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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE DRUG ELIMINATION ACT

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 537

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It supports the establishment of an international maritime law enforcement training center under the auspices of the Coast Guard and the Customs Service.

It advocates a new prioritization for the Defense Department to treat international drug interdiction to be as important as peacekeeping.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This resolution 537 is a modified, open rule. As my colleague from North Carolina has described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) or his designee and a Member opposed to the bill.

Under this rule, amendments will be allowed under the 5-minute rule, which is the normal amending process in the House. However, the amendment process is limited to a 3-hour limit.

Mr. Speaker, illegal drug use is widely considered to be a major problem in our country. More than 11 million Americans buy illegal drugs and use them more than once a month. These drugs contribute to crime, lower productivity, and health problems.

This bill authorizes $2.3 billion over 3 years for equipment, personnel, and training to reduce the flow of illegal drugs into the United States.

This bill spends money to buy aircraft for the U.S. Customs Air Wing and for helicopters for the Colombian National Police. The bill also spends money to establish an air base to support U.S. counternarcotics operations and for international law enforcement academies.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in supporting the war against drugs, and I hope that this bill will make a meaningful contribution. However, I believe that this legislation would have been improved if it had gone through the normal committee process, and though it was referred to five different committees, none held hearings, received formal administration comment, issued a report, or even received a cost estimate from the Congressional Budget Office on this bill.

Had hearings been held, a number of issues might have been raised, such as: Could some of the money end up supporting foreign military forces accused of human rights abuses? Was the bill fully coordinated with existing Federal anti-drug programs? Where will the money come from to pay for these new programs?

Mr. Speaker, these are serious questions, and I would be more comfortable if they were addressed through the normal committee process, considering the enormous amount of money that we are spending. At least under the rule, Members will have 3 hours to raise these and any other issues that are important to them and to their constituents.

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

□ 1100

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield so much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), who is the head of the Speaker's drug task force for a drug-free America.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina and certainly the gentleman from Ohio who are bringing this rule to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, this process was kind of complicated. We crossed the jurisdictions of about six different committees. There have been years of various testimony in hearings that have gone on over the last 3 years that I have been involved in this issue.

Certainly there have been multiple visits to sites, in this case, in this bill, south of our border in places like Mexico and Colombia and Peru and Bolivia and other areas such as Puerto Rico and the Bahamas and other areas, even in Europe as we see drugs being moved across and actually traded by terrorists across the Middle East and also finding their way into our markets.

It is a very complex thing. It is a lot of work by the FBI and the DEA and other law enforcement agencies. The people who do the work beyond our borders are Americans who give up their time and are away from families to fight the scourge of drugs in this country.

When you start to look at the whole issue of cutting off supply, which is really in harmony with the whole issue of demand reduction, we have to have both sides of the equation, try to stop demand, and we are going to debate that bill later on today, but to cut off supply is really cost effective. You can stop supply in places like Colombia and Bolivia and Peru and Afghanistan and even places like Myanmar.

Certainly it is the cost effective and the most effective way you can do it and least expensive. It goes back to the old adage of an ounce of prevention is certainly worth a pound of cure. I think we tried to do that for this bill.

This is an open rule. People have the time to be able to debate this and bring their ideas to the floor, and I certainly welcome it. I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio and certainly the gentlewoman from North Carolina in bringing this rule to the floor.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me say I take a back seat to no one on the issue of drug control. I support all serious initiatives to rid our country in the hemisphere of the scourge of illegal drug trafficking and drug use.

I rise, however, as the ranking minority member of the House Committee on National Security to express grave reservations over the process, over the process under which this important bill is being considered. But I also consider myself a jealous guardian of the process and the rights and responsibilities of the Members of our institution as well as the committees they are on.

This bill has major and far-reaching national and international implications, along with a staggering $2.3 billion price tag. Yet, incredibly, House committee consideration has been totally eliminated from the process in which the bill is being brought to this floor.

No fewer than five committees, unfortunately, waive their jurisdiction over elements of the bill; and I for one would like to go on record as saying that this is an incredibly dangerous precedent to set here in the House.

My colleagues with whom I am privileged to serve on the House Committee on National Security on both sides of the aisle have made it their serious and thoughtful business to develop an expertise in matters of defense policy, including drug policy.

The same can be said of the expertise of other committee members in their areas of jurisdiction. We have a right and we have a responsibility to use the expertise in the careful consideration of any legislation which is referred to our committee, especially one so far-reaching as this bill.

The Chairman of the Committee on National Security, my good friend, my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) has made his reservation known to the Speaker by letter, and I thank him for that. But the waiver, nevertheless, has been granted, and now we usher in a process by which a task force is being formed and laid in the legislative cycle which circumvents all committees of jurisdiction and brings a major initiative to the floor.

There is no reason to believe that this will not occur again and more often in the future as the process succeeds today. As ranking member of my committee, I am greatly concerned that legislative consideration by task forces instead of by committees which has expertise in various areas on comprehensive measures will begin to supersede the normal process and degrade the purpose of service on our respective committees.

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

Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years, there have been numerous hearings on significant opponents of H.R. 4300 in each of the committees of referral: the Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on International Relations, Committee on National Security, Committee on Ways and Means, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, as well as the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

I would just like to mention that, in the full Committee on International Relations in February of 1998, there was a hearing on U.S. narcotics policy to Colombia. March 31 of 1998, there

was also another hearing on U.S. narcotics policy to Colombia; June 24 on Colombia and heroin. March 26, 1998, there was a markup, and it was for providing three Black Hawk utility helicopters to the Colombian national police to fight the war on drugs.

The GAO issued a report in February of 1998, drug control U.S. counternarcotics efforts in Colombia face continuing challenges. Then the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere on drug issues had two hearings, one in July of 1997 on antidrug efforts in the Americas and one August 6, 1998, which was a Colombia insurgency hearing.

So there have been hearings in these various committees, and it has had that hearing process adequately applied.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I, too, share the reservations of the gentleman from Missouri about interrupting the normal committee process with a major new initiative. However, the normal committee process, in my judgment, was a part of this task force from start to finish.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on The Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, over the last almost 2 years, we have held several subcommittee hearings on the Coast Guard's ability to work with other agencies with the Defense Department, even with other countries to figure out a plan to interdict drugs coming into the Caribbean area, the Eastern Pacific, and the United States. I think what we have done is create a plan that needs to move forward. We can interdict drugs on the high seas.

At this point, I am convinced, this might sound astounding, but I am convinced that we as a country by about the year 2005 or 2006 can interdict 80 percent of the illegal drugs coming into this country across the high seas. It is possible to do that. We have the technology, the will, the initiative, and this is the first step in that direction. So I urge my colleagues to vote ''aye'' on this rule.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). Pursuant to House Resolution 537 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4300.

□ 1110

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4300) to support enhanced drug interdiction efforts in the major transit countries and support a comprehensive supply eradication and crop substitution program in source countries, with Mr. GUTKNECHT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT).

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill is one part of the solution to the most insidious national security threat that we as a Nation face today. International drug trafficking is rampant across our borders, and unfortunately this does not affect our borders. It affects our street corners. It affects our neighborhoods. It affects our communities. It affects our children. It affects people in our workplaces. It affects people in our highways and our schools.

This bill is dedicated certainly to the 14,218 Americans, most of them are youth, who died last year directly from drugs and drug violence.

This bill aims to shut down drug growers and drug processors in places like Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, Mexico and Myanmar. Over the past 5 years, first-time use of heroin by kids ages 12 to 17 rose by 875 percent, an 875 percent increase. That means for every one child who tried heroin in 1992, more than 8 children tried it in 1997. That kind of explosion in drug use, in heroin, methamphetamine, marijuana and cocaine, is intolerable. It is immoral, destructive and fundamentally un-American. Worst of all, it is a tragedy of our own making.

Deep cuts, billions of dollars in cuts, are the hallmark in the early part of this administration. In 1993 alone, the White House slashed a billion dollars from drug interdiction programs. Today, our children, in their schools, on playgrounds, in after-school environments, are reaping the deadly harvest of those ill-advised cuts. This nation is awash in these poisons.

This bill does not solve the whole problem. A second major drug bill that will be up today, a prevention bill, focusing on drug prevention and treatment, is also a key to having long-term success in stopping drugs in this country and actually moving toward a drug-free America.

This bill, H.R. 4300, is the blueprint for reasserting U.S. dominance over drug traffickers and permanently shutting down the international drug trafficking cartels.

In summary, the sections of this supply-reduction bill do the following: They reduce drug use by enhancing aircraft, maritime and radar coverage in the source and transit zones by providing aircraft for the Customs Service; aircraft and ships for the Coast Guard; and by improving relocatable-over-the-horizon radar capabilities, especially in the Mediterranean and southeastern Pacific area.

This bill enhances the source country eradication capabilities by providing sorely needed aircraft to the Colombian National Police, as well as additional resources for Peru, Bolivia and Mexico. It enhances alternative development programs through the United States Agency for International Development for Colombia, Peru and Bolivia, and it also enhances counternarcotics research efforts at the Department of Agriculture.

International law enforcement training is enhanced by establishing international law enforcement training centers serving Latin America, Asia and Africa. Additionally, it provides for a United States Coast Guard international maritime training vessel to enhance law enforcement training and maintenance in the Latin American and Caribbean nations. The training provided under this bill is designed to foster cooperation under international law enforcement agencies which in turn will create more efficient counternarcotics efforts and intelligence in the regions.

□ 1115

Moreover, this bill also requires the submission of a report examining options on replacing Howard Air Force Base in Panama for use and support of counternarcotics in the source and transit zones.

This bill has been carefully drafted to address the shortfalls in the current counterdrug efforts. This is an important piece of legislation that will enable our law enforcement agencies to meet head on the surge of drugs flowing into the country and into our neighborhoods.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to serve as an original cosponsor on this piece of legislation, and I commend my colleagues on their hard work in drafting this bill. Most specifically, I commend the work of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) in this area of trying to stop drugs flowing into our country and across our borders.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things we face today is a huge cost to our society, a cost in dollars. Almost $50 billion a year going off our street corners and school yards into the pockets of drug salesmen. That money flows through a system and ends up in the pockets of drug lords in other countries. We need to stop that. But we need to stop it by stopping the drugs moving into our country.

Certainly, if we can stop a pound of coca in Peru or a kilo of heroin on the mountain tops in Colombia, it is much more cost-effective and certainly proves the old adage of an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. This

is the design of this bill, to save the lives of those 14,000 kids who die over year on our street corners, the $90 billion of cost to our communities, our States, and this Nation to adjudicate and incarcerate, and all of those things that we have to do in the drug process.

This bill cuts across the jurisdictions of seven committees. It is a huge, holistic approach in trying to stop drugs coming across our border. It is time that we do this. It is important to do this, and it is probably one of the biggest threats to our national security.

Mr. Chairman, let me leave my colleagues with this one thought. If we lost 14,000 young men and women to an action by Saddam Hussein, if we lost 14,000 young men and women to an action in Bosnia or some place else on the face of the earth, this country would respond and would respond with all the vitality and all the vigor and all the energy that we could muster.

Well, we have lost 14,000 kids last year and every year and will in the years in the future. We need to stop it. We need to be strong. We need to address it, and this bill addresses part of that problem.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4300, the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act. However, I want to caveat my support by noting my deep regret and the frustration with this measure in that it circumvented the committee process, including the Committee on International Relations on which I sit, and the four other committees to which it was referred.

All five ranking Democrats requested consideration and made clear that they were willing to work expeditiously in order to see H.R. 4300 reach the floor. These requests were ignored.

We have reached out to the majority over the last 2 years to work out a bipartisan policy that has received meaningful input from General McCaffrey. I do not understand why the majority did not work with us over the last 2 years to pass a bill and why it has sprung it on us in the last minute. By using this approach, our ability to get the funding to fulfill the promises in this bill is seriously diminished.

So, what we have before us is a rushed measure that makes many important policy changes and funding allocations with regard to a key U.S. national interest, sending it to the House Floor without consideration by the committees of jurisdiction. We have a bill that provides a highly detailed blueprint for equipping and training a number of countries, for establishing counterdrug centers and significantly revamping the process for making policy and assistance decisions in the counternarcotics area, but the legislative committees have been entirely bypassed in making these important decisions.

Second, the open attacks on the administration in the findings section are, I believe, intentionally incendiary and unhelpful. Our counternarcotics policy is something to be taken seriously. It is irresponsible to play partisan politics with such an important issue. All Members of Congress, Republican and Democratic alike, share the desire to rid the plague of narcotics from our schools and streets. This is not a way to conduct U.S. foreign policy or U.S. drug policy. Some may believe it is good politics, but it does not serve the American people well.

Mr. Chairman, on the substance of the bill, having spoken about process, I want to say that I have long said that we needed to get serious about what we continuously call a war on drugs. In essence, to put our money where our mouth is. This bill does make an important step in that direction.

The bill authorizes extraordinary amounts for counternarcotics programs. The bill provides unprecedented funds for drug interdiction and eradication, including enhanced air and seacraft coverage to combat drug transiting, crop substitution, which is crucial to the long term success of any policy, and enhanced international law and drug enforcement training.

I would like to note that I find it unfortunate that we have to spend $10 million for research into mycoherbicides when a potent and reliable source exists, Tebuthiuron, better known in the United States as Round-Up. I learned of this product and its effectiveness on coca crops in Colombia last year touring those areas of crop elimination and saw the success of. Yet it turns out that Tebuthiuron's producer, DowElanco, has refused to sell it to Colombia or make it available to the State Department for drug eradication for reasons I do not believe are particularly valid.

My sole reservations about this bill, other than process, are whether it is implementable and where we will be taking the funds from to fund this $2.3 billion measure. I certainly hope that in the process of doing so, that remind ourselves that we cannot bankrupt those domestic programs geared to reducing drug demand at the same time that we seek to do interdiction. This is clearly an effort that needs to have various aspects to it to be successful: Interdiction, reducing demand, and dealing with education and drug treatment.

Mr. Chairman, while I have some concerns with the bill, I fully agree with the sentiments and with the goals behind it. We must be aggressive in working to shut off the supply of illegal drugs. Supply reduction is an important component of a comprehensive drug policy and demand reduction.

In addition to the measures taken in this bill, we need to enhance our domestic efforts on reducing drug addiction and fund programs to provide children with alternatives to a potential life of crime, such as some of our after-school programs, and we need our partners in the Western Hemisphere to join with us in a meaningful assistance.

I am a strong supporter of working with and supporting professional, honest, and effective law enforcement forces throughout the hemisphere. We must give the President the tools that he needs to effectively and comprehensively address illegal drugs and the havoc drugs wreak in the community, in the United States, and throughout this hemisphere.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons I intend to vote for the bill. I hope to work to improve it as it moves through the legislative process so that this bill will serve as a realistic, effective, and comprehensive blueprint for U.S. supply reduction efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for inclusion into the RECORD the statement of the administration's position which we received only moments ago, which basically says it supports the objective of the bill but has a series of concerns with reference to the bill and unless those concerns are addressed, opposes the bill as currently drafted.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Washington, DC, September 16, 1998.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(THIS STATEMENT HAS BEEN COORDINATED BY OMB WITH THE CONCERNED AGENCIES.)

H.R. 4300—Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act.

The Administration supports the objectives of H.R. 4300 and shares the Congress' commitment to reducing the supply of drugs coming into the United States from other countries in the Western Hemisphere. However, the Administration opposes H.R. 4300 as currently drafted. Some of the Administration's concerns include:

Funding enhancements that are not tied to a coherent strategy. The bill simply enumerates a series of specific procurement and funding actions without indicating how they relate to one another or to existing drug interdiction activities. The Administration has proposed a comprehensive and integrated approach to reducing the flow of drugs into the Untied States in its National Drug Control Strategy.

Proposing authorizations that are far in excess of expected appropriations and the President's Budget without specifying where these funds will come from. H.R. 4300 would authorize $2.6 billion to appropriations in addition to those already authorized for FYs 1999–2001. To date, Congress has not appropriated funds for many of the Administration's anti-drug abuse requests. As one example, the House has provided the Coast Guard with approximately $82 million less than requested for FY 1999 to maintain current operating levels.

Infringing on the authority of the President and the Secretary of State. H.R. 4300 would infringe on the President's appointment powers and the Secretary of State's flexibility in personnel matters and intrude upon well established procedures for providing foreign military assistance.

Suggesting the transfer of the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL) from the State Department to the Drug Enforcement Administration. The clear assumption of Section 207 is that certain foreign assistance activities of the State Department could be better carried out by a

law enforcement agency. This assumption is neither substantiated nor soundly based. INL is a central and highly-regarded component of the interagency counter-narcotics effort.

Imposing inflexible requirements that could quickly become useless. The bill would authorize funds for two mobile x-ray machines to be placed along a specific highway in Bolivia. The locations of such machines should not be specified by statute but left to the discretion of the commanders on the ground.

Reducing the effectiveness of law enforcement agencies by consolidating joint interagency task forces (JIATF). Consolidating all JIATFs would reduce Defense Department support to law enforcement agencies attempting to disrupt the flow of drugs from Asia and the Southwest Border.

The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to implement a drug control strategy that is realistic, comprehensive, coherent, and flexible.

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

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), a Member who has taken a great deal of time and effort and skill in helping put together this legislation.

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) for yielding me this time. I first want to thank the gentleman for all the work that he has done in the drug task force and helping put together a comprehensive plan on both the demand and the supply side questions involved.

Mr. Chairman, we all are concerned about the question of how do we get this whole drug question in the United States under control. It is not a simple matter. It is demand and supply. It is treatment. It is prevention. It is all of those things we talk about.

But the fact of the matter is that we have doubled the teen drug use in the United States since 1992 over the last 6 years. Doubled it. The fact of the matter is there is more cocaine and heroin on the streets of this country today at cheaper prices than at any time in our history.

The fact of the matter today is that we have our law enforcement community domestically, and we have our people in our schools and in our communities who are working on drug prevention and drug treatment programs, overwhelmed by this supply of cocaine and heroin and unable to do the kind of job that we need to see done to get our kids' lives protected again.

The reason for that is manyfold. If we look into the Pacific Ocean of the United States, off our coast, and off the coast of Mexico, between the Colombia and us in the eastern Pacific, there is not one plane or one ship today of the United States Government out there interdicting any drugs coming our way or going to Mexico. Not one.

In the area of the Caribbean and the Gulf of Mexico we have two-thirds less resources at work trying to see if there is somebody shipping drugs our way from Latin America than we did 6 or 7 years ago. It is absolutely a tragedy that this is the case and we have to ask ourselves why are we in this sorry state of affairs.

Well, the reasons are multiple. First of all, our military, which has a primary responsibility it should be exercising to be involved in the drug war, is doing a de minimus job of that. Back several years ago when we were actively patrolling, interdicting drugs in the corridors coming our way from Bolivia, Colombia, and Peru, we had multiple ships and planes of the Army and Navy and Air Force out there with a lot of their effort going into interdiction.

In the intervening year, with Desert Storm and Bosnia and other things, our military has sort of disappeared. Customs has taken planes it had down in the area of the source countries in Colombia, Bolivia, and Peru and put them on the Mexican border and things are not working well.

We also have a lack of will in many ways to do this right. This bill is setting the record straight, because if we look into the countries where this is happening, where these crops are being grown, where this evil product is being produced, and talk to the people on the ground who work for our government fighting the drug effort, talk to the people with the DEA, with the Department of State, with the Department of Defense, with our CIA, with everybody who is involved, we will find out they were never tasked with a question or two about how they could, if they were asked, go about reducing the flow of drugs to the United States by, say, 80 percent, which this bill suggests by the next 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, they were never even asked if this could be done. Some of us went down a few months ago and we asked that question. We asked first of all, could they, if they were given all the resources that they could imagine, could they reduce the flow of cocaine and heroin coming out of this country, the country they are in today serving the United States and its people, could they reduce it by 80 percent within 3 years? The answer was unanimously, by all of the key players in country, yes. Unequivocally, yes.

Then we asked them whether they had ever been tasked, whether anybody ever asked them to develop a plan, the answer was no. Well, we asked them what would they do, and that is what is in this bill, H.R. 4300. What our people on the ground in those countries have told us they need.

First of all, they told us that President Fujimori has done a wonderful job in Peru, which he has, in a policy of forcing down planes leaving that country with coca crop. The net result of that, since that has been in operation 2 or 3 years, a 40 percent reduction in the coca crop in Peru, a country where the majority of coca was grown before that policy was implemented. It could not have worked, and it is not working as well as it should today, had it not been for our aircraft that had radar on it to detect those planes providing information to President Fujimori who could implement that policy.

□ 1130

And what we have discovered as well is that that same type of policy could be implemented and could have been implemented a long time ago in Colombia, where virtually all the crop that is produced in the Amazon, one-third of the country region, has to be taken even in its refined form. And most of the cocaine that is produced in that southern part of Colombia, wherever it is grown, it has to be taken by a small plane across mountains to the coastal areas of Colombia to be shipped out by boat or to be further transported to Mexico, the United States or wherever. If we had a force-down policy in Colombia, we would not solve the entire problem, but we would make great progress in it. But there are no planes, there is no radar, there is no ability for the Colombian forces to go do anything about it that way.

We have talked to the Bolivians and we have asked them what could we do. They have one highway from their crop-growing region into the community where this stuff is refined, and they have two highways out with a refined product. They do not have the equipment down there to stop the flow. They do not have the x-ray machines we have on the Mexican border, and so on. Very simple things they need to have, that our people know, and that is what is in this bill.

We are providing the radar planes, some 20 of them to the Customs folks, that can do the look-down; we are providing the chase planes we need, because we are not chasing; we are providing new intelligence equipment, because intelligence gathering, to know when and where and how this stuff is being shipped and who is making it, is very important; we are providing the helicopters so that the Colombian forces can go up into the mountains of Colombia and actually take out the poppy crop, which they should have been doing a long time ago. If they cannot grow it, we can eradicate it. There is no heroin.

Sixty percent of the heroin that comes to the United States is grown in Colombia. Just shutting that down alone would be an enormous success. But for the equipment, it cannot be done. But we want to provide that in this bill, and we are providing that in this bill.

We need to have what is in the legislation before us today to solve this problem. The bottom line is that our own people have said if we give them this equipment, and we have the cooperation of the governments involved, and I can assure my colleagues the leadership of those countries involved are willing to cooperate in every way possible. They want our assistance and they want the things in this bill. They

want to be able to reduce the flow. They want to stop the drug production and trafficking in their countries. They want their economies to thrive and their people to be able to work at decent wage-paying jobs and other means, and be able to farm crops they can sell that are productive and useful and not deadly, like these. They want all of that. If we have their cooperation, as we will, then the only missing link is the administration getting with it and making all of this happen.

Last but not least, I want to point out that we do not have today the right kind of asset allocation by the Department of Defense of its resources for the effort on drugs. They have had a drug mission for years. It is not just the fact they have moved stuff over to Bosnia or somewhere. If we have a war to fight, then that comes first. But in the order of things that they have in their asset allocation orders that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Department of Defense put out, they have about four priorities of category to send their equipment, their men, their whatever to do. One is war; number two is activities that are somewhat similar to war, where people are under threat of bodily harm, like peacekeeping and so forth; number three is training and exercises; and number four is everything else, which includes humanitarian assistance and anti-narcotics efforts.

In this bill we provide for moving up the priorities, encouraging them to do that. We cannot do that, but we will say to the Department of Defense, get with it. We want them engaged in this war on drugs, at least supplying the minimal material required for our Southern Command to do its job, and we want them to move up their priorities so that the anti-narcotics efforts are at least parallel and equal to the number two priority of peacekeeping in Bosnia.

Our kids are dying on the streets of the United States. We should at least provide as much military effort in fighting this war on drugs for that cause as we are around the world in far-reaching places like Bosnia.

And in conclusion, I would say, my hat is off to the Coast Guard in particular. They have been fighting with their arms tied behind their backs. We have new equipment and ships coming out for them, Coast Guard cutters, so they can do their job. When they went to Puerto Rico a couple of years ago, they did a magnificent job of shutting down the drug traffic coming through Puerto Rico. But while they were there, it came out of other places because they did not have the equipment, they did not have the resources to take care of it somewhere else. They are now working in the Dominican Republic, where a lot of the drug trafficking is coming. We are providing in this bill resources to them as well.

It is extraordinarily important that this legislation be passed. I encourage my colleagues to enact H.R. 4300. Let us get a truly bipartisan drug policy that says, once and for all, here is the equipment, here is the resources, here is what they need; they have asked for it, they need it in the field, in essence the troops in the field, and Colombia, Bolivia and Peru have asked for it, and let us reduce the flow of drugs in this country by 80 percent over the next 2 or 3 years.

It can be done. For the sake of our kids, it must be done. And we have an obligation and an opportunity today to do that by passing H.R. 4300.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I will be offering an amendment today relative to utilization of our military at our border. It has been stripped from the defense authorization bill. It is probably the major debate that exists on this issue.

This is a good bill. I will support it. But there is still one glaring weakness: strong border security to ensure a strong reduction of narcotics.

Theories are theories. Our drug program is heavy on theory, lightweight on substance and factual data to, in fact, measure outcome indicators that reduce the presence of narcotics. Period.

One hundred percent of heroin comes across our border. One hundred percent of cocaine comes across our border. America does not domestically produce these economic giants that have destroyed our neighborhoods. It is the border. But because of politics, we protect and secure our border with only a civilian law enforcement presence.

This is an indictment on Congress. Not a mistake, not an oversight, an indictment. And I want to give credit to the majority party. They are willing to engage in the debate. Enough is enough. We cannot stop drugs at the border with more cops. We cannot stop and reduce reduction with more halfway houses, more counselors, more psychiatrists, more psychologists, more professors, more courses in school. They are all great. We have been doing it for years. Our streets have so much narcotic, a 14-year-old in New York can get it as easy as he can get aspirin. Shame, Congress. Shame.

I have to say this. The administration is in left field on this. They are wrong. In America the people govern. I do not want those troops to be making arrests, I want them to join forces with the civilian law enforcement entity and let the drug cartels know that we are going to wage a real war.

So I will offer my amendment today. I am going to ask my colleagues for support, and I want my colleagues to go beyond politics. There is nothing demeaning in this to Central American nations. There is no intent to demean any ethnic group. My God, every ethnic group in the cities has been decimated by narcotics. If we are going to have a program, by God, let us have one. And if this President is going to veto it for that, let him veto something with substance.

We are too concerned about perception in the Congress of the United States, and we have not been doing the people's jobs. It took me 11 years to change the burden of proof in a civil tax case because the White House did not want it, Treasury did not want it, IRS did not want it. But, my colleagues, the people wanted it. Thank God for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BILL ARCHER), and thank God for the Republicans.

I have been working on this for 7, 8 years. Here is all I am saying. The American people do not want our soldiers cashing a check in Tokyo and going to the theater, cashing a check in Frankfurt and going to dinner. They want them to participate in securing our border. It is not a line between Pennsylvania and Ohio. It is time to do it.

I will be offering that amendment today. I am hoping to have the support of this House.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), the vice chairman of the committee of jurisdiction on drug enforcement, certainly a person who has spent a lot of time and certainly heartfelt effort in this.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) for his leadership, and also the Speaker, who forced this on to the national agenda, because we actually are making some progress.

I first want to make the point, because we are constantly hearing what else does Congress do; all they do down there is talk about sex. We have had over 30 hearings and sex never came up once. We have been in Hollywood talking about the drug problem. We have talked to the record industry. We have been all across this country, in the district of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), in Dallas; down in Orlando with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), where the heroin has devastated our children. And among the things we have learned is it will take a concerted effort on both the interdiction and the demand reduction sides to do this. This bill in front of us deals with interdiction.

A lot of people say this is a lot of money to spend on that. The fact is, when this President took over the government, he cut that budget. We saw an immediate increase in supply, reducing the price on the street and increasing the purity and potency of those drugs. It is no wonder we are seeing the problems we have right now in our country. If we cut drug use 50 percent among our young people right now, we will only be back to where it was when the President took office.

We have to take these efforts. And we know where the drugs come from, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) pointed out. In this bill is one provision that we have been battling for 3 years. There is a war going on in Colombia. I have the hat they gave me of Colonel Gallego, who was a Colombian patriot, who leads Dante, the antidrug division of the Colombian National Police. They are dying fighting the drug war to keep those drugs out of here.

In Colombia, we not only have the number one source of cocaine and heroin that is pouring into our Nation, but they have seen the narco-traffickers spill into the Darien Peninsula of Panama, putting potentially the canal at risk as we transfer power. They are near the Venezuelan border, our now number one source for oil. It is not the middle, it is Venezuela.

We are looking at national security risks in Colombia and we have people dying to fight them, and we for 3 years have been trying to get Black Hawk helicopters so they can get into the high elevations to fight and we have been blocked by this administration. This bill will give six Black Hawk helicopters to the Colombian national police. It upgrades 50 Hueys. They have helicopters going up. They have had a base blown apart in the last month or two. They are constantly fighting with helicopters that do not work. We need to get upgrades.

If we do not help the Colombian National Police, we will have our young men and women down there fighting the drug war, fighting to protect the canal, fighting to protect our oil interests. We should be helping the people who are willing to fight. It is not like Vietnam, where we did not see enough people. Look, here we have people fighting and dying. We need to get them the help. This has been silly. It has been downright silly.

We also have aid going to Peru for crop substitution and eradication where they have a shoot-down policy, all of a sudden the cocaine growers cannot get their crops to market. And they are saying now, they did not want to before, but they are saying, hey, maybe we will plant something else. We need to encourage that.

Same thing in Bolivia, where they have been aggressive. We have help. And in Mexico we have some assistance for them. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and I have been to Colombia three times; we have been in Peru and Bolivia multiple times; Chile; Mexico; met with President Zedillo. We have also been over in Thailand. They have a problem over there with heroin spreading around the world from Afghanistan to Vietnam. The base of this bill has a training center for that.

We, today, will also be dealing with the treatment programs, the prevention programs, and all the local crime enforcement. But in Fort Wayne, Indiana, and across this country, they cannot solve the problem if the cocaine and heroin is pouring in in great quantities, and with the purity, if it can be found anywhere.

Number one, we have to get control of our borders, get control of what is coming in, help the governments that are willing to fight. And in South America and Central America and in Asia they are seeing what it is doing to their economies as well. It is our obligation to get it and support those while we can before it is too late.

□ 1145

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to point out to my colleagues who several times there have been references to the Administration cutting interdiction money. Several points I think need to be made. Number one is those moneys were used for other drug policy purposes, such as demand reduction. We have even heard some of the speakers on the other side suggest that as much as we also need to deal with interdiction, and I agree with that, we also need to deal with demand reduction.

Also the majority has had the opportunity since they took control at any time during that process, in the appropriation process, to rise to the level that they presently offer in this legislation today.

So I would just caution that as some seek to make a point that may be perceived as political in nature, the policy reality is, is that we have voted on the budgets that have been passed, we have had opportunities through the appropriation process to increase interdiction moneys to the levels that we thought were appropriate, and we now have in this bill today a very significant increase in interdiction. Now, that is fitting and appropriate. But I also think it is important in terms of keeping this debate intellectually honest that in fact there was significant assistance given to demand reduction and agreed that this is not just a one-sided war, that there are multiple aspects, different fronts to this war and if we are to be successful, we need to be attacking all of those fronts.

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

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just speak to the gentleman from New Jersey and remind him that we have authorized money in our budget the last two years to do this very thing, and the Administration has yet to spend them.

We should all be aware that our Nation's drug problem is a poison eating away at our country. It is invading our streets and our schools. Statistics show an ever increasing number of drug users within our Nation. Here is a startling fact. Heroin use alone has reached historic levels among 12 to 17-year-olds. Unfortunately these drugs are coming from our neighbors to the south. Now more than ever we need to focus more effort on source country eradication and interdiction to prevent drugs from entering the United States.

To my dissatisfaction, the Clinton administration has resisted congressional attempts, as I said, to assist these source countries as they wage their war on drugs. In general, President Clinton has made our Nation's drug problem a very low priority. As I said, the money was in the budget but they refused to spend it. The good news is that we have drafted an effective drug elimination plan. H.R. 4300 would provide the necessary assistance to countries like Colombia, Peru and Bolivia to strengthen eradication and interdiction strategies and enhance alternative crop developments. As a member of the Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere and the Speaker's drug task force, I have witnessed firsthand the ill-equipped police and military forces as they attempt to fight the war on drugs alone. Specifically I have traveled to Colombia on numerous occasions only to be saddened by their lack of support from the Nation that creates the highest demand for illegal drugs, the United States. I am most pleased that a provision in H.R. 4300 would produce 50 ''Super Huey'' helicopters for the Colombian National Police. These are rebuilt and cost roughly 10 percent of what a new one would. It is money well spent. It is that helicopter package that is essential to the Colombians' ability to fight the increasingly well-funded, well-armed narcoguerillas and to eradicate an increasing number of coca and poppy plants.

Let us support a plan that embodies our role in the war on drugs and at the same time will assist in freeing us from the constricting hold drugs have on our Nation.

I ask for support for H.R. 4300.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) for yielding time. I rise, Mr. Chairman, to state my concern with H.R. 4300, the so-called Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act. I just really want to talk about a problem that I am aware of. I lived in Latin America in Colombia when I was a Peace Corps volunteer. A lot of Members do not realize that in 1991, we signed the Andean Trade Preference Act, ATPA. What we did in signing that act which President Bush brought to Congress where the act was intended to allow an alternative, a diversity of moving from growing coca and drug plants to growing flowers. Since that time, the Colombian and Andean trade pact countries have duty-free flowers coming into the United States. What has happened? They have now 70 percent of the American flower market. Who has been hurt by that? American

flower growers. I mean really hurt. This is a noncompetitive advantage that we have. Any other flowers that we import from Asia or import from Europe have to pay a tariff. It is only the Andean trade pact countries that do not.

So my concern with the bill is we are authorizing in the bill $10 million to urge Colombian farmers and others to stop growing crops that may be used to create illegal drugs. I think we need to deal with this issue that we have opened up in the Andean trade pact and not give them another $10 million until we have gotten something back like requiring them to pay tariffs on their imports. There is not an equal playing field here. I know this is not what the committee intends. I hope that we can in conference committee work these things out. Because frankly the American flower growers cannot be more adamant about the problems that have been created, the unintended consequences of the Andean trade pact on American growers.

Frankly, the $10 million authorization is more than we are giving to the farmers in Texas and to the farmers in the Northeast and in the Midwest for all their droughts. Essentially we are helping farmers in foreign countries more than we are helping our own. I would hope that the committee would be sensitive to this so that we might be able to take a look at a quid pro quo in this bill that will equal the playing field and still result in the intended consequences of diversity away from coca crops. If the committee will look at that, I would appreciate it. I would urge my colleagues to be aware of that as this bill goes into conference.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) who has been at the forefront of working with the Coast Guard and making sure that it is a viable force.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment about the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and the noncompetitive nature of some of the deals that have been made in the past to find some alternative crop to grow in Latin America that we are keenly aware of those facets and we will continue to work to make sure that farmers in this country, whether they grow flowers or vegetables or chickens or whatever, are on a very level playing field with the international marketplace. We do not want to give anybody a particular advantage over another.

I also want to emphasize that this is not a rush piece of legislation. The information that has gone into this legislation has come from various committees over two years. There was a two-year operation in the Caribbean called Frontier Shield in which the Coast Guard worked not only with the Defense Department and other various agencies of this government but they worked with the international community in the Caribbean and European countries. They showed very, very clearly that they could put a net around the island of Puerto Rico and reduce significantly the amount of drugs coming into that particular island. So what we want to do is expand this program.

Just for a second, if people will in their mind imagine the United States and its coastal areas, the Pacific, the Atlantic, the Caribbean and the Gulf. This is a finite region. It is not infinite. We have without a doubt the expertise, the technology, the manpower to cut off drugs coming into this country. We can create a web, a steel web that will interdict these drugs before they reach our shores. We have the expertise, the technology, the manpower. This piece of legislation gives us the will. It is without a doubt a moral imperative for responsible adults to enter into this rather large program to reduce drug use in the United States.

Do we need treatment? Yes. Do we need education? Yes. Do we need hospitals? Yes. Do we need drug interdiction? The answer is yes. I urge my colleagues to vote for the legislation.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) certainly somebody who has been on the prosecutor side of this, very strident in trying to rid our country of drugs.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I think it is about time that finally we are exerting the leadership in this Congress to get assistance to those heroic fighters for the interests not only of their own countries, the peoples of their own countries, in Colombia, in Peru and in Bolivia, but our young people here who are the victims of the poison that is coming in every day from South America. It is those Colombian National Police heroes as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) was talking about that we cannot even get helicopters to. The Administration has held them up even when we have financed them. So this bill does very important things in addition to trying in multiple ways to get to the core of the problem.

Mr. Chairman, I need to point out something that continues to be a reality. I have in my office on video a customs agent who is on the front lines every day fighting drugs. He says that over 50 percent of the cocaine that comes in through the Caribbean comes through or from Cuba. The Clinton administration continues to deny and ignore and thus cover up the Cuban dictatorship's participation in drug trafficking. Out of frustration, the U.S. Attorney in that office, the Southern District of Florida, leaked an indictment that is prepared, and it has been prepared since 1993 that charges the Cuban government as a racketeering enterprise for a 10-year conspiracy to send tons of Colombian cartel cocaine through Cuba to the United States.

Now, that indictment has been put in a drawer due to an order from Washington. Out of frustration it was leaked to the press; as was leaked, also, an investigation of a drug dealer who in 1996 after having been arrested, agreed, due to the fact that he had had multiple drug dealings with the Cuban government, to go back in under surveillance and do another deal with the Cuban government, with the Cuban dictatorship. That continues to be covered up.

So there is an inconsistency. There is an inconsistency between what the people on the front lines are saying and what the higher-ups are saying, even to us here in Congress, where I maintain, Mr. Chairman, we have been lied to and we continue to be lied to.

The Clinton administration cannot continue this cover-up. We are going to continue investigating and pressing this issue, because the poison that is coming in to kill our young people in this country is not acceptable and a policy that covers up the importation of that policy is at the very least unconscionable as well as unacceptable.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a statement as it relates to one of the issues that we have consistently heard about and suggesting that the Administration has cut our overall drug efforts. In essence what we had here was a readjusted strategy. We found that the Administration through its fact-finding found that over the Mexican border, much more was coming through in terms of illicit drugs than from some of the Caribbean aspects, so it reallocated moneys to domestic law enforcement, and our overall budget remained the same. In the 1997 fiscal year, we are talking about 52 percent went to domestic law enforcement, because it understood the intention and the need to deal with what was coming over our border and it reallocated for that purpose. And then 12 percent went for interdiction and 35 percent went for demand. What we are doing, we are taking that 52 percent for domestic law enforcement which was geared at the border, the most porous place in which the ability to transverse drugs into the country was created and now here we are going to try to raise the interdiction part. There are many of us who support that. But we need to characterize it in the appropriate way.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) who has been extremely active over many years in the House and former chair of what was a select committee on narcotics.

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

□ 1200

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor to support this initiative.

It did not come as a surprise to me that the first person I would see on the floor would be my old and dear friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr.

GILMAN). It has been over a quarter of a century now that he and I recognize this threat to our Nation's national security. We have been around the world with the most bipartisan groups we would have in the Congress and in local government and law enforcement. We have been around the world talking with people, and more often than not in recent years we would look at each other and say, whether it was at the United Nations or in committees in this Congress, it looks like this is where we started.

Mr. Chairman, the reason for it is that we all agree that demand is such an important part of this struggle where kids have to not just say no, but have hopes and dreams for the future so that addiction and crime and violence and jail is no longer an option for them, and we have to invest in education if we are going to get a handle on this. We need local law enforcement, of course, so that those who venture to make profit at the expense and misery of others would know that if they commit the crime, they do the time.

We have to protect our borders against this poison that comes in, and we have to let every Nation know that those that venture out and traffick and use their countries for transshipment, that it violates everything that this country stands for, and that we are not going to tolerate that.

Mr. Chairman, we have to talk about corruption, not that we do not have more than our share in this country, but we cannot tolerate it with the countries that we are sending resources to and find that it is not reaching those people that dedicate their lives each and every day to fighting the drug traffickers and those that support them.

I remember the day so vividly when the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and I were on the streets of Bogotá and saw what amounted to their Federal Bureau of Investigation headquarters with a big hole blasted into it as the drug traffickers sought to destroy the very institution of their government. How many funerals we have been to with Colombian law enforcement people; how many trust funds have we set up for their families?

So some people say, well, we tried that, and it has not worked, and so give up. No, we cannot give up. This is not a problem that our great Nation can give up. This is the type of problem where there are no parties, there is no Republicans, there is no Democrats. It is our kids, it is our future. And we have to be able to say at the same time, the same way that we wrestled Communists to the ground, that we are going to wrestle this threat to our security to the ground.

Mr. Chairman, I support this, I support the bipartisan nature in which we come to deal with this.

This administration, be placed on notice, that from the time I came here we have engaged in each 4 years with a new war on drugs, and each time we have not even seen the bang of a flag out of a pop gun in terms of dealing with this tragic problem. I remember that we set up the drug czar, and that was supposed to coordinate all of the efforts. But in setting up the drug czar, we lost the voice of each and every Secretary, whether the Secretary of State, Secretary of Education, Secretary of Health and Human Services, Secretary of Defense. All of these things are necessary when the Commander in Chief and President of the United States declares war.

So let me congratulate the original authors of the bill, and let me say that regardless of which side of the aisle we are on, America will never be free and our legacy will never be clean until we say that on our watch we eliminated this threat to our national security.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of the bipartisanship I was talking about, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) chairman of the Committee on International Relations, someone who has focused a lot of time of his work and efforts here in the Congress on the issue of combating drugs in our country.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this worthy legislation. It is intended to improve our Nation's fight against drugs at their source before they ever reach our shores to destroy our communities and our children.

Yes, it is important we fight this battle on both reducing supply and reducing demand and doing it simultaneously, and this is an important aspect of reducing demand.

I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) our Drug Task Force chairman, for these outstanding efforts, bipartisan efforts, to turn around the serious source-nation neglect by this administration, neglect abroad, I might add, which is already having disastrous consequences at home and in rising drug use among our young, especially with Colombian heroin.

And I am pleased that we are joined today in support of this bill by my good friend and a longtime drug fighter, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who is still fighting the good fight. He chaired, and I recall we had an excellent House Select Committee on Narcotics that he chaired, and we worked together in a bipartisan effort to fight drugs both here and abroad.

As my colleagues know, the fight has not changed one iota, and the problem has not changed. The war on drugs is not a partisan issue; it is, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) noted, it is about our children, and I am so pleased that we have a measure before us which can help substantially.

The most recent drug use data reflects extensive damages. For example, for the first time heroin use is at an all time high: 171,000 teens used heroin for the first time in 1996, the latest statistics we have available. It is way above the 1995 levels. Yes, we are in a crisis with drug use at home, especially heroin, in part due to our neglect abroad. In the last 5 years we witnessed a startling 875 percent increase of heroin use by teenagers 12 through 17, and not long ago a poll of our Nation put the issue of stopping drugs from entering our Nation high atop our U.S. foreign policy goals. At a June 24 Committee on International Relations hearing on the growing Colombian heroin crisis in our Nation, where a startling 75 percent of the heroin on the streets now originates, an FBI witness testified on the best way to tackle this crisis, and he stated and I quote:

''Eradication of the opium poppy in South America seems to be the logical point of attack in order to curb the increasing flow of Colombian heroin into the growing Northeast market.''

This wise approach favored by the FBI to fight Colombian heroin was also shared by our DEA and by our Customs Service witnesses. Our front-line Federal law enforcement agents know best how to fight drugs, and that is at the source.

A recent Ocala, Florida Star-Banner editorial said it best when arguing for more efforts abroad to fight drugs in places like Colombia, and I quote: ''We face a choice. Pay a little now or a lot more later.''

This bill before us starts the process. It authorizes better high-performance helicopters for the Colombian National Police anti-drug unit which has an excellent record both fighting drugs and respecting human rights. And General Serrano, the incorruptible head of the CNP, has lost over 4,000 officers, 4,000 in the past 10 years in the Colombian eradication fight. The CNP was responsible for ridding the world of drug lords like Pablo Escobar. They deserve our support to halt the flow of drugs to our young people. I have long advocated these means to first take the fight against Colombian heroin to the high Andes where the opium poppy grows and eradicate it before it reaches our shores.

In addition, this bill removes the outmoded limits on our DEA's ability to provide nonlethal and drug-related assistance like radios and transport vehicles to cooperative anti-drug police agencies abroad. Low cost, nonlethal, anti-drug aid would be provided more quickly by the DEA to their counterparts under this proposal.

This bill also fixes a major problem with the State Department's Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement inability to effectively process and expeditiously handle foreign military sales cases for counter-narcotics-related military aid abroad.

The bill also ends the need to create whole new files, hire additional officers and bureaucracy to handle FMS anti-drug related cases within the State Department and at local U.S. embassies.

The Department of Defense will now process MFS cases after the order is negotiated by the State and the local security agents in their fight against drugs.

This reform avoids duplication, it takes advantage of our military experience and know-how in promptly providing military aid for counternarcotics assistance related to the foreign police, to military and other security agencies.

So in closing, let me say the long, bitter experience in Colombia, where inexperienced State Department officials cannot process and move along expeditiously vital counternarcotics aid under FMS in the middle of our raging narco-based war, should never be repeated.

Mr. Chairman, these and many other excellent provisions of the source nation bill before us will improve the fight against drugs abroad and at their source as the American people want, expect, and have a right to from their Federal Government. Accordingly, in the interests of effectively fighting the drug war, I urge adoption of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this open and fair rule for the House's consideration of H.R. 4300. My committee waived jurisdiction over H.R. 4300 ''The Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act''. As this session nears conclusion, we are in a serious crisis on the drug front as a result of Administration's neglect in both source nation and interdiction efforts in the war on drugs. We need bold, broad and coordinated action, H.R. 4300 sets out to do this.

The supply of pure, and low cost drugs from abroad increases daily, while corresponding demand and use rises here at home, especially heroin among our young people.

A good case in point of this neglect is Colombia, which produces 80% of the world's cocaine, and most recently has captured the heroin market here in the U.S. (75% in fact).

Our committee has held an extensive set of hearings on drugs in Colombia, and we also had the GAO report on the crisis there.

We have conducted extensive analysis of the critical need for more and better assistance including high performance helicopters, and an overall reform of our war on drugs being waged abroad.

Most recently, events turned for the worse in the fight against drugs at the source in Colombia. U.S. law enforcement is in agreement that the best place to fight drugs, is at the source in places like Colombia. The war on drugs is now on hold in Colombia. Without good helicopters, opium eradication has been cut 50% and the results in the U.S. from the influx of Colombia heroin are indeed frightening. In addition, the narco-guerillas' recently destroyed the Colombian National Police's forward drug fighting base in Miraflores. Fear of attack on their key anti-drug operations base at San Jose del Guaviare, forced the withdrawal of the CNP's few remaining operational Vietnam era Huey helicopters. Coca and cocaine lab destruction have also decreased.

This de facto cessation of the war on drugs in the major source nation in our hemisphere is having impact here at home. More and more in the U.S., the price of hard drugs fall, while the purity rises. The most recent National Household Survey data released while we were on recess, showed 171,100 teens for the first time used heroin in 1996. Heroin use in the U.S. now exceeds the late 1960s, early 1970s historic levels, and the future is not bright. On the cocaine front, prices fall, as purity rises, with use on the rise. We are witnessing a major failed demand only driven drug fighting strategy, which will reverse all of the major Reagan/Bush gains in the war on drugs.

H.R. 4300 is an excellent bill. it sets out a three-year plan to reverse this serious neglect at both the source, and in the area of drug interdiction.

As this drug crisis threatens our youth, and nation, it requires our immediate action before the session adjourns. Accordingly, under these extraordinary circumstances, I am without prejudice to the Committee's ongoing jurisdiction over the subject matter, willing to waive jurisdiction on this bill so the full House can act on it. I urge the adoption of the rule. A vote yes, is a vote to fight drugs at the source.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I just yield myself such time as I may consume very briefly, and then I will yield back.

I think I want to echo comments of my colleague from New York (Mr. RANGEL) which I think very vividly express the sentiments of those on this side of the aisle about our commitment to this fight, understanding that there are many aspects to this fight, many fronts to be fought on. Today we are focusing on one of those fronts, and appropriately, in an appropriate manner.

But I just hope that my colleagues, in the ensuing debate that will take place on the amendments, will understand that in that process, as we deal with interdiction, which is an incredibly important element of this, we need not to forget demand reduction and we need not to forget about education and treatment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to this bill, which attempts to implement various plans aimed at reducing the flow of illicit drugs into the United States through drug interdiction programs in North, Central, and South America, as well as the Caribbean.

Although I cannot in good conscience support this bill, I applaud the effort because it serves as an acknowledgement that the war on drugs cannot be fought on our soil alone. It will take the efforts of the global community, working together, to defeat this scourge and leave a drug-free legacy for our posterity. For this recognition, I applaud the House leadership.

However, there are certain principles that we as legislators must abide by when passing legislation. This bill violates many of them, and for that reason, I oppose the passage of this bill.

This bill contains no human rights or anti-corruption conditionality on assistance, except in the case of Columbia, where the inclusion of that condition threatens the delicate balance of their peace process. As a Founder and Chairperson of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I will not allow federal funds to go to oppressive governments, especially when there is a good chance that those very funds could be used to dehumanize the people of their country.

I also oppose this bill because it represents a failure of the deliberative process. Although the ranking members of several committees, including the Judiciary upon which I serve, requested H.R. 4300, jurisdiction of the bill was waived by the respective Republican Chairperson, essentially blocking Democratic input until it reached the floor of the House this morning. There have been no hearings on this bill, and no markups. That means the bill was not subjected to the scrutiny of elected lawmakers. The representatives who were voted in by the people of the United States to protect their interests. I cannot be a party to that.

Furthermore, the goals of this bill, while laudable, are unrealistic and unattainable, especially in light of the low amount of funds authorized for its implementation. For this reasons, the Office of National Drug Policy also opposes this bill.

We all know that this bill will not be fully funded. Our appropriations for this year are gaunt, and this bill unfairly raises the expectations of the American people. I would love to see an 80-percent reduction in drug trafficking, but I know that this goal is not attainable without the enactment of a truly comprehensive drug bill, wrought through the legislative process, and with due consideration for our long-standing foreign policy objectives.

It is a fact that a tremendous amount of drugs cross our borders every year, and I acknowledge that it is a problem of enormous magnitude. But we cannot leave our common sense and legislative know-how behind as we chase the holy grail of a drug-free America. I vow to remain vigilant in protecting our children the best way I know how, by passing effective legislation that can, realistically and not theoretically, win us the war on drugs.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4300, and commend the efforts of my colleagues to bring this bill to the floor.

As chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I have urged the administration to take a more balanced approach to drug control by increasing Coast Guard drug interdiction resources.

The reason that this is so important is simple: Aggressive interdiction of illegal drugs raises the street price for drug users.

Raising the street price of illegal drugs deters casual drug users, especially teenagers, from using drugs.

Research shows that if people do not use drugs as teenagers, they are unlikely to acquire a drug habit later in life.

Sadly, the latest news on teenage drug use in this country is bleak.

Last month, the administration released the findings of the most recent national household survey on drug abuse.

For young people ages 12–17, the survey found a 32-percent increase in drug use, primarily marijuana, during the last year alone.

We must act immediately to reduce drug use in this country by providing the resources necessary for law enforcement officials to fight the war on drugs.

The drug interdiction funds authorized in H.R. 4300 will allow the Coast Guard to respond aggressively to drug smugglers before they reach our borders.

Billions of dollars of television advertisements are no substitute for tough law enforcement to keep drugs off American streets and out of the hands of American children.

I urge Members to support H.R. 4300.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the ''Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act.'' As a cosponsor of this important legislation, I am proud to speak in favor of its provisions.

I think we are all aware of the enormity of the drug problem.

More than eleven million Americans buy illicit drugs and use them more than once a month, spending as much as $150 billion annually.

Studies indicate that the addictive nature of drugs, their high cost and their illegality play a role in half of the street crime in the United States.

And we all can attest to the debilitating effect drug use has on communities, neighborhoods and families.

Measured in dollar value, at least four-fifths of all the illicit drugs consumed in the U.S. are of foreign origin, including virtually all the cocaine and heroin.

But let's be honest with ourselves—there has never been a real war against drugs in this country. In fact, in recent years we have been waving the white flag of surrender. Drastic cuts to budget of the Drug Czar, reductions in military interdiction efforts, and removal of important radar sites around our borders have had real consequences.

With a brief review of the basic economic doctrine of supply and demand, it is not hard to understand that the more drugs that enter this country, the cheaper the street price is, and the more likely that a young person—maybe a first-time user—will experiment with drugs.

So what can we do to slow the flow of drugs?

First, we must enhance our surveillance efforts to detect and monitor drug traffickers on the high seas or in the skies above. The Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act accomplishes this by authorizing funds for source and transit country aircraft and improved radar coverage.

Second, we must intensify eradication and interdiction in the primary source countries. The legislation at hand addresses this as well by authorizing funds for these activities in Bolivia, Colombia and Peru.

Third and finally, we must focus on international law enforcement training and making sure that our law enforcement agents have the tools they need to fight this war. The legislation before us today recognizes the importance of these resources: it funds three international law enforcement academies, a U.S. Coast Guard training vessel, and a joint maritime law enforcement training center.

While the price tag on this package is significant, I believe it is time to get serious about our war on drugs. Halting the cultivation and transportation of these lethal substances deserves our strong support.

Mr. Speaker, let me close with one last thought. If a large quantity of anthrax was being transported from South America to the United States what would we do? Drugs are just as deadly. And we must be just as vigilant to protect all Americans from the scourge of drug abuse as we would any other national security threat.

I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this bill and would like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. HASTERT for his hard work in expeditiously moving it to the floor. I would also like to thank him for his cooperation in accommodating our concerns with regard to those portions of the bill which fall within the jurisdiction of the House Agriculture Committee.

I would like to speak specifically to the title III of the bill. This title of the bill authorizes a very innovative approach to tackling our drug problems in this country and across the world involving agricultural research. The phenomenal discoveries that USDA and the private sector have developed will be used to literally stop the production of drugs at the initial source by introducing diseases directly into the plants that produce these drugs.

Earlier this year, we passed and the President signed into law a reauthorization of our agricultural research programs. This bill was the result of about a year of work in which Mr. Combest's subcommittee conducted thorough review of agricultural research programs and worked hard to increase efficiencies and improve the performance and results of our agricultural research programs. Within that debate a lot of discussion occurred regarding the vital importance of strong agricultural research to help American farmers and ranchers meet the increasing demands of an ever competitive world marketplace. Frustration was expressed about the lack of appreciation in most of our society for the benefits that we enjoy resulting from agricultural research. This project is a perfect example of agricultural research producing benefits for our everyday lives. Agricultural research will play an integral role in stemming the production of deadly drugs which have been such a detriment to our society.

Also in title III of the bill is an authorization for work by USDA's Agricultural Research Service and the U.S. Agency for International Development to assist producers who have relied on the production of drug producing plants to support their families in switching to alternative crops. This is a vital aspect of this program which needs to be present to make the program successful. I would like to make it clear that the crops which will be encouraged as alternatives for these producers are not major, traditional crops which are widely grown in the United States. Examples of these alternative crops are calca, which is the bean which is used to produce chocolate, and bananas. Therefore, U.S. producers should not be concerned that this project will affect the supply on the world market for the crops that they produce.

Again, I appreciate the work of Mr. HASTERT and others in bringing this bill to the floor and I am glad to support its passage.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in reluctant opposition to this bill.

I agree with the sponsors of this bill that we must do more to combat the trade in illegal drugs. We need to increase our interdiction efforts. We must step up our efforts to eradicate drugs at the source. We should increase our cooperation with other nations and assist them in proper training of law enforcement officers. I also support redoubling our crop substitution efforts.

However, the substantial changes in U.S. policy made by this bill deserve proper consideration by the authorizing committees. This bill was initially referred to five committees, none of which held a hearing or a mark-up. This bill was re-drafted behind closed doors this week and was shared with Democrats only at the last minute.

Seat-of-the-pants legislating may make for good politics in an election year, but it also makes bad law. For example, this bill authorizes new equipment purchases but fails to adequately fund its operation or maintenance. Oversights like this can be easily addressed by the authorizing committees if they are given the chance.

Furthermore, I am opposed to the provisions in this bill which further reduce the role of the State Department in this growing international problem. Specifically, this bill will transfer the Bureau of International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement Affairs from the State Department to the Drug Enforcement Agency.

It may be true, as the sponsors claim, that narcotics control assistance is better conducted by law enforcement agencies than by the State Department. But I do know that the State Department is better equipped to deal with issues of international stability and diplomacy. For example, this bill threatens a tentative peace by withholding assistance if the Colombian government agrees to a demilitarized zone with its insurgents. Disrupting the peace process will weaken the Colombian government and will hamper its ability to effectuate strong, sensible narcotics control programs. It is critical that the State Department retain its seat at the table if we are to adequately consider the effects that our drug control policy has on the stability of other nations and the ability of those nations to cooperate with us as partners in these efforts.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I wonder about the timing of this bill. We always seem to consider major counter-narcotics authorization bills just prior to election day. I'm sure that it is merely coincidental, but I wonder why we've chosen to focus on these authorization bills when the real problem we face in narcotics control is that Congress fails to adequately fund existing programs. If no one proposed full funding of counter-narcotics programs when we considered the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Bill just six weeks ago, does anyone really think passing this bill will result in greater appropriations and greater counter-narcotics efforts?

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule for not more than 3 hours.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, numbered 1, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 4300

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings and statement of policy.

TITLE I—ENHANCED SOURCE AND TRANSIT COUNTRY COVERAGE
Sec. 101. Expansion of aircraft coverage and operation in source and transit countries.
Sec. 102. Expansion of maritime coverage and operation in source and transit countries.
Sec. 103. Expansion of radar coverage and operation in source and transit countries.
TITLE II—ENHANCED ERADICATION AND INTERDICTION STRATEGY IN SOURCE COUNTRIES
Sec. 201. Additional eradication resources for Colombia.
Sec. 202. Additional eradication resources for Peru.
Sec. 203. Additional eradication resources for Bolivia.
Sec. 204. Additional eradication resources for Mexico.
Sec. 205. Miscellaneous additional eradication resources.
Sec. 206. Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs.
Sec. 207. Report on transferring international narcotics assistance activities to a United States law enforcement agency.
TITLE III—ENHANCED ALTERNATIVE CROP DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT IN SOURCE ZONE AND MYCOHERBICIDE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
Sec. 301. Alternative crop development support.
Sec. 302. Authorization of appropriations for Agricultural Research Service counterdrug research and development activities.
Sec. 303. Master plan for mycoherbicides to control narcotic crops.
TITLE IV—ENHANCED INTERNATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING
Sec. 401. Enhanced international law enforcement academy training.
Sec. 402. Enhanced United States drug enforcement international training.
Sec. 403. Provision of nonlethal equipment to foreign law enforcement organizations for cooperative illicit narcotics control activities.
TITLE V—ENHANCED DRUG TRANSIT AND SOURCE ZONE LAW ENFORCEMENT OPERATIONS AND EQUIPMENT
Sec. 501. Increased funding for operations and equipment.
Sec. 502. Sense of Congress regarding priority of drug interdiction and counterdrug activities.
TITLE VI—RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS
Sec. 601. Authorizations of appropriations.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Teenage drug use in the United States has doubled since 1993.

(2) The drug crisis facing the United States is a top national security threat.

(3) The spread of illicit drugs through United States borders cannot be halted without an effective drug interdiction strategy.

(4) Effective drug interdiction efforts have been shown to limit the availability of illicit narcotics, drive up the street price, support demand reduction efforts, and decrease overall drug trafficking and use.

(5) A prerequisite for reducing youth drug use is increasing the price of drugs. To increase price substantially, at least 60 percent of drugs must be interdicted.

(6) In 1987, the national drug control budget maintained a significant balance between demand and supply reduction efforts, illustrated as follows:

(A) 29 percent of the total drug control budget expenditures for demand reduction programs.

(B) 38 percent of the total drug control budget expenditures for domestic law enforcement.

(C) 33 percent of the total drug control budget expenditures for international drug interdiction efforts.

(7) In the late 1980's and early 1990's, counternarcotic efforts were successful, specifically in protecting the borders of the United States from penetration by illegal narcotics through increased seizures by the United States Coast Guard and other agencies, including a 302 percent increase in pounds of cocaine seized between 1987 and 1991.

(8) Limiting the availability of narcotics to drug traffickers in the United States had a promising effect as illustrated by the decline of illicit drug use between 1988 and 1991, through a—

(A) 13 percent reduction in total drug use;

(B) 35 percent drop in cocaine use; and

(C) 16 percent decrease in marijuana use.

(9) In 1993, drug interdiction efforts in the transit zones were reduced due to an imbalance in the national drug control strategy. This trend has continued through 1995 as shown by the following figures:

(A) 35 percent for demand reduction programs.

(B) 53 percent for domestic law enforcement.

(C) 12 percent for international drug interdiction efforts.

(10) Supply reduction efforts became a lower priority for the Administration and the seizures by the United States Coast Guard and other agencies decreased as shown by a 68 percent decrease in the pounds of cocaine seized between 1991 and 1996.

(11) Reductions in funding for comprehensive interdiction operations like OPERATION GATEWAY and OPERATION STEELWEB, initiatives that encompassed all areas of interdiction and attempted to disrupt the operating methods of drug smugglers along the entire United States border, have created unprotected United States border areas which smugglers exploit to move their product into the United States.

(12) The result of this new imbalance in the national drug control strategy caused the drug situation in the United States to become a crisis with serious consequences including—

(A) doubling of drug-abuse-related arrests for minors between 1992 and 1996;

(B) 70 percent increase in overall drug use among children aged 12 to 17;

(C) 80 percent increase in drug use for graduating seniors since 1992;

(D) a sharp drop in the price of 1 pure gram of heroin from $1,647 in 1992 to $966 in February 1996; and

(E) a reduction in the street price of 1 gram of cocaine from $123 to $104 between 1993 and 1994.

(13) The percentage change in drug use since 1992, among graduating high school students who used drugs in the past 12 months, has substantially increased—marijuana use is up 80 percent, cocaine use is up 80 percent, and heroin use is up 100 percent.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to—

(1) reduce the supply of drugs and drug use through an enhanced drug interdiction effort in the major drug transit countries, as well support a comprehensive supply country eradication and crop substitution program, because a commitment of increased resources in international drug interdiction efforts will create a balanced national drug control strategy among demand reduction, law enforcement, and international drug interdiction efforts; and

(2) support policies and dedicate the resources necessary to reduce the flow of illegal drugs into the United States by not less than 80 percent by December 31, 2001.

TITLE I—ENHANCED SOURCE AND TRANSIT COUNTRY COVERAGE

SEC. 101. EXPANSION OF AIRCRAFT COVERAGE AND OPERATION IN SOURCE AND TRANSIT COUNTRIES.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.—Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of the Treasury for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for the enhancement of air coverage and operation for drug source and transit countries, as follows:

(1) For procurement of 10 P–3B Early Warning aircraft for the United States Customs Service to enhance overhead air coverage of drug source zone countries, the total amount of $430,000,000.

(2) For the procurement and deployment of 10 P–3B Slick airplanes for the United States Customs Service to enhance overhead air coverage of the drug source zone, the total amount of $150,000,000.

(3) For each of fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for operation and maintenance of 10 P–3B Early Warning aircraft for the United States Customs Service to enhance overhead air coverage of drug source zone countries, $23,500,000.

(4) For each of fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for personnel for the 10 P–3B Early Warning aircraft for the United States Customs Service to enhance overhead air coverage of drug source zone countries, $12,500,000.

(5) For each of fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for operation and maintenance of 10 P–3B Slick airplanes for the United States Customs Service to enhance overhead coverage of the drug source zone, $23,500,000.

(6) For each of fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for personnel for the 10 P–3B Slick airplanes for the United States Customs Service to enhance overhead air coverage of drug source zone countries, $12,500,000.

(7) For construction and furnishing of an additional facility for the P–3B aircraft, 6,000,000.

(8) For each of fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for operation and maintenance for overhead air coverage for Colombia, $6,000,000.

(9) For each of fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for operation and maintenance for overhead air coverage for Bolivia, $2,000,000.

(10) For each of fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for operation and maintenance for overhead air coverage for Peru, $6,000,000.

(11) For each of fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for operation and maintenance for overhead coverage for the Caribbean and Eastern Pacific regions, $25,000,000.

(12) For purchase and for operation and maintenance of 3 Schweizer RU–38A observation aircraft (to be piloted by pilots under contract with the United States), the total amount of $16,500,000, of which—

(A) $13,500,000 is for procurement; and

(B) $1,000,000 for each such fiscal year is for operation and maintenance.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than January 31, 1999, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of Central Intelligence, shall submit to the Committee on National Security, the Committee on International Relations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report examining the options available in the source and transit zones to replace Howard Air Force Base in Panama and specifying

the requirements of the United States to establish an airbase or airbases for use in support of counternarcotics operations to optimize operational effectiveness in the source and transit zones. The report shall identify the following:

(1) The specific requirements necessary to support the national drug control policy of the United States.

(2) The estimated construction, operation, and maintenance costs for a replacement counterdrug airbase or airbases in the source and transit zones.

(3) Possible interagency cost sharing arrangements for a replacement airbase or airbases.

(4) Any legal or treaty-related issues regarding the replacement airbase or airbases.

(5) A summary of completed alternative site surveys for the airbase or airbases.

(c) TRANSFER OF AIRCRAFT.—The Secretary of the Navy shall transfer to the United States Customs Service—

(1) ten currently retired and previously identified heavyweight P–3B aircraft for modification into P–3 AEW&C aircraft; and

(2) ten currently retired and previously identified heavyweight P–3B aircraft for modification into P–3 Slick aircraft.

SEC. 102. EXPANSION OF COAST GUARD DRUG INTERDICTION.

(a) OPERATING EXPENSES.—For operating expenses of the Coast Guard associated with expansion of drug interdiction activities around Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, and other transit zone areas of operation, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation $129,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001. Such amounts shall include (but are not limited to) amounts for the following:

(1) For deployment of intelligent acoustic detection buoys in the Florida Straits and Bahamas.

(2) For a nonlethal technology program to enhance countermeasures against the threat of transportation of drugs by so-called Go-Fast boats.

(b) ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For acquisition, construction, and improvement of facilities and equipment to be used for expansion of Coast Guard drug interdiction activities, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation for fiscal year 1999 the following:

(A) For maritime patrol aircraft, $66,000,000.

(B) For acquisition of deployable pursuit boats, $3,500,000.

(C) For the acquisition and construction of 15 United States Coast Guard 87-foot Coastal Patrol Boats, $71,000,000.

(D) For the reactivation of 3 United States Coast Guard HU–25 Falcon jets, $7,500,000.

(E) For acquisition of installed or deployable electronic sensors and communications systems for Coast Guard Cutters, $16,300,000.

(F) For acquisition and construction of facilities and equipment to support regional and international law enforcement training and support in Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, and Caribbean Basin, $4,000,000.

(G) For acquisition or conversion of maritime patrol aircraft, $17,000,000.

(H) For acquisition or conversion of 2 vessels to be used as Coast Guard Medium or High Endurance Cutters, $36,000,000.

(I) For acquisition or conversion of 2 vessels to be used as Coast Guard Cutters as support, command, and control platforms for drug interdiction operations, $20,000,000.

(J) For construction of 6 United States Code Coast Guard medium endurance cutters, $289,000,000.

(2) CONTINUED AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated under this subsection may remain available until expended.

(c) REQUIREMENT TO ACCEPT PATROL CRAFT FROM DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Transportation shall accept, for use by the Coast Guard for expanded drug interdiction activities, 7 PC–170 patrol craft offered by the Department of Defense.

SEC. 103. EXPANSION OF RADAR COVERAGE AND OPERATION IN SOURCE AND TRANSIT COUNTRIES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of the Treasury for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for the enhancement of radar coverage in drug source and transit countries, as follows:

(1) For restoration of radar in the Bahamas, the total amount of $13,500,000, of which—

(A) the total amount of $4,500,000 is for procurement; and

(B) $3,000,000 for each such fiscal year is for operation and maintenance.

(2) For each such fiscal year for operation and maintenance, for establishment of ground-based radar coverage at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base, Cuba, $300,000.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than January 31, 1999, the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Director of Central Intelligence, shall submit to the Committee on National Security and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report examining the options available to the United States for improving Relocatable Over the Horizon (ROTHR) capability to provide enhanced radar coverage of narcotics source zone countries in South America and transit zones in the Eastern Pacific. The report shall include—

(1) a discussion of the need and costs associated with the establishment of a proposed fourth ROTHR site located in the source or transit zones; and

(2) an assessment of the intelligence specific issues raised if such a ROTHR facility were to be established in conjunction with a foreign government.

TITLE II—ENHANCED ERADICATION AND INTERDICTION STRATEGY IN SOURCE COUNTRIES

SEC. 201. ADDITIONAL ERADICATION RESOURCES FOR COLOMBIA.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF STATE.—Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for the enhancement of drug-related eradication efforts in Colombia, as follows:

(1) For each such fiscal year for sustaining support of the helicopters and fixed wing fleet of the national police of Colombia, $6,000,000.

(2) For the purchase of DC–3 transport aircraft for the national police of Colombia, the total amount of $2,000,000.

(3) For acquisition of concertina wire and tunneling detection systems at the La Picota prison of the national police of Colombia, the total amount of $1,250,000.

(4) For the purchase of minigun systems for the national police of Colombia, the total amount of $6,000,000.

(5) For the purchase of 6 UH–60L Black Hawk utility helicopters for the national police of Colombia, the total amount of $60,000,000 for procurement and an additional amount of $12,000,000 for each such fiscal year for operation, maintenance, and training.

(6) For procurement, for upgrade of 50 UH–1H helicopters to the Huey II configuration equipped with miniguns for the use of the national police of Colombia, the total amount of $70,000,000.

(7) For the repair and rebuilding of the antinarcotics base at Miraflores, $2,000,000.

(8) For providing sufficient and adequate base and force security for any rebuilt facility at Miraflores, and the other forward operating antinarcotics bases of the Colombian National Police antinarcotics unit, $6,000,000.

(b) COUNTERNARCOTICS ASSISTANCE.—United States counternarcotics assistance may not be provided for the Government of Colombia under this Act or under any other provision of law on or after the date of the enactment of this Act if the Government of Colombia negotiates or permits the establishment of any demilitarized zone in which the eradication and interdiction of drug production by the security forces of Colombia, including the Colombian National Police antinarcotics unit, is prohibited.

SEC. 202. ADDITIONAL ERADICATION RESOURCES FOR PERU.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF STATE.—Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for the establishment of a third drug interdiction site at Puerto Maldonado, Peru, to support air bridge and riverine missions for enhancement of drug-related eradication efforts in Peru, the total amount of $3,000,000, and an additional amount of $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for operation and maintenance.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study of Peruvian counternarcotics air interdiction requirements and, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to Congress a report on the results of the study. The study shall include a review of the Peruvian Air Force's current and future requirements for counternarcotics air interdiction to complement the Peruvian Air Force's A–37 capability.

SEC. 203. ADDITIONAL ERADICATION RESOURCES FOR BOLIVIA.

Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for enhancement of drug-related eradication efforts in Bolivia, as follows:

(1) For each such fiscal year for support of air operations of the Red Devils of Bolivia, $1,000,000.

(2) For each such fiscal year for support of riverine operations of the Blue Devils of Bolivia, $1,000,000.

(3) For each such fiscal year for support of coca eradication programs, $1,000,000.

(4) For the procurement of 2 mobile x-ray machines with maintenance support for placement along the Chapare highway, the total amount of $5,000,000 and an additional amount of $1,000,000 for each such fiscal year for operation and maintenance.

SEC. 204. ADDITIONAL ERADICATION RESOURCES FOR MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO PURCHASE HELICOPTERS.—Contingent on the agreement of the Government of Mexico to approve full diplomatic immunity for Drug Enforcement Administration personnel serving in Mexico with privileges granted to United States Government officials to carry weapons necessary for the performance of their duties, the Secretary of State, subject to the availability of appropriations, shall purchase 6 Bell 212 high altitude helicopters designated for opium eradication programs in the Mexican states of Guerrero, Jalisco, and Sinaloa, for enhancement of drug-related eradication efforts in Mexico.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State during the period beginning on October 1, 1998, and on ending September 30, 2001, $18,000,000 to carry out paragraph (1).

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) all United States law enforcement personnel serving in Mexico should be accredited the same status under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Immunity as other diplomatic personnel serving at United States posts in Mexico; and

(2) all Mexican narcotics law enforcement personnel serving in the United States should be accorded the same diplomatic status as Drug Enforcement Administration personnel serving in Mexico.

SEC. 205. MISCELLANEOUS ADDITIONAL ERADICATION RESOURCES.

Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for enhanced precursor chemical control projects, in the total amount of $500,000.

SEC. 206. BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT AFFAIRS.

(a) QUALIFICATIONS FOR SERVICE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any individual serving in the position of assistant secretary in any department or agency of the Federal Government who has primary responsibility for international narcotics control and law enforcement, and the principal deputy of any such assistant secretary, shall have substantial professional qualifications in the fields of—

(1) management; and

(2) Federal law enforcement, or intelligence.

(b) FOREIGN MILITARY SALES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the receipt by the Department of State of a formal letter of request for any foreign military sales counternarcotics-related assistance from the head of any police, military, or other appropriate security agency official, the implementation and processing of the counternarcotics foreign military sales request shall be the sole responsibility of the Department of Defense, which is the traditional lead agency in providing military equipment and supplies abroad.

(2) ROLE OF STATE DEPARTMENT.—The Department of State shall continue to have a consultative role with the Department of Defense in the processing of the request described in paragraph (1), after receipt of the letter of request, for all counternarcotics-related foreign military sales assistance.

SEC. 207. REPORT ON TRANSFERRING INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES TO A UNITED STATES LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the responsiveness and effectiveness of international narcotics assistance activities under the Department of State have been severely hampered due, in part, to the lack of law enforcement expertise by responsible personnel in the Department of State.

(b) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees a report, which shall evaluate the responsiveness and effectiveness of international narcotics assistance activities under the Department of State during the preceding 4 fiscal years.

(2) RECOMMENDATION AND EXPLANATION.—The study submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the recommendation of the Director and detailed explanatory statement regarding whether the overseas activities of the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs of the Department of State should be transferred to the Department of Justice.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Office on National Drug Control Policy $100,000 to carry out the study under this section.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees'' means—

(1) the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, Foreign Relations, and the Judiciary of the Senate;

(2) the Committees on Appropriations, International Relations, National Security, and the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(3) the Select Committees on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

TITLE III—ENHANCED ALTERNATIVE CROP DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT IN SOURCE ZONE

SEC. 301. ALTERNATIVE CROP DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT.

Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the United States Agency for International Development for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for alternative development programs, as follows:

(1) For startup costs of programs in the Guaviare, Putumayo, and Caqueta regions in Colombia, the total amount of $5,000,000 and an additional amount of $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for operation and maintenance costs.

(2) For each of fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for enhanced programs in the Ucayali, Apurimac, and Huallaga Valley regions in Peru, $50,000,000.

(3) For each of fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for enhanced programs in the Chapare and Yungas regions in Bolivia, $5,000,000.

SEC. 302. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE COUNTERDRUG RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture for each of fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001, $23,000,000 to support the counternarcotics research efforts of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture. Of that amount, funds are authorized as follows:

(1) $5,000,000 shall be used for crop eradication technologies.

(2) $2,000,000 shall be used for narcotics plant identification, chemistry, and biotechnology.

(3) $1,000,000 shall be used for worldwide crop identification, detection tagging, and production estimation technology.

(4) $5,000,000 shall be used for improving the disease resistance, yield, and economic competitiveness of commercial crops that can be promoted as alternatives to the production of narcotics plants.

(5) $10,000,000 to contract with entities meeting the criteria described in subsection (b) for the product development, environmental testing, registration, production, aerial distribution system development, product effectiveness monitoring, and modification of multiple mycoherbicides to control narcotic crops (including coca, poppy, and cannabis) in the United States and internationally.

(b) CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—An entity under this subsection is an entity which possesses—

(1) experience in diseases of narcotic crops;

(2) intellectual property involving seed-borne dispersal formulations;

(3) the availability of state-of-the-art containment or quarantine facilities;

(4) country-specific mycoherbicide formulations;

(5) specialized fungicide resistant formulations; or

(6) special security arrangements.

SEC. 303. MASTER PLAN FOR MYCOHERBICIDES TO CONTROL NARCOTIC CROPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall develop a 10-year master plan for the use of mycoherbicides to control narcotic crops (including coca, poppy, and cannabis) in the United States and internationally .

(b) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall develop the plan in coordination with—

(1) the Office of National Drug Control Policy;

(2) the Drug Enforcement Administration of the Department of Justice;

(3) the Department of Defense;

(4) the Environmental Protection Agency;

(5) the Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Activities of the Department of State;

(6) the United States Information Agency; and

(7) other appropriate agencies.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 1999, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a report describing the activities undertaken to carry out this section.

TITLE IV—ENHANCED INTERNATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING

SEC. 401. ENHANCED INTERNATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADEMY TRAINING.

(a) ENHANCED INTERNATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADEMY TRAINING.—Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Justice for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for the establishment and operation of international law enforcement academies to carry out law enforcement training activities, as follows:

(1) For the establishment and operation of an academy, which shall serve Latin America and the Caribbean, the total amount of $3,000,000 and an additional amount of $1,200,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for operation and maintenance costs.

(2) For the establishment and operation of an academy in Bangkok, Thailand, which shall serve Asia, the total amount of $2,000,000 and an additional amount of $1,200,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for operation and maintenance costs.

(3) For each such fiscal year for the establishment and operation of an academy in South Africa, which shall serve Africa, $1,200,000.

(b) MARITIME LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER.—Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Transportation and the Department of the Treasury for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for the joint establishment, operation, and maintenance in San Juan, Puerto Rico, of a center for training law enforcement personnel of countries located in the Latin American and Caribbean regions in matters relating to maritime law enforcement, including customs-related ports management matters, as follows:

(1) For each such fiscal year for funding by the Department of Transportation, $1,500,000.

(2) For each such fiscal year for funding by the Department of the Treasury, $1,500,000.

(c) UNITED STATES COAST GUARD INTERNATIONAL MARITIME TRAINING VESSEL.—Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Transportation for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of maritime training vessels, as follows:

(1) For a vessel for international maritime training, which shall visit participating

Latin American and Caribbean nations on a rotating schedule in order to provide law enforcement training and to perform maintenance on participating national assets, the total amount of $7,500,000.

(2) For each such fiscal year for support of the United States Coast Guard Balsam Class Buoy Tender training vessel, $2,500,000.

SEC. 402. ENHANCED UNITED STATES DRUG ENFORCEMENT INTERNATIONAL TRAINING.

(a) MEXICO.—Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Justice for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for substantial exchanges for Mexican judges, prosecutors, and police, in the total amount of $2,000,000 for each such fiscal year.

(b) BRAZIL.—Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Justice for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for enhanced support for the Brazilian Federal Police Training Center, in the total amount of $1,000,000 for each such fiscal year.

(c) PANAMA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Transportation for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for operation and maintenance, for locating and operating Coast Guard assets so as to strengthen the capability of the Coast Guard of Panama to patrol the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of Panama for drug enforcement and interdiction activities, in the total amount of $1,000,000 for each such fiscal year.

(2) ELIGIBILITY TO RECEIVE TRAINING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, members of the national police of Panama shall be eligible to receive training through the International Military Education Training program.

(d) VENEZUELA.—There are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Justice for each of fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001, $1,000,000 for operation and maintenance, for support for the Venezuelan Judicial Technical Police Counterdrug Intelligence Center.

(e) ECUADOR.—Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Transportation and the Department of the Treasury for each of fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for the buildup of local coast guard and port control in Guayaquil and Esmeraldas, Ecuador, as follows:

(1) For each such fiscal year for the Department of Transportation, $500,000.

(2) For each such fiscal year for the Department of the Treasury, $500,000.

(f) HAITI AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.—Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of the Treasury for each of fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001, $500,000 for the buildup of local coast guard and port control in Haiti and the Dominican Republic.

(g) CENTRAL AMERICA.—There are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of the Treasury for each of fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001, $12,000,000 for the buildup of local coast guard and port control in Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua.

SEC. 403. PROVISION OF NONLETHAL EQUIPMENT TO FOREIGN LAW ENFORCEMENT ORGANIZATIONS FOR COOPERATIVE ILLICIT NARCOTICS CONTROL ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, in consultation with the Secretary of State, may transfer or lease each year nonlethal equipment, of which each piece of equipment may be valued at not more than $100,000, to foreign law enforcement organizations for the purpose of establishing and carrying out cooperative illicit narcotics control activities.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—The Administrator shall provide for the maintenance and repair of any equipment transferred or leased under subsection (a).

TITLE V—ENHANCED DRUG TRANSIT AND SOURCE ZONE LAW ENFORCEMENT OPERATIONS AND EQUIPMENT

SEC. 501. INCREASED FUNDING FOR OPERATIONS AND EQUIPMENT; REPORT.

(a) DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION.—Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the Drug Enforcement Administration for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for enhancement of counternarcotic operations in drug transit and source countries, as follows:

(1) For support of the Merlin program, the total amount of $8,272,000.

(2) For support of the intercept program, the total amount of $4,500,000.

(3) For support of the Narcotics Enforcement Data Retrieval System, the total amount of $2,400,000.

(4) For support of the Caribbean Initiative, the total amount of $3,515,000.

(5) For the hire of special agents, administrative and investigative support personnel, and intelligence analysts for overseas assignments in foreign posts, the total amount of $40,213,000.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF STATE.—Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State for fiscal year 1999, 2000, and 2001 for the deployment of commercial unclassified intelligence and imaging data and a Passive Coherent Location System for counternarcotics and interdiction purposes in the Western Hemisphere, the total amount of $20,000,000.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.—Funds are authorized to be appropriated for the United States Customs Service for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001 for enhancement of counternarcotic operations in drug transit and source countries, as follows:

(1) For refurbishment of 30 interceptor and Blue Water Platform vessels in the Caribbean maritime fleet, the total amount of $3,500,000.

(2) For purchase of 9 new interceptor vessels in the Caribbean maritime fleet, the total amount of $2,000,000.

(3) For the hire and training of 25 special agents for maritime operations in the Caribbean, the total amount of $2,500,000.

(4) For purchase of 60 automotive vehicles for ground use in South Florida, $1,500,000.

(5) For each such fiscal year for operation and maintenance support for 10 United States Customs Service Citations Aircraft to be dedicated for the source and transit zone, the total amount of $10,000,000.

(6) For purchase of 5 CTX–5000 x-ray machines to enhance detection capabilities with respect to narcotics, explosives, and currency, the total amount of $7,000,000.

(d) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REPORT.—Not later than January 31, 1999, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, shall submit to the Committee on National Security and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report examining and proposing recommendations regarding any organizational changes to optimize counterdrug activities, including alternative cost-sharing arrangements regarding the following facilities:

(1) The Joint Inter-Agency Task Force, East, Key West, Florida.

(2) The Joint Inter-Agency Task Force, West, Alameda, California.

(3) The Joint Inter-Agency Task Force, South, Panama City, Panama.

(4) The Joint Task Force 6, El Paso, Texas.

SEC. 502. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PRIORITY OF DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTERDRUG ACTIVITIES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should revise the Global Military Force Policy of the Department of Defense in order—

(1) to treat the international drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department as a military operation other than war, thereby elevating the priority given such activities under the Policy to the next priority below the priority given to war under the Policy and to the same priority as is given to peacekeeping operations under the Policy; and

(2) to allocate the assets of the Department to drug interdiction and counter-drug activities in accordance with the priority given those activities.

TITLE VI—RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS

SEC. 601. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The funds authorized to be appropriated for any department or agency of the Federal Government for fiscal years 1999, 2000, or 2001 by this Act are in addition to funds authorized to be appropriated for that department or agency for fiscal year 1999, 2000, or 2001 by any other provision of law.

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCCOLLUM

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. MCCOLLUM:

Page 5, line 25, insert the following:

(14) The Department of Defense has been called upon to support counter-drug efforts of Federal law enforcement agencies that are carried out in source countries and through transit zone interdiction, but in recent years Department of Defense assets critical to those counter-drug activities have been consistently diverted to missions that the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff consider a higher priority;

(15) The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, through the Department of Defense policy referred to as the Global Military Force Policy, has established the priorities for the allocation of military assets in the following order: (1) war, (2) military operations other than war that might involve contact with hostile forces (such as peacekeeping operations and noncombatant evacuations), (3) exercises and training, and (4) operational tasking other than those involving hostilities (including counter-drug activities and humanitarian assistance);

(16) Use of Department of Defense assets is critical to the success of efforts to stem the flow of illegal drugs from source countries and through transit zones to the United States;

(17) The placement of counter-drug activities in the fourth and last priority of the Global Military Force Policy list of priorities for the allocation of military assets has resulted in a serious deficiency in assets vital to the success of source country and transit zone efforts to stop the flow of illegal drugs into the United States;

(18) At present the United States faces few, if any, threats from abroad greater than the threat posed to the Nation's youth by illegal and dangerous drugs;

(19) The conduct of counter-drug activities has the potential for contact with hostile forces;

(20) The Department of Defense counter-drug activities mission should be near the top, not among the last, of the priorities for the allocation of Department of Defense assets after the first priority for those assets for the war-fighting mission of the Department of Defense.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak for a few minutes about the issue that we talked about briefly in the general debate on the priorities that are set by our Department of Defense. They have a particular terminology they use over there about global military force policy in the Department of Defense. It is not a legislative matter; it is a matter of how they do a lot of things that perhaps we do not need to discuss here today on the floor, but one of those things is to set some priorities for the allocation of assets, military assets, presumably equipment, everything else. Unfortunately, today the way this works, there are things that just simply are not right with respect to this in my judgment.

The Department of Defense has a mission of anti-narcotics. But that anti-narcotics mission is way down the pipeline, and as a consequences of that, our Southern Command, which is in charge of all of our military forces in the Caribbean and Latin America principally concerned about the anti-narcotics effort, though there might be other defense measures and needs, our Southern Command is not able to provide the equipment and the manpower and the effort that Congress envisioned years ago when we designated a role for the military in the anti-narcotics effort.

Now I realize the Department of Defense budget has declined in real terms for 14 consecutive years, and I am one of the strong proponents of a tough and stronger military. I think we have let it deplete terribly. I think we have a problem with the absence of a ballistic missile defense system in this country. We should have deployed one a long time ago, and we should be deploying one today, especially in light of the Rumsfeld report where we know that there may be missile capabilities from some of our potential adversaries that can even reach our shores in the next 2 or 3 years with nuclear, chemical or biological weapons aboard.

□ 1215

I know that our young men and women are stretched beyond where they should be in deployments in far-reaching parts of the world today and peacekeeping missions like in Bosnia. The threat is certainly there for not only terrorism acts, but more serious matters even than that for our military with respect to the Middle East and Near East and so forth.

It is a dangerous world we live in out there and we very badly need to readdress our defense strategy and our defense resource allocation by this Congress. It is desperately in need. I am a former JAG officer in the Navy and I spent 20 more years in the Reserves after that, and I am around a lot of folks who have been on active duty and are today, and I know the morale is not good, the maintenance stream is not good, and while we have the finest men and women we would ever want out there serving, we have a lot to do.

So I can sympathize with the fact that DOD does not want to provide, because it does not think it has the resources, what it needs to, to SOUTHCOM in the antinarcotics efforts because it has a higher priority charge. But therein lies the problem.

The priorities that are currently set out in this global military force policy set of priorities says that there is, indeed, a 4-pronged measuring rod of how we allocate. Number 1 is in case of war, nobody disputes that. Number 2, for military operations other than war that might involve contact with hostile forces such as peacekeeping operations, and training; and number 4, operational tasking other than those involving hostilities. So we have the exercises in training coming ahead of the number 4 one, and number 4 includes counterdrug activities and humanitarian assistance.

The amendment I am offering today are findings to go along with the sense of the Congress that is already in this bill. We have expressed a sense of the Congress in this bill, in the last portion of it, which calls upon the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to change these priorities, and to put the counterdrug activities up into the number 2 slot in priorities, not way down at the bottom along with humanitarian assistance. So that SOUTHCOM and our folks out there fighting the effort on the drug front can have what resources they need, at least competitively equal with those that are being sent to Bosnia or elsewhere for peacekeeping operations.

We are losing young men and women every day to drugs in this country. We need to be engaged in a war on drugs, a true war on drugs. That does not necessarily mean invading another country, but it means going in and assisting in every way possible, with airplanes and with ships, with manpower, with training and things like that, that we are simply not doing today, and to have a higher priority that they have in some of the things they are engaged in today I just do not agree with, and I do not think this Congress should agree with. That is why the Sense of the Congress resolution in the bill calls for those changes in priority to be made, asks them to be made.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today would put findings of fact into the RECORD to support that by stating in the RECORD, the first part of it, that the Department of Defense has been called upon to support the counterdrug efforts, which we have done legislatively in the past, and all of the bases for this, in fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCOLLUM was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the findings of fact involve, as I said, the statement of the fact that the Department of Defense has been called upon to support the counterdrug efforts; the fact that we have this global military force policy that has these 4 different provisions in it, in the order of priority with regard to asset allocation.

The next one is that the use of the Department of Defense assets is critical to the success of efforts to stem the flow of illegal drugs, and the next one is that the placement of counterdrug activities in the fourth and last list of priorities for the allocation of assets has resulted in the serious deficiency in assets vital to the success of source country and transit zone efforts to stop the flow.

The next finding says that at present, the United States faces few, if any, threats from abroad greater than the threat posed to our Nation's youth, which I think is certainly true.

The next finding says the conduct of counterdrug activities has the potential for contact with hostile forces.

The final one says the Department of Defense counterdrug activities missions should be near the top, not among the last of the priorities, and that is what we do in the Sense of the Congress resolution.

So my amendment is simply a finding of fact that supports the Sense of the Congress resolution and sets forth the argument so everybody can read it, hopefully the Secretary of Defense will read it and hopefully the President will read it, about why we need to see them reorganize their priorities and put counterdrug efforts much higher at the top.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, to make the war on drugs a high priority at the Defense Department.

Make no mistake about it. This is a war we are fighting, fighting with drugs. Mr. Chairman, 15,000 deaths annually, 12 million property crimes annually, 70 percent of our violent crime, drug-related. More than half of our prisons are filled with those who either

use, possess, or traffic in drugs. Clearly, U.S. national interest is at stake: fighting drugs which come from abroad and threaten our well-being. One President after another has said that this is a national security risk.

If Saddam Hussein was responsible for killing 15,000 Americans each and every year, we would clearly declare war on Iraq. I say it is time to declare a war on drugs and put our Defense Department on the front lines fighting this scourge.

Our Nation produces no cocaine, we produce no heroin. All of these poisons come from abroad, and we need our hard-working and over-extended law enforcement communities to have the full benefit, the full support and assistance of our outstanding military in doing their difficult tasks.

Accordingly, I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) for his amendment in making our drug war a national priority, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support.

I want to make the comment that we have now received a few thoughts about what SOUTHCOM may need specifically, and we look forward to working with the Department of Defense in the coming year in the new Congress to develop even more new initiatives that may be helpful to them.

I want to thank the gentleman for his support. This reorganizing of priorities, our effort to give them new resources will not do any good if they do not reorganize their priorities.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) for focusing attention on this very critical problem.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the nature of the gentleman's concern and effort, but I am concerned about the potential consequences that he may unintentionally have by virtue of the amendment.

In essence, the crux of the amendment is to make it very clear that the Department of Defense should change its priorities to raise the priority of, and therefore, the resource allocation to, counterdrug activities, and that is an admirable goal. However, it seems to me that when the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who I think are eminently better positioned to determine what in essence are the needs of the Nation's defense, they need to analyze risks to the national security of the United States, and it seems to me that they, not the Congress, are the individuals who ought to make this decision.

In that respect, I am concerned. I look at the nature of the amendment, and the amendment talks about placing this as a priority above that established under the provisions of the global military force policy, which talks about missions of military operations other than war that might involve contact with hostile forces. Now, my understanding is that includes, for example, the efforts of the military under counterterrorism. We equally believe, obviously, that counterterrorism is an incredibly important function. Are we to say that using the military second only after war for drug intervention is more important than counterterrorism? I do not know. I do not think that we should be in that position.

So I think the amendment is somewhat arbitrary. It is not based on any factual assessment of the Department of Defense's needs, nor does it take into consideration the Department of Defense's priorities that this policy would have.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we give flexibility, particularly in dealing with this grave threat, but I am not sure that we are in a position to analyze the threat to the national security at any given point in time better than those who have all of the intelligence resources and who have all of the readiness and understanding of what our military forces are capable of at any given moment.

Our military confronts threats around the world, doing more with less as they confront increasingly sophisticated and complex enemies. It seems to me that the experts and the proven military leaders who we put our faith and trust in in terms of the Nation's defense need to make these assessments. I do not know that we can make those decisions from this chamber on where our troops are needed in terms of equipment and resources. It appears to me that our military leaders ought to do that.

Now, certainly we want to be able to have the armed forces of the United States play a greater role in interdiction, but the amendment in essence says that it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of Defense should revise the priorities for the Department of Defense, and that this would be equal to or higher than the priority for the mission of military operations, other than war, that might involve contact with hostile forces. Well, if that includes counterterrorism, as I understand that it does, I am not sure that we can make those statements.

We have seen the vulnerability that the United States has, or for that matter any country in the world: recently the bombings in Africa. I am not quite sure, while we want to make an important statement, that the goal of the gentleman is best achieved in the manner in which he has offered it, and I think that there are some serious concerns in that regard.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Narcotics is terrorism. Narcotics in America is the most serious terrorist threat we face. Narcotics coming across our border have basically not only challenged the spirit of American freedom, they have eroded not only our health and our youths' initiatives, but they have attacked us at the very fiber of our republic.

Individual freedom is being all that we can possibly be. I support this amendment. The tragedy in Congress is that I believe we do not even go far enough.

I will be offering an amendment that will, in fact, complement the McCollum amendment to ensure that at least the matter of narcotics is treated very seriously and at the highest levels of priority.

I think it is time to recognize that we do not have to hold a gun to someone's head to simply destroy their life. Narcotics have certainly torn away of the fabric of the quality of life in America. They have destroyed literally communities. They have destroyed our youth, they have corrupted our youth, and we have not done everything we possibly can.

So I think this is a mild measure, to a degree, but it is the beginning. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) works that way, and he is to be given credit for his legislative gains incrementally. I am glad to support it and I recommend a strong vote on behalf of the McCollum amendment.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4300, the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act.

Between 1992 and 1995, there has been an increase in teen drug use of 105 percent. Now, let me repeat that staggering statistic. Mr. Chairman, a 105 percent increase in teen drug use in just 3 years. We can no longer just stand by and let this happen. It is our obligation to our children to address this issue.

Florida, the State which I represent, is one of our main entries for drugs coming into our country. The children in Florida are standing at the front door of this crisis. This bill will cut off the supply of drugs coming into not just Florida, but into our whole country, which means there will be less drugs on the street and the price will increase dramatically.

Mr. Chairman, this is simple economics. If the cost is outrageously high, then our youth will not be able to afford to purchase such drugs. We have to get serious about winning the war on drugs, and this bill does get us going in the right direction. By enhancing our interdiction efforts and through international eradication, we can win the war.

I was recently in Colombia, Guatemala and Costa Rica, and I met with the Presidents of those countries, 2 of whom are brand-new. All 3 of these men are honest. They are committed to their country's efforts to stop the narcotrafficking.

□ 1230

But they need our assistance. They need further enhanced assistance from our country. This is truly a war, which if we lose, then it will cause a continued loss of thousands of our young people. We are losing 14,000 to 15,000 a year now, and we need to stop this loss of life due to this gouge.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to think of our American children's future and indeed the future of our country and support the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support, not only of this amendment, but in support of the direction that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) has taken on this issue. It just seems to me that, when we say Department of Defense, that we are talking about national security, we are talking about priority, we are talking about what threatens our Nation.

No one can challenge the fact that this poison that has been pouring into the United States by the tons each day has been a threat to everything that our country stands for and especially the protection of our youth.

Every President that I know, and more particularly President Reagan and President Bush, has made this a national foreign policy priority. Certainly the Department of Defense has no reason why they should not volunteer to make this a priority.

Certainly the equipment that we have to protect the United States against foreign foes can be used to protect us against the flow of drugs into this country since we have such sophisticated equipment against drug traffickers that are using sophisticated equipment.

I would like to say that, as we have this amendment that asks the Secretary of Defense to make this a priority, I would be supporting each and every amendment that would make this a priority with every Secretary of every branch of government.

Why should not the Secretary of Education make drug control and reduction of demand a priority? Why should not the Secretary of Health and Human Services make drug treatment and drug prevention a priority? Why should not the Secretary of State as relates to dealing with foreign countries make this a priority? Why should not the Secretary of Transportation say that all of those that are involved in transportation should be drug free and have it as a priority?

There is no question that the Secretary of Defense should mean exactly what the words say, defense of our great republic against any foes that could destroy her.

So let me congratulate those that worked so hard on this bill and to be able to say that whatever resources we have in the military, no matter what branch of the military, and even the CIA should be involved in determining what can they do to make our country more safe against the scourge of drugs.

So while I support this effort, I hope we continuously see in every committee, in every subcommittee, in every cabinet position, in every agency, in every department that we say this should be a priority. What is the good of a sound economic policy if our young people do not have the health in order to enjoy it?

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, today the chickens have come home to roost. I say that because I want to review with you just for a minute where we have been on this issue. I was active as a Senate staffer some years ago on this issue when the Reagan administration created most of the laws and took an active and strong stand towards the question of illegal narcotics.

I say the chickens have come home to roost because we today see the results of a policy that has failed and that has put our Nation and our children at risk. We see a policy that was adopted by a President in 1993 that put in place as the chief health officer of our Nation, the Surgeon General, an individual who said just say maybe to drugs.

We have seen the destruction of the laws which we put on the books to certify drug producing countries and make a joke of them. We have seen the highest officer of the land say, if I had it to do all over again, I would inhale.

Mr. Chairman, we see the chickens have come home to roost. Let me read a few of these statistics. Current Illicit Drug Use Among Our Nation's Youth Continues to Skyrocket. This is a report of August 21 of 1998. Youth aged 12 to 17 using illegal drugs has more than doubled, 120 percent, a 27 percent increase from 1996 to 1997.

For kids 12 to 17, these are the latest statistics, first time heroin use, which is proven to kill, surged a whopping 875 percent from 1991 to 1996. The overall number of past month heroin users increased 378 percent from 1993 to 1997.

I submit the chickens have come home to roost. When we have a policy and we have an administration from 1993 to 1995 that cut our interdiction programs, that decimated our source country programs, that reduced the military involvement in stopping drugs come into this country, which destroyed the Coast Guard's ability to protect our coast and areas like Puerto Rico, the chickens have come home to roost, and we see the results.

This bill by my colleague the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) is the antidote. It is what the doctor has ordered. It directs our resources to the source countries. We know where the drugs are coming from, heroin and cocaine. They are coming from Colombia. They are coming from Peru. They are coming from Bolivia. And they are being transited through Mexico.

This puts the resources to stop drugs at their source, the most cost effective means of stopping drugs. So we have got to put Humpty Dumpty back together again. He has fallen off the wall. He has been destroyed. But it is going to take this legislation and subsequent legislation that we will hear today and tomorrow by this country to refocus our energy to stop drugs at their source.

I do not want to see another headline in my district with another teenager, a record number killed, dying a horrible death in central Florida, my peaceful central Florida that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) shares with me. A fluent area, not a ghetto, not an urban blighted area, but the suburbs, the heart and core of this Nation has now been affected.

So it is something that really is important that we pass this legislation, this cost effective measure that is produced, not only to stop drugs at their source by our efforts, but also training those who are involved in producing drugs at their source to help us interdict this death and destruction that is plaguing our streets and our children.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly support what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) is doing. One of the things is, we talk about terrorism and we talk about drug use. When one talks about 14,000-plus kids and other Americans dying on our street corners every year, that is some kind of terrorism. That is a terrorism that we face day in and day out.

I have a brother who teaches in a middle school in Aurora, Illinois, who had children killed out of his classroom last year because of drugs and gang violence. That is certainly a terrorism that we face.

In reality, when one looks at the international side, one cannot separate drugs and terrorism because the narcotraffickers of South America and especially Colombia today, who were once ideologues that believed in the fight for a political reason, today are using almost $100 million a month in revenue from drugs to be able to move their causes.

So one cannot separate this type of terrorism of kidnapping and murder and things like that that goes on in Colombia and Bolivia from terrorism or drugs. They are intertwined. When one talks about bin Laden in the Middle East, there have been reports that there has been trafficking through Afghanistan and other Middle Eastern countries perpetrated by these folks and the profits that they made from drugs actually go for terrorism. So really we cannot separate terrorism and drugs because they are intertwined.

We need to allow the armed services, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) has done in his amendment, to weigh this evidence and try to make decisions that are good decisions,

decisions that protect Americans, decisions that stabilize peace and tranquility not only in this country but other nations, and I really salute the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) for doing that.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a clarification, a comment for the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and anybody else here, and that is my amendment today is not affecting the actual bill. The underlying bill has the sense of the Congress resolution in it that says that the question of asset allocation to the Department of Defense should be given the same priority as is given to the peacekeeping operations just after war, but it does set forth the findings of fact that form that predicate. I think we need to state that.

I think the gentleman has accurately and correctly stated the fact that we need to treat this on a wartime footing. It is the same as terrorism. It is our kids whose lives are being lost, and while if we were really at war against some nation, obviously we would be mobilizing and so forth, and that would be a little different and we do not ask that people put that over there at the Department of Defense on the same level but we are asking in the sense of the Congress that is in the bill and supporting it with this amendment findings of fact, that the Department of Defense recognize that it does have a high priority. It should be up there at least equal to those things they are doing elsewhere in the world that are short of war, and I think that is very justifiable.

I was not going to earlier but eventually I intend to ask for a recorded vote on this so we can go on the record on it and make sure that it does work.

Mr. Chairman, again, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) for yielding to me.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 537, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I think that this is a substitute motion, and I am not sure how we can proceed with other amendments if this motion is not voted on.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The larger amendment in the nature of a substitute pending is the original text under the rule. What was just postponed was a request for a vote on an amendment thereto.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HASTERT

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. HASTERT:

Strike section 303 and insert the following:

SEC. 303. MASTER PLAN FOR MYCOHERBICIDES TO CONTROL NARCOTIC CROPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall develop a 10-year master plan for the use of mycoherbicides to control narcotic crops (including coca, poppy, and cannabis) in the United States and internationally.

(b) COORDINATION.—The Director shall develop the plan in coordination with—

(1) the Department of Agriculture;

(2) the Drug Enforcement Administration of the Department of Justice;

(3) the Department of Defense;

(4) the Environmental Protection Agency;

(5) the Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Activities of the Department of State;

(6) the United States Information Agency; and

(7) other appropriate agencies.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 1999, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress a report describing the activities undertaken to carry out this section.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a very simple amendment. It is a technical amendment. It came at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I think at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture. What we have done is asked the director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy to develop a 10-year master plan for the use of mycoherbicides to control narcotic crops of coca, poppy and cannabis in the United States and internationally, that is, to do the research.

Before, the original text of the bill asks the Department of Agriculture to do it. We think that this keeps it in more the focus of the ONDCP and it gives them authority to develop that 10-year plan for herbicides and we think that this is probably a correction and something that should be done in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1245

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of title V add the following new section:

SEC. 503. PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE BY THE ARMED FORCES TO THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE AND CUSTOMS SERVICE.

The Secretary of Defense shall assist in keeping illegal drugs out of the United States by assigning members of the Armed Forces to assist—

(1) the Immigration and Naturalization Service in preventing the entry of drug traffickers and narcotics into the United States; and

(2) the United States Customs Service in the inspection of cargo, vehicles, and aircraft at points of entry into the United States.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue.

The Clerk continued reading the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, we just supported the McCollum amendment, and I congratulate the gentleman for incremental gains in securing America from illegal narcotics.

International narcotics traffickers are international terrorists. Period. Our borders have been overwhelmed by tons and tons of narcotics. One hundred percent of all the heroin, 100 percent of all cocaine is a stone cold import coming across not only our Mexican border but, contrary to what is the popular thought around here, our Canadian border as well, that can be assured, and through our many ports of entry and other security check points.

It has been pointed out that 14,000 kids die in America each year and the majority of them are victims of international narcotic traffickers who made available powerful drugs.

Mr. Chairman, who speaks today for the youth of America with noses running, eyes watering, stomach cramps, bowels breaking loose, pain and suffering, because no one really has ever really waged a war on drugs, as far as I am concerned?

There are some in the Congress that want to hand out free needles to make this destruction somewhat safer. Beam me up, literally. There is no intelligent life left here. Demand reduction is great. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) education is great. Treatment? Cops? More cops, great. Psychiatrists? Psychologists? Absolutely marvelous. Slogans? Slogans are good. I am for them. Counselors? Teachers? Yes, we can use more. Chemotherapy? Methadone, use of narcotics to blunt the effect of narcotics? It has its place. Halfway houses? Hospitals? Free clinics? All great, I support them. Task forces? How many more blue ribbon panels will we support? I support them. They are all good; they are not good enough.

There was an amendment to the national security bill that the other body would not accept. It was abandoned, and I surely accepted that. It took 11 years to change the burden of proof in a civil tax case. Frankly, in my opinion there is not enough balsam in the United States Senate to do anything about this.

Mr. Chairman, I think the House of Representatives has been right on target. We have troops receiving a check from Uncle Sam in Frankfurt, cashing that check, going to the dinner theater. All the Traficant amendment says is the Secretary of Defense shall assist in keeping illegal drugs out of the United States by assigning members to the respective divisions to give it a hand. Now, if that is earth shattering, so be it. But I am going to ask a for vote again.

Mr. Chairman, we are not waging a war on drugs if we are continuing to treat addicts. It is time to deal with the supply side of this issue. The greater the supply, the lower the price. The lower the price, the younger the initiate. The younger the initiate, the greater the problem.

We can rehabilitate a 40-year-old alcoholic. How do we rehabilitate a 15-year-old heroin addict? It is not about rehabilitation, it is about habilitation. We are wrong. It is time to do something.

I am glad to see that the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) former chairman of the narcotics committee of the United States Congress, supports the initiative. I believe everybody with some common sense is beginning to recognize that all facets of our government have to assist with this tremendous problem.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the Congress to once again stand up, the House of Representatives, and take the lead on straightening out this problem in our Nation.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's amendment is a good amendment. It is very straightforward. It simply says the Department of Defense and the military shall assist, and the word is ''assist,'' no particular details to it, the Immigration and Naturalization Service and Customs in their efforts at antinarcotics.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is extremely important, particularly with regard to the Customs question. In this bill what we are proposing to do is to, in essence, put into the hands of Customs the full force of the air control and surveillance that we want to have, not only at our direct border but also over the source country region and in the transit zone, in the sense that they would get 10 planes, specifically designed P–3s with AWACS-type radar on them, to be the eyes that can look down and survey the area of the waters, that before these planes that might be coming to the United States with drugs can get here in the air over the source countries of Colombia, Bolivia and Peru, to keep track of all these craft that might be coming our way by air or maybe even by sea, since those planes have some of that capability too.

We are asking them to take care, Customs to take charge of all of this. We are giving them 10 more chase planes as well, a different form of the P–3 plane, adapted a little differently, asking them to go out and chase anybody that they find who is coming across with these drugs or coming our way from the source countries. They are not necessarily going to be as up to speed on doing all of the work in this regard as we would like them to be, because in the past, AWACS planes, the big radar planes, are and have been a military asset. They have been part of our Department of Defense inventory. Occasionally now, and in the past very often, but occasionally, like one-half a day a month I am told, an AWACS plane is on loan for our Southern Command to go down and take a little survey run to see if they can spot any of these planes flying around, trafficking in drugs.

Mr. Chairman, what Customs is going to have is a fleet of planes. It is going to have the money in this bill to be able to man those planes and operate those planes 24 hours a day around the clock over the source countries of Bolivia, Colombia and Peru, in the region, in the Atlantic, in the Pacific, in the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean, wherever that is needed; to fly that region; to map every single small, private plane flying in the region and keep track of it at all times; to be able to identify those planes, and then be able to communicate with other intelligence that information needed by the source countries in order for them to be able to force down planes that are identified as drug trafficking planes and to give our Customs forces, their adjunct sister force, the ability to go chase any of those planes that are coming across open waters or coming across our borders.

Now, that is an awesome task. In the past, to whatever extent that task has been performed, Customs has done some of it, but our Department of Defense has done a lot of it. So it is very appropriate that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) is offering this amendment today that says that the Department of Defense shall assist Customs in its effort at antinarcotics, because that assistance may well be training. It may well be helping them with the details of what they need to know and how to do these things. It may well be some minor, albeit not large and expensive, item of equipment that they need on an emergency basis for assistance.

We do not know what it may be, but there needs to be in this bill, and I think the gentleman is making a great addition, an explicit direction to do this. This is different from the amendment we just took a vote on on the asset allocation reprioritization. That is very important too, that they make a policy change to do that so that there are assets available and other things that we do not know what equipment it might be, manpower or whatever of the Department of Defense itself. That priority needs to be changed so it cannot get lost down there somewhere.

This is different. This is saying they shall go forward and assist in these ways so they have specific authorization, if it is not already clear in law, and I do not know that it is, that they will help Customs do these things and, to some extent, Immigration and Naturalization and Customs.

Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment. I thank him for offering it. We need to wage a real war against drugs, and only if we have the Department of Defense at least involved in assisting can that be done.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, back when I was a freshman in this institution, we passed on the floor an amendment that I put forth, and that was to strike the provisions which prevented the military from getting involved in law enforcement, with a specific reference and specific thought towards what they have since contributed since we have modified the posse comitatus laws of this country. That is a giant step forward.

Before we passed that particular amendment in this Congress, and the final passage was in the next Congress because we could not talk the Senate into such a radical position, can my colleagues imagine where we would be now without even the surveillance activity of the Armed Forces with the sophistication that the bad guys are using to bring drugs into this country?

There is no question in my mind that any country in this world that protects or refuses to cooperate in harboring the drug dealers and the drug industry, whether they be growers or processors, they are terrorist nations by allowing these things to continue within their own borders.

Actually, I would like to see at a future date, and I believe we will see at a future date, going further than what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) wants to do in this particular amendment, Mr. Chairman, when we can go in and take out laboratories that are producing weapons of mass destruction, germ warfare, chemical warfare, all of these things, where we are going in and stopping the spread of it in Iraq or Libya, wherever we see it on the face of this globe. What is more terrifying to the future of this country or more destructive to our youth than the processing of drugs and then turning a blind eye as they come into our shores?

I think it is a good amendment. Anything we can do to further the role of the military in this regard is to the advantage of our country and I would urge the acceptance of the amendment.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, for the purposes of understanding the gentleman's amendment, I would ask the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) for clarification. Can the gentleman tell me, is he proposing what he has proposed in the past, that the Secretary of Defense shall assist by placing troops on the border? What exactly did the gentleman have in mind?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REYES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, it does not specify exactly what that assistance is. It just makes in order the understanding that the Congress of the United States wants the Secretary of Defense and our military to be one of the participants in the effort and to assist where they can. It does not make specifications.

It differs from the previous amendment, which called for specific training, specific activities when assigned; the training, the law enforcement aspect. This just calls for an assistance in a broad term and broad form, and a commitment to assist, and a direction and mandate of the Congress that the Defense Department shall assist where they can and where it is acceptable to do so.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, what I would like to know is what is the procedure to amend the amendment to make sure that we are talking about assistance from the Department of Defense by way of what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) mentioned in terms of equipment, in terms of being able to track planes and those things, and specifically not troops on the border?

□ 1300

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The Traficant amendment is subject to amendment, so the gentleman from Texas would have to draft an amendment and, of course, send it to the desk.

Mr. REYES. And Mr. Chairman, what is the time frame for that? Do I have to do it immediately?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time frame is very soon; during the debate of the amendment that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) has offered, which is right now.

Mr. REYES. I thank the Chairman, and I thank the gentleman for clarifying for me his amendment.

Part of the concern that I have is we just recently settled with the family in Redford, Texas, $1.9 million for the death of their son, who died as a result of an incident along the U.S.-Mexican border which, unfortunately, was involved with specifically military units on the border patrolling in assistance to law enforcement.

I have the background of 26½ years of Federal law enforcement on the U.S.-Mexican border. I am very concerned about periodically the attempts in this House, in the people's House, to put forth a policy, a law, a procedure, or a process where we would make such a situation where military troops would be on our border to help law enforcement.

I am reminded of the analogy where we have a very rich dessert that looks good, it tastes good and it feels good. But although while we are eating it we think it is good for us, it does not have any nutritional value. It adds fat content to our body, and, ultimately is very detrimental to us. And that is exactly the point I want to make here this afternoon about putting troops on the border.

If the amendment is to bring military assets, such as radar, such as being able to track airplanes, such as being able to assist law enforcement in identifying routes but specifically excluding military patrols on the border, then I do not have any objection to it. In fact, in the past it has been a very effective policy. I worked on the border. I worked in south Florida. I can attest to the fact that we do need that kind of capability.

One other concern that I want to bring forth here is that we cannot possibly have it both ways. I just came here from a hearing where we listened to testimony from U.N. Inspector Scott Ritter about the situation in Iraq. Part of the concern and the testimony that we are hearing now is the readiness factor that we have right now and our inability at this point, and the concern from the national security perspective, that we would not be able to do a Gulf War type operation today.

So we cannot have it both ways. We cannot continue to bring forth, because it sounds good, because it feels good, a proposal to have the military participate in the war on drugs and then expect them to do and carry out their mandates.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in support of the gentleman's amendment. I have been working on this not as long as some, but the last 4 years, and we see in the eastern Pacific where cocaine would come up from Mexico or would come up from Colombia or would come up from Peru unfettered, unstopped. Why? Because we have not one ship, Navy ship, Coast Guard ship, or anything else in the eastern Pacific to stop trainloads of cocaine in the bottom of fishing boats and luxury liners and freighters and cargo containers. Even though we have the intelligence to do it, we cannot do it. The resources are not there.

I have seen classified programs in the eastern Pacific and the Caribbean, both in the western Caribbean and the eastern Caribbean, dropped. They are not there. Why? We do not have the resources to do it. Meaning we have literally tons and tons, and hundreds of tons of cocaine and marijuana and, in some cases, heroin coming up through our island chains through the Bahamas, through Puerto Rico, through the Dominican Republic. Why? Because we do not have the resources.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), who spoke before, talked about having an AWACS one-half a day a month. If there are 30 days in a month, round it off, and we have a half a day, that means that any narco-trafficker, moving narcotics by air or by sea from Mexico or Colombia or through the Mediterranean or through the eastern Pacific, has 59 out of 60 chances of success because we do not have the AWACS to do that.

Now, do we need AWACS? No, all the AWACS are in the Middle East or they are up in Alaska. Fine. But we do have P–3s. I was in Monthan Davis Air Force Base last winter just to see what inventory we had there. We have P–3s by the score, with the radar domes and everything else we see sitting on the ground. They are there. The resources are there. Why not be able to use the resources that we already have to put eyes in the sky and stop the drugs?

Finally, I have to address the problem that the gentleman just talked about. I was in Texas. I spent 4 long days in Del Rio and Eagle Pass; talked to a lot of people; talked to ranchers; talked to people who have kids in school. It was 115 degrees. And I tell my colleagues, that is a tough place to live. Walking out in that desert, and whatever else it is, there is something that will either scratch you, bite you or eat you. Unfortunately, we are losing scores of people who are dying in that desert, being brought across the border by what they call ''coyotes,'' and are forced to swim and they are drowning. They are moving through that desert and they are dying, but a lot of those people are dying with backpacks on their back with illegal narcotics.

Now, we can have observers helping law enforcement sitting there watching. I had ranchers tell me, a group of about 50 ranchers that came and sat and we had a long discussion one evening, it was in Del Rio, Texas, and they were saying, ''We do not understand.'' They feel the United States Government has abandoned them. Those were their words. They feel we do not care because we have taken the troops away from the border. And they are saying that they cannot leave a tractor sit out in their field, these ranchers right along the Rio Grande River, because people come over at night, steal the tractors, steal the parts, and they are gone.

They talked about people shooting into their houses, into their ranches. And these are people that have been there for five and six generations and are losing the ability of having the

right of their land, the right of their homes, because there is nobody there to protect them.

Now, what has happened, and this meeting was set up by the Border Patrol to sit down and be able to talk to these people, the same people the gentleman worked with over the years. And I am not sure if the outcome of the meeting was what the outcome of the meeting was intended, but this was the story that rolled out. These people feel that they are abandoned American citizens because there is nobody there to protect them. The Border Patrol can do some things, but they are rolling along. They are not sitting there and being observers hour after hour.

We need the help. If the Secretary of Defense deems it necessary, if he deems it wise to do, we need to give people the options to do these things.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REYES TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REYES to the amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

On line 7, strike ''members of''.

On line 14, add the following new sentence, ''Nothing in this amendment shall be construed to authorize the deployment of the Members of the Armed Forces in contravention of United States law for the purposes of this amendment.''

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, first of all, in my 5 minutes I wish to address some of the comments my colleague from Illinois made.

I just want to, first of all, tell my colleagues that one of the things we need to understand and remember here is that if the intent is to control and to stop the flow of narcotics into this country, then we have to realize that 90 percent of the drugs that flow across the U.S.-Mexican border, 90 percent of the drugs that flow across the U.S.-Mexican border, come through the ports of entry. Statistics show us that only 10 percent come in between the ports of entry, and have nothing to do with some of the concerns that the gentleman raises.

That is point number one. Point number two is that we in this Congress, for the last several years, and for 2 or 3 years henceforth, have taken it upon ourselves to increase the number of resources specifically intended for the United States Border Patrol. We have doubled their force. By the year 2001, we are going to have a Border Patrol force that will exceed 10,000 officers.

I am a cosponsor of a bill that was introduced, bipartisan bill introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) that states that we want to take the Border Patrol up to 20,000. I think that if we will continue on that course, giving the United States Border Patrol the resources necessary to do the job, it does several things.

First of all, we have trained, professional Federal law enforcement agents that understand and are recognized as being part of the law enforcement presence along the border. They understand the culture, they are bilingual, they are expected to be there, and it makes sense. That is part of what I think we ought to be about in terms of addressing the strategy in between the ports of entry.

Second thing is that I am also a cosponsor of a bill that will give additional resources to Customs. We have to understand that in order to be successful at the ports of entry, we have to do two things. First of all, we have to send a strong law enforcement presence; and, secondly, we have to facilitate commerce. That has been part of the argument and part of the frustration that I have faced here, and other Members from the southern border, from the U.S.-Mexican border have faced here in this Congress, is that we want and expect people to settle for different rules between the United States and Mexico and between Canada and Mexico. That was the premise of the argument in section 110.

So what we are trying to do is put forth some public policy and resources that, first of all, do the job; secondly, do not endanger border communities; and, third, have people understand that there is a better way of doing things.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REYES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Will the gentleman be addressing the amendment that the gentleman has offered as well?

Mr. REYES. Yes, I will.

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REYES TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, at this point I want to ask unanimous consent to make a technical modification to my perfecting amendment to change the last word ''amendment'' to say ''section''.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification offered by Mr. REYES of Texas to his amendment:

Strike out the word ''amendment'' in both places that it appears and insert in lieu thereof ''section''.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the modification to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES)?

There was no objection.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, what is my remaining time?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman has 1 minute of time remaining.

Mr. REYES. Again, in summary, and again concluding as to the perfecting amendment that I have before this House, I hope that this body understands that there is a reasonable way to address the problems that we face against narcotics trafficking and against those that would perpetrate criminal acts against border residents.

I understand. I spent 26½ years working the area. I understand what my colleague from Illinois is talking about. But I think that we have to respect a process that takes into account the fact that border residents are United States citizens also, and they deserve and should expect the same kinds of protections and the same kinds of rights and privileges that the rest of the country has.

□ 1315

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to the perfecting amendment, or the secondary amendment. Basically a couple of things. The gentleman from Texas said that 90 percent of all the drugs go through ports of entry. We are doing a better job quite frankly because we have given Customs better and more technical equipment and this bill does that, too. So we have a parallel interest here. But as you start to shut down the ports of entry and do a better job, especially in places like El Paso and Laredo and on and on down the line, the next place and the next porous area along the border is the Del Rios and the Eagle Passes and the place where there are no ports of entry, so these are the areas where they are coming through and it is tougher to do it. You do not bring it through by a truckload, you put it in backpacks on 20 people and have them march across the river, go through the desert to the next highway. That is what is happening. That is a fact. When they do that, they trample across people's property. They are outlaws in the first place. They are taking and shooting at people's homes, moving them out, terrorizing people along there.

We are just saying, a simple fact, that if the Secretary of Defense is asked and has an option to put people down there to help observe and help the Border Patrol, it was interesting because my discussions with the Border Patrol and especially in Del Rio and Eagle Pass is that they thought they worked well with the military observers that were there.

Mr. Chairman, I regretfully oppose this amendment.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak against the Reyes perfecting amendment and in support of the Traficant amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have lived in a land of ''maybe'' for 5½ years now. We have lived in a land of we should do this and we should do that but we have not done this or that. Ladies and gentlemen, we have seen again the results, and I do not want to repeat them, but the results are devastating on our children and on the flow of drugs and illegal narcotics into this country.

The question before us is, shall we use the military along our borders to protect our borders in the interest of national security? I strongly support the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT). Mr. Chairman, if this Nation has

ever been under attack, it is now. If you do not count 15,000 deaths per year and add up in the last 5½ years the number of innocent Americans and mostly young people who have died on the streets and in our neighborhoods and in our communities, you cannot say that is not war. The total is more than the casualties, the fatalities in the Vietnam War and the Korean War and in the Persian Gulf War. I submit that we have 2 million Americans in prison behind bars locked up at public expense. Any sheriff, any law enforcement officer will tell you that 70 percent of them are there because of use of illegal narcotics. If this is not a national security threat, if we have not seen enough lives destroyed in our communities, whether it is Plano, Texas; Los Angeles, Detroit or my central Florida, I do not know when we will recognize the problem. And here we are in our Nation's capital, the United States of America, Washington, the District of Columbia. I have been coming here for 18 years. And every week I have read the obituaries. Every year 3 to 400 young black Americans have been slaughtered in the streets here because people will not stand up and take a stand against illegal narcotics and trafficking. That is thousands of lives lost in this Nation. And here we are debating ''shall'' or ''should.'' It is time to stop playing games. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) is correct.

Fifty percent of the drugs have come in from Mexico. Here are the reports, we have held hearing after hearing. Here are the reports. There are facts. The drugs are coming in across the borders. We must use every possible means to stop them. In this poll-driven city, everyone relies on polls. Here is a poll taken September 15, 1998, 60 percent of Americans say the use of military patrols along the border to stop drugs is either an excellent or very good idea. So hide behind polls but do what we need to do, because if drug dealers were to lob missiles across our borders, they could not do any more damage than they have done to this Nation's capital, to the streets of America. So do not come up with these last-minute ''should,'' ''maybe'' or ''possibly.'' This is a time for action. We need to defeat the Reyes amendment. We need to support our colleague on the other side of the aisle and let us go forward and stop this travesty on our youth and this Nation.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. That was a very passionate speech. Let me just talk about the fact that we do have a real serious problem in this country, but part of that seriousness is taking an obligation that we also have a problem in this country, in this country in terms of what exists in our area and providing that assistance to those individuals. I would ask to those individuals who stand up here and talk to also inquire how many times they are willing to fund those programs that are out there and those youngsters that are in need of those programs to be able to respond to some of their concerns and some of the problems that they have.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on National Security and a member representing communities along the U.S. border, I represent two counties right on the border in the Rio Grande. I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman that would allow the troops to go in there and I support the amendment, the substitute that is being submitted by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES). An increase of U.S. troops on the border with Mexico is a dangerous proposal that would put border residents in danger and reduce military readiness. I would repeat that again. It is going to reduce military readiness. Our military is the world's best trained fighting force. They are not police officers. They are not Border Patrol agents. They are trained to fight. We put our own citizens at risk by deploying them on American soil. I represent two counties, as I indicated, right on the Mexican border. In the town hall meetings that I have had during the month of August, I had 11 town hall meetings during the month of August, not once did anyone raise that this is a key issue that we need to do. In fact most of my constituents do not approve putting troops on the border. We do have existing troops that are working there now that are working directly with the Border Patrol, that are working there directly with the Customs. Those individuals are doing a tremendous job. But to put them in the way that we have had them in the past that has created problems is not the way that we should approach this.

Again I would indicate to the gentleman that spoke before, it is fine to scapegoat other countries, but we have a responsibility to take and fight it here at home, also, because our citizens are the ones that are also choosing to also take those drugs. Border residents just like everyone else want to stop the influx of illegal drugs. They believe in stopping the flow of undocumented immigrants. But the solution they support is more Border Patrol that are well qualified, more Customs Service agents which we have failed to put enough money to assure that we have those Customs individuals. The Customs Service is the one that opens those trunks, is the one that looks into those cars. Those are the individuals that we should be supporting. Those are the individuals that we should be increasing their budgets. That is where the trade has increased and doubled and tripled in the last few years, but we have failed to put enough resources for the Customs where it is needed.

In the last two years, an 18-year-old young man, an American citizen, was shot to death by a Marine on the border in Redford, Texas. That particular case after it came out, and this was a tragic incident that highlights the complexity of this issue, and places our soldiers on the border and the potential harm to other residents. The military itself has come back after the settlement, has indicated that it was a very serious mistake to even put those Marines there on the border. They were there in camouflage as they worked the border. They shot this innocent young man who was in high school and he was out there herding his goats. They shot him. They indicated there after the settlement, and it is no wonder, that the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, all of them, oppose this process. The Border Patrol, they have nearly 8,000 agents patrolling the national borders. Congress has authorized an additional 1,000 agents up to the year 2001. We are going to have an additional 1,000 agents on the border. Last year the San Antonio Express-News pointed out that the Redford incident may be isolated but the warning against deploying soldiers into an area lawfully and peacefully used by private citizens needs to be seriously looked at.

Mr. Chairman, again let me inform my colleagues that I serve on the Subcommittee on Military Readiness of the Committee on National Security. At the time when readiness concerns are at their highest and with troops sent for extended periods to Bosnia and elsewhere, we cannot afford to pull additional men and women away from their posts to do work that Border Patrol agents should be doing. It is unfair to our fighting men and women and it does harm to our national interests.

I ask that we support the Reyes alternative.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when this issue last came before the House in May, I said it was a wrongheaded measure. My sentiments have not changed, not one iota in the intervening months. As I said when I spoke at that time, all of our budgets are tight. I certainly have been trying to find precious dollars for items that I deem of much higher priority than this, items such as funding higher education, programs which are badly needed throughout the country.

As a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I can vouch for that. Now, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) is proposing asking us to fork over tens of millions of dollars for a program that is not only costly but unnecessary. Putting troops on our borders is simply a bad use of government resources and taxpayer dollars. These funds could better be used for training our armed forces for military readiness, not performing the jobs of Border Patrol agents.

This country already benefits from the work of highly qualified, highly trained Border Patrol agents who courageously and skillfully enforce our Nation's laws and protect our borders on a daily basis. I have said it before

and I will say it again, to replace these INS agents with military troops is simply a bad idea.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to vote against the Traficant amendment today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. I thank the gentleman for yielding. One of the things that my colleagues will recall, Mr. Chairman, I started out by asking my colleague from Ohio specifically what he intended or what the intent of his amendment was. Based on that conversation, I offered my perfecting amendment. The issue here, and this should be of concern to all of us, are those that think that we here in this body should adhere to a quick fix at any price. We have already seen one young man killed on the Texas-Mexico border as a result of military troops on the border. I would ask my colleagues that are so intent on protecting the neighborhoods, does that mean that they are willing to deploy United States military resources to the neighborhoods in Washington, D.C. and Florida and Kansas and Illinois and the areas that they represent? I think not. We cannot afford it. We should not subject neighborhoods to that kind of military presence. Yet that is the very thing that they are proposing in the context of the amendment that is offered that they are opposed to a perfecting amendment that would preclude border neighborhoods from seeing and having to deal with troops on our borders.

Part of the process of understanding those that want that quick fix, because of what we need to clarify here is that it is not inconsequential that those of us who represent border communities are opposed to military troops in our communities and along our borders, the areas that we serve, the areas that we represent. No one should be enamored with a quick fix. No one should say, it is okay to put U.S. soldiers in jeopardy both professionally, legally and personally by deploying them to the border to do counterdrug operations.

□ 1330

That is not what they were trained for, that is not what they want, that is not what anyone wants that is involved in drug enforcement. INS does not support it, the Attorney General does not support it, the administration does not support it. Those of us that know and understand and have worked, not have gone for 3 or 4 days and suffered 115 degree heat and the bites of insects and everything else, those of us that have worked that area, in my case 26½ years, and in the cases of America's finest law enforcement officers that are serving us very well today, day in day out, 24 hours a day, they do not want troops on the border to complicate an already complicated and controversial part of the legacy of this country.

We should understand that there are no quick fixes. Quick fixes come with a tremendous cost. It has already cost the life of an 18-year-old high school student in Redford, Texas. I would submit that those of us that are so concerned about the deaths in this country throughout the neighborhood should take that into account.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to propound a question to the author of the main amendment, if he would be willing to respond. He and I have discussed this on many, many occasions, and I understand the seriousness of the problem that we are dealing with here, and I support the gentleman's amendment, as I have in the past on other times, that we have this debate before us.

But I listened to the debate of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), and I would have to tell my colleagues that I have tremendous respect for him, I have listened to his debates at great length, not only today but at previous times. He and I have the privilege of serving together on the Board of Visitors at the Air Force Academy, and his presentations are always very well thought out, very sincere, and his questions are right on target.

But today I have this question, I want to confirm this. It is my understanding that the Traficant amendment does not specify that there would be U.S. troops placed on the border.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman if he would respond to that.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, the Traficant amendment does not mandate troops on the border but does not limit any action taken by the Secretary of Defense and our military to assist in drugs crossing our border.

So under the Traficant amendment, if the administration had so chosen, it has the option of using every asset they have to combat this problem. Under the Reyes amendment, they would limit it and take away the assignation of troops, if they would wish to assign to our borders, and I believe it is a killing amendment, I believe it is designed to simply kill the total flexibility of the Pentagon to aid in the matter.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's response, and I maintain my support for the gentleman's amendment and in opposition to the amendment to his amendment.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to point out that as I read the bill and as I read some of the substitutes and some of the amendments that will be offered, there are quite a few references to the Department of Defense, the transfer of assets and the distribution of authorizing funds from a Defense Department account to a nonDefense Department account. And I just wanted to make the case to my colleagues that yesterday we appointed conferees to go to work with the Senate on the defense appropriations bill, and as we talk about any legislation that authorizes additional spending, we need to know that as we go to conference with the Senate now, we are approximately $5 billion apart between the two houses, and we do have, as my colleagues know, a cap that was set by the budget agreement of last year. And so we need to be very careful about what types of mandated Defense Department spending that we deal with here.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Committee on National Security, and I do not know how many of my colleagues have had a chance to look at the military report that came out just recently. A military report earlier this month found that the marines involved in the fatal shooting on the border were not adequately trained for anti-drug operations that place combat-ready troops amongst civilians. The report found that the mission appears to have been viewed at every level of Marine Corps command as more of a training opportunity than a real world deployment. The failure to appreciate the difference has tragic consequences.

Mr. Chairman, I not only served in the military, I was in law enforcement for 14 years, and there is a difference being sheriff, with all due respect to my good friend, we both were sheriffs, in middle America than being a sheriff in a district that is very, very close to Mexico.

We talk about drug trafficking, we talk about illegal aliens coming into this country. What have we done about consumption? If we do not have consumption, and it is not only the United States, other countries are beginning to experience, and at one point they were considering only as being transshipment points. But it has changed now. Now Columbia, Costa Rica and other countries are beginning to have problems with consumption as well.

Mr. Chairman, this is something that we are going to have to work on together.

So, I have a lot of respect for my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) but I do not think that the answer is putting troops on the border, even at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense.

So at this time I would just ask my colleagues to look back and see what has happened. Read the military report and see what it says. The training, my colleagues, is totally different.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT).

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, it was an unfortunate situation, tragic situation, that happened in Redford, Texas. I do not think anybody debates that. But we have tragic situations all over this country in my district, in my colleagues' districts, everywhere we are where kids

are getting killed either by gang violence tied with drugs or by drugs themselves. So the teenager in Redford, Texas, who actually shot three times at the servicemen who were doing observations there, that was unfortunate. But there was three shots fired at those troops.

But let us look at and talk about this. What this allows is JTF–6 has basically suspended intelligence operations along the border. Last year they did 350 surveillance operations in conjunction with the Border Patrol and Customs and everybody else that made this system work, and now that action is largely suspended.

And if we talk about education, we should spend dollars for education, we can spend a lot of dollars for education, but as long as those kids have drugs in the classroom and those schools are in jeopardy of being shot up, I will tell my colleagues all the dollars in education does not do any good, at least where my brother teaches, in Aurora, Illinois.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, in the time that I have remaining, I would like to underscore what the gentleman from Illinois said in opposition to the amendment to the Traficant amendment.

We have technical equipment out there, sophisticated defense-oriented equipment out there, that really needs the people in the Defense Department, our troops, to be able to monitor them and to operate and to be able to work in concert with law enforcement officials. And there is nothing that says that we cannot train some of our military personnel in law enforcement. We do it all the time with our military police. There is no reason we cannot cross-train these people.

The Traficant amendment does not mandate troops to the border; let us get this out of the way. But if my colleagues want to mandate that we can not in any way use our troops along the border, then support the amendment to the Traficant amendment which, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) says, is a killer amendment. It is a poison pill to the Traficant amendment, and I think it would certainly kill this amendment which is well thought out, when it is put in place. It does not mandate the placement of troops, and I would hope that we would defeat the amendment to the Traficant amendment and then support the Traficant amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleague from Texas (Mr. REYES) in supporting his amendment to the Traficant amendment. I know my colleague, my other colleague from Texas who is here, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), was a former sheriff like my colleague from Ohio is a former sheriff; but the background that I know of Congressman Reyes, and I knew of him long before he decided to run for Congress, he was an INS officer not only in the El Paso district, but also in south Texas a few years ago, and he showed us how we can handle the problem with illegal immigration.

He created the hold-the-line program that now INS is doing in California, and they are doing in south Texas and the Rio Grande Valley without military presence. He showed us how to do it, and that is why it is so important that we listen to his expertise in law enforcement and not necessarily even my colleague from Texas or my colleague from Ohio, because as my colleague from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ) mentioned, it is different to be a sheriff in middle America or even a sheriff in Texas than it is to be a law enforcement officer charged with the border protection that the INS does.

The hold-the-line was successful without military personnel. We have military personnel now on the border, and we know the tragedy that happened. That was just one tragedy, and one tragedy is too many, particularly the incident. And I know I heard from my colleagues that that young man took a couple of shots at somebody that was following.

Well, I also know, coming from Texas, the difference between a 22 rifle that a young man a 16-, 17-, 18-year-old may be using and someone carrying an M–16. So we know the difference between a 22 shell that does not have the velocity or the threat that maybe a bigger weapon does.

The concern I have is that we already have them for detection. They need to have more oversight there, more civilian cooperation, but that is why I support the Reyes amendment. We have the way that can be done, the success that can be done, and this Congress has passed every session more INS agents to go to the border and to institute hold-the-line from the Rio Grande all the way out to the Pacific Ocean. We just have to put the resources there and not bring our military to have to guard our borders.

The United States has a great tradition of military only being used in national emergencies. Now I know the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) will make that case, and I have some constituents who are concerned about illegal immigration, but we have a way to solve it using civilian personnel without using the military.

And one last thing before I yield to my colleague from Texas. We also have a concern that our military is being overutilized or used in functions that they should not be done, not only around the world, but I think this is another case that we may be over-extending the military commitment that our country needs in using it to be a border patrol, and we can do that with civilian authority and keep our military highly trained to protect our Nation from terrorists and from foreign enemies and not just do civilian police work.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from San Antonio, Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I also wanted to add, I think of anyone here I think I am probably the only one that has worked as a case worker. I had a caseload of over 60 heroin addicts, and I worked for about 3 years with them. I worked about 2 years with adolescent substance abuse, and we do have a very serious problem. And one of those areas is in our backyard where we really need to come down, and I am going to give my colleagues one example:

In Bexar County during the 1970s, it was occasionally, every time the D.A. came up for reelection, most of my addicts were picked up, in all honesty, and those were some of the individuals that, yes, they might have been selling and, yes, they might have been using. But they were the ones that were fixing, they were not the ones who had the money, they were not the ones making the big profits.

There is a need for us to really look at our own backyards and go after those individuals that are making those millions. When that money comes in, there is someone there that is capable of dishing out several million dollars to get involved. Those are the ones that we need to get after, those are the ones that we need to make sure that we go after.

The other thing that I wanted to share with my colleagues, I think there has been some discussion talked about the fact that the military can provide assistance, and they are. They are doing a great job there with the Customs, they are doing a great job there in the form of assistance, but not in the form of troops.

We have a real serious situation with the budget, and it is time, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ) has indicated, and I am also in the Committee on National Security, and we recognize the importance of the fact that we are real tight when it comes to the budget. But putting troops on our border is extremely costly and is a bad use of our scarce resources, and I would ask for support.

□ 1345

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Reyes amendment and in support of the Traficant amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 3400, the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act. However, I do with some disappointment over how the bill was handled.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, our subcommittee did not have the normal opportunity to hold hearings on this bill or to spend some time discussing the various provisions of the bill. That being said, I am still cosponsoring this legislation.

I certainly support any effort we can make to enhance our fight against illegal narcotics. I do not know of any

Member in this body who would be opposed to making resources available for this effort. H.R. 3400 aims to reduce the drug flow into the United States by 80 percent over the next 3 years. This legislation is vital if we are going to stem the flow of drugs into our country and to protect our citizens.

This bill is plain and simple. It provides increased resources for international interdiction and eradication programs of the antinarcotics effort. This bill provides increased funding for alternative development programs which must be provided to convince coca growers that they can make a livelihood by producing other products.

Finally, the bill provides much-needed assistance to primary source nations such as Colombia, Peru and Bolivia to help them fight drugs. Demand reduction and domestic law enforcement are important parts of our anti-drug strategy, but we can no longer allow eradication and interdiction to lag behind.

We need to get back on track with a balanced anti-drug program that makes attacking drugs at their source and stopping their shipments a top priority.

This legislation will clearly help make a dent in the fight on drugs, and I urge its support.

Now, despite my strong support for this effort, there is one provision in this legislation which I am very uncomfortable with and one which I would have preferred further discussion on, at least before it was included in the McCollum substitute.

I believe this is one of those provisions which slipped into the legislation precisely because there was no committee consideration of the bill. That provision is found in section 201 regarding aid to Colombia. This provision, which may border on interference in Colombia's internal affairs, stipulates that if the Colombian government negotiates certain agreements in its attempt to end the bloody civil war which has engulfed the nation for the past 40 years, then we will cut off all antinarcotics assistance to that nation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I agree that we do not want to see any peace agreement in Colombia which gives the guerrillas a free hand to continue to produce and ship lethal drugs into this country. But I do not believe we should be instructing or threatening the president of Colombia in a bill such as this in what the provisions of their peace agreement should be.

President Pastrana has only been in office now for 1 month, Mr. Chairman. He was elected with a mandate to end the civil war. He has made this his top priority. His job is a very difficult one. But for us now in this bill to threaten to tie one arm behind his back could jeopardize the peace negotiations before they even begin. This provision is premature. We have a very tough certification process, and if the Colombian government does negotiate a treaty which includes provisions which we cannot accept because they impact on the war on drugs, then Colombia could face decertification and their funds would be cut off. But let us give the new president of Colombia a chance. Let us not threaten or try to dictate what he should do to end the civil war.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I support the overall thrust of this bill. I applaud its authors; I am a cosponsor. But I would have preferred that this bill have gone through the regular order and the committees of jurisdiction have the opportunity to work on the provisions of the bill in more detail. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about those who would portray the debate as some who would be softer on fighting the interdiction of drugs into this country and others who would be tougher, and who can outtough who? The fact of the matter is that for those of us who are supporting this bill, as myself, we want to take a very tough stand on the question of interdiction.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) raises a serious concern. Now, I have heard the language that has been used with reference to the Traficant amendment, but the language that has been used is not the words of his amendment. I have heard here about observers. Fine. I have heard here about AWACS, fine. I have heard about helicopters. Fine. I have heard about surveillance. Fine. I have heard about intelligence. Fine. All of those things are fine. But to suggest that this amendment does not specify the use of troops on the border is not to read the amendment at least the way I read it.

What does it say? The Secretary of Defense shall assist in keeping illegal drugs out of the United States, by doing what? By assigning members of the armed forces, by assigning members of the armed forces to do what? To assist the INS in preventing the entry of drug traffickers into the United States. Where is that? Along the ports and borders. And the United States Customs Service and inspection of cargo vehicles and aircraft, at what? At points of entry into the United States.

Therefore, although one can say in debate that this does not mean that troops will go at the border, the amendment says the Secretary of Defense shall assist in how? By assigning members of the armed forces. And where? At the points of entry to the United States. That means U.S. troops on the borders.

Now, I asked my colleagues. I have heard those who are involved in the Committee on National Security, which I am not. I have listened to them and their expertise. I asked my colleagues. We have passed bills over the last several years for 1,000 new border patrol every year for the next 10 years. That means 10,000 new border patrols on the borders of the United States. I voted for that. I support that. But now, in addition to those 10,000 border patrols, we are talking about placing armed forces of the United States at the border.

No one has suggested, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) did not offer in his amendment nonlethal forces, which is what everybody talks about, but that is not what the amendment provides for. We could have provided for nonlethal forces so that we could have the surveillance, the intelligence, the helicopters, the AWACS and all of that, but that is not what is being provided for here.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues who do, in fact, have a sense of what the national security of the United States is in the context of the number of troops that we need across the world, what are we doing? We have troops in Bosnia. We have troops in Macedonia. We have troops in Kosovo. We have troops in the Gulf, in north and south. We have troops in South Korea. We see the need to respond to terrorism in the recent attacks that took place in Afghanistan. We do not know where the next threat comes from, and we need to have the ability to respond to those threats.

Now, does anybody here want to fight drugs more than the next? No. My 2 children, I am concerned about them, as my colleagues are for their children and the children of the district my colleagues represent. But let us be honest. The fact of the matter is that we have a finite set of resources. Mr. Chairman, 52 percent of all of our monies right now are being used in domestic police protection along the borders. We are going to add to that another 1,000 border patrol a year for the next 10 years, 10,000 more.

Yes, we can have the ancillary services of the armed forces to assist that effort. But should we now take from all of the other efforts we need throughout the world, from our counterterrorism efforts that only have to increase because we are all the more susceptible, should we now take those troops and put them in lethal positions on the borders of the United States? That is what the legitimacy of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES)'s point is.

We can support the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) in the context of saying that the ancillary forces of the nonlethal aspects should be in fact used, but we should support the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) in the context that lethal forces with our troops are already stretched throughout the world and the necessity to respond in what I have heard Members here speak so many times of 2 different theaters in the world in which our troops need to be able to respond.

Mr. Chairman, look what we are asking them to do: Respond in 2 different places in the world at the same time. All of the peacekeeping missions we

have, all of the places we want them to support, all of the antiterrorism efforts we want to address, and in addition to all of that, we want to put them on the borders of the United States. We do want to fight drugs, but let us be intelligent about the way that we do it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

We are not sheriffs today, we are lawmakers. I support the bill and the tremendous effort of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and the process that was developed to eliminate drugs in the Western Hemisphere. That is the bill.

I want to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ). He is a most capable leader on our side of the aisle, and certainly advancing himself up the ladder.

I want to talk about the Reyes amendment.

I have great respect for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES). I support his bill to amplify and increase Customs. I support the bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) to increase border patrol. Increased border patrol, increased Customs is not going to eliminate drugs from the Western Hemisphere.

Let us talk about what the Traficant amendment would do. The Traficant amendment would allow the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the White House and the administration and congressional leaders, to do everything in their power to mitigate and eliminate narcotics from our country. The Reyes amendment would limit the White House and the Secretary of Defense if they chose to take a specific course and allow for troops on our border.

The tragedy of Esequiel Hernandez cannot be overlooked. FBI agents have been killed in wrongful death shootings. American soldiers have been shot by their own company men. Do we throw out the army? Do we defund the FBI?

We are today targeting narcotics. The Traficant amendment is not targeting immigration.

Now, we have had that whole sphere constantly brought into this matter. We have painted anyone who takes this stand as having some sinister ethnic bias. That is very foolish. Very, very foolish.

I support every initiative on our borders to be fair, but I will say this to Members of Congress. We have not really engaged in a war on drugs. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) knows that; the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) knows that. We all know that. We are now debating the politics of how the Pentagon can assist us.

The Reyes amendment says, even if we want to, we cannot. The Traficant amendment says, we do not have to do anything but assist, but we want you to assist and we do not limit you in any way.

Now, I want to talk about 14-year-olds in Youngstown, Ohio who buy brown Mexican heroin every day. If, and I say this to the Committee on National Security, if 5 tons of heroin can be brought across our border, is it not a fact that a nuclear warhead can come across our border?

□ 1400

I am asking that question today. Our border is a national security checkpoint. It should be treated as such. We should not limit the Secretary of Defense in any of his capacities.

So if we vote for the Reyes amendment, we vote technically to put a limitation on what we do and how we do it as a Nation. I think it is time to take the shackles off. I think it is time to let our Nation truly engage in the battle against drugs. We need the help like the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) said of all of our departments.

I do not mandate it. But let it be well known the Traficant amendment allows for every military asset to be used if so chosen by our administration and our leadership because the Congress is allowing them to do so. In America, the people govern. We are not out-toughing one another. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) is awfully tough. We might differ; but on this, he would kill our efforts.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious debate about a very serious issue that can potentially have very serious consequences on communities along the border.

Again, let us one by one separate fact from fiction. My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) talks about 5 tons of heroin coming across the border and asked the rhetorical question: If 5 tons of heroin can come across the border, cannot a nuclear weapon come across the border? Yes. Absolutely.

But I can tell my colleague from Ohio, there has never been one incident on the U.S.-Mexican border where 5 tons of heroin have come across the border. There has never been one single incident where 1 ton of Mexican brown heroin has come across the border. I know because I worked it, I lived it, I did it. I fought the war on drugs.

Part of what we need to understand here is to get a grip on what the facts are and what all the rhetoric is and separate these two things. First of all, heroin is introduced into this country in very small quantities because it is a very valuable commodity, and drug smuggling organizations do not want to risk millions of dollars on one intercepted package.

Secondly, fact from fiction. My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio talks about my perfecting amendment limiting the power and the authority of the White House, the President of the United States. I want to tell this body and I want to tell my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, that if there is a national emergency, the President already has that authority. He can deploy every single soldier wherever he wants if there is a national emergency. So I think the argument about my perfecting amendment limiting us in the war on drugs is ludicrous.

Fact from fiction. I mentioned earlier let us separate our ability for instant gratification and for that all-satisfying quick fix. There is no quick fix. I made mention that there are currently two bills that will increase the resources of customs, that will increase the resources of the United States border patrol; and, conceivably, we will have a United States border patrol of as many as 20,000 agents, trained, profession, bilingual officers that work on the border, that are expected to be on the border, and would never confront an 18 year old by shooting at him. Those are the facts. Those are the kinds of things that repeatedly get ignored here.

I listened to my colleagues, and they all say they have a tremendous amount of respect and all of the nice things that they say about me in the context of the job that I did for 26½ years. But that is not what this is about.

What this is about is listening, listening and understanding the impact that a proposal like this would make on communities along the border. Again, I ask this House to consider, is it not strange that all those that propose and support this kind of an effort, that want to sound tough on the war on drugs, that want to sound like they want to protect communities all across this country do not live nor do they represent the border? I find that kind of strange.

All of us that represent border communities understand the implications. All of us understand the consequences. All of us understand and live with constituents that do not want the danger. They do not want this kind of proposal coming out of the people's House.

Listen to the argument. Listen to the consequences, and then understand that the military is not a solution. The military trains for warfare. We need the military to be ready to defend us in a completely different context, not patrolling the border, not in our border communities, and not jeopardizing the residents that live along that border. They have an expectation to have the same kinds of protections that the rest of the communities along this great country have.

Those are the issues. Those are the facts. Ultimately, if this thing passes, and ultimately, time and time again, as we argue and debate this thing, ultimately if it passes, those are going to be the consequences. Yes, we are going to be talking about settling with families whose children have been killed, settling with communities that are not understanding why this body would put troops in their communities.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of the Reyes amendment and against the Traficant amendment, and I would start by reading something. ''El Paso, August 11. The federal government will pay $1.9 million to the family of a teenager who was killed by a Marine patrolling the U.S.-Mexico border,'' according to the family's attorney. ''The controversy over the May 27, 1997, shooting led to the suspension of military patrols along the Rio Grande. Esequiel Hernandez, Jr., 18'' years of age ''was killed while herding goats near Redford, Texas, 200 miles southeast of El Paso, by Marines who said the youth fired on them.''

''After a long battle over what happened, the Hernandez family has signed a settlement agreement with the Justice Department and the Navy.''

''The settlement is 'one more piece of evidence that there was total wrongdoing in this case by various arms of the government,' said the Reverend Melvin LaFollette, a Redford activist. 'Innocent parties don't pass out millions gratuitously.' ''.

We did that last year because this Congress told the armed forces to send troops to the border. One of the first things that happened was an American citizen lost his life, an 18-year-old American citizen.

The Traficant amendment says not only shall we go back to that failed policy but we will require that the Department of Defense do it, not in its discretion do it but require that we do it.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) says that if we pass the Reyes amendment and not his amendment we are going to throw out the Army, we are going to defund the FBI and that the Reyes amendment would put a limitation on our Nation's ability to fight drugs.

Let me read what the Reyes amendment says and see if any of that can be found. Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the deployment of the members of the armed forces in contravention of United States law for the purpose of this section.

The only thing the Reyes amendment says is, let us continue to follow the law that says that we will not have various forces, military and quasi-military forces, doing the job that is not assigned to them. That is the only thing the Reyes amendment says.

Now, what does the Traficant amendment say? It says the Secretary of Defense shall, shall assist, in keeping illegal drugs out of the United States by assigning the armed forces to assist the INS and the Customs Service; shall.

I want to make a note. ''Shall'' is written in by hand. Stricken right below it in type, the original form of the amendment was ''should,'' ''should assist,'' which is what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) has been saying; discretion.

The Traficant amendment originally did provide the Department of Defense, the President of the United States and Congress with discretion to proceed. Someone struck that, I suspect it had to be the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), it is his amendment, and now it is ''shall.''

So contrary to what the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) is saying, this provides no discretion to the President, no discretion to the Secretary of Defense, no discretion to the Secretaries of the Army, Navy or Marines. They must do this. That is what ''shall'' means. It is not ''may'' or ''should.''

We can stand here and talk all about this, but the only person who really has a right to tell us what really is best for the border is the gentleman who spoke earlier, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), who spent more than 20 years of his life doing exactly that, patrolling the border. Many of us could continue to talk and we will.

I shudder to think what the men and women who actually are on the border, carrying the guns, doing the surveillance, having to stop drugs, having to stop people from coming into this country illegally, are saying as they listen to this debate; we must not be very good officers, they must be thinking, that they believe that now we must send down the troops to help them do their job. Not give them more resources to hire more INS officers and Customs officers to do the job, but, no, send the armed forces, which is trained not to surveil, not to guard, not to interdict but to kill.

What a statement we are sending to the men and women who day after day put their lives on the line trying to do what we say we need to have the Army do. If one really believes we need to put more on the border, and we do, then give the INS Border Patrol, give the Customs agency more resources to hire people who are trained to do exactly that. Do not try to have our men and women who are trained to do something different in the armed forces all of a sudden go into a foreign atmosphere and now try to do the work, because when you do, what happens? Folks like Esequiel Hernandez are killed. And what else? The taxpayers are told, give me $2 million because we have to pay off this family for having killed people like Esequiel Hernandez.

Are we destined to travel down that same path? Are we destined to repeat history? I urge my colleagues to vote for the Reyes amendment and against the Traficant amendment.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Traficant amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAHOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there have been a couple of misrepresentations here and I would like to clarify them. With the legislative intent by the author of those provisions, the Secretary of Defense shall assist in keeping illegal drugs out of the United States by assigning members of the armed forces to assist the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the United States Customs Service. It does not limit the assistance but it does not say it must be patrolled, either. It is at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with what I had assumed to be the brain trust of our country.

Let me just close out and make this statement: American troops, as we speak, are guarding borders all over the world. The only border our military is not guarding is the United States of America border. We have a civilian law enforcement service that is doing a respectable job, but we are guarding foreign borders, we are not guarding our own.

Second of all, one other thing, I think it is time to stand up for number one, and I do not apologize for wanting to bring in every asset that the Pentagon has to have us keep illegal drugs out of the country.

So I want to close by saying, the first vote evidently in this series will probably be the vote on the McCollum amendment. Then the second vote would be the Reyes substitute.

Let there be no mistake, the Reyes substitute strikes the use of members of the armed services for patrols. That, it does. The Traficant amendment allows for it and allows for the Secretary of Defense to do everything in his power to help us with the problem.

With that, I would hope that the Members would vote for McCollum, defeat Reyes, and give me a vote on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 537, further proceedings on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1415

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SHAW

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. SHAW: At the end of the bill add the following new title:

TITLE VII—CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS ON PORT EMPLOYEES

SEC. 701. BACKGROUND CHECKS.

Upon the request of any State, county, port authority, or other local jurisdiction of a State, the Attorney General shall grant to such State, county, port authority, or other local jurisdiction access to information collected by the Attorney General pursuant to section 534 of title 28, United States Code, for the purpose of allowing such State, county,

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 4300. This amendment would allow local and State governments the ability to access Department of Justice information for the purpose of doing criminal background checks on port employees or applicants to become port employees. I had previously introduced this amendment as a bill entitled the ''Drug-Free Ports Act,'' H.R. 3975.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment because of the increasingly high incidence of collusion between drug traffickers and port employees. These ''internal conspiracies'' at ports are becoming a major avenue for bringing illegal drugs into the United States. To lessen the chance of future internal conspiracies, my amendment would simply allow the local governing body to conduct Federal criminal background checks at their discretion on port employees and applicants to become port employees.

The subject of this amendment was discussed at length at a hearing of the House Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs and Criminal Justice last year which I attended on an ex-officio basis.

Internal conspiracies are clever in the way they help smugglers. They have been known to ''innocently'' swing a container in front of a surveillance camera in order to allow another container filled with drugs to pass through undetected. They also have been known to tip off smugglers regarding the routines of Customs officials to maximize the chance of success in bringing in the illegal contraband.

According to James Milford, a former head of the DEA in Miami, Florida, ''Longshoremen are a source of frustration for us, particularly in South Florida. One of the things that concerns us is the ability of longshoremen to be utilized successfully in pulling cocaine shipments out of cargo and moving it out of the port with impunity.''

In response to the reports about internal conspiracies at Florida's ports in the press, I requested that the Customs Service do a random sample of arrest records of longshoremen at the Port of Miami and the Port Everglades in the Ft. Lauderdale/Hollywood area. The results are quite disturbing.

Of a random sample of 50 Port of Miami longshoremen, 36 had arrest records. Of these 36 arrest records, they had a total of 213 arrests, including 68 on drug charges. In a random sample of 38 Port Everglades longshoremen, 19 had arrest records. Of these 19, they had a total of 73 arrests, including 14 drug arrests.

Mr. Chairman, consider the arrest records from the following two subjects: Subject 1, from the Port of Miami: Arrested for robbery, assault and battery, carrying a concealed firearm, possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, aggravated assault, possession of heroin with intent to distribute, possession of cocaine with intent to sell, possession of heroin with intent to sell, grand theft, petty theft, uttering a forged instrument, forgery of a U.S. Treasury check, possession of cocaine, simple battery, aggravated battery, and petty theft. This is one person.

Subject 2, from Port Everglades: Arrested for robbery, assault with intent to commit murder, breaking and entering, disorderly conduct, shoplifting, burglary, dealing in stolen property, possession of cocaine, sale of cocaine, and domestic violence.

Mr. Chairman, since 1993, the Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor had been conducting criminal background checks on certain employees and their system has worked well. I believe that that particular port is in the jurisdiction, or in the district of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

This is a federally chartered port and these ports have access to Federal records. Considering the torrent of drugs and other contraband that moves in and out of our ports, I do not consider it unreasonable for the local government, or a port authority, to require clean records for the people who work on the docks, the people who are actually on the front lines, the people that are handling the cargo.

For that reason, I would urge support of this amendment. Quite frankly, all we are asking is to have the same privilege, that the ports in the district of the gentleman from New Jersey already have, in the Port of Miami, Port Everglades, the Port of Boston, Norfolk, New Orleans, Charleston, all over this country. It has worked in New York and New Jersey and it will work elsewhere.

The incidence of drugs coming into this country through ports is increasing tremendously. We need to cut this off and it is only common sense that we do not have criminals or do not have the foxes guarding the hen house.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the intentions of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). I want to express, however, some reservations.

Port employees overwhelmingly are hard-working and honest people who have a strong commitment to doing their jobs and serving their Nation. Also not only in terms of moving the trade that we always talk about in this Chamber, 95 percent of all the Nation's commerce moves through ports like the ones that I represent, but also in their efforts to eradicate illegal drug importation.

Mr. Chairman, I represent the largest port in the Eastern seaboard. I clearly understand the need to fight the entry of illegal drugs through the ports of entry. In fact, port workers cooperate with the Customs Department in a program that they work together called the ''Dock Workers Against Drugs Initiative.'' They are not coerced or force to do this. Rather, they participate voluntarily.

Now, this bill imposes a Federal mandate in an area where local efforts are already underway. Criminal background check records of the Port of New York and New Jersey workers, including ancillary workers, are already examined thoroughly. The port already does what this amendment offers. The Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor did this without a mandate from the Federal Government.

My concern is the extent in which the amendment is written. It says upon the request of any State, county, port authority, or other local jurisdiction of a State, the Attorney General shall grant to that entity all of these rights to have criminal background checks on employees or applicants for employment at any point under the jurisdiction of that otherwise State, county, port authority, or other local jurisdiction.

Now, my sense is I am not quite sure whether by ''local jurisdiction'' we mean port authorities or what is the extent of that entity. I am concerned that the extent, the broad net that is being cast here, provides no safeguards to prevent the distribution of sensitive information to those with no connection to port operations.

This amendment provides no limits to the information that can be collected and records can be released to a wide variety of entities, as I think are described here, that may not in essence accomplish our goals. The protection of the integrity of our borders and stopping the entry of illegal drugs is a worthy goal. The gentleman from Florida clearly has a worthy goal.

The workers at our ports I know, and I have spoken before the International Longshoremen's Association, I have heard from them their efforts and their commitment. These are working men and women who clearly understand the consequences to their families and to the communities in which they live.

But I am concerned, and I just raise the caution and concern here in terms of the potential overbreadth of the way that this amendment has been written. In that context, I raise those concerns and hope that we can, as this bill moves, seek to make sure that the purposes of the gentleman from Florida can be tailored in such a way that we reach his goals, but provide certain protections.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW). I am not an expert on longshoremen. I live in the corn fields of Illinois and we see the products that are moved through our ports. It happens in our schools and our towns and our villages and the little country towns where those narcotics are available.

We know that most of those narcotics come across the Southwest border, something we have just talked about. We also know that about 40 percent of those narcotics come through our ports of entry into this country, our seaports and airports. It is pretty important, I think just common sense, it is pretty important that the people who handle the luggage, the people who handle the containers, the people who load the boats, who onload the ships, who load the trucks, who maneuver cargo through the railroads, those people need to be trusted. They need to be screened.

It would surely be wonderful if it was always voluntary, but we understand those people who have been able to infiltrate, and it happens in this country and it is rampant throughout this country. They are not law-abiding citizens. They would hide the fact.

Mr. Chairman, I just think we ought to be able to screen them. The facts show themselves. Out of the scores of people that were finally arrested, and we found that we had 200 to 300 arrests for that score of people, we ought to do that screening. If we are going to protect our children, if we are going to protect our families and we are going to protect our communities against drugs, we need to be able to make sure that the ports of entry, those people handling cargo and those poisons coming from across the oceans, that they are people that we can trust and that we have faith in and that will do the right job.

Mr. Chairman, I insert the following letters for printing in the RECORD:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, September 14, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER. I understand that it is the desire of the Leadership to take H.R. 4300, the ''Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act,'' and H.R. 4550, the ''Drug Demand Reduction Act,'' to the floor without this committee reporting these bills.

In the interest of the Leadership's desire to move expeditiously on these bills, I will agree to Judiciary Committee's being discharged from further consideration of these bills. However, this should not be construed as a relinquishment of the Committee's jurisdiction as to these matters generally, or as to any further amendments relating to them. I also request that the Committee's rights to have our Members named to any conference committee on these bills or any similar bill be protected.

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE, *Chairman.*

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, September 11, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On July 22, 1998 the bill H.R. 4300, the ''Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act of 1998,'' was introduced in the House. Amendments made to this bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture.

Knowing of your interest in expediting this legislation, the Committee on Agriculture will agree to waive jurisdiction and will not seek a sequential referral in order to speed its consideration of the floor. In so doing, the Committee on Agriculture does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over this or similar measures. Furthermore, the Committee reserves the right to seek appropriate representation in the event the measure should go to conference.

Thank you very much for your courtesy in this matter and I look forward to continuing to work with you on this important project.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. (BOB) SMITH, *Chairman.*

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY,
Washington, DC, September 15, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In recognition of the desire to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 4300, the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act, the Committee on National Security agrees to waive its right to consider this legislation. As you know, H.R. 4300, as introduced, addresses subject matter that falls within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on National Security pursuant to House Rule X.

The Committee on National Security's waiver of its right for further consideration is taken with the explicit understanding that the text H.R. 4300 will be modified on the floor by a manager's amendment incorporating changes agreed to between the Committee and sponsors of the legislation. Further, this action is taken with the understanding that the Committee on National Security's jurisdiction over the provisions in question is no way diminished or altered, and that the Committee's right to appointment of conferees during any conference on the bill remains intact.

Finally, while I commend and appreciate the willingness of the sponsors of the legislation to work with the Committee to address the various jurisdictional concerns associated with the introduced bill, I still hold reservations over portions of the legislation that express the need to alter the Global Military Force Policy of the Department of Defense. This fundamental policy question deserves careful and thorough consideration as it has the potential to alter how limited defense resources are allocated among the many worthy and critical national security priorities, including the Department's counterdrug efforts. Further, this matter is currently being negotiated with the Senate as part of the conference on H.R. 3616, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 which I hope to bring back to the House within days. As the likely conference outcome on this issue differs from the text contained in H.R. 4300, I believe this matter will require further consideration in conference or any subsequent consideration of this legislation.

With warm personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

FLOYD D. SPENCE, *Chairman.*

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, September 11, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: One of the bills scheduled for consideration before the Committee on Rules next week, H.R. 4300, the Western hemisphere Drug Elimination Act, was referred to several Committees, including the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I strongly support H.R. 4300, and, in order to expedite its passage, do not object to the Rules Committee granting a rule for Floor consideration next week. This should not be deemed to be a waiver of this Committee's jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in H.R. 4300, or our right to be appointed as conferees should this bill go to conference with the Senate.

The problem of drug use among teenagers in this country has reached crisis proportions. H.R. 4300 will authorize funds to allow the Coast Guard to aggressively pursue drug smugglers and protect our country's borders from illegal contraband. We must act now to provide the funds necessary to deter America's teenagers from using illegal drugs.

Although I agree that time does not allow us to proceed through the normal Committee process for this legislation, in the future, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will continue to exercise its jurisdictional responsibilities over all Coast Guard drug interdiction issues, and all related legislation.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER, *Chairman.*

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, September 14, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing concerning consideration of H.R. 4300, the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act. Sections 101(a) and 501(e) contain authorizations for appropriations for the U.S. Customs Service for drug interdiction and, as such, fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

As you know, the House recently passed, by an overwhelming margin, H.R. 3809, the Drug Free Borders Act. This bill greatly increased authorization levels for the U.S. Customs Service for drug interdiction, particularly along the southwest border.

I have long been concerned that Customs have adequate resources to fulfill its responsibilities for drug interdiction, particularly along the southwest border, as well as the facilitation of legitimate trade, and these priorities have been reflected in H.R. 3809. I understand that since the passage of H.R. 3809, certain serious needs have come to light for which you seek additional authorizations for the U.S. Customs Service in H.R. 4300. I understand, however, that you fully support the funding priorities authorized in H.R. 3809. I further understand that you do not seek in any way to diminish those funding levels by the new authorizations in H.R. 4300 but that you intend to seek supplemental appropriations to fund the bill.

In order to expedite the consideration of this important legislation, I do not believe that a markup of H.R. 4300 by the Committee on Ways and means will be necessary. However, this is being done only with the understanding, first, that this does not in any way

prejudice the Committee's jurisdictional prerogatives on this measure or any similar legislation; second, that it should not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Ways and Means in the future; and, third, that you will support the funding priorities and levels in H.R. 3809.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

With best personal regards,

BILL ARCHER, *Chairman.*

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, September 9, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is my intention to waive committee jurisdiction over H.R. 4300 ''The Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act''. As this session nears conclusion, we are in a serious crisis on the drug front as a result of Administration's neglect in both source nation and interdiction efforts in the war on drugs. The supply of pure, and low cost drugs from abroad increases daily, while corresponding demand and use rises here at home, especially among our young people.

A good case in point of this neglect is Colombia, which produces 80% of the world's cocaine, and most recently has also captured the heroin market here in the U.S. (75%). Our committee has held an extensive hearings on drugs in Colombia, and we also had the GAO report on the crisis there. We have conducted extensive analysis of the critical need for more and better assistance including high performance helicopters, and overall reform of our war on drugs.

Most recently, events turned for the worse in the fight against drugs at the source in Colombia. U.S. law enforcement is in agreement that the best place to fight drugs is at the source. The war on drugs is now on hold in Colombia. Without good helicopters, opium eradication has been cut 50%, and the results in the U.S. from the influx of Colombia heroin are indeed frightening. In addition, the narco-guerrillas' recently destroyed the Colombian National Police's forward drug fighting base in Miraflores. Fear of attack on their key anti-drug operations base at San Jose del Guaviare, forced the withdraw of its remaining few operational Vietnam era Huey helicopters, so coca and cocaine lab destruction are also down.

The results from this de factor cessation of the war on drugs in the major source nation in our hemisphere are becoming more and more evident in the U.S. as the price of hard drugs fall while they purity rises. Most recent National Household Survey data released while we were on recess, showed 171,100 teens for the first time used heroin in 1996. Heroin use in the U.S. now exceeds the late 1960s, early 1970s historic levels, and the future is not bright. On the cocaine front, prices fall, as purity rises, with use on the rise. We are witnessing a major failed demand only driven drug fighting strategy, which will reverse all of the major Reagan/Bush gains in the war on drugs.

H.R. 4300 sets out a three-year plan to reverse this serious neglect at both the source and in the area of interdiction. The bill provides vital anti-drug assistance like high performance helicopters for the excellent and effective Colombian National Police to help eradicate opium and coca, as well as take down and destroy the production laboratories making these drugs for the U.S. market. It also increases aid to other drug producing nations in the region, and increases our interdiction capacity to prevent these drugs from every reaching our shores.

As this drug crisis threatens our youth, and nation, it also requires our action before the session adjourns. Accordingly, under these extraordinary circumstances, I am without prejudice to the Committee's ongoing jurisdiction over the subject matter, willing to waive jurisdiction on this bill so the full House can act on it.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
Chairman.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, in the minute that is left I would like to say that I think that I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) that I do believe without question that the language is sufficiently tight. What we are talking about, people who are either working in ports or apply for positions in ports, are going to get their background checked. I think the language is very clear that only the jurisdiction controlling the port can pull up this information and pull it up on these particular people.

Right now, they can pull up the State records as in Broward County, they passed a county ordinance that required this. In Dade County, they have done the same. But now they can only get to the State records. We should have the same privilege that the Port of New York has and the Port of New Jersey, and that is to be able to tap into the Federal records. That is all this does.

It certainly makes sense to have the honest people be the ones that are handling the cargo. They have the greatest opportunity to assist the drug smugglers and assist the drugs smuggled into this country, and we know that drugs are a huge problem. Mr. Chairman, I ask the approval of the amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to the Shaw amendment to H.R. 4300. The amendment would allow any state, county, port authority or any local government entity to utilize information collected by the U.S. Justice Department about working men and women at our nation's ports. This draconian measure was introduced in response to drug smuggling activities of a few longshore workers in the State of Florida.

The longshore and port workers in my district work hard. They are a proud lot. They are proud of their affiliation with the International Longshore and Warehouse Union—a union dedicated to democracy, economic security for all workers and a peaceful world.

The Shaw legislation is a dagger in the heart of these patriotic Americans. Port workers perceive this legislation as questioning their character and honesty. The legislation would affect workers on the West Coast involved in the international drug trade. It is blatantly offensive to single these workers out because of a few bad apples in one state. The Constitutional right to privacy is cherished by the American people, and there are no extraordinary circumstances that would warrant local government officials rifling through FBI and Justice Department files on a select group of individuals.

There are no safeguards in the Shaw amendment to prevent the dissemination of sensitive information on individuals to use material for selfish political ends, blackmail, or any other nefarious activity. Surely, there is a better way to fight drugs than to invade the privacy of a proud group of workers.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before us labels a whole class of workers guilty until proven innocent. I rise to express my strong opposition to this amendment. It automatically considers any worker at a port suspect, and it only targets port workers. Port employees are hard-working and honest people who have a strong commitment to doing their jobs and serving their nation in its efforts to eradicate illegal drug importation. This amendment does not account for those facts.

Let me emphasize that I represent the largest port in the eastern seaboard. I understand the need to fight the entry of illegal drugs at our ports of entry. There's no doubt we need to continue in those efforts.

The U.S. Customs Service with other government agencies does a valiant job in trying to seize narcotics at New Jersey's ports. They could not accomplish this without the assistance of the Port's workers. Here are some examples: in July 1998 under Operation Brass Ring the U.S. Customs Service seized 700 pounds of cocaine at Port Newark/Port Elizabeth, New Jersey; and in June 1998 the Customs Service seized 1,300 pounds of cocaine concealed in a shipment at Port Newark/Port Elizabeth. I cite these examples to demonstrate ongoing narcotics fighting efforts at the Port; efforts which the Port's workers aided.

Port workers have their own initiatives to fight illegal drugs with programs like the Dock Workers Against Drugs initiative. They are not coerced or forced to do this; rather they participate voluntarily.

This amendment imposes a federal mandate in an area where local efforts are already underway. The criminal background records of the Port of New York and New Jersey's workers, including ancillary workers, are already examined thoroughly. The ports of New Jersey and New York already do what this amendment offers. But the Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor did this without a mandate from the Federal government.

This amendment violates workers' privacy. It does not provide any safeguards to prevent the distribution of sensitive information to those with no connection to port operations. This amendment provides no limits to the information that can be collected, and records could be released that date back years and have no relation to the work of port employees. The information could be used in inappropriate ways.

Protecting the integrity of our borders and stopping the entry of illegal drugs is a worthy goal and the workers at our ports support this effort wholeheartedly. Mr. Chairman, we need to fight the entry of illegal drugs coming into our ports. In New Jersey we have established rigid background checks to ensure our workers can function in the port environment, but we did it without a mandate from the Federal government. We shouldn't use this bill as a means to violate the privacy rights of our workers. The International Longshoremen's

Association, the AFL–CIO, and the International Longshore and Warehouse Union all oppose this amendment. We should use this bill as an opportunity to provide the resources to stop illegal drugs at their source.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. WATERS:

Strike section 201.

Strike section 204(a).

In section 204(b), strike ''(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—''.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) for working with me to accommodate me and give me the opportunity to get this amendment up, who happens to be the chair of the Republican Drug Task Force.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Florida for the work that he has put into this legislation. I do have some concerns that this legislation did not travel the traditional course and have the oversight of all of the committees that should have seen it. However, I am one of the cosponsors on the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, having said that, I would like to make it absolutely clear that one of the priorities of the Congressional Black Caucus is the eradication of illegal drugs in our country. The Congressional Black Caucus, in formulating its agenda at the beginning of the 105th Congress, made this a priority simply because we were tired of sitting around and waiting for someone else to make this happen.

We have put millions of dollars into the eradication of illegal drugs in our society. We have had presidents and elected officials for years now talking about the eradication of drugs, and to tell the truth, those drugs continue to show up in our communities.

□ 1430

And the gentleman is absolutely correct; too many lives are lost, too many families are destroyed, too many dreams and hopes unrealized because, in fact, these drugs continue to flow.

And let me tell the gentleman what a lot of the young people say. They say, ''Ms. Waters, we don't have any planes, and we don't have any boats, and we don't have the money to go out and buy huge shipments of drugs to bring them into our community. Why don't you go and get the big boys? Why don't you do something about interdiction? Why don't you do something to stop the flow of drugs into the communities?'' And this bill attempts to do something of that nature.

This amendment is simple, direct and crucial, and I join with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to do something about the eradication. However, I am simply asking that we strike two provisions that currently give direct military aid to the Colombian National Police and army as well as the Mexican military. I believe this is a crucial amendment due to the disturbing and most recent revelations about the involvement of the Colombian and Mexican military and police in drug trafficking.

The first part of the amendment strikes section 201, which gives additional eradication resources for the army and national police of Colombia, the section which gives $165 million of direct military aid to these forces at a time when they are being alleged to have ties and providing protection for Colombian drug cartels.

The second part of the amendment strikes section 204 that gives direct military aid to Mexican military forces at a time when they are being implicated for their ties to drug cartels. In fact, just today in The New York Times, we have reports that elite Mexican drug officers are said to be tied to traffickers. The Washington Post ran an article last week on reports of those supposedly incorruptible anti-narcotics police who were taking suitcases full of cocaine and walking around the drug-sniffing dogs in Mexico City's airport and then placing the suitcases back on the luggage racks for the cartel agents to pick up.

Other similar revelations have surfaced regarding the Colombian military. A June 22 New York Times editorial wrote of the ties between the paramilitaries in Colombia and drug cartels. Colombia's investigative police say Carlos Castano, a top paramilitary leader, heads a drug cartel. According to reliable sources, his paramilitary drug cartel is also receiving protection from Colombian police and security forces.

In fact, the Colombian military and anti-narcotics police units based in Guaviare have been recently implicated in supporting Carlos Castano and his paramilitary when they carried out a massacre that took place from October 18 through October 20, the day before our own General Barry McCaffrey landed at the capital at San Jose del Guaviare.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support on this amendment to make sure we stop dumping our dollars, our taxpayer dollars, into corrupt police officers who are part of the drug problem in Mexico and Colombia.

October 29, 1997.

Hon. MADELEINE ALBRIGHT,

Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: We are writing to you regarding the human rights situation in Colombia. We have just received credible information that military and anti-narcotics police units based in Miraflores, Guaviare actively supported a paramilitary massacre that took place from October 18 through October 20, the day before Gen. (ret.) Barry McCaffrey landed at the capital at San Jose del Guaviare.

According to the Public Ombudsman's office, on October 18, heavily armed men calling themselves the Autodefensas del Sur (Southern Self-Defense Group) entered Miraflores and executed four men, identified in press reports as Jose John Gordillo Daza, Pablo Quejoa Menza, Silvano Batioja Castro, and Florentino Torres. Apparently the paramilitaries had a list of names that they used to search out their victims. In the formal complaint, witnesses said that they overheard the men say, ''Who said we couldn't come to this town? From here on, we give the orders here.'' Over the course of three days, at least six people were reported executed.

Miraflores has the permanent presence of three security force units: the army's ''Joaquin Paros'' Battalion, the navy, and the anti-narcotics police. Although the surrounding countryside is controlled by guerrillas, the town itself is heavily militarized.

Eyewitnesses reported that security force personnel did not leave their barracks until 45 minutes after the first three people had been killed. Then, their only activity was to collect the bodies left in the street. According to our information, they did nothing to apprehend the paramilitaries, who were still in town searching for more people on their list. One more person was killed that day and two more on October 20.

On the afternoon of October 18, our information indicates that army soldiers provided an escort for two of the gunmen to the army-controlled airstrip. Eyewitnesses also claim that soldiers summoned a private airplane with an army radio, which arrived shortly thereafter, boarded the gunmen, and left. Subsequently, Miraflores mayor Edgar Emilio Lozano and many other residents fled Miraflores out of fear.

We are also concerned because the security forces have not impeded this paramilitary group's free movement in the region using a DC–3 airplane. According to local residents, Autodefensas del Sur landings are frequent and notorious. The group is also implicated in the October 16 killings of Jorge Puerto and his mother, Maroa, near the town of Puerto Trujillo, Meta.

Paramilitaries led by Carlos Castano publicly identified the department of Guaviare as a military objective a year ago. Like the attack in Mapiripon, Meta in July, which left seven confirmed dead, the Miraflores massacre appears to be part of a paramilitary plan to expand their operations into areas historically dominated by guerrillas. Although the role of the security forces in the Mapiripon massacre is not clear, eyewitnesses have provided compelling testimony about the role of Colombian units in the Miraflores attack.

We know you must share our dismay at the apparent role played by the Colombian military and anti-narcotics police in the Miraflores massacre. If confirmed, security force assistance in the massacre would constitute a serious human rights violation. It would also challenge the United States decision to permit anti-narcotics aid to be sent to units operating in the department of Guaviare, according to the August end-use monitoring agreement.

We ask you to carry out an immediate inquiry of the Miraflores massacre, and particularly the reported involvement of the Colombian military and anti-narcotics police. We also request that U.S. intelligence relevant to the incident be shared with the Fiscaloa and Procuraduroa, to aid them in their on-going investigation. Finally, we urge you to ensure that appropriate action is taken with regards to the provision of U.S. assistance to units operating in Guaviare and Meta under the guidelines laid out in the Leahy amendment.

Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter.

Sincerely,

JOSE MIGUEL VIVANCO,
Executive Director,
Human Rights Watch/Americas.
COLETTA YOUNGERS,
Senior Associate,
Washington Office on Latin America.
GEORGE VICKERS,
Executive Director,
Washington Office on Latin America.
JAMIE FELLNER,
Associate Counsel,
Human Rights Watch.

[From the New York Times, September 16, 1998]

ELITE MEXICAN DRUG OFFICERS SAID TO BE TIED TO TRAFFICKERS

(By Tim Golden)

WASHINGTON.—An ambitious effort to overhaul Mexico's corrupt law-enforcement system has been thrown into turmoil by the disclosure that top investigators of an elite American-trained police unit may have ties to drug traffickers, American officials say.

The disclosure emerged after recent lie-detector tests administered, at Mexican authorities' request, to Mexican police agents by American Government experts.

Officials said at least some of those investigators whose tests indicated collusion with traffickers had been chosen for their posts after elaborate screening devised by Americans.

American officials said they were just beginning to assess the damage that corrupt investigators might have wrought, a task that will take weeks. Most senior officials in the unit were implicated by the lie-detector tests.

Officials said they feared that much of the sensitive information that American law-enforcement agents had shared with the Mexican unit during the last year might have been compromised.

''You have to assume that everything we've been giving them has ended up in the hands of the traffickers,'' said a senior United States law-enforcement official who, as did others, insisted on anonymity.

''It's a disaster.''

Other officials were more cautious about the significance of the tests. But they said they expected that American collaboration with the unit to be suspended until the Mexican Attorney General's office undertook an investigation of the case.

A senior Mexican law-enforcement official said tonight that the accusations were serious, but did not necessarily mean that senior investigators had been working for traffickers. He said, though, that an administrative inquiry was under way and that one senior investigator had been reassigned.

''This vetting process was not the one we agreed to; the questions were not clear and they were not the ones we authorized,'' the official, who insisted on anonymity, said of the American conclusions.

''Failing a polygraph does not mean that these people committed crimes or took money, and there may be a lot of reasons why they did not tell the truth, he said, in a telephone interview from Mexico City. ''But the law is very clear. To work in this unit you have to pass the polygraph.''

The possible penetration of the unit, apparently by powerful drug gangs, in the latest in a series of such calamities.

Last week The Washington Post reported that Mexican officials were investigating allegations of corruption against dozens of army soldiers who had been stationed at the Mexico City airport as part of the armed forces' American-supported involvement in the fight against drugs.

For 10 years, as successive Administrations in Washington have sought to work more closely with the Mexican authorities, both to fight the flow of illegal drugs to the United States and to strengthen the rule of law in a strategically vital neighbor, American officials have publicly embraced senior Mexican prosecutors, police commanders and other officials who have later been revealed, one after another, to have taken bribes from major drug smugglers.

In the most serious case, the Mexican Government announced early last year that its drug-enforcement chief was in fact working secretly with the man then considered the biggest cocaine trafficker in the country, Amado Carrillo Fuentes. Days earlier the official, Gen. Jesús Gutiérrez Rebollo, had been basking in the praise of the Clinton Administration's drug-policy director, Gen. Barry R. McCaffrey.

General McCaffrey and other Administration officials vowed that such a debacle would not occur again. They pressed for a sweeping reorganization of how the United States gathers and disseminates intelligence about trafficking. The reorganization plans have run into wide opposition among Mexican law-enforcement officials.

But more important for Mexico, American law-enforcement officials also provided extensive help in writing a new law against organized crime, in setting up an investigative unit to enforce the law and in screening hundreds of other police agents assigned to drug enforcement.

Prospective members of the Organized Crime Unit were submitted to extensive background and financial checks, lie-detector tests and psychological evaluations. Most of those chosen also received training from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Drug Enforcement Administration or both.

But after a year and a half, in which the team of more than 200 investigators, prosecutors and intelligence analysts has been responsible for investigating many of the most important drug-trafficking and kidnapping cases, its record is mixed.

Mexican and American officials praise the unit for what they say was its role in the arrests of a handful of important smugglers and the dismantling of a kidnapping ring that terrorized central Mexico while receiving protection from state officials.

In particular Dr. Samuel González Ruiz, 37, a former law professor who heads the unit, has won wide respect from American officials for what they say is honesty and courage. Dr. González Ruiz was one of three top unit officials who were said to have passed the lie-detector tests.

Increasingly, though, American officials have grown critical of the unit for the same basic failing of the special forces that came before it. Despite issuing dozens of arrest warrants, the squad has been unable to capture leaders of the biggest trafficking gangs, despite having access to some of the most sensitive intelligence that Washington has ever given the Mexican Government.

As part of the law on organized crime that went into effect in November 1996, the unit has pioneered the use of protected witnesses and plea bargaining in criminal cases. Among other actions, Dr. González Ruiz arranged this year for testimony before a Federal grand jury in Houston by a former Mexican federal police chief who agreed to cooperate with authorities in return for a reduced prison sentence on corruption charges.

But the unit's handling of its witnesses has sometimes left a lot to be desired. A highly valued informer who implicated senior military officials in drug corruption, Tomás Colsa McGregor, was murdered last year after having left the custody of the unit, American officials said.

Another informer, a former federal highway police officer, Jaime José Olvera, was kidnapped from a street in Mexico City on Thursday, after having been in the protective custody of the unit. He was found dead on Friday.

American officials said Officer Olvera had provided crucial information about the most important drug gang, which he had once worked for, providing security.

Three officials said the lie-detector tests were partly a response to informers. But other experts said Americans screened agents in countries like Bolivia, Colombia, Peru and Thailand.

According to two officials, the testing, led by the F.B.I. and the Drug Enforcement Administration, focused in part on whether senior investigators had passed information to drug traffickers.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

I understood the rule to say that preprinted amendments have a preference. I also understood the gentlewoman from California to stand up and ask to strike section 201.

I think what has happened is there is a combination of two amendments here. I just want to know what rule are we going under? Has there been a change in the amendments? Because I did not hear a unanimous consent request.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The rule allows for any sections of the bill to be stricken by amendment because the bill is open to amendment at any point, and the gentlewoman's amendment has, in fact, done that.

Mr. HASTERT. My question, Mr. Chairman, was based, and I understand we are going to hear these amendments, but there are independent issues on each side of this bill, or these two pieces of legislation. The preprinted amendments, which was the rule, asked that those amendments have preference.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman's amendment is in order. It is the Chair's understanding that the gentlewoman's amendment is one amendment, as reported by the Clerk.

Mr. HASTERT. I am just trying to get straight what we are debating here. My understanding is the preprinted amendments, which were the rule and as the rule was passed, had two different provisions, two different amendments. And now we are going from preprinted preference to rules that are just reported by the Clerk. I do not quite understand.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair's understanding of the rule was that the preprinted amendments received discretionary preference on their order. The rule did not require that all amendments be preprinted to be offered.

Mr. HASTERT. So would we not have to offer the two preprinted amendments first?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair's understanding is that the gentlewoman from California chose not to offer the preprinted amendments.

Mr. HASTERT. I thank the Chair. I would just say to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) I misunderstood that. If she is to take both these together, it is a little more complex issue when she combines them.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman's time on his inquiry has expired.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

What this combined amendment asks is basically to do a couple of things. First of all, what the text of the bill says is that our law enforcement agencies that work in Mexico ought to have the protections that anybody who works in an embassy should have. And in exchange, people who work in Mexican law enforcement, who have duties in this country, ought to have those same types of privileges.

Also, the black tar Mexican heroin that is now coming into our street corners in Los Angeles and Chicago and New York, some of the cities in New Jersey, and certainly Denver and other places, comes from the high mountains in Mexico. The only way that we can eradicate that black tar heroin is from helicopters that have the ability to reach high altitudes.

Now, we need to be able to provide, in cooperation with explicit actions from the Mexican Government that we require, we need to be able to provide those helicopters. We need to have our agencies and agents in Mexico to have the same protections that other people in our embassies have, and that is basically, on the Mexican side of this issue, that is that part of the amendment. That is what we afford. Why should we take that away from our people, law enforcement agents that work in Mexico?

The second part of this deals with Colombia. The law enforcement agency in Colombia that is in charge of drugs, that we have worked with, is the Colombian National Police. They have an extraordinary record on human rights. And as a matter of fact, the 18 people that got killed, that the gentlewoman from California talked about, right before General McCaffrey was there, were Colombia National Policemen. They were ambushed and killed. As a matter of fact, there has been 400 Colombian National Policemen killed in the last year; 4,000 over the last 10 years. These are people who have fought and struggled to stop drugs being produced in Colombia and have given a lot of their life and talents, for those people who have been wounded and others, to try to fight this battle.

They need help. That country is at the brink, absolute brink of chaos. If they do not have help, if they do not have the ability to fight within their own country, we will see Colombia being the first Democratic nation in the southern part of this Western Hemisphere become a narco-state. That is the danger that we are in, my colleagues.

Both of these amendments, combined, first strike at our ability to work with Mexico, which has been, at times, a difficult country to work with; and also try to get things straight with the ability to move this process and to stop narcotics flowing into our neighborhoods from Colombia. We need to have the helicopters, we need the eradication, we need to be able to do the job with the Colombian National Police who are vetted and who have wonderful human rights' records. Why destroy that? Why take that ability to deal with those folks away?

I just question why are we doing this in this amendment? I strongly oppose these amendments and would ask other Members of this body to vote ''no''.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I rise in strong opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment to cut off aid to Colombia.

Let the record reflect the aid in this bill for Colombia primarily goes to the Colombian National Police to fight drugs at their source. General Jose Rosso Serrano is the director general of that outstanding organization. His Colombian National Police antidrug unit, the Danti, is the recipient of most of the drug fighting funds for Colombia.

In March of this year, our House passed H. Res. 398 to provide Blackhawks for the Colombian National Police. It was passed out of our House Committee on International Relations with bipartisan support. There was no major opposition to that resolution.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) has expired.

(On request of Mr. GILMAN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HASTERT was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, let me read some parts of that resolution:

> Whereas the Colombian National Police is led by the legendary and incorruptible General Jose Serrano, who has dedicated his life to fighting drugs, and whereas the elite anti-narcotics union of the Colombian National Police, the Danti, is one of the best and most effective anti-narcotics police forces in the region and the world.

That was the preamble to that measure. The CNP have had 4,000 police officers killed over the last 10 years fighting drugs in Colombia, before they reach our streets and before they kill our children. They destroyed the Cali and Medellin cartels, and killed the violent notorious drug dealer Pablo Escobar in a shoot-out. So let us understand who we are giving funds to and who deserve it.

There is no corruption in the CNP antidrug unit nor is there any history of human rights' abuses by the Danti antidrug unit. In fact, the Ambassador to Colombia, Myles Furchette, told our committee staff of the Congress not long ago that in the 10 years of providing U.S. assistance to General Serrano's antidrug unit, there have been no allegations of human rights' abuse.

The amendment to delete antidrug aid to Colombia and especially the Colombian antidrug police is ill-founded and lacks merit. Accordingly, I request our colleagues to defeat the Waters amendment.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

First of all, I want to say I have a great deal of respect for the gentlewoman and particularly for her concerns about the corrupt activities that take place in Mexico and in Colombia, particularly with reference to the narcotics trade. And I think it is a legitimate concern. We have concerns about human rights' abuses, but most particularly by the military aspects of those countries, and it is a legitimate concern. But I must respectfully and strongly oppose her amendment.

The fact of the matter is that I would suspect that we would have all of the end use monitoring that we have had under what is known as the Leahy amendment, and that we would continue to have that. The fact of the matter is that it is in the national interest of the United States and the national security interest of the United States to assist these countries because, ultimately, assisting these legitimate efforts helps us in the interdiction and eradication of those drugs that would transverse our borders into our country, into our communities and, ultimately, to our children and those who are the most susceptible.

□ 1445

So, in fact, as someone who traveled last year to Colombia with the Committee on International Relations and who boarded a helicopter in the jungles of Colombia and who went with the Colombian National Police in the jungle to see their eradication and who in the process ended up catching, in the very fields of the jungles a laboratory which refined these products and saw all of the work and the risk that was engaged and who talked to members of the Colombian National Police who were harmed and injured, and to their leadership which our own U.S. ambassador in Colombia has talked about time and time again, both in our visit there and as the chairman of the full committee has just suggested before the committee in terms of the degree of integrity that they have, not to suggest that for so long as there are human beings in any entity there is not a risk, but ultimately when we focus on the Colombian National Police, for example, we are more likely than not to have the type of resources flowing to an entity that is legitimately dedicated to combating narcotics trafficking. So it makes a lot of sense to have these provisions.

If we without any limitation go ahead and strike these provisions, then

Colombia and Mexico clearly will not have the wherewithal, particularly in Colombia, will not have the wherewithal to go ahead and be able to have any enforcement efforts. You also have to understand that in Colombia, we have very difficult consequences. We have guerillas who seem to lack any ideological perspective, but you have guerillas who use the narcotraffickers as their enforcement and the narcotraffickers use the guerrillas to fuel economically their efforts. So the bottom line is you have a synergistic relationship, none of them ultimately for any good purposes, and obviously for purposes that are incredibly detrimental to the interests of the United States and the national security of the United States in our efforts to combat drugs.

I share the gentlewoman's concerns on the questions of corruption and human rights. But this broad swath of cutting I think would not meet our interests.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, we are being laughed at. I want to call my colleagues' attention to when our drug czar went down to Mexico and wrapped his arms around Drug Czar Gutierrez Rebollo, a week before it was revealed that he was on the payroll of the Juarez cartel.

I want to draw my colleagues' attention to Colombia, when people were saying that the National Police were clean. I will tell you what happened to Pablo Escobar. They were supporting him until we put so much heat on them, and they tried to make it look as if they were better, they killed him. But these are the same National Police that we are talking about putting more money in their hands. This is above and beyond the current appropriations.

I am simply saying, we need money to fight drugs in this country. We need good interdiction. What we do not need is to keep talking about giving our money to dope dealers under the banner of their police. Our own officers that we send down there to train them are disgusted and they are saying we are the laughingstock. I know that we need to get up in those mountains, but I think we need to go up there ourselves and stop giving our money.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Reclaiming my time, I simply will say that I understand the gentlewoman's concerns, but unless we are going to send armed forces into another sovereign country which has all other types of ramifications, I think it is very, very dangerous and I would urge a ''no'' vote on the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. First off I know the gentlewoman shares a deep concern about the heroin and cocaine on the streets of Los Angeles and in Fort Wayne in my hometown, but she maligned the name of the National Police.

This hat belongs to Colonel Gallego who personally took down Pablo Escobar. He did not take him down because he was in on some kind of drug deal. They were trying to take out the Medellin cartel and then the Cali cartel. It has been difficult. You cannot make just random allegations about individuals.

There are problems in Colombia. We know there are problems in Colombia. None of us are going to stand here and defend Mexico. She mentioned it. But she is failing to distinguish between the Colombian National Police and their defense units.

General Wilhelm, the head of SouthCom, said that in Colombia, it is the number one priority in his command. I outlined earlier this afternoon the importance not only directly in Colombia but to the oil from Venezuela and the Panama Canal.

DEA Administrator Tom Constantine said after his visit that General Serrano and the Colombian National Police are the first line of defense in the war on drugs. He called these policemen heroes.

I know that while I may have a general reputation as a conservative among many people, I am still viewed in many places as kind of a liberal, open-minded guy. For example, Ambassador Frechette when I was in Colombia in particular asked me if I would go over and meet with the Human Rights Watch people and the people who had the concerns about the Colombian National Police and the Defense Department. In going through the particulars, they had no complaints on record, this was not this year but last year, with the Colombian National Police narcotics unit in particular but they do have them with the military. That is why this bill specifies specifically that the Black Hawks go to the Colombian National Police and the 50 Hueys go to the National Police.

The incident that she referred to earlier, there is a difference between the Danti, the Colombian antinarcotics group, and the National Police as a whole. It is on this hat. It says antinarcotics. You are accusing Colonel Gallego of not participating in the takedown of a paramilitary organization when he only has jurisdiction over antidrug issues and was in an antidrug raid at the time. You cannot mix apples and oranges and that is an incorrect statement on the House floor.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUDER. I will let you get additional time when I am done with my points.

Ms. WATERS. We have documentation.

Mr. SOUDER. You have documentation that he did not participate, not that he participated and took somebody down.

I want to illustrate what is at stake here. We have Huey helicopters that we would not allow Americans to ride in. Our only line of defense now in Colombia to keep the cocaine and heroin from our streets are these helicopters that are grounded. I personally visited in the hospital in Colombia some of the people in some of these Huey helicopters that have crashed. It is a tragedy that we are putting these old junkers out right now that will not work and we are trying to say that this is the only way we are going to protect our kids and families in America? If we do not make sure that the National Police have these helicopters and the ability to get up to the higher elevations with the Black Hawks and the Black Hawks can carry larger loads of people to protect the people who are trying to eradicate the drugs, let me assure you, if we do not do this, my son and daughter and your sons and daughters are going to be down there in Colombia trying to fight this war directly.

We have people out there, Colonel Gallego has a multimillion-dollar price on his head and his family is in hiding. General Serrano has even more millions of dollars' price on his head. If they are with the drug dealers, why are they trying to kill them? Why have they killed the equivalent of 30,000 American police officers in the last few years trying to fight this? These people are dying. These people deserve our praise and credit. I understand and am concerned about the corruption, too, and that is specifically why we are not allowing these funds to go into places where we are concerned they are going to be misused. But if we do not stand with those people who are fighting this war, we are going to have to fight it because our national security is at stake and our kids' lives are at stake.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's concern.

I have here a letter from the very people that he referred to in the Human Rights campaign. Jose Miguel Vivanco, Executive Director, Human Rights Watch; Coletta Youngers, Senior Associate, Washington Office on Latin America; George Vickers, Executive Director, Washington Office on Latin America; and Jamie Fellner, Associate Counsel, Human Rights Watch, raising these questions about the National Police.

I have great sympathy for the fact that you have a relationship and that you certainly are pointing to someone who lost their life. Yes, a lot of people have lost their lives; however, we cannot stop them from dumping these drugs in our country.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SOUDER was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, the point here is that the gentlewoman alludes to allegations. There is one specific point, it is well known publicly, that is, that the National Police antinarcotics unit did not participate in stopping a paramilitary group. That is different than alleging human rights abuses.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the amendment because I know the gentlewoman from California, a colleague of mine, does fight in every way she can to remove drugs from the streets. I think her heart is in the right position on this particular amendment. I do see it a little bit differently and I would like to go through why we have those differences.

Almost every family in this country has been affected negatively by drugs one way or another, including my own, not only from usage but sale of drugs. I want to tell you how disappointing, how hurtful it is and how damaging it is to the family. It is not easy to deal with those kinds of things. We have had a lot of activity, President Reagan, President Bush, President Clinton. I think President Reagan and President Bush made more of a dent in antidrugs than many of the other Presidents, but we have never really had a war, a real war on drugs. That is what it is going to take. It is across the lot of broad fronts. Is it education? Absolutely. Interdiction. Border control where most of it is coming from. The cargo containers. That is why one of the reasons we did not want Long Beach Naval Shipyard to fall to the Communist Chinese because they have been known to sell drugs along with AK–47s and the rest of it. Diplomatic, trade agreements ought to include these things and be real tough, and also penalties. Many times we come to the floor to penalize the people that are really selling these poisons to our neighborhoods and many people feel differently, that we should not do that.

Mr. Chairman, you remember a man named Enrique Camerino, a Border Patrol guy just east of my district and the district of gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER). He was buried alive after being tortured by Mexican officials. Yes, Mexico does have a problem. But I want to tell my colleagues, I live down on the border. There are citizens in Mexico that feel the same as we do, they are fed up, they are exasperated. They want drugs out of their country and they do not want drugs being sold to other countries. There are law enforcement agents in Mexico that feel the same that we do. There are politicians that feel the same.

Are there problems? Yes. But I would say to the gentlewoman, if we are going to have this war, first of all we need to make sure that the resources go to where it is going to do the good and not pilfered. But if we take away those resources with the gentlewoman's amendment to people that we think are really fighting this war, then we are going to have problems. Because there are people in every one of those countries that are good citizens, whether they are law enforcement, politicians or just citizens.

I would remind my colleagues, it was right here in the House when we closed the Post Office, there were members, not Members of Congress but there were individuals selling cocaine right here in the Capitol of the United States. We have the Mayor of Washington D.C. that went to jail for cocaine.

Does it affect a lot of people? Is it in the political world? Is it individual? Every Member is being affected. I would say with the most humility, the gentlewoman's heart is in the right place in this amendment. I just happen to disagree with the amendment itself.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the recognition that the gentleman has for the concern of the Congressional Black Caucus and myself as we try and deal with the issue of drugs and he is right. It has touched an awful lot of lives. But as a fiscal conservative, I know that you would not throw your money away time and time again. You talk about, for example, the war on poverty and you make the case, well, what do we have to show for our money, you say?

I can show you more there than you can show me in terms of advancements that we have had, given the money we have been throwing down this rathole. I am saying to you as a fiscal conservative, you should not want to keep doing the same old thing. You have got to try something new. When you find time and time again and you have an article even in today's newspaper that says once again, these are the very people that we are funding to help fight the war on drugs are the drug dealers themselves and they are protecting those who are trafficking in drugs. You ought to want to change. You should not want to keep on doing the same old thing.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reclaiming my time, I am a strong fiscal conservative. That is where the disagreement is. We feel that to fight this war and give it to the people that are very effective is the best that we can do, because it saves a lot of money in our own country and other countries fighting this. I think that is where the difference is, that we feel that there are people in Mexico and Colombia that are fighting this war effectively. If we accept the gentlewoman's amendment, then we lessen that war.

□ 1500

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for supporting this bill. She has been a strong proponent of H.R. 4300, been an original sponsor of it, and I am very pleased that she joined in it. With all due respect, I do disagree with her over her amendments. I am only going to briefly remark on those because they have been discussed considerably here, but one point I do want to make is that the only aid to Mexico in this bill would be in the form of six helicopters, if this were adopted, this bill were adopted, and that is contingent upon granting Mexico, granting our Drug Enforcement Administration the same diplomatic immunity that we have for the FBI and the same right to carry arms, which they have been very reluctant to do because of the incidents surrounding some drug enforcement agents. But we think that is terribly important, those helicopters are important, but nobody would deny the Mexicans, and currently the Mexican Government is embroiled in considerable problems with respect to the people down there who are running their operation, and we are all disturbed by that.

Columbia, as has been stated, is a different scenario completely. The Columbian National Police are extraordinary folks. All of the money in here, all of the equipment in here, goes strictly for their purposes, not to the Columbian military as such. In the 10 years the United States has been assisting the Columbian National Police in their efforts against narcotics, they have sustained 4,000 casualties. The Columbian National Police have given up 4,000 lives to try to destroy the drug operations in that country. General Serrano, when he came to office in taking charge of this group, purged 7,000 of his police officers because of human rights violations, and an incredible screening operation has gone on since then.

So I, with all due respect, must oppose the gentlewoman's amendment in that regard.

I also want to point out, though, in the closing moments of the debate here, as we get near the end of the bill, the very important bill itself that the gentlewoman supports, this bill is to provide some direction in conformance with what our people in Bolivia, Columbia, Peru, and in our military at the lower levels in SouthCom who are on the front lines of the effort against narcotics have told us that they need, that they want; and if they have it, that they could produce, with the cooperation of the three key governments involved, and our own government, of course, at the highest leadership levels, they could produce a reduction in the flow of drugs out of those three countries into the United States by 80 percent within 3 years.

That would be truly remarkable. When we consider the fact we have had double the teen drug use in this country in the last 6 years since 1992 and the fact that the administration's drug plan calls for a 10-year plan to simply

reduce drug use and drugs imported into this country by 50 percent in 10 years, this is a very, very significant thing we are trying to do in this bill, and we very much need to come to a closure on giving them the resources. That is, the planes; there are a lot of planes in here that go to Customs, new planes so we get the radar we need to be able to see down. We need to have the Coast Guard equipment, we need to have the resources that are here. Most of all, we need to do what this administration has not done, and that is to fight a real war against drugs and to end all of this now that we need to be doing.

So I urge in the strongest of terms the adoption of this bill at the conclusion of the amendment process and, of course, the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by commending the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), and all the different Members who have spent so much time working on this. Let me commend all the Members in the Democratic Party who have been active on this issue and who know that drugs have been a disaster for this country, who know that a great deal of the violence we are now facing is violence that either comes directly from the use of drugs or comes from drug dealers or from people fighting over drug territory.

Since 1992, we have seen an 80 percent increase in marijuana use among high school seniors. Since 1992 we have seen an 80 percent increase in cocaine use among high school seniors. Since 1992 we have seen a 100 percent increase in heroin use among high school seniors. For kids 12 to 17, first-time heroin use has surged 875 percent from 1991 to 1996. Heroin is killing kids in Texas, in New York, in Florida, in California.

And make no mistake about it. Heroin, cocaine, marijuana, are not problems of the inner city, they are not problems of minorities, they are not problems of the poor; these are problems that affect every American in every town in this country.

To stand in Iowa and be told that one of the two biggest issues in Iowa this fall is methamphetamines and the traffic coming in from Mexico and coming up the interstate in the smallest towns in Iowa, clearly that is a problem. What makes it a tragic problem is not only that it destroys young people, that it ruins their lives, but that it is avoidable.

From 1980 to 1992, we had a dramatic decline in drug use in the United States. It is very important to understand that. From 1980 to 1992, drug use kept coming down. It is ironic to me that we have living proof, as an historian, occasionally these things happen, and we kind of wonder how did we get there.

As an historian, I know that in the summer of 1992, by any reasonable standard, we were winning the war on drugs. Cocaine use in that period was down dramatically, marijuana use in that period was down dramatically, heroin use in that period was down dramatically, I think largely for two very different reasons, both of which this bill seeks to work on.

First because, led by Nancy Reagan, there was a just-say-no program that the experts laughed at but the American people listened to, and it turned out that when 7,- 8,- 9,- 10-, 11-year-olds hear just say no, when they hear it on television and advertising, when they hear it in school, when they hear it at church or synagogue or mosque, when they hear it from their parents, when they hear it from authority figures they respect such as President Reagan, they say, I guess that is right. And they said no, and we saw a dramatic impact over a 12-year period. And drug use was declining, and it was reasonable to project in the summer of 1992 that we were going to win the war on drugs. Literally win the war. We were on the way.

Then for a variety of reasons, and I do not want to go into the partisan background, and I am not going to make any partisan attacks here, for a variety of reasons, the war on drugs got off track and drug use went back up over the following 6 years.

So here we are in 1998. This is not the bill I wish we were passing. The bill I wish we were passing would have been written by General McCaffrey with the total support of the Pentagon, with the strong support of the State Department, with the strong support of the Justice Department, with the strong support of the Treasury Department, with the open hand of the Office of Management and Budget, and with the enthusiastic public speeches by the President and the Vice President. That is the bill I wish we had here.

That bill does not exist. General McCaffrey is not given the authority to write that bill, the Pentagon will not cooperate in writing it, the State Department will not pay attention in writing it, the Treasury Department will not think through the problems of our border, the Justice Department is itself busy, and the Office of Management and Budget will not approve the funds.

So the Congress is writing a bill.

I just talked to General McCaffrey a few minutes ago, and I assured him that when this bill passes the House and when it passes the Senate and when we meet in conference, we will be glad to sit down with him and work out any practical details he is concerned about. But what we will not do in this Congress is have the administration fail to show leadership, fail to provide a successful plan, fail to provide the resources.

For example, there are no ships in the eastern Pacific. That is not the Congress's fault. So to be told we do not solve all their problems, which by the way they do not solve either, is a nonstarter. Why are there no ships in the eastern Pacific? Because this administration did not think it was a high enough priority. To be told, on the one hand, we do not have the airplanes today and, on the other hand, under our bill they will not get them for 2 years, so that 2 years from now we will have the airplanes; but if we do not pass our bill, 2 years from now they will not have the airplanes and they will say, well, they will not get them for 2 years.

So the answer all too often downtown has been, let us not talk about it, let us not address it, let us not solve it, let us not pay for it, let us not do it, let us not plan it. And then our children use drugs. And our children die.

This bill is a step in the right direction. It is a step on prevention, it is a step on rehabilitation, it is a step on interdiction. All three steps need to be taken simultaneously.

It is a good bill, it is an important bill, and it says in the right direction we are going to do what it takes to win the War on Drugs.

And let me just say one closing thing. I see the chairman of the Committee on International Relations is here. We have Members from every committee that deals with this, from the Committee on Appropriations, from the Committee on Ways and Means, from the Committee on the Judiciary, from the Committee on Government Reform. Every committee that has a piece of this action is involved, because we think saving our children is important enough to transcend the bureaucracies and transcend the territorialities and get the job done.

I commend in particular the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) who has led the task force that has brought everyone together. And we stand ready, as soon as this is done, to go right to the administration, to sit down with every part of the bureaucracy that needs to be involved, to work in good faith in our children's behalf and to make sure that we get the best possible bill to dramatically strengthen our ability to tell the kids not to do it, where the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) has been such a great leader, to help rehabilitate those who are doing it, and to help interdict those who would come and destroy our children.

I urge a strong ''yes'' vote on final passage.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The gentleman is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support and really I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH), I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) for the leadership as well as those others, the

gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and others who have supported this substitute offered by Mr. MCCOLLUM.

But sections 201 and 204, striking them would not do violence to what the Speaker has just talked about. I even applaud his work in this area. But I would remind the Speaker, as he decried the fact that the administration has not been as supportive as he would like on these issues, I would remind him that the administration is also supporting using the surplus for Social Security, and the other side would like to use it for tax cuts, and that has not stopped the other side from pushing a tax cut bill.

The Speaker has spoken so eloquently about education over the past several months. He has decried efforts in the public arena to educate kids. That did not stop him from pushing a voucher program because he thought that our public schools were not educating our kids. We have evidence, ample evidence, that much of the money that we are spending in these areas is not actually being used to fight drug trafficking. All of us on this side support all efforts, interdiction and domestic efforts, to fight at every point of entry in this Nation, every point of entry in all of our communities and neighborhoods. But we cannot continue going down a path where we are getting a door slammed in our face. It is clear that moneys we are spending now are being used by drug traffickers. It is clear that what we are doing now, moneys are being spent with agencies who are apparently purportedly out to attack drug traffickers who are actually complicit in working with drug traffickers.

Let us do the right thing, strike 201 and 204, and let us pass this Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act and do something positive.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time for consideration of amendments in this bill having expired, the Chair must now put the question on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 537, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1515

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). Pursuant to House Resolution 537, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 4 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM); the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT); the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCCOLLUM

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 362, noes 61, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

AYES—362

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fattah
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McGovern
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—61

Allen
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Berman
Blumenauer
Brown (CA)
Carson
Chenoweth
Clay
Conyers
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Frank (MA)
Furse
Hamilton
Harman
Jackson (IL)
Kanjorski
Kennedy (RI)
Klink
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
McDermott
Miller (CA)
Minge
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Porter
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Scott
Skaggs
Stark
Stupak
Tauscher
Torres
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Yates

NOT VOTING—11

Engel
Gonzalez
Goss
McHugh
Meeks (NY)
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Riggs
Schumer
Smith, Linda
Towns

□ 1538

Messrs. MINGE, VISCLOSKY, DOOLEY of California, VENTO, BROWN of California and MATSUI changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. DANNER, and Messrs. HINOJOSA, COYNE, BERRY, ABERCROMBIE, BECERRA and MATSUI changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). Pursuant to House Resolution 357, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed for further proceedings.

The Chair also intends to put the question on the Traficant amendment immediately after the vote on the Reyes amendment to the Traficant amendment. If a recorded vote is ordered on the Traficant amendment, it will be taken immediately, and it will also be a 5-minute vote.

AMENDMENT, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. REYES TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 256, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

AYES—167

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Buyer
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Coyne
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehrlich
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kilpatrick
Kingston
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntosh
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Rahall
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Souder
Stabenow
Stark
Stokes
Stump
Stupak
Thompson
Thornberry
Tierney
Torres
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—256

Aderholt
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Manton
Manzullo
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snowbarger
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Engel
Gonzalez
Goss
McHugh
Meeks (NY)
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Riggs
Schumer
Smith, Linda
Towns

□ 1548

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment, as modified, to the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 291, noes 133, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

AYES—291

Aderholt
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)

Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moakley
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
White
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—133

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Buyer
Carson
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Conyers
Coyne
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Ehrlich
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Green
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hooley
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E.B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Kolbe
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lofgren
Markey
Martinez
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntosh
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Mollohan
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Parker
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pombo
Porter
Rahall
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Slaughter
Snyder
Stark
Stokes
Stump
Stupak
Thompson
Thornberry
Tierney
Torres
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weygand
Whitfield
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—10

Gonzalez
Goss
McHugh
Meeks (NY)
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Riggs
Schumer
Smith, Linda
Towns

☐ 1558

Mr. ROTHMAN changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 67, noes 354, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

AYES—67

Abercrombie
Barrett (WI)
Bonior
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
DeFazio
Doggett
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Furse
Gephardt
Hamilton
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Lee
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McKinney
Meek (FL)
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Rivers
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Scott
Stabenow
Stark
Stokes
Thompson
Tierney
Torres
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—354

Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McGovern
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Conyers
Gonzalez
Goss
Kaptur
McHugh
Meeks (NY)
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Riggs
Schumer
Smith, Linda
Towns

□ 1607

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote 441. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) having assumed the chair, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4300) to support enhanced drug interdiction efforts in the major transit countries and support a comprehensive supply eradication and crop substitution program in source countries, pursuant to House Resolution 537, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 384, noes 39, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

AYES—384

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McGovern
McHale
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—39

Bonior
Carson
Chenoweth
Conyers
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Filner
Frank (MA)
Hamilton
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
McDermott
Miller (CA)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Reyes
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Scott
Skaggs
Stark
Torres
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Watt (NC)
Woolsey
Yates

NOT VOTING—12

Gonzalez
Goss
Horn
Martinez
McHugh
Meeks (NY)
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Riggs
Schumer
Smith, Linda
Towns

□ 1628

Ms. WOOLSEY changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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 and include extraneous material on H.R. 4300, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1995

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1995.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.