

drug use and availability in America in half over the next 10 years—a historic new low. This plan has been developed under the leadership of General Barry McCaffrey, Director of National Drug Control Policy, in close consultation with the Congress, the more than 50 Federal agencies and departments involved in the fight against drugs, the dedicated men and women of law enforcement, and with stakeholders—mayors, doctors, clergy, civic leaders, parents, and young people—drawn from all segments of our society.

I am also proud to report that we have made real and substantial progress in carrying out the goals of the 1997 *Strategy*. Working with the Congress, we have begun the National Anti-Drug Youth Media Campaign. Now when our children turn on the television, surf the “net,” or listen to the radio, they can learn the plain truth about drugs: they are wrong, they put your future at risk, and they can kill you. I thank you for your vital support in bringing this important message to America’s young people.

Together, we enacted into law the Drug-Free Communities Act of 1997, which will help build and strengthen 14,000 community anti-drug coalitions and brought together civic groups—ranging from the Elks to the Girl Scouts and representing over 55 million Americans—to form a Civic Alliance, targeting youth drug use. By mobilizing people and empowering communities, we are defeating drugs through a child-by-child, street-by-street, and neighborhood-by-neighborhood approach.

We have also helped make our streets and communities safer by strengthening law enforcement. Through my Administration’s Community Oriented Police (COPs) program, we are helping put 100,000 more police officers in towns and cities across the Nation. We are taking deadly assault weapons out of the hands of drug dealers and gangs, making our streets safer for our families. We have taken steps to rid our prisons of drugs, as well as to break the vicious cycle of drugs and crime. These efforts are making a difference: violent crime in America has dropped dramatically for 5 years in a row.

Over the last year, the United States and Mexico reached agreement on a mutual *Threat Assessment* that defines the scope of the common threat we face; and, an *Alliance* that commits our great nations to defeating that threat. Soon, we will sign a bilateral *Strategy* that commits both nations to specific actions and performance benchmarks. Our work to enhance cooperation within the hemisphere and worldwide is already showing results. For example, Peruvian coca production has declined by roughly 40 percent over the last 2 years. In 1997, Mexican drug eradication rates reached record levels, and seizures increased nearly 50 percent over 1996.

We are making a difference. Drug use in America has declined by 50 percent over the last decade. For the first time in 6 years, studies show that youth

drug use is beginning to stabilize, and in some respects in even declining. And indications are that the methamphetamine and crack cocaine epidemics, which in recent years were sweeping the Nation, have begun to recede.

However, we must not confuse progress with ultimate success. Although youth drug use has started to decline, it remains unacceptably high.

More than ever, we must recommit ourselves to give parents the tools and support they need to teach children that drugs are dangerous and wrong. That is why we must improve the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program, and other after school initiatives that help keep our kids in school, off drugs, and out of trouble. We must hire 1,000 new border patrol agents and close the door on drugs at our borders. We must redouble our efforts with other nations to take the profits out of drug dealing and trafficking and break the sources of supply. And we must enact comprehensive bipartisan tobacco legislation that reduces youth smoking. These and other efforts are central elements of the 1998 *National Drug Control Strategy*.

With the help of the American public, and the ongoing support of the Congress, we can achieve these goals. In submitting this plan to you, I ask for your continued partnership in defeating drugs in America. Our children and this Nation deserve no less.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 3, 1998.

□ 1730

SPECIAL ORDERS

WETLANDS RESTORATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about our Nation’s wetlands and a bill I have introduced to protect and expand these national treasures. I represent a district in eastern North Carolina which includes a majority of the State’s coast and 4 major river basins. According to the Federal Government, 65 percent of the area can be classified as wetlands. Clearly wetlands are very important to me and to the citizens of my district.

Eastern North Carolina appreciates the beauty and value of wetlands as much if not more than anybody else. They understand the importance of wetlands to the environment, to water quality and to the life they support. Eastern North Carolinians also want to respect the rights of property owners, and therefore have reached for a balanced approach to protecting our wetlands while allowing landowners to have reasonable use of their properties.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that the common sense solution we have sought is wetlands mitigation banking. Mitigation banking allows private

property owners to pay wetlands experts to mitigate the impact their development will have on wetlands. Those experts, working with regulators, do the mitigation in banks of land which are set aside, restored to wetland status and, most importantly, enhanced.

This concept has been embraced by regulators, developers and the conservation community. It is an improvement upon traditional mitigation, which simply is not working because it is too expensive, time consuming and ineffective. Approximately 90 percent of on-site mitigation is unsuccessful. Mitigation banking, on the other hand, creates complete ecosystems.

Regulators usually require that more wetlands be restored in a bank than are destroyed in a development project. For example, in some parts of the South that ratio is 4 to 1, meaning that 4 acres of land must be restored for each acre that was destroyed. So instead of only trying to protect the remaining wetlands with mitigation banking, we are actually increasing wetlands acreage. What is more, because mitigation banks give economic value to wetlands, potentially billions of private sector dollars could flow into restoring wetlands in sensitive watersheds.

Mitigation banking is already being implemented in several areas throughout our Nation. The problem is there is no statutory authority to guide mitigation bankers. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker: The problem is there is no statutory authority to guide mitigation bankers. Thus investors are hesitant to supply the money needed without legal certainty.

For this reason, I have introduced the Wetlands Restoration and Improvement Act, H.R. 1290. The legislation, one, requires the bank to meet rigorous financial and legal standards to ensure that wetlands are restored and preserved over the long term; secondly, provides for ample opportunity for meaningful public participation; and, third, ensures that the bank itself has a credible, long-term operation and maintenance plan.

This legislation is the common-sense, balanced approach America needs to protect both our valuable wetlands and the rights of property owners. I hope my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, in the House will look seriously at cosponsoring this legislation.

TOWARD A FAIRER, FLATTER AND SIMPLER TAX SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIAHRT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the President is defending the indefensible. President Clinton yesterday described congressional Republican efforts to overhaul the Tax Code and to change