it is true and we must address it. Drug and alcohol abuse is the manifestation of a hopelessness that is now an epidemic in this country, and what we need as we approach this next great American century is a zero tolerance policy at every level of our society on drug and alcohol abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I use the two together because many people talk about drug abuse and they overlook the fact that alcohol abuse is even more prevalent in our society than drug abuse. It is the number two common denominator of violent crime in our country and violent crime is going to be an even greater problem as we turn this century than it is today.

Now, what do we need to do about it? We need a balanced approach on substance abuse between prevention,

treatment, and interdiction. Today, if my memory serves me correctly, we spend about \$16 billion through the Federal Government fighting the drug war. About 20 percent of that money is spent on interdiction and, frankly, that is where we can actually document the most success at fighting the war on drugs, through interdiction.

The military is doing an excellent job. There are four supply countries. We actually now do a better job of intercepting drugs from those supply countries than we have ever done. The transit zone in Central America, we have really restricted the transit of illegal drugs into this country. But we are only spending 20 percent of our gross resources on interdiction, yet that is where the most success actually is today. We need to spend more money and help our military fight the international war on drugs. I really believe that.

We are spending a lot of money on prevention, and I think there are ways by block granting we can spend it more effectively. A lot of money is being spent on prevention. Prevention really starts at home. If we leave it up to the government to stop substance abuse, and we overlook the importance of the home, as Ronald Reagan used to say, the most important decisions in America are not made in Washington, D.C.; they are made around the dinner table of American families. Is that not true?

Treatment is an interesting piece of this, because I believe that treatment should be available in this country to anyone who wants it who has a substance abuse problem. But I can also say that I believe treatment works for people who want treatment, and treatment does not work for people who do not want treatment. That sounds obvious, but we are actually spending a lot of money providing treatment to people who do not even want to get better and, therefore, it is not successful.

Mr. Speaker, we need a balanced approach on all three aspects of fighting a real war on substance abuse, I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey. Not just a war of words, but a real attack on this.

Mr. Speaker, we need cooperation from the mayors who actually do not need to be lectured by those of us in Congress. They need our help. The district attorneys need our help. We need the administration, the Presidential administration to cooperate. And the Congress needs to get more serious about this issue as we approach the turn of the century than we have ever been.

We need to recognize this is a national crisis. It is ripping apart the fiber of our society, drug and alcohol abuse, and it is going to take a team effort to fight it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], who serves as the distinguished cochairman of our task force, he actually has said at several meetings that he did not really appreciate Nancy Reagan when she was First Lady, but he misses her now and

he said, at least then, somebody was saying that it was important to just say no to drugs. Now, we do not have that focus, and there is something about all of us leading by example and hammering away at this issue that this is a national crisis, drug and alcohol abuse.

It is going to take a team effort. We need to get underway. I appreciate this night being a start and a step in the right direction. I commend the Members of this freshman class for bringing this issue to the floor, and I thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to my friend the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend. I hope that Mrs. Reagan is watching. And if not, we will have to see that she gets a copy of this to pay tribute to her dedication to this effort. It is one that is so important.

Mr. Speaker, just earlier this month I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 267. It is a Sense of the Congress Resolution, and it basically states and encourages citizens of our country to remain committed to do whatever we can to combat the distribution, sale, and illegal use of drugs to our Nation's youth and by our Nation's youth.

□ 1915

For those of my colleagues who are here who have yet to become cosponsors of this particular resolution, I certainly would encourage them to do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to another member of our freshman class, my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SESSIONS].

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, for yielding to me.

I am glad to be here today because the problem of drugs in our country is dire and urgent. There is a moral crisis in America.

I want to use some of the data published in a report by the House Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs and Criminal Justice to illustrate just how bad this moral crisis is.

The report entitled, National Drug Policy: A Review of the Status of the Drug War, details the startling use and rise of drug use among Americans, all Americans, but most especially those that are young Americans.

According to the 1994 Michigan University study, 13 percent of eighth graders experimented with marijuana in 1993. That is almost twice the 1991 level. Experimentation among 10th graders increased about two-thirds the previous 3 years. And daily use among high school seniors was up by half over the 1993 levels. Increasing use was also reported in 1994, by the Drug Abuse Warning Network Data, which collected data from emergency rooms around the country on drug-related emergencies in 1993. That data showed an 8 percent increase in drug-related emergency room cases between 1992 and 1993, 45 percent of which were heroin overdoses. Cocaine was also at an

alltime high, having almost doubled since 1988, and marijuana emergencies increased 22 percent between 1992 and 1993.

1995 data is even worse. The National Household Survey, released in September 1995, shows that overall drug use among kids, ages 12 to 17, jumped 50 percent in 1994, from 6.6 to 9.5 percent. The National Pride Survey of 200,000 students shows that one in three American high school seniors now smokes marijuana. There has been a 36-percent increase in cocaine use among students in grades 9 through 12, from 1991 to 1992, and hallucinogen use by high schoolers has risen 75 percent since 1988 and 1989.

Finally, October 1995 DAWN data says that in 1994, cocaine-related episodes reached their highest level in history and registered a 15 percent increase from 1993, and a 40 percent increase from 1988.

On top of this, marijuana or hashish-related emergencies rose 39 percent from 1993 to 1994. And total drug-related emergency room cases rose 10 percent between 1993 and 1994.

The reason we are here today is to call on all Americans to join in this fight against drugs. As we know, this is Red Ribbon Week across America. That is what those red ribbons are there for. That is why we are calling on Americans now to join with us at this time to fight drugs.

But parents can also start by demanding that their children and the schools that they attend, that they learn to be drug free. The fight against drugs must be waged in churches, schools and by every family in America. Kids should report drug dealers to their teachers, and parents and teachers need to do what they know is right by leading by example and doing the right thing. And that is by saying, no. I also wish adults had the courage to do the same thing.

Currently, there is also a drug that has taken hold in neighborhoods throughout America, and this is wreaking havoc. This drug is called methamphetamine or it is called speed, crank or crystal. If there is a drug that enslaves the mind and destroys the soul, this is it.

According to a report by the Drug Enforcement Administration, and I quote, the extreme agitation and paranoia associated with the use of methamphetamine often leads to situations where violence is more likely to occur. Chronic use of methamphetamine can cause delusions and auditory hallucinations that precipitate violent behavior or responses. End of quote.

This is a violent drug that devastates the user. DEA Administrator Constantine, in a statement, attested to the horror of this drug, when he said, and I quote, during the summer in New Mexico a father, while high on methamphetamine, beheaded his 14-year-old son. Administrator Constantine also described how a mother and 3 young children under 5 were recently seriously burned when a meth lab exploded

causing a fire in their home. Two of the children were rushed to the hospital in critical condition and one died. The responsible father fled the scene, abandoning his critically injured family before rescue teams arrived to assist them.

Methamphetamine, just like other drugs, is a cancer on our society. In 1994, there were over 700 methamphetamine-related deaths in the United States. In several cities, meth-related deaths are up over 50 percent in the last three years. And in 1995 alone, the DEA seized 241 methamphetamine laboratories.

Methamphetamine is easier to manufacture in the United States because its precursor chemicals are more readily available. If the penalties for the manufacture of this killer drug do not deter its production within our borders, how are we going to stop its rising use? I think we should make punishment more severe so that we push it out of America's cities and towns.

It is important to note that the danger from those chemicals used in the manufacture of methamphetamine is immense. They are highly flammable and explosive and can cause extensive damage to first responders, including law enforcement, firefighters and civilians, as well as devastation to our environment.

We must give law enforcement the tools to deal with this epidemic efficiently by getting those drug thugs off our streets. I believe that those involved in the manufacture and distribution of methamphetamine should spend the rest of their lives in prison. I have drafted a bill to do just that, the Speed Manufacturing Life in Prison Act of 1997.

This legislation will help stem the rise in methamphetamine production by giving those involved in the manufacture and distribution of methamphetamine a mandatory sentence of life in prison.

This is just one way to address the problem of drugs in our society. Unfortunately, in Washington, there are many who cannot even agree how to address the problem.

According to the General Accounting Office, the bipartisan watchdog agency of the Federal Government, the current drug policy under the leadership of the Office of National Drug Control Policy is not clear. It is not coordinated. It is not comprehensive, and it is not consistent.

It is no wonder we are here tonight calling on the families and communities of America to help us solve this problem. To save our children we will have to all work together and, if we do that, we can ensure that the lives of our children are safer, more productive and free of the drugs that can cripple the mind and destroy the soul.

I want to thank the gentleman for being here tonight. I want to thank my good friend from New Jersey for allowing me the opportunity to speak on this important subject tonight.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for his participation. We have spoken about this, and I commend him for the leadership that he has shown and the legislation that I think I am an original cosponsor of.

Mr. SESSIONS. You are.

Mr. PAPPAS. We have spoken about a number of specific areas of the country and a number of drugs in particular that people are abusing. I know we have spoken about heroin. I know you have some thoughts. I am wondering if you would share that.

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes. We have a terrible problem in Texas. Just outside of Dallas, in a neighboring community, we have had a minimum of eight heroin-related deaths by teenagers in the last year. Of course, this is causing a lot of inward thought to the community. And I want you to know that every single time those parents say, please talk about the problem, please tell the story, because many of them did not even recognize that their children were even on drugs. So this is why I think this is important. I thank you for bringing that up.

Mr. PAPPAS. I thank you very much.

We are joined by yet another member of our class, my friend from Arkansas. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas in a moment.

Before I do that, I know that we all have heard an awful lot about those in our society that think that the answer is to legalize certain drugs and that that will unclog our court system. And I disagree.

Just last week I met with a group of police chiefs from one of my counties in the district, Hunterdon County. When I concluded my remarks and I just made my last pitch, so to speak, to indicate that my door is always open to them and I hope that they do not feel that they cannot offer a suggestion or a viewpoint, if it is unsolicited, one of the comments that one of the gentlemen made was that a response that some have to our drug epidemic of legalization is not the answer, sending the exact wrong signal.

I know that the gentleman from Arkansas, my friend, who is here joining us has had a very distinguished career in many capacities. Certainly, I am glad to see him here tonight, certainly glad to serve with him in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. I am grateful that he has taken the leadership in addressing this very important subject. Hopefully, by our discussion, we can center some legislative activity but, most importantly, some momentum in our country to reinforce and reinvigorate the war against drugs.

I approach this subject as a former Federal prosecutor, serving in the Reagan Administration as United States Attorney, but more importantly, I approach this subject as a parent. I have raised three teenagers. I

have another one coming. I know the struggles that parents go through in dealing with this very, very tough issue, because it truly affects all families.

I think back during the 1980s, when I was a United States Attorney and my wife Susan was involved in "Just Say No" clubs, starting them in the schools, encouraging young people to think about their decision and their commitment in regard to drugs.

This last week I had a very interesting experience. I serve on the House Committee on the Judiciary on the Subcommittee on Crime. We had a hearing in the Subcommittee on Crime in which we had a witness who we called Mr. Rodriguez, which is not his real name, but he assumed that name to protect his identity. He further protected himself by coming to testify before Congress with a hood over his face to protect him further. And he was from New York City. He was in prison. He had pled guilty to drug trafficking.

He was the number two person in the New York City branch of the Medellin drug cartel out of Colombia. So he is about as high as one can get in that drug structure in New York City.

He testified about the drug federation, the Medellin federation. He testified as to his experience, the organization, trying to shed some light on what Congress can do, on what our country can do as we fight this devastating disease called drugs.

As he testified, he talked about his organization which outmans and outguns law enforcement agencies on both sides of the border, both in Colombia and here, an organization that resorts to bribery, to kidnapping, to intimidation and murder to protect their trade and profits.

He described the organizational structure in which we could see it, just like any organizational chart, the Medellin federation has consultants, financial and tax, administrative, legal, political, media. They have their operations for payments and deliveries, their security, their international operations for their shipments, their New York City branch. They have their distribution outlet, their deliveries, their warehouses and so on.

□ 1930

It is an organization that is as sophisticated as any business organization in America. But what is of interest, I believe, as I talked to him, I asked him four common sense questions that I think a lot of people in America would ask someone in that position in the drug trade.

The first question I asked him was, how would he compare the resources of the drug organizations to the resources of law enforcement here in the United States? And I asked this same question in a previous hearing to the head of the FBI, the head of the Drug Enforcement Administration, and I got the same answer out of both. And the answer was, for Mr. Rodriguez, that he saw the resources tilting a little bit more on the

side of the drug federation, the drug cartel, and the drug organization.

This flabbergasts me, that in a country as large as the United States we are outgunned, we are outmanned, and they have more resources on the opposite side. The point of that question and answer is that we have to have a commitment of resources, yes enormous resources, in this country to win this war.

The next question I asked him was, what is the greatest weapon that drug dealers fear that law enforcement has? And the answer surprised me. His answer was extradition. And, of course, he is speaking as someone who was from Colombia that is in New York City, and from the Colombia perspective, the worst thing that could happen is that a drug dealer was extradited to the United States.

I asked him to elaborate on that. He said they cannot fix the system in the United States. That is what we have going for us, is the integrity of our justice system. We can never let our prosecutors, our judges be attacked, our system be attacked, and get in the hands through bribery, through intimidation, of these drug dealers, as it has in other countries in South America and in Mexico.

And then I asked him the question, the third question, does he and his other drug dealers use cocaine or other illegal drugs? And his answer was no, of course not, it is bad for business. And a drug dealer has the understanding, the sophistication, to know how dangerous drugs are. And if they understand it, our young people certainly must get that message very clearly.

Then the final question I asked him was, what advice would he, as a person who is waiting prison time, what advice would he give a young person who is confronted by a drug dealer? And his answer was, as he stood there in prison garb with a hooded mask over his face, he said, look at me, do you want to wind up where I am? I hope our young people can think seriously and the parents can think seriously about the end result of drug dealing, of using drugs.

But he did indicate that we are making progress. The encouraging word, the sophistication of law enforcement in dealing with money laundering, in financial transactions is really making it tough on the drug dealers. So we are making some progress.

I see when I look at the drug problems, not just statistics but life stories, and when I was a United States attorney we looked at New York City as a far off territory, but I can cite numerous instances in which the drugs went straight from Colombia to New York City and straight from New York City to my State of Arkansas and then into the hands of teenagers. It was 98 percent pure cocaine. And with that level of not being diluted, it was straight from Colombia through New York City. What happens in New York City, what happens in Chicago, what happens in Dallas affects us in the

rural areas. So this hooded witness impacts us all.

And then I think about that young teenager who went to a high school in Arkansas, who never used drugs, who spoke against drugs in high school, and went to a college campus and in a short amount of time was free-basing cocaine. Why do I tell that story? It is because this could happen to anyone, and we have to clean up our high schools, we have to clean up our campuses, and we have to have an ever vigilant society in this dangerous situation.

How do we win the war on drugs? It is commitment, commitment of resources, and then I think just as importantly, it is consistency. We were starting to make progress and win the war in the late 1980's and early 1990's and then we changed direction in 1992. And as soon as we did that, the teenage use of drugs went up. Marijuana, experimentation with cocaine went up and we started losing. We did not have the resources. Now we are starting to get back there, but we cannot change our commitment and the consistency we have to fighting this drug war.

I know I have taken a little bit longer than I intended to. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. I commend him for this. There is not a more important subject that we deal with in the United States Congress. But we have to put the resources in it, and the answer comes from every family, every community, every city in America who must take the bull by the horns and deal with this important issue.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, and before he leaves, I want to compliment him not just on his statements here tonight, but also I can recall the early part of this year, I think the gentleman was one of the first members of our class that said we need to talk about this, and I am glad he is here and I hope we will continue to do this.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member from central New Jersey, I frequently get visits from students in my district. It is about a 4-hour drive by car or bus, and I have been amazed at the number of students that have visited me here. But while I am home in New Jersey, I spend an awful lot of time visiting schools and speaking to students, all age categories, and I try to challenge them and ask them the question, where do they see themselves in 5 years, in 10 years, in 15 years, and try to make them realize that the choices they make now in grammar school, in middle school, and high school have a tremendous effect upon where they are going to be 5, 10, 15 years from now. We all need to challenge them.

We are joined now by another distinguished member of our class, and I would like now to yield to my friend from Illinois [Mr. SHIMKUS].

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for running this hour for this message. It is one that I really get fired up about. I remember harking back to

even the campaign days when this issue would come up, it stirs emotions in many of us, and my perspective comes from, I guess, the different jobs that I have held before coming to this floor, one being that of a military officer.

We have done ourselves a great disservice by calling this a war on drugs, because we have never significantly started a campaign. We have not identified the resources. We have not focused the attention. We have not really, unfortunately, decided to fight a war on drugs. We like to use the verbiage, and I am aghast at it. So I wish we would get that out of our lexicon until we are ready to do it, until we are ready to fight the war on drugs.

I think three things have to be done, and I think we are taking some steps in the right direction, but I do not want skirmishes, I want a war on drugs. I want to drive it from the land.

A couple of things. We need to, as we did this year in the House, we need to say let us put military forces on the border and stop drugs coming across the country's border. And on the House floor we said let us put 10,000 troops there because this is a serious conflict that we are in and we need a serious commitment. So we have to do everything in our power to stop the importation of drugs from outside the Continental United States.

Second thing is, and my colleague from Arkansas has had great experience, we have to punish the drug pushers. We need to identify them, which we can. They are on the streets. We need to arrest them. We need to lock them up. They need to be breaking rocks. They need to be sweeping streets. They need to be chained up so that they are an example. There is an example, when kids see a chain gang sweeping the streets of drug pushers. So if they do the crime, they do the time. And, of course, we have a judicial system that does not support that.

The third thing is we just need to look at ourselves. And I am going to say shame on my colleagues who used drugs in high school that are still abusing drugs as adults. And I am going to say shame on the entertainment industry who glorifies the use of drugs. And I am going to say shame on the professional athletes who glorify drugs or abuse drugs. Because what this is all about is our children, and they are looking at the folks in the entertainment industry, they are looking at their parents, they are looking at sports leaders and idols, idolizing them, wanting to be like them. But we have adult leadership in our Nation, adult idols, and I hate to use the word "adult" because they are still caught in a juvenile world that thinks drug use is cool, and so we have to get that message out.

An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. We need to work on preventing the first use by children of drugs. We can stop it at the border if we commit ourselves, we can arrest the

pushers if we commit ourselves, but if we do not educate the children to make good choices, then those others are for naught.

As a former teacher, as a West Point graduate, we lead by example. Children are crying out for leadership. They are crying out for good examples. And we as a society continue to fail our most vulnerable, which are our children.

Our message is simple: Nancy Reagan was right. Just say no. The current administration is wrong when they laugh about it and they send the wrong message. We need to take the moral high ground. We need to talk to our kids. We need to plead with them. We need to lead by example. We need to just say no. If we truly love our children, we will tell them just say no. We will spend time with them and we will work with them.

And to the gentleman from New Jersey, I again thank him for this opportunity. It helps air out some major concerns that I have that I do not get to address many times in some of the other forums.

One of these days, and I just hope we get serious and that we will move in the right direction. As I see so often in this body, we really have no national policy on specific issues. We pick here and we pick there and there is no coordination. I would ask the drug czar to be a little bit more coordinating in these efforts.

Mr. PAPPAS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois, and knowing of his family and seeing him with his boys here sometimes on the floor of the House, I know what he has said is heartfelt.

Mr. Speaker, Monday, when we had that hearing back in my district in Freehold Borough High School, I mentioned that there were some students from three or four different schools in my district. One of them was the Manalapan Township High School, and there were eight students interested in coming forward and speaking their minds, and I would like to mention a couple of the things they said, because it really bears repeating.

Several of them said that we need to put more emphasis on stopping drugs from coming across the border, north or south. Many of them mentioned that in their opinion the education system does not solve anything; that there needs to be more younger people closer to their age to speak to them about why doing drugs is not going to do anything for them in their future.

Some view that the discipline that they are given is not very good. One of the students spoke that there is a smoking area outside of the school where some of the students congregate to smoke and a teacher or guard gives them some sort of a detention slip as punishment, and that they believe, the students believe, that more needs to be done to prevent even kids from smoking, which I believe is illegal for minors.

I will speak about some of their other suggestions a little bit later, but now

we are joined by my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, and I would like to yield to him.

□ 1945

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding and commend him for bringing this topic to the floor and allowing us to share a little bit tonight with each other and with the American people about an issue that is so crucial to the future of our country. I am a parent of 4 children. What I bring with me here to Washington is my hopes and dreams and aspirations for my children and all children just like them throughout the country. Tonight we have focused quite a lot on the drug abuse problem and juveniles and what our hopes are for children in America and I want to talk about that and what we can do as conservatives and as Republicans here in this Congress and focus for a moment, if you will, on some of the programs that exist. But again with the underlying thought being, what is it that we can best do to safeguard the future for our children in a positive and constructive way?

Mr. Speaker, government programs are nice. In fact some even work. But when it comes to improving the general virtue of American children, few things matter more than fathers, faith and fortune. Sure, there are examples of public programs that have turned around the lives of youngsters, stood in where families were nonexistent or provided support where it was needed most. Virtually every social worker and counselor I have ever met genuinely cares about the youth they serve and are dedicated to straightening out juvenile lives.

However, after 10 years in public service as a Colorado State Senator and a United States Congressman, I have come to the frank conclusion that too many government programs aimed at helping wayward youths fall far short of achieving their noble goals. The anecdotal stories of adolescents rescued from their troubled settings are regarded by grant writers and politicians to be all that is necessary to justify heftier appropriations from public coffers. Yet what public officials frequently fail to consider are the untold millions of young Americans robbed of economic opportunity by the mammoth bureaucracies inevitably created by an expanding welfare state.

Always I ask how much a juvenile program spends per successful case. The calculation more often than not is dismaying. More vexing is the frequency of the worn retort, "But, Congressman, if it helps only one child, isn't that worth it?" When will we ever wake up and realize that our government spends too much on a welfare state that hurts children by making bureaucrats the gatekeepers of prosperity? The national debt has soared as a direct result of unbridled spending jeopardizing not only present income,

but the future incomes of many generations. A child born today owes \$20,000 as his share of the present debt. Over the course of his working life, the interest on that debt will amount to \$200,000. For every child in America, this means less money for their education, less money for their insurance, less money for their college education and instead of capital to draw on to build their families and fortunes, heavy taxes to pay off the debt. No new Federal youth program no matter how ingenious can replace the security of these essential items of self-sufficiency. With such tall odds is it any wonder that today's youngsters feel disconnected from society, lose hope, experience great anxiety, and rebel against the rest of us?

Worse yet, the common family feels powerless to offer answers. In 1950 the median family of 4 paid just 3 percent of its income to the Federal Government in taxes. Today that figure has risen to 24 percent. When State and local taxes are thrown in, the typical family of 4 now pays 40 percent of its income in taxes to the government. The results of this disastrous policy are only too apparent. Even as its punitive tax policy discourages child rearing by traditional middle class families, the Federal Government continues to subsidize illegitimacy and broken homes. By placing crippling financial burdens on two-parent families, our government is essentially engineering social collapse. One need only consider the current juvenile crime statistics. Teenagers account for the largest portion of all violent crime in America. In 1995, those under the age of 18 were responsible for almost 2 million violent crimes, more than one-fifth of all violent crime. It is reasonable to ask, where are their parents? While marriage and the stable two-parent family remain the most essential and central social unit in America, outrageous rates of divorce and out-of-wedlock births are destroying this crucial institution and weakening the development of the next generation. More and more children must grow up with little guidance from a parent who loves them. Youth violence is dominated by boys. More murder and robbery is committed by 18-year-old males than any other group. Research tells us the likelihood that a young male will engage in criminal activity doubles if he is raised without a father and triples if he lives in a neighborhood with high concentrations of single-parent families. 72 percent of adolescent murderers grew up without fathers and 60 percent of America's rapists grew up in homes without fathers.

On the other hand, children living with both biological parents are up to 4 times less likely than other children to have been expelled or suspended from school. The tax burden on families with children has raised the cost of having children and forced many couples to endure a tradeoff between time at home and time spent at work earning money to support the family. The

tax system no longer helps families raising young children. Rather than defend the family and encourage marriage, the Tax Code does just the opposite. That is primarily due to the erosion of the personal exemption by inflation and steep increases in payroll taxes.

Simply put, children need fathers. They need parents at home. They need an America offering economic promise, which strengthens the lot of parents and a society providing hope for economic participation, particularly at a young age. But economics is not the only place pro-family leaders should look for solutions. America's moral decline is more often cited by experts as the fundamental cause of family instability. More than 4 out of 5 Americans, that is 83 percent, when polled, say they are deeply concerned about our moral and religious well-being as a Nation. They know we will never effectively reach out to America's youth by avoiding the essential challenge, the lack of spiritual life in society.

As elected representatives, all political leaders ought to be able to discuss the need for spiritual renewal. And we should not be ridiculed and castigated for discussing the spiritual life of our society. Clearly our moral problems are too great to remain silent. Fortunately, where matters of faith are concerned, things are frankly not as bad as the media would have us believe. The fact that the majority of adults in this country believe there is a moral crisis in America is pressing policymakers to the conclusion that there are definite rights and wrongs when it comes to immorality. On increasing occasions, politicians are hearing from constituents their belief in the values of faith, family, community, responsibility, accountability, and they desperately want others, particularly their elected representatives, to believe in them, too.

For America's youth, inclusion in a pious society is perhaps the greatest hope. It is clearly here where we can do the most to stem juvenile violence. A recent survey found that 93 percent of the American people believe in God. Historian Will Durant once concluded that the soul of the Nation is its religion. By that standard the American people are returning to the divine in record numbers. It would be the height of abuse if children were denied the chance to know the God who made them and the glorious truth of His presence among us today.

On this point it becomes apparent that despite the best intentions of the Federal Government, this government is unable to fully embrace wayward youths in the wholesome custom that American people deep down know is needed. The notion of it takes a village is an errant message for Americans precisely because in America the village is too big and too impersonal to really care.

Public institutions and bureaucracies cannot love. They possess no resources or emotion

of their own to constitute true charity, and they are incapable of instilling the faith upon which our forefathers built a great nation.

The only thing bureaucracies do well is spend other peoples' money, and they do it with reckless abandon on the chance that a program or two will actually hit its mark. That chance is far too great when a child's future stands in the balance.

Sure government should legitimately continue to maintain a minimal safety net to save children from poverty, and protect their physical health, etc. But if America is serious about reserving moral decay and social disintegration for the sake of juvenile behavior we need to find ways to allow private, and faith-based charities to lead the way; for only they are unrestrained in conveying family values and moral precepts in godly terms that children need and understand. Moral absolutes are good but rarely exist in government settings.

America's youth deserve a country that believes the Right to pursue Happiness is for real, that this right is unalienable, endowed by God and secured for every child. They deserve an America where government rewards honest hard work and respects the authority of families, where they are not unjustly taxed and where jobs are not regulated away.

For juveniles to behave like Americans, they must be allowed to embrace the American Dream. They must be treated like real Americans and given the moral backing to thrive in a free society full of opportunity.

Mr. PAPPAS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his enthusiastic comments and his dedication to his family and to our country.

I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I would like to thank and congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey for initiating this hour and this issue that we are talking about, I believe the most important issue facing this country. Our children, our young people, our future and the problem they face of drug use, which has just grown immensely. They have often talked about a war. I have not seen a war. As I look back on war, it is life and death. It is fighting till death takes over, or we win the war. I have not seen a war in this country. We may have called it a war, but it is a life and death issue, and I have not seen many leaders in this country that have made drugs a life and death issue.

When we look at what goes on with professional sports today, how many football players in the National Football League and the National Basketball Association and Major League Baseball which is holding a World Series game tonight, how many of their players have had multiple drug use, have been arrested for drugs, have sold drugs and continue after some short penalty to be a leader in this country, a model that our young people look up to and they have had multiple drug crimes, multiple instances where they have used drugs in this country, a terrible example that we have allowed.

Television and the movie industry have glorified drug use. The results of that have been 47 percent of 14-year-

olds today say they can buy marijuana within a day. That is half of our young people. 76 percent of high school students and 46 percent of middle school students say that drugs are kept or used or sold on school grounds. 29 percent of high school students and 12 percent of middle school students say that a student in their school died in the past year from an accident related to alcohol or drugs, an astounding figure. 56 percent of high school students and 24 percent of middle school students have attended a party in the past 6 months where marijuana was available. 41 percent of high school students and 18 percent of middle school students have reported seeing drugs sold in school or on school grounds. High school students say that 50 percent of their peers are using drugs at least monthly. 35 percent of teens cite drugs as the most important problem they face.

Every youth group that I speak to, and I never turn one down, and some we organize and we bring them into our district from schools all over our congressional district. We used to do it in the Senate district when I served in State government, and we have panels of issues where we are teaching them about government and talking about issues, the number one issue they want to talk about is drugs. Why is it that young people bring it up again and again? Because they are scared, because they know in some instances that they do not do drugs and that they do not participate in alcohol. They are looked at as some kind of a square, they are not cool, they are not part of the in group. There is a little bit of good news. In 1996, there may have been some good news. Our overall current has remained about the same as last year and currently illicit drug use among teens 12 to 17 years old appears to have declined for the first time since 1992. However, current drug use among 18 to 25-year-olds is still on the rise. While teenage use of marijuana in the past month appears to have declined, in 1996 first-time use of heroin and cocaine has increased. Heroin and cocaine is in our small towns. It is in rural America. It is not just in the cities. Many people made fun of or made light of the Just Say No campaign. But as we look back, even those who criticized it at the time realized it was a crystal clear message. There was no way you could dispute it. There was no way you could not understand.

During that period of time, drug use was really declining. We were making major progress. And then we come to the current administration, the Clinton-Gore administration. Since they have been in office, marijuana use is up 140 percent. LSD use overall is up 183 percent. Use of LSD has reached its highest rate since they began keeping statistics in 1975. Fully 11.7 percent of the class of 1995 have tried it at least once, LSD. And we all know the dangers of that drug. The number of cocaine and heroin-related emergency

room admissions has jumped to historic levels. Perhaps most troubling is the rise in teen drug use during the Clinton administration. The number of 12 to 17-year-olds using marijuana has doubled. Teenage use of cocaine is up 166 percent.

I think a lot of that has been this ambiguous message, no clear message. What are the costs? The costs are unmeasurable. Loss of loved ones. How many of us know a friend who has died? How many of us know a family who has lost a child? The juvenile suicide rate has skyrocketed. I have two granddaughters, Tara and Nicki. Tara is in seventh grade and Nicki is in fourth. My number one concern as a grandparent is their exposure to drugs in school because they are there. The school administration last year thought I was overevaluating the issue. But last spring at the close of the year, two 6th graders were arrested with drugs. The greatest problem facing this country is out of control use of drugs. Our young people are exposed to it on a daily basis. It is an issue that we must make the number one issue in this country. We must start a war on drugs.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I get the same thing from students in my district. It is the number one issue as well. I now want to turn to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] and yield to him.

Mr. THUNE. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding and credit him with the great work he has done in introducing a resolution which I think calls attention not only to the problem, helping define the problem, but also in terms of the solutions and where we need to look for solutions. I am proud to be a part of the effort tonight to draw attention to this important issue. If we look at what the future of our country depends upon and where America is headed, I do not think there is any problem that is more pervasive and more terrifying than is drug use in this country. Substance abuse is clearly public health enemy number one.

If we look at the effects, they are seen in our Nation in so many different ways, from crime, to violence, to welfare dependency, to divorce, family breakup, domestic violence, child abuse, high health care costs, the spread of AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases. The cost to our society according to a recent estimate is some \$400 billion a year.

□ 2000

I have always thought that my State of South Dakota, is somewhat immune from these pressures, but we are seeing an increasing evidence of drug use there as well. In fact, drug-related arrests have risen dramatically. In 1991, there were 1,308 drug related arrests. In 1995, there were 3,000. We are seeing a pervasive problem all over the country. It is something that I want to credit my friend from New Jersey for drawing

attention to, and I hope that we can continue to have a dialog about what we might do as a country, as communities, as families, as churches, to attack this problem and deal with it in a very realistic way.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I hope that this is the beginning of how our House can continue to focus on this most important issue.

THE WAR ON DRUGS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON] and I would like to carry on a little bit of this discussion on drug use in America. As I mentioned just previously, we have seen in my state of South Dakota drug use rise in a dramatic way. The number of arrests has almost tripled in the last four years' time.

I want to draw particular attention to one instance that I was recently informed about, which is a good example of this. In July of 1995, drug agents in Lincoln County, South Dakota, got warrants to search a home in the City of Worthing.

Now, Worthing is not what you would call a hot bed of criminal activity. It had a population of 371, but even Worthing, South Dakota, is not immune to the problem of drugs.

When agents entered the home they found what you might expect to find in any home around this country, and that is someone cooking. The only difference was this person was using a recipe from something called the Anarchist Cookbook. He was not cooking with food, he was cooking with chemicals. When agents entered that home in Worthing, a community of 371 people, they found the beginnings of a methamphetamine lab. The man in the home had a wide array of chemicals spread out, and he was trying various combinations, trying to come up with the perfect recipe to cook up a good batch of meth.

Well, eventually he did find the right recipe. I am happy to report, thanks to South Dakota law enforcement agencies, he is now serving a second stint in the South Dakota State Penitentiary. But it goes to show that no city, no matter how large or how small, is immune from the problem of drugs.

That does not mean our communities cannot fight back. There are important initiatives going on all over our State, I believe all over this country, that are attempting to address this important problem in ways that are very practical, very realistic, and I think get at the heart and the core of what the problem is.

If you drive into South Dakota today, you will see when you arrive on the interstate one of 14 different bill-

boards. It says "Warning: If you bring illegal drugs into South Dakota, plan to stay a long, long time." It looks something like this, but you will see it anyplace you enter our state.

These signs are not the result of some piece of Federal legislation, they are not the result of some Federal grant or program. Every billboard is sponsored by a local business. No tax dollars are used. It is an effort coordinated with the state, with local businesses and the cooperation of the private sector, to keep drugs out of our states and out of our communities.

South Dakota is doing other things as well, particularly in the area of our schools. In the largest city in our state, police officers are not only fighting drugs from the police department. They are fighting the war from the hallways of the city's high schools.

Each high school has its own full-time police officer. Each officer has an office at the school. When they walk their beat, they are walking past lockers, past the gymnasium, into the school parking lot, and back through the cafeteria.

The students do not just see the cops when the law is broken. They see officers every day under all kinds of circumstances in the hallways at their schools. These officers are forming bonds with kids, and kids are learning the very fundamental fact that cops are not bad people.

These officers are also able to keep an eye on drug traffic in the schools while keeping an eye on the kids. They talk to students, they talk to parents, they talk to teachers, and they all work together to keep our schools drug free.

People in South Dakota are working at every level to fight the war on drugs. Not long ago a 15 year old came to the attention of the South Dakota Juvenile System. She was running away from home, skipping school, using drugs and drinking.

But instead of just locking her up and then releasing her a few hours later, the State of South Dakota tried a new and novel approach. She was put in a treatment and counseling program. Shortly thereafter, she discovered she was pregnant. Counselors worked with her and with her family to help her quit drinking and taking drugs. She was then placed in a long-term counseling program. She had her baby and went on to live, with the supportive family members, who helped her through the recovery and counseling stages of the process. She went back to school and graduated.

Recently she and her baby showed up at the South Dakota Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse to thank those very people for helping her to get her life back on track.

These people are trying new programs which bring judges, police officers, teachers, parents and problem children together to deal with the problem when it starts. Hopefully this young woman will go on to lead a productive and fulfilling life. The drug