ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2086) to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—The Act may be cited as the "Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2003".

(b) AMENDMENT OF OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1998.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-277; 21 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

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

Sec. 1. Short title; references; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Amendments to definitions.
Sec. 3. Amendments relating to appointment and duties of Director and Deputy Directors.
Sec. 4. Amendments relating to coordination with other agencies.
Sec. 6. High intensity drug trafficking areas program.
Sec. 7. Funding for certain high intensity drug trafficking areas program.
Sec. 8. Amendments relating to Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center.
Sec. 9. Repeals.
Sec. 10. National Youth Antidrug Media Campaign.
Sec. 11. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 12. Extension of termination date.

SECOND SECTIONS TO DEFINITIONS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS.—Section 702 (21 U.S.C. 1701) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (B), (C) and inserting "and"; and

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (G) and inserting "; and";

(C) by adding at the end the following: "(H) interventions for drug abuse and dependence; and

(ii) international drug control coordination and cooperation with respect to activities described in this paragraph.";

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking "implies" and inserting "indicates";

(3) in paragraph (10)—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (B); (C) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting "; and"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following: "(D) domestic drug law enforcement, including drug enforcement directed at drug users; and"

(4) in paragraph (11)—

(A) by inserting before the semicolon in subparagraph (A) the following: "(including source country programs, and law enforcement outside the United States)";

(B) by inserting "and" after the semicolon in subparagraph (B);

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

(D) by striking subparagraph (D).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 702(b)(3) (21 U.S.C. 1702(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "(G)" and inserting "(G) and";

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking "(C)" and inserting "(D)"; and

(B) by striking "and subparagraph (D) of section 702(11)".

(c) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAM BUDGET.—Section 702(c)(3) (21 U.S.C. 1703(c)(3)) is amended by striking subsection (B) and inserting this new subsection (B): "(B) provides the Director —

(i) with the authority to "

(ii) requests for fiscal year 2005 for activities of the United States Department of Education, unless it is accompanied by a report setting forth a plan for providing expedited consideration of student loan applications for all individuals who submitted an application for Federal Direct Loan assistance that was rejected or denied pursuant to 484(r)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(r)(1)) by reason of a conviction for a drug offense not occurring during a period of enrollment for which the individual was receiving any Federal grant, loan, or work assistance."

(d) INTEGRAL ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—Section 702(c)(4)(A) (21 U.S.C. 1703(c)(4)(A)) is amended by striking subsection (A) and inserting the following:

"(A) provides the Director —

(i) with the authority to "

(ii) requests for fiscal year 2005 for activities of the United States Department of Education, unless it is accompanied by a report setting forth a plan for providing expedited consideration of student loan applications for all individuals who submitted an application for Federal Direct Loan assistance that was rejected or denied pursuant to 484(r)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(r)(1)) by reason of a conviction for a drug offense not occurring during a period of enrollment for which the individual was receiving any Federal grant, loan, or work assistance."

(e) POWERS OF DIRECTOR.—Section 702(d) (21 U.S.C. 1703(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8)(D), by striking "have been authorized by Congress;" and inserting "authorized by law;"

(2) in paragraph (9)—

(A) by inserting "notwithstanding any other provision of law" after "(8)"; and

(B) by striking "Strategy; and" and inserting "Strategy and notify the authorizing Committees of Congress for the Office of any fund control notice issued;"

(3) in paragraph (10), by striking "(22 U.S.C. 2299)"; and inserting "(22 U.S.C. 2299j)" and section 706 of the Department of State Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2299j-1); and

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

"(11) not later than August 1 of each year, submit to the President a report, and transmit copies of the report to the Secretary of State and the authorizing Committees of Congress for the Office of the Director, which report shall be entitled: """", and insert-
Title 21. Food and Drugs
Chapter 1. Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act
Subchapter V. Drug Importation
Section 878. Drog Importation
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"(i) United States Interdiction Coordinator.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be in the Office of the United States Interdiction Coordinator such number of individuals as the Director shall appoint and shall perform duties determined by the Director with respect to coordination of efforts to interdict illicit drugs from the United States.

(2) APPOINTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (except subparagraph (B)), the Director may appoint any individual to serve as the United States Interdiction Coordinator.

(B) LIMITATION.—The Director may not appoint any individual who concurrently serves as the head of any other Federal department or agency or any subdivision thereof with responsibility for counter narcotics interdiction activities, except the counter narcotics officer of the Department of Homeland Security appointed under section 878 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 438).

(g) Requirement for South American Heroin Strategy.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive strategy that addresses the increased threat from South American heroin, and in particular Colombian heroin.

(2) CONTENTS.—The strategy shall—

(A) include opium eradication efforts to eliminate the problem at the source to prevent it from reoccurring before the heroin enters the stream of commerce;

(B) interdiction and precursor chemical controls;

(C) demand reduction and treatment;

(D) provisions that ensure the maintenance at current levels of efforts to eradicate coca in Colombia;

(E) the assessment of the level of additional funding and resources necessary to simultaneously address the threat from South American heroin and the threat from Colombian coca.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.

(a) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking "abuse";

(b) by amending paragraph (3) of subsection (a) to read as follows:

(3) REQUIRED REPORTS.—

(A) SECRETARIES OF THE INTERIOR AND AGRICULTURE.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall, by July 1 of each year, jointly submit to the Director and the authorizing Committees of Congress for the Office an assessment of the quantity of illegal drug cultivation and manufacturing in the United States on lands owned or under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government for the preceding year.

(B) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall, by July 1 of each year, submit to the Director and the authorizing Committees of Congress for the Office information for the preceding year regarding the number and type of—

(i) arrests for drug violations;

(ii) prosecutions for drug violations by United States Attorneys;

(iii) the number and type of seizures of drugs by each component of the Department seizing drugs, as well as statistical information on the geographic areas of such seizures;

(C) SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, by July 1 of each year, submit to the Director and the authorizing Committees of Congress for the Office information for the preceding year regarding—

(i) the number and type of seizures of drugs by each component of the Department seizing drugs, as well as statistical information on the geographic areas of such seizures;

(ii) the number of air and maritime patrol hours undertaken by each component of the Department primarily dedicated to drug supply reduction missions under each component of the Department of Defense; and

(iii) the number of seizures of drugs by each component of the Department seize drugs, as well as statistical information on the geographic areas of such seizures.

(b) in subsection (b)(2), by striking "Program," and inserting "Strategy;".
Strategy in effect is not sufficiently effective; or "(B) if a new President or Director takes office.

"(B) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM.—Not later than February 1 of each year, the Director shall submit to Congress a description of the national drug control performance measurement system, designed in consultation with affected National Drug Control Program agencies, that includes performance measures for the National Drug Control Strategy and activities of National Drug Control Program agencies related to the National Drug Control Strategy.

SEC. 6. HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Office a program to be known as the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program (in this section referred to as the Program).

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Program are the following: (1) To reduce drug availability and facilitate targeted efforts between Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies in areas with significant drug trafficking problems that harmfully impact other parts of the Nation; (2) To provide assistance to agencies to come together to assess regional threats, design coordinated strategies to combat these threats, share intelligence, and develop and implement coordinated initiatives to implement the strategies.

(c) DESIGNATION.—The Director, upon consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Homeland Security, heads of the National Drug Control Program agencies, and the Governor of each applicable State, may designate any specified area of the United States; or distribution for the United States as a high intensity drug trafficking area.

(d) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—(1) In general.—In considering whether to designate an area under this section as a high intensity drug trafficking area, the Director shall consider, in addition to such other criteria as the Director considers to be appropriate, the extent to which—(A) the area is a major center of illegal drug production, manufacturing, importation, or distribution for the United States; and (B) State and local law enforcement agencies have committed resources to respond to the drug trafficking problem in the area, thereby indicating a determination to respond aggressively to the problem; (C) drug production, manufacturing, importation, or distribution in the area is having a significant harmful impact in other areas of the United States; and (D) a significant increase in allocation of Federal resources is necessary to respond adequately to drug-related activities in the area.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), in considering whether an area is a significant center of drug production, manufacturing, importation, or distribution as compared to other areas of the United States, the Director shall consider—(1) the quantity of illicit drugs produced in the area, entering or transiting the area originating in foreign countries; (2) the quantity of illicit drugs produced in the area; (3) the number of Federal, State, and local arrests, prosecutions, and convictions for drug trafficking and distribution offenses in the area; (4) the degree to which the area is a center for the activities of national drug trafficking organizations; (5) such other criteria as the Director considers appropriate.

"(e) SOUTHWEST BORDER.—The Director may not designate any county contiguous to the international border with Mexico as part of any high intensity drug trafficking area other than as part of a Southwest Border high intensity drug trafficking area.

"(f) REMOVAL FROM DESIGNATION.—The Director may remove an area or portion of an area from designation as a high intensity drug trafficking area under this section upon determination that the area or portion of the area no longer is a high intensity drug trafficking area, considering the factors in subsections (d) and (e) in addition to such other criteria as the Director considers to be appropriate.

(g) AUTHORITY OF THE DIRECTOR.—After making such a designation and in order to provide Federal assistance to the area so designated, the Director shall—(1) obligate such sums as appropriated for the Program, in accordance with subsection (h); (2) direct the temporary assignment of Federal personnel to such area, subject to the approval of the head of the department or agency that employs such personnel; and (3) take such action authorized under section 704 to provide increased Federal assistance to those areas.

(h) ALLOCATION OF FUNDING.—In obligating sums appropriated for the Program, the Director shall comply with the following:

"(1) 30 PERCENT SET ASIDE.—The Director shall expend no less than 30 percent of the amounts appropriated under this section in the ten high intensity drug trafficking areas (excluding the Southwest Border high intensity drug trafficking area) for which the Director determines that Program activities with respect to such areas will have the greatest impact on reducing overall drug traffic in the United States.

"(2) 25 PERCENT SET ASIDE.—The Director shall expend no less than 25 percent of the amounts appropriated under this section in the ten high intensity drug trafficking areas (excluding the Southwest Border high intensity drug trafficking area) for which the Director determines that Program activities with respect to such areas will have the next greatest impact on reducing overall drug traffic in the United States.

"(3) SOUTHWEST BORDER AREA.—(A) 20 PERCENT SET ASIDE.—The Director shall expend no less than 20 percent of the amounts appropriated under this section in the Southwest Border high intensity drug trafficking area.

"(4) REALLOCATION WITHIN AREA.—(A) That portion of the amounts appropriated under this section in the remaining high intensity drug trafficking areas may be reallocated up to five percent of the total funds allocated to that area among its components, with the approval of the Director.

"(5) REMAINING AREAS.—The Director shall expend no less than 10 percent of the amounts appropriated under this section in the remaining high intensity drug trafficking areas.

"(i) DISCRETIONARY EXPENDITURES.—(A) In general.—In addition to the amounts appropriated under paragraphs (1) through (4) the Director may expend 15 percent of the amounts appropriated under this section on a discretionary basis.

"(B) COOPERATIVE PROJECTS.—In allocating funds under this paragraph, the Director shall consider—

"(j) TERRORISM ACTIVITIES.

"(k) ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Director may authorize the use of resources available for the Program to assist Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies in investigations and activities related to terrorism and prevention of terrorism, especially but not exclusively where such investigations are related to drug trafficking.

"(l) LIMITATION.—The Director shall ensure—(1) that assistance provided under paragraph (1) remains incidental to the purpose of the Program to reduce drug availability and bring about drug-related law enforcement activities; and (2) that significant resources of the Program are not redirected to activities exclusively related to terrorism.

"(m) BOARD REPRESENTATION.—None of the funds appropriated under this section may be expended for any high intensity drug trafficking area, or for a partnership under the Program, if the executive board or equivalent governing committee with respect to such area or partnership is not comprised of representatives of Federal law enforcement agencies and representatives of State and local law enforcement agencies.

SEC. 7. FUNDING FOR CERTAIN HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Office of National Drug Control Policy shall—(1) review each of the areas currently designated as a high intensity drug trafficking area to determine whether it continues to warrant designation as a high intensity drug trafficking area, considering the factors in subsection (d) of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1996, as amended by this section, in addition to such other criteria as the Director considers to be appropriate; and (2) terminate such description for an area or portion of an area determined to no longer warrant designation.

"(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following: (1) In the early morning hours of October 16, 2002, the home of Carmen and Angela Dawson was firebombed in apparent retaliation for Mrs. Dawson's notification of police...
about persistent drug distribution activity in their East Baltimore City neighborhood.

(2) The arson claimed the lives of Mr. and Mrs. Dawson and their 5 young children, aged 9 months-

(3) The horrific murder of the Dawson family is a stark example of domestic narco-terrorism.

(4) In all phases of counter-narcotics law enforcement—from prevention to investigation to prosecution to reentry—the voluntary cooperation of ordinary citizens is a critical component.

(5) Voluntary cooperation is difficult for law enforcement officials to obtain when citizens feel that cooperation carries the risk of violent retaliation by illegal drug traffickers or the loss of valued benefits, such as the opportunity for relocation by local, State, and Federal law enforcement.

(6) Public confidence that law enforcement is doing all it can to make communities safe is a prerequisite for voluntary cooperation among people who may be subject to intimidation or reprisal (or both).

(7) Witness protection programs are insufficient on their own to provide security because many individuals and families who strive every day to make distressed neighborhoods livable for their children, other relatives, and friends will resist or refuse offers of relocation by local, State, and Federal prosecutors and agencies because, moreover, the continued presence of strong individuals and families is critical to preserving and strengthening the social fabric in such communities.

(8) The快手 (a name) in sections of Baltimore City) interstate trafficking of illegal drugs has severe ancillary local consequences within areas designated as high intensity drug trafficking areas, it is important to identify, disrupt, and dismantling drug-trafficking organizations and their affiliates.

(9) Witness protection programs and legislation failed to combat illegal drug trafficking.

(c) FUNDING FOR CERTAIN HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS.—Section 707 (21 U.S.C. 1706) is further amended in subsection (h) by adding at the end of the following new paragraph:

“(g) SPECIFIC PURPOSES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall ensure that, of the amounts appropriated for a fiscal year, at least $1,000,000 is used in high intensity drug trafficking areas, it is important to identify, disrupt, and dismantle drug-trafficking organizations and their affiliates.

(B) USE OF FUNDS.—

(i) In using amounts for creative and talent costs under paragraph (1)(B), the Director shall use creative services donated at no cost to the Government wherever feasible and may only procure creative services for advertising campaigns that cannot timely be otherwise authorized in this section.

(ii) In using amounts for creative and talent costs under paragraph (1)(B), the Director shall use creative services donated at no cost to the Government wherever feasible and may only procure creative services for advertising campaigns that cannot timely be otherwise authorized in this section.

(ii) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(ii) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(iii) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(iii) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(iii) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(iv) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(iv) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(v) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(v) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(vi) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(vi) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(vii) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(vii) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(viii) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(ix) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(x) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(xi) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(xii) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(xiii) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(xiv) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(xv) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(xvi) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(xvii) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(xviii) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(xix) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(xx) To combat illegal drug trafficking through such methods as the Director considers appropriate, such as establishing or operating (or both) a toll-free telephone hotline for use by the public to provide information about illegal drug-related activities.

(b) ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF DIRECTOR.—Section 708(c) (21 U.S.C. 1707(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The Director, acting through the Chief Scientist shall—

(A) identify and define the short-, medium-, and long-term scientific and technological needs of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies relating to drug enforcement, including—

(i) advanced surveillance, tracking, and radar imaging;

(ii) electronic support measures;

(iii) communications;

(iv) data fusion, advanced computer systems, and artificial intelligence; and

(v) computerized and technological (including neutron, electron, and graviton), and other means of detection;

(B) demand reduction (including drug prevention) basic and applied research needs and initiatives, in consultation with affected National Drug Control Program agencies, including—

(i) improving treatment through neuroscience advances;

(ii) improving the transfer of biomedical research to the clinical setting; and

(iii) selecting research projects at the National Institute on Drug Abuse and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and through interagency agreements or grants, carry out research designed to improve the understanding, treatment, and prevention of drug abuse. (2) PRIORITIES IN TRANSFERRING TECHNOLOGY.—In transferring technology under the authority of paragraph (1)(E), the Chief Scientist shall give priority, in transferring technology, to those most likely to assist in drug interdiction and border enforcement, to local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies in southwest border areas and northern border areas with significant traffic in illicit drugs.

(3) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.—The authority granted to the Director under this subsection shall not extend to the award of contracts, management of individual projects, or other operational activities.

(c) ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF DIRECTOR.—Section 708(d) (21 U.S.C. 1707(d)) is amended by inserting "", the Secretary of Homeland Security," after "The Secretary of Defence":

SEC. 8. REPEALS.

The following provisions are repealed:

(1) Sections 709 and 711 (21 U.S.C. 1708 and 1709).


SEC. 9. NATIONAL YOUTH ANTIDRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Act is further amended by inserting after section 708 the following:

"SEC. 709. NATIONAL YOUTH ANTIDRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN.

(1) The 'Monitoring the Future Study' published by the Department of Health and Human Services.

(2) The 'Monitoring the Future Study' published by the Department of Health and Human Services."
"(ii) the Attitude Tracking Study published by the Partnership for a Drug Free America; 

"(iii) the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse; 

"(iv) other relevant studies or publications, as determined by the Director, including tracking and evaluation data collected according to marketing and advertising industry standards; and 

"(ii) ensure that the effectiveness of the media campaign is evaluated in a manner that captures the impact of which portion of the media campaign has contributed to reduction of illicit drug use among youth and such other factors or situations as the Director determines are appropriate. 

"(3) PURCHASE OF ADVERTISING TIME AND SPACE.—For each fiscal year, not less than 77 percent of the amounts appropriated under this section shall be used for the purchase of advertising time and space for the media campaign, subject to the following exceptions: 

"(A) In any fiscal year for which less than $125,000,000 is appropriated for the media campaign, not less than 82 percent of the amount appropriated under this section shall be used for the purchase of advertising time and space for the media campaign. 

"(B) In any fiscal year for which more than $150,000,000 is appropriated under this section, not less than 72 percent shall be used for advertising production costs and the purchase of advertising time and space for the media campaign. 

"(C) ADVERTISING.—In carrying out this section, the Director shall devote sufficient funds to the advertising portion of the national media campaign to meet the goals of the campaign. 

"(d) PROHIBITIONS.—None of the amounts made available under subsection (b) may be obligate or expended for any of the following: 

"(1) To supplant current antidrug community-based coalitions. 

"(2) To supplant pro bono public service time donated by national and local broadcasting networks for other public service campaigns. 

"(3) For partisan political purposes, or express advocacy in support of or to defeat any clearly identified candidate, or to clearly identify balloting initiatives or clearly identified legislative or regulatory proposal. 

"(4) To fund advertising that features any electronic communications seeking elective office, cabinet level officials, or other Federal officials employed pursuant to section 213 of Schedule C of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations. 

"(5) To fund advertising that does not contain a primary message intended to reduce or prevent illicit drug use. 

"(6) To fund advertising containing a primary message intended to promote support for the media campaign or private sector contributions to the media campaign. 

"(7) In general.—Amounts made available under subsection (b) shall be matched by an equal amount of non-Federal funds for the media campaign, or be matched with in-kind contributions of the same value. 

"(2) NO-COST MATCH ADVERTISING DIRECT RELATIONSHIP REQUIREMENT.—The Director shall ensure that no-cost match advertising provided directly relates to substance abuse prevention consistent with the specific purposes of the media campaign, except that in any fiscal year in which less than $125,000,000 is appropriated to the media campaign, the Director shall ensure that at least 85 percent of no-cost match advertising provided directly relates to substance abuse prevention consistent with the specific purposes of the media campaign. 

"(3) NO-COST MATCH ADVERTISING NOT DIRECTLY RELATED.—The Director shall ensure that no-cost match advertising that does not directly relate to substance abuse prevention consistent with the specific purposes of the media campaign shall not be included in the Federal Drug Free America Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 256d) and shall be excluded from the Federal Drug Free America Services Act of 1977 (41 U.S.C. 256d). 

"(f) FINANCIAL AND PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY.—The Director shall cause to be performed— 

"(I) audits and reviews of costs of the media campaign pursuant to section 304 of the Federal Drug Free America Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 256d); and 

"(II) an audit of the cost of the media campaign described in section 306 of such Act (41 U.S.C. 256e). 

"(g) STRATEGIC GUIDANCE AND DONATIONS.—The Partnership for a Drug Free America shall serve as the primary outside strategic advisor to the media campaign and be responsible for coordinating donations of creative and other services to the campaign, except with respect to advertising created using funds permitted in subsection (b). The Director shall inform the Partnership for a Drug Free America of the strategic goals of the campaign and consider advice from the Partnership in the Federal Drug Free America media campaign strategy. 

"(h) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director shall submit on an annual basis a report to Congress that describes— 

"(I) the strategy of the media campaign and whether specific objectives of the media campaign were accomplished; 

"(II) steps taken to ensure that the media campaign operates in an effective and efficient manner consistent with the overall strategy and focus of the media campaign; 

"(III) plans to purchase advertising time and space; 

"(IV) policies and practices implemented to ensure that Federal funds are used responsibly to purchase advertising time and space and eliminate the potential for waste, fraud, and abuse; and 

"(V) all contracts entered into with a corporation, partnership, or individual working on behalf of the media campaign. 

"(i) LOCAL TARGET REQUIREMENT.—The Director shall, to the maximum extent feasible, to the maximum extent feasible, ensure that Federal funds are used to supplement advertising time and space and encourage the production of local media messages directly related to youth in a particular community. 

"(j) PREVENTION OF MARIJUANA USE.— 

"(1) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following: 

"(A) 60 percent of adolescent admissions for drug treatment are based on marijuana use. 

"(B) Potency levels of contemporary marijuana, particularly hydroponically grown marijuana, are significantly higher than in the past, rising from under 1 percent of THC in the mid-1970s to as high as 30 percent today. 

"(C) Contemporary research has demonstrated that youths smoking marijuana early in life may be up to five times more likely to use hard drugs. 

"(D) Contemporary research has demonstrated clear detrimental effects in adolescent educational achievement resulting from marijuana use. 

"(E) Contemporary research has demonstrated clear detrimental effects in adolescent brain development resulting from marijuana use. 

"(F) An estimated 9,000,000 Americans a year drive while under the influence of illegal drugs, including marijuana. 

"(G) Kissing directly after smoking 50 to 70 percent more of certain cancer causing chemicals than tobacco smoke. 

"(H) Teens who use marijuana are up to four times more likely to have a teen pregnancy than teens who have not. 

"(I) Federal law enforcement agencies have identified clear links between the trade in hydroponic marijuana facilitates trade by criminal organizations in hard drugs, including heroin. 

"(J) Federal law enforcement agencies have identified possible links between trade in marijuana and financing for terrorist organizations. 

"(2) EMPHASIS ON PREVENTION OF YOUTH MARIJUANA USE.—In conducting advertising and activities otherwise authorized under this section, the Director may emphasize prevention of youth marijuana use. 

"(K) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Office to carry out this section, $195,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 and 2005 and $210,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2008. 

"(b) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED PROVISIONS.—The Drug-Free Media Campaign Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 3112 et seq.) is repealed. 

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS. 

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Partnership for a Drug Free America for fiscal years 2004 and 2005, $10,000,000. 

(1) by striking "title," inserting "title, except activities for which amounts are otherwise specifically authorized by this title;" and 

(2) by striking "1999 through 2003" and inserting "2004 through 2008". 

SEC. 12. EXTENSION OF TERMINATION DATE. 

Section 715(a) is amended by striking "September 30, 2003" and inserting "July 31, 2005".

This SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes. 

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER). 

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration. 

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

There was no objection. 

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

Mr. Speaker, the abuse of illegal narcotics and its silent, everyday impact on the health and safety of families and the stability of every community across the country continues to be one of the most pressing issues facing the United States. This bill, introduced by myself and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the distinguished chairman of the full committee, is a forceful and bipartisan recommitment to our diverse national efforts to control drug abuse and to reduce supply through a strong Office of National Drug Control Policy, to plan and coordinate the President's strategy to measurably reduce drug use by American youth and to control drug abuse and its consequences. 

My plan for a government in which the war on drugs is prosecuted on two-lane highways throughout the farmland of northeast Indiana would probably find it hard to believe that
the plague of illegal narcotics hits home even there, but drug use and abuse is not unique to the big cities on the coast. In 1996, Indiana law enforcement knew of only a single methamphetamine lab in the entire State. Only 5 years later, that number tripled to 375 in 2002, but it is still an indication of the kinds of challenges places like Indiana face when it comes to illegal drugs.

This summer alone, two separate stings in Fort Wayne yielded 50 pounds of cocaine with a street value of $2.3 million. We thought cocaine was nearly gone. We were wrong.

Mr. Speaker, almost half of the 12th graders in Indiana say they have used marijuana in the last year. Almost 9 percent say they have used powdered cocaine; 15 percent have used methamphetamine. We consider that as the worst of it. Almost four in 100 sixth graders in Indiana say they have used marijuana in the last year. One in 200 have used powdered cocaine. These are 11- and 12-year-olds.

Consequently, we might ask, is there any point in fighting this battle at all? I am frequently asked whether we believe we can ever completely eliminate illegal drug use. The simple answer to the question is no. We cannot eliminate sin. But that does not answer to that question is no. We can.

Since 1982, 6.1 million who needed treatment. In 2001, including excluding violent crime, exact on communities. So it is with great seriousness that I approach this legislation reauthorizing ONDCP and its programs for 5 years. It makes several significant revisions to current law that will enhance the effectiveness and accountability of the National Drug Control strategy and its programs, streamline and simplify the 5-year strategy, and even provide increased flexibility to the ONDCP Director to respond to changing circumstances.

For example, we have replaced an inflexible legal requirement for a bloated 5-year strategy, with a series of out-dated statutory mandates, with a flexible and responsive annual strategy that still follows the same basic principles to ensure a comprehensive and responsible drug strategy. We have also eliminated many of the impediments that still follow the same basic principles. We can.

The legislation reauthorizes ONDCP and its programs for 5 years. It makes several significant revisions to current law that will enhance the effectiveness and accountability of the National Drug Control strategy and its programs, streamline and simplify the 5-year strategy, and even provide increased flexibility to the ONDCP Director to respond to changing circumstances.

For example, we have replaced an inflexible legal requirement for a bloated 5-year strategy, with a series of out-dated statutory mandates, with a flexible and responsive annual strategy that still follows the same basic principles to ensure a comprehensive and responsible drug strategy. We have also eliminated many of the impediments that still follow the same basic principles.

Moreover, the legislation reauthorizes ONDCP and its programs for 5 years. It makes several significant revisions to current law that will enhance the effectiveness and accountability of the National Drug Control strategy and its programs, streamline and simplify the annual strategy, and even provide increased flexibility to the ONDCP Director to respond to changing circumstances.

For example, we have replaced an inflexible legal requirement for a bloated 5-year strategy, with a series of out-dated statutory mandates, with a flexible and responsive annual strategy that still follows the same basic principles to ensure a comprehensive and responsible drug strategy. We have also eliminated many of the impediments that still follow the same basic principles.

The legislation reauthorizes ONDCP and its programs for 5 years. It makes several significant revisions to current law that will enhance the effectiveness and accountability of the National Drug Control strategy and its programs, streamline and simplify the annual strategy, and even provide increased flexibility to the ONDCP Director to respond to changing circumstances.

For example, we have replaced an inflexible legal requirement for a bloated 5-year strategy, with a series of out-dated statutory mandates, with a flexible and responsive annual strategy that still follows the same basic principles to ensure a comprehensive and responsible drug strategy. We have also eliminated many of the impediments that still follow the same basic principles.

The legislation reauthorizes ONDCP and its programs for 5 years. It makes several significant revisions to current law that will enhance the effectiveness and accountability of the National Drug Control strategy and its programs, streamline and simplify the annual strategy, and even provide increased flexibility to the ONDCP Director to respond to changing circumstances.

For example, we have replaced an inflexible legal requirement for a bloated 5-year strategy, with a series of out-dated statutory mandates, with a flexible and responsive annual strategy that still follows the same basic principles to ensure a comprehensive and responsible drug strategy. We have also eliminated many of the impediments that still follow the same basic principles.

The legislation reauthorizes ONDCP and its programs for 5 years. It makes several significant revisions to current law that will enhance the effectiveness and accountability of the National Drug Control strategy and its programs, streamline and simplify the annual strategy, and even provide increased flexibility to the ONDCP Director to respond to changing circumstances.

For example, we have replaced an inflexible legal requirement for a bloated 5-year strategy, with a series of out-dated statutory mandates, with a flexible and responsive annual strategy that still follows the same basic principles to ensure a comprehensive and responsible drug strategy. We have also eliminated many of the impediments that still follow the same basic principles.

The legislation reauthorizes ONDCP and its programs for 5 years. It makes several significant revisions to current law that will enhance the effectiveness and accountability of the National Drug Control strategy and its programs, streamline and simplify the annual strategy, and even provide increased flexibility to the ONDCP Director to respond to changing circumstances.

For example, we have replaced an inflexible legal requirement for a bloated 5-year strategy, with a series of out-dated statutory mandates, with a flexible and responsive annual strategy that still follows the same basic principles to ensure a comprehensive and responsible drug strategy. We have also eliminated many of the impediments that still follow the same basic principles.
The director of National Drug Control Policy, or the drug czar, will have strong influence over the shape, direction, and implementation of Federal drug policy by certifying the drug control budgets of Federal departments and agencies, and can certify to the United States Congress that the Federal drug control strategy is meeting the stated goal of preventing drug use before it starts, healing America's drug users, and disrupting the market for illegal drugs.

I would point out that the Washington-Baltimore HIDTA's innovative use of treatment as a crime control tool in direct support of law enforcement initiatives has resulted in substantially reduced recidivism and re-arrest rates for offenders who have participated in HIDTA-funded treatment programs. In other words, our HIDTA law enforcement efforts are more effective because they are linked with HIDTA-funded treatment initiatives that are specifically designed to support and enhance the treatment component of law enforcement initiatives. Our negotiations with the current bill, one, maintain the existing prohibition on partisan political use of the media campaign; two, bar the use of media campaign funds to support advocacy campaigns or ballot initiatives; three, bar the use of media campaign advertising for the purpose of influencing elections and legislative or regulatory proposals involving medical marijuana or any other extraneous issue.

The current bill also does not contain a provision that would have opened the door to partisan political use of a national anti-drug media campaign with respect to anti-law enforcementClicked to the ballot initiative, or legislative or regulatory proposals involving medical marijuana or any other extraneous issue. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), the former chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Unfortunately, this is an issue that sometimes gets shoved below the radar screen in Congress and in our society, but I can tell the Members that there are very few social issues facing this Nation like the problem of illegal narcotics. In the latest report I have, the deaths that were drug related in this country in the year 2000, this is 3 years old, were 19,686. That is almost 54 human beings, 54 citizens in our country that die from drug-related deaths each day in the United States, an incredible number. And that is not to mention those who lose their lives such as the tragic death of those who were murdered in a drug-related crime in Baltimore, the Dawson family. Drug deaths now exceed homicides in the United States, and I would venture to say that nearly half of the homicides in the United States are drug related.

One of the issues that I think the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman SOUDER) again for his cooperation in working with us to resolve the matters of sharpest disagreement. Another initiative within the HIDTAs that already have limited treatment programs to continue their treatment initiatives.

I would point out that the Washington-Baltimore HIDTA's innovative use of treatment as a crime control tool in direct support of law enforcement initiatives has resulted in substantially reduced recidivism and re-arrest rates for offenders who have participated in HIDTA-funded treatment programs. In other words, our HIDTA law enforcement efforts are more effective because they are linked with HIDTA-funded treatment initiatives that are specifically designed to support and enhance the treatment component of law enforcement initiatives. Our negotiations with the current bill, one, maintain the existing prohibition on partisan political use of the media campaign; two, bar the use of media campaign funds to support advocacy campaigns or ballot initiatives; three, bar the use of media campaign advertising for the purpose of influencing elections and legislative or regulatory proposals involving medical marijuana or any other extraneous issue.

The current bill also does not contain a provision that would have opened the door to partisan political use of a national anti-drug media campaign with respect to anti-law enforcement initiatives. But I can tell the Members that there are very few social issues facing this Nation like the problem of illegal narcotics. In the latest report I have, the deaths that were drug related in this country in the year 2000, this is 3 years old, were 19,686. That is almost 54 human beings, 54 citizens in our country that die from drug-related deaths each day in the United States, an incredible number. And that is not to mention those who lose their lives such as the tragic death of those who were murdered in a drug-related crime in Baltimore, the Dawson family. Drug deaths now exceed homicides in the United States, and I would venture to say that nearly half of the homicides in the United States are drug related.

One of the issues that I think the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman SOUDER) again for his cooperation in working with us to resolve the matters of sharpest disagreement.
approach, and I think the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) have tried to do that, and certainly the administration has. We have to understand that in the previous fiscal year 2002, the Federal Government spent nearly half, 45 percent, of all of its drug control policy budget on treatment and prevention. And it is not always how much we spend. It is very important how we spend that money, that it is spent effectively.

If we have learned nothing else in our experience over the years on this social problem facing us, it is that a balance of education and prevention, of treatment, of interdiction, of enforcement, and all of these elements put together in a balanced approach will make a difference. That is why this is a good, balanced approach.

We have seen what has happened when we have good enforcement and when we do not have good enforcement. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) has experienced that himself in Baltimore, one of our Nation's great cities, where the death toll was way over the 300 mark and they had lax enforcement. Mayor O'Malley went in, with the guidance of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), and with attention from the Federal Government and others, we have reduced the tragedy of deaths in that city.

We saw in New York City under the Giuliani administration that there were more than 2,000 in New York City. With a tough enforcement plan, that was reduced to between 600 and 700; and we still see the results of that tough enforcement. So we cannot make the mistake of championing our approach, and that is why this is a good approach.

Mr. Speaker, I want to salute the chairman and ranking member. The President of the United States has taken a personal interest in the leadership of the full committee (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the chairman of this subcommittee (Mr. CUMMINGS). The President, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Attorney General, and the Attorney General's counterpart, the gentleman from California (Ranking Member WAXMAN) for their leadership, dedication, and hard work on this authorization legislation. I am happy that we could reach a bipartisan agreement on this bill. It is too important to play politics with, and there is no place for partisanship in protecting our children against drugs. This bipartisanship was reflected in the unanimous vote to pass the bill out of our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that we have put together a cohesive, effective piece of legislation to maintain and provide ONDCP with the necessary tools and resources to reduce drug manufacturing, trafficking, and drug-related crime and violence, and drug-related health consequences.

The bill we bring to the floor today is bipartisan in every sense of the word. It is the product of negotiation and bipartisanship. In crafting this important piece of legislation, we aimed to provide the best possible support for the administration and Director Walters in implementing the President's drug strategy. We sought to make ONDCP more efficient by reducing outdated reporting and structural requirements that are in the current law. We also gave significant attention to reforms of the Media Campaign and the HIDTA program to ensure that it is effective and true to their original aims. Both of these programs have grown in ways that were not originally intended, and the bill reflects the desire to ensure that the programs remain accurate and dedicated to their core purposes.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman SOUDER) and the subcommittee ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the chairman of the full committee counterpart, the gentleman from California (Ranking Member WAXMAN) for their leadership, dedication, and hard work on this authorization legislation. I am happy that we could reach a bipartisan agreement on this bill. It is important to play politics with, and there is no place for partisanship in protecting our children against drugs. This bipartisanship was reflected in the unanimous vote to pass the bill out of our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that we have put together a cohesive, effective piece of legislation to maintain and provide ONDCP with the necessary tools and resources to reduce drug manufacturing, trafficking, and drug-related crime and violence, and drug-related health consequences.

The bill we bring to the floor today is bipartisan in every sense of the word. It is the product of negotiation and bipartisanship. In crafting this important piece of legislation, we aimed to provide the best possible support for the administration and Director Walters in implementing the President's drug strategy. We sought to make ONDCP more efficient by reducing outdated reporting and structural requirements that are in the current law. We also gave significant attention to reforms of the Media Campaign and the HIDTA program to ensure that it is effective and true to their original aims. Both of these programs have grown in ways that were not originally intended, and the bill reflects the desire to ensure that the programs remain accurate and dedicated to their core purposes.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman SOUDER) and the subcommittee ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the chairman of the full committee counterpart, the gentleman from California (Ranking Member WAXMAN) for their leadership, dedication, and hard work on this authorization legislation. I am happy that we could reach a bipartisan agreement on this bill. It is important to play politics with, and there is no place for partisanship in protecting our children against drugs. This bipartisanship was reflected in the unanimous vote to pass the bill out of our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that we have put together a cohesive, effective piece of legislation to maintain and provide ONDCP with the necessary tools and resources to reduce drug manufacturing, trafficking, and drug-related crime and violence, and drug-related health consequences.

The bill we bring to the floor today is bipartisan in every sense of the word. It is the product of negotiation and bipartisanship. In crafting this important piece of legislation, we aimed to provide the best possible support for the administration and Director Walters in implementing the President's drug strategy. We sought to make ONDCP more efficient by reducing outdated reporting and structural requirements that are in the current law. We also gave significant attention to reforms of the Media Campaign and the HIDTA program to ensure that it is effective and true to their original aims. Both of these programs have grown in ways that were not originally intended, and the bill reflects the desire to ensure that the programs remain accurate and dedicated to their core purposes.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman SOUDER) and the subcommittee ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the chairman of the full committee counterpart, the gentleman from California (Ranking Member WAXMAN) for their leadership, dedication, and hard work on this authorization legislation. I am happy that we could reach a bipartisan agreement on this bill. It is important to play politics with, and there is no place for partisanship in protecting our children against drugs. This bipartisanship was reflected in the unanimous vote to pass the bill out of our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that we have put together a cohesive, effective piece of legislation to maintain and provide ONDCP with the necessary tools and resources to reduce drug manufacturing, trafficking, and drug-related crime and violence, and drug-related health consequences.

The bill we bring to the floor today is bipartisan in every sense of the word. It is the product of negotiation and bipartisanship. In crafting this important piece of legislation, we aimed to provide the best possible support for the administration and Director Walters in implementing the President's drug strategy. We sought to make ONDCP more efficient by reducing outdated reporting and structural requirements that are in the current law. We also gave significant attention to reforms of the Media Campaign and the HIDTA program to ensure that it is effective and true to their original aims. Both of these programs have grown in ways that were not originally intended, and the bill reflects the desire to ensure that the programs remain accurate and dedicated to their core purposes.
Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for yielding me this time. I know how hard he and others have worked on the bill, and I certainly know what they are attempting to do. If I were in his role, I believe I would be derelict in my duty if I did not speak to some of the issues that I have spent so many years working on. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) did not have to allow me this time, knowing that I oppose the bill, and I am extremely appreciative for that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition both to the process that has brought this bill to the floor under suspension of the rules and to the substance of the underlying bill, H.R. 2686, the reauthorization bill for the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the so-called Drug Czar’s Office.

Mr. Speaker, why is this bill before us today? This money should be spent on prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation. During proceedings in the Committee on the Judiciary, I certainly tried to offer amendments to defund this program altogether. We need to start over again.

Mr. Speaker, the nationwide prison inmate population today is about 2.1 million people, over 160,000 of them in my State of California alone. Many of the inmates are serving time for drug offenses. Nationwide, more than 40 percent of the prison population consists of African American inmates. About 10 percent of the African American men in their mid to late 20s are behind bars. In some cases, more than 50 percent of young African American men are under the supervision of the criminal justice system. Given the role of mandatory minimum sentencing for drug offenses in producing these statistics, we need to have a more balanced approach to drug policy and the soundness of the war on drugs and on mandatory minimum sentencing.

Mr. Speaker, Americans need real help for their children from drug use. Families need rehabilitation to save and unite families. This so-called war on drugs is merely a joke, and I believe that we can do better.

Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy observed in a major speech this summer to the annual meeting of the American Bar Association on mandatory minimum sentencing, he said, “Our resources are misspent.” This is a Supreme Court Justice. Our punishment system is woefully out of whack and too long. The Federal sentencing guidelines should be revised downward. I can accept neither the necessity nor the wisdom of Federal mandatory minimum sentencing. In too many cases, mandatory minimum sentences are unwise and unjust.

These task forces go out into these poor communities and find some misguided kid with one gram of crack cocaine. They spend all this time locking them up, taking them to court, getting mandatory minimum sentences where they spend 5 years or more under mandatory minimum sentencing. The judge has no discretion. It does not make any difference whether they have ever been in trouble before. I think it is unjust.

Mr. Speaker, I just had all the defendants here at the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation weekend from Tulia, Texas, and there was 10 percent of all of the African American men in the town of Tulia, Texas, arrested on the testimony of one lying guy, one man who was a part of the drug task force, the drug agent. Mr. Thomas Coleman, who is now, by the way, under indictment for his misconduct in Tulia. He simply lied. And he went to the judge, no jury, they gave people sentences from anywhere from 4 or 5 years to 20 and 30 years. They had to take an army of lawyers from the big law firms and from the NAACP and from the ACLU to go out and get these sentences overturned. This is a joke, and it needs to be stopped.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify one of the matters from the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS). Because of the drug war under President Bush, in 2 straight years of requests, he has had larger increases in treatment than in supply reduction. And it is good to see that she at least agrees with the President and the House and the Senate. While we may have other disagreements, we all agree that we need to focus increasing amounts on treatment.

I also want to clarify to the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS), not only the drug war, but the drug war in Tulia, where local and State law enforcement could tap into the Federal law enforcement, so rather than just going after the user on the street, we could actually have local and State law enforcement move up through the system to find the networks, to try to get the major drug dealers. That has not stopped all the street-level arrests, but it has made differences in Los Angeles and in Indiana that has something to do with the chain and try to get the big people behind those who are abusing the people in our neighborhoods on the street.

We have worked hard to try to manage this financially, and it is incorrect to imply that this bill is anything other than a freeze for the next few years. I think the wording is confusing on the criticism.

Furthermore, it proposes to criticize the one major prevention program we have, the media campaign, because of an OMB study. We have addressed a lot of the things in this bill that the OMB has asked for which was more restrictions. The letter also confuses authorizing and appropriations bills and also has false data in it on whether the media campaign has been effective. In fact, it is accurate, but there is a misleading thing. It says that the media campaign has been ineffective, but then in its wording says “among certain age groups,” meaning it has been effective in most categories with most drugs, but among a few it has not. Therefore, they sent out a memo falsely implying that we increased the spending and falsely attacking the ad campaign, and that did not do this group justice which has been a great crusader for responsible spending.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform. The gentleman has worked very hard on this legislation, and I would like to thank him.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, the senior member on our subcommittee that handled this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of our committee and the ranking member of the subcommittee for the constructive way that this bill has been processed by our Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of our committee and the ranking member of the subcommittee for the constructive way that this bill has been processed by our Committee on Government Reform.

The introduced version of the bill had a number of...
problems which I am pleased that we were able to work through. It provided that the possibility that the media campaign could be used for partisan political purposes and imposed limitations on the funds that could be used by the drug czar for free media campaigns.

On a bipartisan basis, we changed that, and the bill now ensures that the media campaign cannot be used for partisan political activities, and it adds a new provision banning the use of the media campaign to advocate for or against a ballot initiative, draft legislation, or regulatory proposal.

We also struck controversial language allowing the director to take resources away from the States that have medical marijuana laws. We dropped language limiting the ability of the ONDCP to engage in nontraditional forms of outreach and education. We deleted language overturning a unanimous ruling of the FCC requiring ONDCP advertisements be identified as paid for by the ONDCP. We made progress in requiring that 80 percent of the media campaign dollars must go to media buys. The present requirement is now 77 percent. I would prefer that there be no exceptions at all, but I think this is an improvement.

We were able to address many problems during the committee process, and the result is a much better product. I want to point out that this bill is not a perfect bill. And one of the remaining problems concerns the use of HIDTA, the HIDTA funds, for treatment. Further work need to be done to address the need for more drug treatment, and I have talked to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) about that matter. And based on his promise that we will continue to talk about it and look further at this issue, I am not going to oppose the bill on that basis. But I do hope that when the bill goes through to a conference or committee of the whole, that we will do more in the area of treatment.

Mr. Speaker, it is a bill that I urge my colleagues to support. I hope that we can work to make ONDCP even better in the future.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD). The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make sure that Members understood there was one program we have not talked about at all today which is CTAC, the Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center, which has a technology transfer program that is so important to so many of our local and State programs; 5,366 local and State agencies across the United States have tapped into this technology.

I also wanted to point out for those who are somewhat confused about HIDTAs that, for example, in New York City, Detroit and Los Angeles, over half of the members of that HIDTA are local law enforcement and two-thirds are State and local law enforcement. This was a program that said rather than just have Federal law enforcement buy and leverage the resources of the State and local communities by working together.

If we do not adequately fund this program, every city has pretty much told us that they believe that they have to use their State and local dollars to join with these HIDTAs, and it is a very marginal decision to do so, but they believe putting two-thirds of the officers in has been beneficial in reducing crime.

In New York City, the HIDTA there is referred to as the U.N. of law enforcement because after 9/11, they have consolidated not only the narcotics, but the anti-terrorism efforts to make sure that New York is safe because it has been on orange alert since 9/11. It is on orange alert when the rest of us are on elevated alert. And to cut back the HIDTA, or eliminate the HIDTA, in New York City would be devastating to anti-terrorism protection as well.

Lastly, I want to point out that I have had excellent discussions with the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and with the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN). We have continued to disagree, but understand that we need to work out some kind of additional language to get its duty on drug treatment, although that should not be the primary function, and HIDTA dollars should not be used for that effect.

We continue to talk about the grandfathers in of the two programs that are grandfathered in under this and if, whether that money could be used like it is in the Washington-Baltimore HIDTA to work on drug treatment, and I pledged that I would continue to work on this as we move through conference.

So I hope that given the many changes, this bill makes a very strong statement to drug dealers across America, that we are not going to back off. It makes a very strong statement on marijuana, and the dangers of marijuana. It talks about how to tighten the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program to make sure it has a clear anti-drug message. It includes efforts to make sure that the HIDTA focus on national drug trade and not just at the local level where we lock people up but how do we get into the systems. On the supply side, we have also asked for new assessments on the accelerating problem of Columbia.

I believe that in the end this bill represents a bipartisan approach to a balanced, coordinated and effective strategy to address the serious problem of drug abuse and its many effects across our country. I urge all Members to support H.R. 2086.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2086, the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2003. This legislation also reauthorizes the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign—a critical component of our Nation's drug control strategy.

We know that one important way to get the drug message, message out through the media: television, radio and newspapers. I am a firm believer that an effective media campaign can help prevent and delay the onset of substance abuse among youth. The Partnership for a Drug-Free America operated a successful media campaign long before the Federal Government became involved. Congress understood the importance of the anti-drug media message and wanted to ensure that it would continue as public service campaigns have the proven ability to change attitudes and behavior.

Since 1998, the Office of National Drug Control Policy has run a National Youth Anti-Drug Campaign. With the help of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, the Campaign has created more than 200 commercials.

We know that the Media Campaign is working. In New York City, the Media Campaign helps parents realize that they play a vital role in preventing their kids from using drugs. Results clearly show that the Campaign helps initiate conversations about substance abuse between parents and their children. We also know that the Campaign has helped parents set rules and clear standards about drug use.

Survey results released this month confirm that youth are getting the right messages about drug use. The ads have contributed to a climate of disapproval of drug use that is important in reducing the human, social, and financial costs of this deadly disease. The Campaign reaches 90 percent of the youth audience 4 times a week; and 74 percent of the parent audience 3.5 times a week.

Drug use behaviors are beginning to show positive effects from youth exposure to the Media Campaign. For example, almost half (49 percent) of youth with high exposure to the marijuana ads said the ads made them less likely to try or use drugs versus 38 percent of the youth who had little or no exposure to the ads. A strong correlation was found between high exposure to the ads and increased perceptions of risk associated with marijuana use that have been specifically highlighted by the Campaign. Recent data also indicates that kids who see or hear anti-drugs ads at least once a day are less likely to do drugs than other adolescents who don't see or hear ads frequently.

I have seen first-hand in my own community the positive results that can be gained through an effective media campaign. The Coalition for a Drug-Free Greater Cincinnati, which I founded, recently conducted a survey that showed a decline in teen drug use in our region for the first time in 12 years. Marijuana use by teens is down 13 percent, alcohol use is down 24 percent, and cigarette use is down 28 percent.

The media component of the community coalition in Cincinnati plays a critical role in the coalition's overall success. The Coalition helps run an extensive local media campaign through television, radio and print. In fact, the local media in southwest Ohio have generically donated over $1 million in anti-drug ads on an annual basis for the last three years. The survey data tells us that the media campaign is helping bring these numbers down.
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