The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 195, not voting 14, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
<th>Not Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yeas—223

Aderholt Fossella McCaul (TX)
Akkin Fox McCotter
Bachus Frelinghuysen Mulvaney
Baker Gillespie McCulloch
Barrett (SC) Garrett (NJ) McKeon
Bartlett Gibbons Morris
Barton (TX) Gilchrest Mica
Bass Gilmer Miller (OH)
Beauregard Gingrey Miller (GA)
Biggert Gohmert Miller, Gary
Bilirakis Goodes Moran (KS)
Boehlert Goodlatte Murphy
Blackburn Granger Musgrave
B human Graves Myers
Boehner Green (WI) Neugebauer
Bonilla Gutierrez Ney
Bono Hart Nelson
Boozman Hastings (WA) Osborne
Boxstany Hayes Otter
Bradley (NH) Hayworth Osteen
Brady (TX) Hedley Paul
Brown (SC) Hensarling Pearce
Brown-Waite Hutto Reed
Bunning Holcomb Peterson (PA)
Burges Hokestra Peterson
Buyer Houtchison Pickering
Calvert Hulshof Pitts
Camp (MD) Hueter Poe
Campbell (CA) Hydo Pombo
Cannon Ingold (SC) Porter
Cantor Iowa Price (GA)
Capito Istook Pyrz (OH)
Carter Jenkins Putnam
Castle Jindal Radanovich
Chabot Johnson (CT) Ratcliffe
Chabot Johnson (IL) Ramirez
Coble Johnson, Sam Rehberg
Cole (OK) Jones (NC) Reichert
Crenshaw Keller Reni
Cubin Kelly Reynolds
Culberson Kennedy (MN) Rogers (AL)
Davis (KY) King (IA) Rogers (KY)
Davis, Joe Ann King (NY) Rogers (MI)
Davis, Tom Kingston Roahrnbacher
Deals (GA) Kirk Ros-Lehtinen
Delay Klince Royce
Dent Kluehn Kolb
Diaz-Balart, L. Kuhl (NY) Kolbe
Diaz-Balart, M. LaHood Kolb
Doolittle LaTourette Loeberman
Drake Latham Lofgren
Dreier LaTourette Longiare
Duncan Leach Longo
Ehlers Lewis (CA) LoBiondo
Emerson Lewis (KT) Lucas
English (PA) Linder Lugar
Everett Lindy Limbro
Feeney Lucas Menendez
Ferguson Llorente Menendez
Flake R. Miller (OH)
Foley Mink Smith (NJ)
Forbes Manzullo Smith (TX)
Fortenberry Marchant Sodrel

Tahirt Tiberi Turner
Upton Walden (OH)
Wahl Wamp
Weldon (FL) Weldon (PA)

NAYS—195

Abercrombie Grijalva Gianforte
Ackerman Garamendi Harman
Allen Hastings (FL) Harris
Baca Higginson Hijiri
Baird Hinshaw Hinojosa
Barrow Hobbs Honda
Bean Holden Hook
Becerra Hooley Hoyer
Berman Howard Inslee
Bishop (GA) Issa Israel
Bishop (NY) McCarthy (IL) Jackson-Lee
Boren Jarvis Jackson-Lee
Bowser Johnson, R. B.
Brady (PA) Jonas (OH)
Brown (OH) Kanjarchi Kaptur
Brown, Corrine Kennedy (RI)
Burgess Kildee Kilpatrick (MI)
Cardina Lincoln Kindred
Cardoso Kucinich Langewisch
Carnahan Larson (WI) Larson (MI)
Case Larsen (WA) Larson (CT)
Chandler Lee Lawsky
Clay Leavine Lency
Claypool Clyburn Longworth
Connor Clyburn Lowey
Costello Cramer Lowey
Cramer Crowley Lynch
Crawley Currier Maloney
Cuellar Cummings Markel Meyers
Davis (AL) Matheson Meehan
Davis (CA) McEwen McMillan
Davis (IL) McCrery McConkey (MN)
Davis (TN) McDermott McGovern
DeLauro McIntyre McNulty
Dicks Menahy Meehan
Dingell Menendez Meeks (FL)
Doocy Meeks (NY)
Doyle Mendelson Michaud
Edwardso Miller Millender
Engel Miller (NC) Miloluh
Eshoo Miller (NY) Millman
Ehlers Miller George Milloy
Eilers Miller, George Miller, Tom
Elizondo Moore (KS) Moore (WI)
Endicott Moore (VA) Moran (VA)
Eskander Morris Morris
Evans Morris (TX) Napolitano

Green, Al Neal (MA)
Green, Gene Neal (MA)

NOT VOTING—14

Birch (IN) Fitzpatrick (PA) Saraceno
Bouma Goins Sweeney
Bouyer Gooden Weiner
Browne Hoyer Wexler
Buckley Jordan Wilson
Burge Kucinich Wolman
Butler Kindred Wolfe

So the previous question was ordered as above recorded.

Stated for: Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, today, March 9, 2006, I missed rollcall vote No. 33, H. Res. 713, on ordering the previous question to provide for reconsideration of the bill (H.R. 2829) to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy Act. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 33.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, this morning, we voted on the previous question on the rule for H.R. 2829, the Office of National Drug Control Policy Act. At the time that the vote was called, I was in the Energy and Commerce Committee participating in a hearing regarding the Department of Energy Budget. In my rush to go from the hearing to the House floor and for more meetings, I inadvertently voted “yes” on the previous question rather than “no” as I had intended.

While I know that my vote would not have changed the outcome of the previous question vote, I feel strongly that the House should be allowed the opportunity to consider legislation that would block the Dubai port deal and strengthen the review process for future foreign port deals I would like the RECORD to reflect that I intended to vote “no”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHDER). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. 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. 2829.

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

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 713 and rule XVIII, 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. 2829.

In the Committee of the Whole

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2829) to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy Act, with Mr. Bonner in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 30 minutes.
Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), chairman of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2829, the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act. Since its inception, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, better known as ONDCP, has been the cornerstone of drug policy in America, improving the lives of all Americans by reducing the presence of drugs in our society. This office has been producing results Americans need and want. Teen drug use is on the decline, and ONDCP deserves much of the credit for that.

ONDCP’s success means we are faced not with the question of whether to reauthorize it, but how best to do so. The many positive signs and trends reported in this year’s National Drug Control Strategy clearly demonstrate the difference the office can make with adequate resources and sound policy.

Drug use is a national crisis that affects the health of all our citizens, and because of this ONDCP must remain an active body in the executive office. In order to win the war on drugs, we need to address the problem on our society from every single angle. This legislation gives ONDCP the appropriate resources to stop drug use before it starts, heal drug users, and disrupt drug markets.

We all know that drugs affect people from all walks of life. Addiction does not discriminate. A strong national drug policy is in the interest of every American. Mr. Chairman, this bill we bring to the floor today was crafted in true bipartisan fashion. It is a product of careful negotiations and strong bipartisanship. We aimed to provide the best possible support for the administration and Director Walters in implementing the President’s strategy, making a strong office even stronger.

We sought to make ONDCP more efficient by reducing outdated reporting and structural requirements required by law. The bill also improves ONDCP and its programs by enhancing effectiveness and accountability in drug treatment and requiring greater diligence in addressing our Nation’s methamphetamine epidemic.

We also gave significant attention to reforms of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign and the HIDTA program to make them more effective. Both of these programs have grown in ways that were not originally intended, and the bill reflects the desire to ensure the programs remain accountable and dedicated to their core purposes.

This bill recognizes the media campaign as an effective prevention tool and the HIDTA program as an integral part of the Federal Government’s commitment to reducing teen drug use. We have all seen the well-known advertisements on subjects such as drugs and terrorism, the consequences of marijuana use and parent skills. These advertisements carry important messages to youth about the consequences of abuse and remind parents of the importance of keeping kids away from drugs. The media campaigns are unique, and the message is being heard. It is preventing drug abuse before it starts.

When it comes to addressing the complex dilemma of drug addiction, prevention is only one part of the equation. Treatment and maintenance abuse and addiction is also essential. Because addiction has so many dimensions and disrupts multiple aspects of an individual’s life, treatment is never easy. Drug users need the support of family, friends, and institutions to help guide them in treatment and recovery. This bill gives ONDCP the tools to maintain and strengthen programs so Americans who need help can receive it and begin on a path to recovery.

It also recognizes an important part of helping the addict is to remove the supply of drugs from our society. I have been to Colombia with Chairman SOUDER on numerous occasions. It is apparent to me that ONDCP is making every effort to disrupt the basis of the drug trade by disrupting markets at home and abroad. We need to continue to wage war on the supply side of the drug equation while reaffirming our commitment to addressing the demand side as well.

I want to thank Chairman SOUDER, Ranking Member CUMMINGS, and my ranking member, HENRY WAXMAN, for their leadership and hard work on this reauthorization legislation. I am happy we could reach bipartisan agreement on this bill since there is no place for partisanship in protecting our children against drugs. This bipartisanism was reflected in a unanimous vote to pass this bill out of our committee.

I am proud to be a part of a cohesive, effective piece of legislation that gives ONDCP the necessary tools to reduce illicit drug use, manufacturing, trafficking, drug-related crime and violence and drug-related health consequences.

America’s families need this legislation. I urge support of all of my colleagues for H.R. 2829 to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 2829, which reauthorizes the Office of National Drug Control Policy, ONDCP, including its National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign and High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas, HIDTA, programs.

I want to begin by acknowledging the efforts of Chairman SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS, the chairman and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources. They have worked tirelessly to develop this legislation. They are true leaders in the fight against drug abuse. I would like to recognize Chairman DAVIS as well for the bipartisan way he has approached this issue.

Drug use is an enormous problem in our Nation, ruining lives, filling our prisons and sometimes terrorizing our communities. Many people are not even aware how drugs adversely affect their families and their children. Our children and families suffer from drug abuse. ONDCP’s primary mandate is to coordinate all aspects of the drug problem through drug prevention, treatment, enforcement, interdiction, and supply reduction.

The ONDCP’s mandate is to coordinate all of these efforts in a comprehensive strategy, coordinating with State, local, and international governments and institutions.

We must work together to protect our children against drug abuse. I would like to recognize Chairman DAVIS as well for his tireless work and dedication to developing this legislation.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, let me thank Chairman SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS, and let me draw your attention to a specific section of the bill that I think is troubling not only to most Members of Congress but law enforcement throughout our country. I refer you to the increasing use and production of methamphetamine. This is a uniquely dangerous drug that is extremely addictive and ruins its victims. “Methamphetamine suddenly becomes this thing in their life that they cannot do without,” stated Attorney General Alberto Gonzales. “In terms of damage to children and to our society, meth is now the most dangerous drug in America.”

Consider the following facts: meth is the number one drug problem for the majority of county law enforcement agencies. According to the National Association of Counties, 58 percent of counties report that meth has become the primary or a top problem for law enforcement. In many areas, meth cases are swamping hospital emergency rooms. In one NACO survey, 47 percent of hospitals said meth is the top illicit drug involved in patient presentation. Three of four of these patients are uninsured, placing a tremendous added burden on already strained emergency rooms.
As the meth epidemic spreads, other crimes are bred. Wherever meth gains a foothold, substantial increases in property crime are seen as addicts desperately seek cash to fund their addiction. In affected areas, a 62 percent increase in domestic violence due to meth has been reported. Meth is a major cause of child abuse and neglect. Domestic meth labs create environments hazardous to children. A nationwide survey of child welfare officials has reported an increase of out-of-home placements because of meth use about twice, in 1993 and 1998. Its basic mandate to fight back against illegal drugs by mounting a comprehensive strategy for sharing all available resources, whether it be in enforcement, interdiction and supply reduction.

The Dawson provisions underscore the importance of the HIDTA program, which provides vital Federal funding to support uniquely flexible and effective collaboration between Federal, State, and local agencies. H.R. 2829 includes provisions to preserve and strengthen the HIDTA program in its current form and in its current location within ONDCP. This is in stark contrast to the administration’s proposal, set forth in the President’s fiscal year 2007 budget request, to reduce HIDTA funding and move HIDTA to the Department of Justice. H.R. 2829 reiterates Congress’s intent that HIDTA should remain where it can be most effective.

H.R. 2829 also includes provisions to ensure that programs and access to drug treatment are adequately supported in the Federal drug control budget and further requires ONDCP to develop comprehensive strategies to address the severe threats posed by South American heroin, Afghan heroin, and drug smuggling across the Southwest border. In addition, H.R. 2829 calls for a comprehensive strategy for sharing and coordinating counterdrug intelligence and provides for increased coordination of interdiction assets and efforts.

With regard to the Media Campaign, the bill authorizes increased funding, recognizes pro bono advertising as the program’s central component, provides for greater contractor accountability, requires testing and evaluation of ads before they appear on the air, and requires an independent evaluation of the campaign’s impact on preventing and reducing illicit drug use by youth.

All in all, I believe this legislation addresses the bipartisan concerns. I emphatically support a strong, comprehensive, and coherent Federal anti-drug effort.
Let me explain a couple of points about this. The ONDCP, Office of National Drug Control Policy, is often called the “drug czar.” It was created by Congress. It was not created by an administration. It was taken somewhat unwillingly and against many years ago, and now we are up for reauthorization. We attempted to reauthorize this several years ago. It passed the House unanimously, but never got through the Senate at the end of the year. We are now coming back with a bill that is bipartisan and bicameral. I believe that this bill now can move through the Senate.

It is important to remember a couple of reasons why it is important to authorize agencies, not just to appropriate. What has happened in this interim without an authorization is that the administration has attempted to gut the HIDTA program. They have attempted to wipe out many other programs. I believe they have lacked a national meth strategy. In addition, they have failed to give better guidance to safe and drug-free schools and then proposed to zero it out; failed to give better guidance to State and local law enforcement and then proposed to zero out those programs.

What happens when you do not have an authorization bill is that it gives complete discretion to the administration to spend whatever funds we allocate in whatever way they choose. This was a Department created by the United States Congress, by both parties, by both Houses, and it is important we give guidance. When an administration refuses to respond to an issue like meth and refuses to use the office in the way Congress intended, you move from a bill that was the original authorization, like this, to a bill like this. In other words, you get more micromanagement.

We have also eliminated a number of subboards and appointments and things that were irrelevant, but there is much more direct guidance to try to make sure that you do not just criticize programs but that the drug czar, the director of ONDCP, directly gives guidance, whether it be on heroin in Afghanistan, whether it be in Colombia; that this will preserve the success of, for example, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas programs. If we pass this reauthorization bill, they will not be able to wipe it out or move it to other Departments.

The administration’s proposal the last 2 years has been unanimously opposed by every HIDTA director in America. Every single HIDTA in America has opposed the administration’s proposed changes. This authorization would keep HIDTA where it belongs. It will refocus the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. This bill clarifies the purposes of the campaign. Some of these have worked out with the administration in the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, where they were at odds a number of years ago and they have implemented some of these changes; but we have now put it into law, because, remember, this is a 5-year reauthorization. This administration basically has 2 years to go. This is really outlining where the next administration is going to work in anti-drug policy, not just the current administration.

It will strengthen the Southwest border counternarcotics strategy. Many of you are aware that there has been of a coordinated Southwest border narcotics strategy, to say the least; and this bill will prescribe that there has to be a counternarcotics strategy. We will also target the methamphetamine epidemic. This bill requires at least $15 million to be dedicated to combating meth in the HIDTAs.

We will also see a whole series of amendments. The United States Congress last year began asking for, and this year, a nor erstuate, in Afghanistan if you do not have meth strategy. We have had pathetic attempts, small attempts, at a meth strategy. But we have not had a national meth strategy. Amendment after amendment today, with the support of this subcommittee, will show the intensity of how this body feels on methamphetamines.

It will also rationalize the General Counter-Drug Intelligence Plan. We have had overlaps on intelligence that have been totally unacceptable and a waste of taxpayer dollars. It will elevate the rank and status of the ONDCP director. Because the director is tasked with coordinating drug control of numerous agencies, at cabinet level Departments, this bill designates that he has the same rank and status as a Cabinet officer. You cannot suggest to the State Department or the Defense Department that they are not working with the administration is going to work in anti-drug policy, not just the current administration.

They have implemented some of these changes; but we have now put it into law, because, remember, this is a 5-year reauthorization. This administration basically has 2 years to go. This is really outlining where the next administration is going to work in anti-drug policy, not just the current administration.

It will strengthen the Southwest border counternarcotics strategy. Many of you are aware that there has been of a coordinated Southwest border narcotics strategy, to say the least; and this bill will prescribe that there has to be a counternarcotics strategy. We will also target the methamphetamine epidemic. This bill requires at least $15 million to be dedicated to combating meth in the HIDTAs.

We will also see a whole series of amendments. The United States Congress last year began asking for, and this year, a nor erstuate, in Afghanistan if you do not have meth strategy. We have had pathetic attempts, small attempts, at a meth strategy. But we have not had a national meth strategy. Amendment after amendment today, with the support of this subcommittee, will show the intensity of how this body feels on methamphetamines.
is a truly bipartisan effort with the input of members from multiple committees. The reason this is in the Government Reform Committee is that 20-some subcommittees have jurisdiction over narcotics; and years ago when this office was created, it was put under the Government Reform Committee, normally an oversight committee but here with authorizing; and an increasing number of things were put under the drug czar so that we could coordinate it, and this bill will reestablish this because we have been frustrated that there has not been such clear coordination. This bill will mandate more directly that it is done.

I believe we have had some successes. We are having success in Colombia, Afghanistan, we are going backwards, but we are fighting hard. I believe that the DEA has done some good work in meth, but we need a lot more in meth. We need our national ad campaign and our HIDTAs to focus more on the meth epidemic. We have other different problems, and I believe that this bill is a comprehensive, bipartisan, bicameral way to try to address this.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who has been a leader in our efforts to address this problem of drug addiction in our country and certainly throughout the world.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS deserve a tremendous amount of credit.

I look at this problem, as a former mayor, as a criterion, one of the major criteria, for homeland security. If we cannot secure our neighborhoods, if we cannot secure our towns, small and large, against the poison of illicit drugs, which take many of our own sons and daughters every year, then we are not going to be able to address foreign terrorism on our shores.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), a former chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), a former chairman of the subcommittee. He and I both were senior staffers in the other body and have worked on this issue for a long time. I appreciate his leadership in fighting narcotics throughout the United States.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chair of this important subcommittee and his leadership in bringing to the floor today probably one of the most important pieces of legislation that we will consider in this entire session of Congress. Not only do I thank him for his leadership and being a long-term soldier in this battle, but also the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member, whom I have had the privilege to work with, who is also dedicated to dealing with this scourge on our Nation.

I say scourge on our Nation, because we just heard the previous speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey, talk about what illegal narcotics and drug abuse, substance abuse, has done to our Nation.

We have statistics. There are more than 20,000 American drug casualties a year. If we look at just the 3 years we have had the conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan, we have lost more than 20,000 per year in our streets and neighborhoods, and those are only the recorded statistics. It is not all of the victims of crime and the murders. These are people who have died just fighting illegal narcotics, who live in neighborhoods that are infested by drugs? Have you ever seen that terror?

He said, "I know exactly where you are going, Congressmen, because homeland security should be a place where we make our stand as well."

Families are being ruined. This bill increases funding for the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, I think you put it better than I could ever put it. This bill earmarks money for the Dawson Family Community Protection Act, which would focus on providing avenues for citizens to report drug trafficking in at-risk neighborhoods without putting their lives on the line.

This is an urgent problem, Mr. Chairman. This is a very urgent problem. When you see how many of our own kids are dying, and adults, I might say, during the year, and compare that to the tragedy of 911, we must address both of these problems to bring sanity back to our neighborhoods and back to our families.

There is an urgency here. Is there an urgency down the street, Mr. SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS?

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), a former chairman of the subcommittee. He and I both were senior staffers in the other body and have worked on this issue for a long time. I appreciate his leadership in fighting narcotics throughout the United States.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chair of this important subcommittee and his leadership in bringing to the floor today probably one of the most important pieces of legislation that we will consider in this entire session of Congress. Not only do I thank him for his leadership and being a long-term soldier in this battle, but also the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member, whom I have had the privilege to work with, who is also dedicated to dealing with this scourge on our Nation.

I say scourge on our Nation, because we just heard the previous speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey, talk about what illegal narcotics and drug abuse, substance abuse, has done to our Nation.

We have statistics. There are more than 20,000 American drug casualties a year. If we look at just the 3 years we have had the conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan, we have lost more than 20,000 per year in our streets and neighborhoods, and those are only the recorded statistics. It is not all of the victims of crime and the murders. These are people who have died just fighting illegal narcotics, who live in neighborhoods, and many of them are our young people, the future of our Nation lost.

The cost in jails, incarceration, I am told 60 percent of those behind bars are there because of substance abuse. The social costs on all of our social agencies across this Nation is high.

Again, there is probably no greater social challenge that we have than the ravages of substance and drug abuse, child abuse, spouse abuse, all types of abuse that we see, are unspeakable because of the effects of illegal narcotics.

I will say that President Bush and John Walters have done an excellent job in a number of areas. They set out a comprehensive, comprehensive, bipartisan strategy, and some of them have been achieved. We have seen a dramatic reduction in youth drug abuse. But we have a constant change in the challenge.

I know working with Mr. SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS, we have seen the crack epidemic. We saw the heroin epidemic that ravaged Baltimore and other cities, great cities across the Nation. We have seen designer drugs. Now we see the meth scourge. So we have to have a flexible and adaptable policy. Hopefully this plan and the 5-year reauthorization provides that.

It is not always how much we spend, it is how we spend it. I think this administration has also focused attention on the High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Area designations, HIDTA, which we have done over the years, and we have set some of those in stone, and we keep funding them year after year. We need to look at how we spend that, how much we spend and where we put the resources for high-intensity approaches to going after problems that do shift and change. I think that is an important debate. I am not crazy about moving it over to the Department of Justice, but I do think we need a more accountable HIDTA forum.

In conclusion, though, we do have a changing threat. We have seen some successes, as I said, with our youth. Plan Colombia, which we fought for during those years, we finally got implemented. It is an example of a success. We have some challenges to look forward to, the disruption in South America with people like Morales in Bolivia, whose policies raise great questions about the progress we have made in controlling illegal narcotics.

But we do know from our experience that we have to have a plan, we have to spend our money wisely, and hopefully...
Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the great State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership, which is why I have an opportunity to congratulate Mr. SOUDER, who I have had the pleasure of working with on these issues, both from the perspective of interdiction, along the “third border,” but also from the perspective of homeland security as it relates to the northern and southern borders.

I rise to acknowledge and appreciate the great amount of work that has gone into this legislative initiative, and particularly as it relates to the reauthorization of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

I recall that one of my first introductions to the severity of drug usage and the willingness to work full time on this issue was the opportunity to visit with Mr. CUMMINGS in his area, the city of Baltimore, which he was not reticent to let us know that there was a problem, and a problem, of course, that was connected to HIV/AIDS, and he has been working to make great strides in the city of Baltimore.

Mr. CUMMINGS, I want to congratulate you both for introducing Members of Congress to the crisis early on, as well as your leadership in this area.

So I don’t take away from this legislative initiative the importance of stemming the rising tide of drug usage. In fact, we had thought, I think, in some years past that there was a curving of the curve when listening to this debate and the many drug treatment centers around America and the addicted persons, I know that they are willing to admit that we still have a concern and a crisis, and the reauthorization of this particular agency is important for what it does.

In particular, as cochair of the Congressional Children’s Caucus, I see a frightening rise in the utilization of addictive substances by our children, particularly as it relates to the rising rise in the number of girls that are participating in drug usage, whether or not it is alcohol, starting in middle school; and we know that if you start taking substances like alcohol in middle school, by the time you reach the high school level you are addicted and we have a problem.

We also make a mistake when we rely on randomized student drug testing to prevent addiction and abuse of drugs. Instead of focusing our efforts on educating our children about drugs and engaging them in the decisions about their futures, drug testing assumes all youth are the same. Drug testing may be right in certain situations with reasonable evidence and a court order, but randomized testing renders all youths suspect and treats them as criminals. High expectations for our children may reap great rewards, but what will we sow with the expectation of deception? So we have to focus our efforts on helping our children, not punishing them, and we cannot allow the war on drugs to become a war on children.

I am sure there are many provisions of the bill before us that are aimed at helping many communities, but I just want to talk about, as a member of the Oversight Committee, about the provisions, if not in general about our policies, so that as we get into a broader discussion on other legislation, that we pay close attention to the policies that we are considering or are enacting in our schools.

Mr. SOUDER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the great State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).
networked in, fish-netted in, conspiratorially grabbed into this whole drug conspiracy, mothers and uncles, brothers. Sometimes whole families were wrapped up in, indicted, tried and convicted, many of whom were serving jail time unable to get their hands on the investigation, lawyers were able to intervene, and the rogue cop was exposed and all of his testimony was discovered to be false.

So there needs to be an oversight and a concern about whether or not these are effective uses of our dollars and whether or not we can effectively have oversight, so that, yes, the drug dealers who are poisoning our community, real drug dealers, the cartels, the smugglers of drugs, the producers of methamphetamine labs, the sellers of prescription drugs for children to use and others, the abuse of cough medicine, all of that is important to be able to highlight, to indict, try and convict, but not to go in and use a fishnet, rely only on the testimony of a rogue cop and have no other evidence to be utilized and to break the backs, the hearts of families, and to destroy a community.

And so I hope that as we move this legislation forward, we will be able to be focused on the good items that are here, the direction that we can go with our children with an amendment that I have on the assessment of our programs; and, of course, Mr. Cummings, thank you for the concern that when people are under this particular legislation, there is a basis for fairness and accuracy in any charges being made and that people are not singled out because of the color of their skin because they are associated with drug use.

With that, let me thank my colleagues for this legislation. I hope my words will be considered as we continue to debate this legislation and fight the war on drugs in a united and positive and successful manner.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

In closing, Mr. Chairman, this is a very, very important piece of legislation. I think it was Mr. Pascrell who said that we must act with a sense of urgency. And he was absolutely right. The Bush administration continued to do this then corrects. You only lose a student loan if you commit a drug crime while you have the loan.

That is the least that the taxpayers should expect; and even then, if you go to drug treatment and get clean, you can get your loan back. Even then, if you get convicted, not arrested, but convicted of a drug crime, you still can get it back 2 years, or if you go through drug treatment and get clean. The third time after you commit a drug crime and get convicted, then you lose your student loan. This is the least that the taxpayers should expect.

We also have this constant debate whether it is a war or a disease. Former drug czar Barry McCaffrey always said he felt it was both, and I agree. Because with heart disease you do not see doctors getting assassinated on the street. You do not see heart surgeons getting shot in deals about heart surgery.

Also it is a controllable disease. You do not have the equivalent of Alcoholics Anonymous or narcotics anonymous for Alzheimer’s. But it is a disease. That is why treatment is very important. That is why the prevention programs are very important.

I appreciated Congressman Pascrell, and actually it was Congressman Cummings who first said that narco-terrorism is something that we live with every day.

As I said earlier, tragically, 3,500 people were killed on 9/11. But that fall, 7,500 died because of illegal narcotics; 30,000 in 2002; 30,000 in 2003; 30,000 in 2004; roughly 7,500 in the first quarter of this year 165,000 people have died.

While we get obsessed with every little thing going on in homeland security, we have terror on our streets, in our homes, and in our neighborhoods. They have been forced and divert funds from the daily threat of narco-terrorism in the United States as we do this.

I want to again refer to the Government Reform Subcommittee report that was unanimously adopted today. You can find it on the Web site of the Criminal Justice Subcommittee under Government Reform, 154 pages, 607 footnotes. If you tap the footnote, you can get the actual numbers.

There you can get a full view of the whole narcotics policies, whether it is in HHS, Department of Justice, Defense, State Department. It is part of what we do in our committee.

The ONDCP, the director in front of us, has two major functions. One is directly under the control of the so-called drug czar, the director of ONDCP. It is a national media campaign, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas, and the Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center.

In addition, the drug czar reviews all budgets of all agencies with narcotics and has broad authority to make sure that we have a coordinated national drug policy, and this bill strengthens that.

This bill was not easily put together. I want to thank first off the Members of both parties. We have had an extraordinary working relationship and come very close friends, Mr. Cummings and I, but other members of our committee, too. We have had well-attended subcommittee hearings.

We have held field hearings as well as hearings in Washington. Our staff, particularly Nick Coleman, who has just recently left to go to the U.S. Attorney’s Office, has visited almost every HIDTA in America.

We as Members have visited HIDTA directors here and have gone out and visited the different HIDTAs. Marc Wheat, the staff director; Dennis Kilcoyne; Jim Kaiser; Tony Haywood from the minority staff have worked hard in developing this comprehensive legislation.

Mr. Cummings and I both thank our staff, because they help make it look good. In a bill this complicated, working with every agency in the Federal Government basically, in a bipartisan way, is not easy to do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act, and I was pleased that the House Judiciary Committee adopted two amendments that I offered and that they are part of the base bill.

Street drug markets, such as open air drug dealing at the corner and at drug houses, are a serious public safety problem. Often located in poor, minority, and disadvantaged communities, they cause severe harm by easing initiation and use among youth and by drawing youth into the drug trade.

My first amendment, which is designated Sec. 14 of H.R. 2829, provided for demonstration programs by local partnerships to shut down illicit drug market hot-spots by deterring drug dealers or altering the dynamic of drug sales. This provision authorizes funding for demonstration programs that seek to coordinate an effective intervention using a credible,
deterrent message. This would encourage criminal justice agencies to collaborate with researchers and social welfare agencies to analyze local conditions and develop strategic, problem-solving interventions.

Such an approach was proven successful in High Point, NC. Upon identifying the drug market and the criminal group of active dealers, law enforcement carefully monitored and documented drug activity and probation/parole violations through surveillance and drug buys. Offenders with any violent criminal history were immediately arrested. Non-violent offenders, on the other hand, were confronted by law enforcement, city officials, service organizations and their families with a strong deterrent message. They were given a choice between facing immediate legal action or ceasing dealing and receiving rehabilitative services.

Consequently, the drug market promptly collapsed with minimal police intervention or crime displacement. Within one year of implementation, the drug crime rate of High Point fell by 34% and the violent crime rate was cut in half.

Sec. 14 of this bill authorizes $10 million for the next three years to fund demonstration programs supporting these interagency collaborations. The agencies would be responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of the strategic intervention, and the Director would be responsible for submitting to Congress a report identifying the best practices in drug market eradication.

My second amendment, which is designated Sec. 15 of H.R. 2829, provided for demonstration programs by local partnerships to coerce abstinence in chronic hard-drug users under community supervision through the use of drug testing and sanctions. This provision authorizes funding for demonstration programs that seek to reduce the use of illicit drugs by chronic hard-drug users living in the community while under the supervision of the criminal justice system.

Approximately 80 percent of the Nation’s cocaine is consumed by a relatively small group of chronic users (approximately 4 million). Three-quarters of these users are under the supervision of the criminal justice system. By deterring these users, we would be able to reduce the nation’s cocaine consumption by 60 percent—and these numbers are similar for other hard drugs, such as heroin and meth.

Coerced abstinence is a highly effective means for targeting these users. This model is based on predictable, frequent drug testing and known, non-negotiable, immediate, graduated sanctions. For example, a system where users are assigned random days of testing per month, they are subject to a search led by a search team, and these teams must return with the results after 8 hours. If the search is positive, the participant is subject to immediate, graduated sanctions that range from suspension of the drug test to immediate arrest.

An ongoing example of this model is being used in Hawaii, where substance abuse violations are common, with meth being the drug of choice. In October 2005, only 27 months after the program began, program participants had an 83 percent reduction in positive test results (from 21.9% for control group to 3.8% for program participants) and an 87 percent reduction in missed appointments for testing (from 10% for control group to 1.3% for program participants).

This level of effectiveness we cannot ignore. For this reason, Sec. 15 of H.R. 2829 authorizes $10 million for the next 3 years for demonstration programs that administer drug tests to individuals at least twice a week and swiftly impose a known set of graduated sanctions for non-compliance.

The program must include a plan for monitoring the progress toward reducing the percentage of positive drug tests in the community and the Director would be responsible for submitting to Congress a report identifying the best practices in reducing the use of illicit drugs by chronic hard-drug users.

I commend the Office of National Drug Control Policy for publicly committing itself to the goal of reducing illegal drug use and abuse in the United States. However, I also call on the Director to increase the allocation of funds dedicated for treatment and demand reduction efforts, which have shown to be very successful in reducing drug use. To achieve this national drug control policy that efficiently reduces drug use and abuse in the United States, we need strategies that are as smart as they are tough. This requires that we remain open to evidence-based programs and respond to them.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, as we work to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy today, I’d like to pay tribute to the work and dedication of Southwest Michigan’s Regional Methamphetamine Taskforces. It is through their efforts that March is Methamphetamine Awareness Month in Southwest Michigan.

The unfortunate reality is that each and every one of our communities is vulnerable to the dangers of meth—it is a highly addictive drug that does not discriminate. However, the communities of Southwest Michigan are united in their fight against this epidemic. Regional meth taskforces consisting of dedicated law enforcement officials, pharmacists, firefighters, and the troops are assembled in Southwest Michigan.

I applaud the efforts of our dedicated Regional Meth Taskforce coordinators: Heidi Bertschinger of Allegan, Liz Lenz of Barry, Kim Palchak of Branch, Jennifer Lester of Cass, Tina Harbaugh of Kalamazoo, Mike Wilson of St. Joseph, and EJ. McAndrew of Van Buren. I would also like to commend Rick Shanley of Kalamazoo for increasing public awareness of the progress that the task forces are accomplishing.

These folks, and many others who follow their lead, have worked diligently to educate communities on the dangers of this drug. Among their many contributions to our region, the taskforces have trained community members to recognize the warning signs of the meth production and addiction, conducted recherche used by local treatment providers and educated school groups. Our communities are better off for the efforts of our regional taskforces.

Special thanks also goes out to all of our local law enforcement officials, they face the dangers associated with meth abuse each and every day. While March is Methamphetamine Awareness Month in Southwest Michigan, this is a problem that must be addressed each and every month of the year, until it has been conquered.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, when I am home in Utah, I constantly hear about the prevalence of methamphetamine and the dangers to our community posed by this highly addictive drug. This legislation has some excellent measures to help the federal government better deal with the problem and I sincerely hope that it will help ONDCP to combat meth abuse.

The Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) was created in 1988 in order to establish policies, priorities, and objectives for our Nation’s drug control program. Its stated goals are to reduce illicit drug use, manufacturing, and trafficking, drug-related crime and violence, and drug-related health consequences. I support this bill and am proud to vote for strengthening the agency in charge of producing the National Drug Control Strategy.

But it would be a mistake to look at this bill without also considering the need to fully fund local law enforcement. In our State of Utah is so pervasive that it absolutely requires the dedication and the cooperative efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement. I know that Utah is not alone—I’ve heard many of my colleagues talk today about the volume of methamphetamine and other drugs in thousands of communities across the nation. As a result, I am gravely concerned about the President’s budget proposal for funding local law enforcement.

The federal government needs to step up to the plate and properly fund law enforcement, if we are serious about national drug control policy. That’s why I strongly support funding for critical law enforcement programs, such as BODEETS, JAG grants, and other programs. During my time in Congress, every single person involved with law enforcement has made a point to share with me exactly how these grants help protect Utah citizens.

As we vote today to reauthorize ONDCP, let us also remember that our drug problem is not just in our nation and in my home State of Utah is so pervasive that it absolutely requires the dedication and the cooperative efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement. I know that Utah is not alone—I’ve heard many of my colleagues talk today about the volume of methamphetamine and other drugs in thousands of communities across the nation. As a result, I am gravely concerned about the President’s budget proposal for funding local law enforcement.

The federal government needs to step up to the plate and properly fund law enforcement, if we are serious about national drug control policy. That’s why I strongly support funding for critical law enforcement programs, such as BODEETS, JAG grants, and other programs. During my time in Congress, every single person involved with law enforcement has made a point to share with me exactly how these grants help protect Utah citizens.
hereby waives further consideration of the bill. The Committee has jurisdictional interests in H.R. 2829, including intelligence and intelligence-related provisions contained in the bill.

The Committee takes this action only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the jurisdictional interest to the Committee in the future. In addition, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence will retain any provisions in the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation.

Finally, I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the consideration of the bill on the House floor. I appreciate the constructive work between our committees on this matter and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Peter Hoekstra,  
Chairman.

U.S. House of Representatives,  
Committee on Government Reform,  

Hon. Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKown,  
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce,  
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Thank you for your recent letter regarding the Permanent Select Committee’s jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2829, the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005. As you have stated, the Committee has a valid jurisdictional interest in the intelligence-related provisions contained in the bill.

Thank you for waiving further consideration of H.R. 2829. I agree that waiving further consideration of this bill does not prejudice the jurisdiction of the Permanent Select Committee nor should it be considered as precedent for matters of jurisdictional interest in the future. In addition, I will support your request for conferences from your Committee should a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation be convened.

As you have requested, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your assistance as I work towards the enactment of H.R. 2829.

Sincerely,  
Tom Davis,  
Chairman.

U.S. House of Representatives,  
Committee on Education and the Workforce,  

Hon. Tom Davis,  
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,  
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to consideration of H.R. 2829, the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005, which the Committee on Government Reform reported on November 18, 2005. The bill was referred to the Committee on Government Reform and in addition to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

On March 17, 2006, in response to your letter to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to consideration of H.R. 2829, the “Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005,” on the House floor. The bill was referred to the Committee on Government Reform and in addition to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

Thanks to your cooperation and diligent efforts to improve H.R. 2829, the bill, as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, represents the legislative text that will be the basis for consideration by the House. I have therefore agreed to make in order the version of the bill reported by your Committee. However, I do not only have the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Government Reform and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future.

I respectfully request your confirmation of our mutual understanding. I will include a copy of our exchange of letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the consideration of this bill. If you have questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,  
Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKown,  
Chairman.

U.S. House of Representatives,  
Committee on Government Reform,  

Hon. Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKown,  
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce,  
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Thank you for your recent letter regarding the ‘Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005. As have stated, the provisions relating to high schools and collegiate athletics (proposed sections 21 U.S.C. §§725, 729, and 730) is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. Given the Committee’s referral by the Committee on the Judiciary on March 2, 2006, which does not contain the Clean Sports Act, the base text considered by the House, I do not intend to ask for continued referral of H.R. 2829. However, I do so only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the Committee on Education and the Workforce’s jurisdictional interest and pre-rogative on these provisions or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future. Furthermore, should these or similar provisions be included in future versions of H.R. 2829, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will be appointed to the conference committee on these provisions. Finally I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the consideration of this bill. If you have questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to call me. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Tom Davis,  
Chairman.

U.S. House of Representatives,  
Committee on Education and the Workforce,  

Hon. Tom Davis,  
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,  
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to the consideration of H.R. 2829, the ‘Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005’ and that the version of H.R. 2829 reported by the Committee on the Judiciary represents the text that should be considered on the House floor. In addition, I will support your request for conferences from your Committee should a House-Senate conference on this or similar provisions be convened.

As you have requested, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your assistance as I work towards the enactment of H.R. 2829.

Sincerely,  
Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.,  
Chairman.

U.S. House of Representatives,  
Committee on the Judiciary,  

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman. I rise in opposition to H.R. 2829, the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization. Other than the TSA making our shoes uncomfortable rather than medical problem is not only scientifically unsound—it’s a waste of money.
If we’re going to spare no dollar in the war on drugs, then let’s have quality education and after-school options for every child in America. And let’s reverse the diabolical and failed policy of denying college loans to students with prior drug offenses. Americans with drug problems need more—not fewer—opportunities to change their lives for the better.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this senseless, wasteful Office of National Drug Control Policy. Let’s redirect these dollars to programs that work rather than “tough on crime” soundbites and countless useless government reports that do nothing to reduce drug use or addiction.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BASS). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

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

H.R. 2829

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assem-bled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.
(a) Short title.—This Act may be cited as the “Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005”.
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Sec. 6. Amendments relating to appointment
Sec. 5. Amendments relating to establishment of Office of National Drug Control Policy actions, sections, and provisions, the reference

Sec. 10. Funding for certain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas.
Sec. 11. Amendments relating to Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center.
Sec. 12. National youth antidrug media campaign.
Sec. 13. Drug interdiction.
Sec. 14. Awards for demonstration programs by local partnerships to shut down illicit drug market hot-spots by deterring drug dealers or altering the dynamic of drug sales.
Sec. 15. Awards for demonstration programs by local partnerships to coerce absti-nence in chronic hard-drug users under community supervision through the use of drug testing programs.
Sec. 16. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 17. Technical amendments and repeal.
Sec. 18. Requirement for disclosure of Federal sponsorship of all Federal advertis-
ing or other communication materials.
Sec. 19. Policy regarding to syringe exchange pro-

Sec. 2. AMENDMENT OF OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1998.

Sec. 6. Amendments relating to appointment
Sec. 5. Amendments relating to establishment of Office of National Drug Control Policy actions, sections, and provisions, the reference

Sec. 10. Funding for certain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas.
Sec. 11. Amendments relating to Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center.
Sec. 12. National youth antidrug media campaign.
Sec. 13. Drug interdiction.
Sec. 14. Awards for demonstration programs by local partnerships to shut down illicit drug market hot-spots by deterring drug dealers or altering the dynamic of drug sales.
Sec. 15. Awards for demonstration programs by local partnerships to coerce absti-nence in chronic hard-drug users under community supervision through the use of drug testing programs.
Sec. 16. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 17. Technical amendments and repeal.
Sec. 18. Requirement for disclosure of Federal sponsorship of all Federal advertis-
ing or other communication materials.
Sec. 19. Policy regarding to syringe exchange pro-

Sec. 2. AMENDMENT OF OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1998.

Sec. 6. Amendments relating to appointment
Sec. 5. Amendments relating to establishment of Office of National Drug Control Policy actions, sections, and provisions, the reference

Sec. 10. Funding for certain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas.
Sec. 11. Amendments relating to Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center.
Sec. 12. National youth antidrug media campaign.
Sec. 13. Drug interdiction.
Sec. 14. Awards for demonstration programs by local partnerships to shut down illicit drug market hot-spots by deterring drug dealers or altering the dynamic of drug sales.
Sec. 15. Awards for demonstration programs by local partnerships to coerce absti-nence in chronic hard-drug users under community supervision through the use of drug testing programs.
Sec. 16. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 17. Technical amendments and repeal.
Sec. 18. Requirement for disclosure of Federal sponsorship of all Federal advertis-
ing or other communication materials.
Sec. 19. Policy regarding to syringe exchange pro-

Sec. 2. AMENDMENT OF OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1998.

Sec. 6. Amendments relating to appointment
Sec. 5. Amendments relating to establishment of Office of National Drug Control Policy actions, sections, and provisions, the reference

Sec. 10. Funding for certain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas.
Sec. 11. Amendments relating to Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center.
Sec. 12. National youth antidrug media campaign.
Sec. 13. Drug interdiction.
Sec. 14. Awards for demonstration programs by local partnerships to shut down illicit drug market hot-spots by deterring drug dealers or altering the dynamic of drug sales.
Sec. 15. Awards for demonstration programs by local partnerships to coerce absti-nence in chronic hard-drug users under community supervision through the use of drug testing programs.
Sec. 16. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 17. Technical amendments and repeal.
Sec. 18. Requirement for disclosure of Federal sponsorship of all Federal advertis-
ing or other communication materials.
Sec. 19. Policy regarding to syringe exchange pro-

Sec. 2. AMENDMENT OF OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1998.

Sec. 6. Amendments relating to appointment
Sec. 5. Amendments relating to establishment of Office of National Drug Control Policy actions, sections, and provisions, the reference

Sec. 10. Funding for certain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas.
Sec. 11. Amendments relating to Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center.
Sec. 12. National youth antidrug media campaign.
Sec. 13. Drug interdiction.
Sec. 14. Awards for demonstration programs by local partnerships to shut down illicit drug market hot-spots by deterring drug dealers or altering the dynamic of drug sales.
Sec. 15. Awards for demonstration programs by local partnerships to coerce absti-nence in chronic hard-drug users under community supervision through the use of drug testing programs.
Sec. 16. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 17. Technical amendments and repeal.
Sec. 18. Requirement for disclosure of Federal sponsorship of all Federal advertis-
ing or other communication materials.
Sec. 19. Policy regarding to syringe exchange pro-

Sec. 2. AMENDMENT OF OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1998.

Sec. 6. Amendments relating to appointment
Sec. 5. Amendments relating to establishment of Office of National Drug Control Policy actions, sections, and provisions, the reference

Sec. 10. Funding for certain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas.
Sec. 11. Amendments relating to Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center.
Sec. 12. National youth antidrug media campaign.
Sec. 13. Drug interdiction.
Sec. 14. Awards for demonstration programs by local partnerships to shut down illicit drug market hot-spots by deterring drug dealers or altering the dynamic of drug sales.
Sec. 15. Awards for demonstration programs by local partnerships to coerce absti-nence in chronic hard-drug users under community supervision through the use of drug testing programs.
Sec. 16. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 17. Technical amendments and repeal.
Sec. 18. Requirement for disclosure of Federal sponsorship of all Federal advertis-
ing or other communication materials.
Health Services Administration and established in section 501(d)(16) of the Public Health Service Act by—

(ii) encouraging all National Drug Control Programs and Detectives to develop all appropriate and relevant information; and

(iii) supporting the dissemination of information to all interested entities; and

(ii) and add the following—

(16) shall coordinate with the private sector to promote private research and development of medications for treatment; and

(17) shall seek the support and commitment of State and local officials in the formulation and implementation of the National Drug Control Strategy and other relevant issues; and

(18) shall monitor and evaluate the allocation of resources among Federal law enforcement agencies in response to significant local and regional drug trafficking and production threats;

(19) shall submit an annual report to Congress detailing how the Office of National Drug Control Policy has consulted with and assisted State and local governments with respect to the formulation and implementation of the National Drug Control Strategy and other relevant issues; and

(20) shall, within one year after the date of the enactment of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005, report to the appropriate congressional committees on the impact of each Federal drug control strategy upon the availability, addiction rate, use rate, and other harms of illegal drugs;—

(c) Submittal of Drug Control Budget Requests.—Section 704(c)(1) is amended by adding at the end the following—

(3) CONTENT OF DRUG CONTROL BUDGET REQUESTS.—A drug control budget request submitted by a department, agency, or program under this paragraph shall include all requests for funds occurring during a period of enrollment for which the individual was receiving any Federal grant, loan, or work assistance that was re-

(4) in subparagraph (D)(iii), as so redesignated, by inserting “and the appropriate congressional committees” after “House of Repre-

(5) in subparagraph (E)(ii)(bb), as so redesignated, by inserting “and the appropriate congressional committees” after “House of Repre-

(d) Drug Control Budget Request.—Section 704(c)(2) is amended in sub-

(2) in subsection (h), by striking “and the emerging threat from opium poppy production” and inserting “and the threat from South American heroin, and in particular Colombian heroin and the emerging threat from opium poppy production”;

(3) in subparagraph (D), such as through leaflets adver-

(4) in paragraph (8)(D), by striking “have been authorized by Congress,” and inserting “authorized by Congress in the National Foreign Intelligence Program”;

(5) in paragraph (9)(B), by striking “and notifying the appropriate congressional committees of any fund control notice issued;”;


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

(i) 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 appropriate congressional committees, that—

(1) reviews the adequacy of information; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) specific requests.—The Director shall not con-

(i) requests funds for Federal law enforce-

(ii) for law enforcement activities on the borders of the United States that do not adequately direct resources to drug inter-

(iii) requests funding for drug treatment ac-

(iv) provides the Director’s assessment of whether each country identified under subparagraph (A) cooperated fully with the United States and made appropriate steps on its own to achieve full compliance with the goals and ob-

(b) provides the Director’s assessment of whether each country identified under subparagraph (A) cooperated fully with the United States and made appropriate steps on its own to achieve full compliance with the goals and ob-

(c) provides the Director’s assessment of whether application of procedures set forth in section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291), as provided in section 706 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291f-1), is warranted with respect to countries the Director assesses have not cooperated fully.);

(d) by inserting a comma before “and Tac-

(e) Technical Amendments.—Section 704(21 U.S.C. 1703) is amended—

(1) in subsection (p)—

(A) by striking “National Foreign Intelligence Program” and inserting “National Intelligence Program”; and

(B) by inserting a comma before “and Tac-


(g) Reprogramming and Transfer Requests.—Section 704(c)(4)(A) (21 U.S.C. 1703(c)(4)(A)) is amended by striking “$5,000,000” and inserting “$1,000,000”;

(h) Powers of Director.—Section 704(d) (21 U.S.C. 1703(d)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (8)(D), by striking “have been authorized by Congress,” and inserting “authorized by Congress”;


(k) Technical Amendments.—Section 704(21 U.S.C. 1703) is amended—

(l) Technical Amendments.—Section 704(21 U.S.C. 1703) is amended—

(1) in subsection (q)—

(A) by striking “National Foreign Intelligence Program” and inserting “National Intelligence Program”; and

(B) by inserting a comma before “and Tac-

(c) submission requirements set forth in subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) of this subsection;

(d) Review and Certification of National Drug Control Program.—Section 704(c)(3) (21 U.S.C. 1703(c)(3)) is amended—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively;

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) specific requests.—The Director shall not con-

(i) requests funds for Federal law enforce-

(ii) for law enforcement activities on the borders of the United States that do not adequately direct resources to drug inter-

(iii) requests funding for drug treatment ac-

(iv) provides the Director’s assessment of whether application of procedures set forth in section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291), as provided in section 706 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291f-1), is warranted with respect to countries the Director assesses have not cooperated fully.);—

(2) in subsection (h), by striking “Director of Central Intelligence” and inserting “Director of National Intelligence or the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency”;

(3) in subparagraph (D), such as through leaflets adver-

(4) in paragraph (9)(B), by striking “and notifying the appropriate congressional committees of any fund control notice issued;”;


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

“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 threat from South American heroin and in particular Colombian heroin and the emerging threat from opium poppy production and the threat from Colombia for processing into heroin, coca, or other illicit drug production or trafficking;

(7) reports to inform and involve local citizens in prevention programs described in subparagraph (A) (through D), such as through leaflets advertising warnings for information;

(8) provisions that ensure the maintenance at current levels of efforts to eradicate coca in Col-

(9) assessment of the specific level of funding and resources necessary to successfully address the threat from South American heroin and the threat from Colombian and Peruvian coca;

(10) treatment of classified or law enforce-

(11) content of the strategy that involves information classified under criteria established by an Execu-

(12) to the Congress a comprehensive strategy that addresses the increased threat from Afghan heroin.”
The strategy shall include—
(A) opium crop eradication efforts to eliminate the problem at the source to prevent heroin from entering the stream of commerce;
(B) efforts to ensure direct elimination of stockpiles of heroin and raw opium, and heroin production and storage facilities;
(C) interdiction and precursor chemical controls;
(D) demand reduction and treatment;
(E) alternative development programs;
(F) efforts to ensure cooperation and coordination between Federal Government agencies, and between such agencies, agencies of foreign governments and international organizations with responsibility for the prevention of heroin production in, or trafficking out of, Afghanistan; and
(G) assessment of the specific level of funding and resources necessary significantly to reduce the production and trafficking of heroin.

(3) TREATMENT OF CLASSIFIED OR LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION.—Any content of the strategy that involves information classified under criteria established by an Executive order, or whose public disclosure, as determined by the Director or the head of any relevant Federal agency, would be detrimental to the law enforcement or national security activities of any Federal, foreign, or international agency, shall be submitted to Congress separately from the rest of the strategy.

(k) REQUIREMENT FOR GENERAL COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE PLAN.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and not later than every two years thereafter, the Director of the Office of National Intelligence, or the head of any relevant National Drug Control Program agency, would be required to present to Congress a complete and thorough scientific peer review of the strategy that involves information classified under criteria established by an Executive order, or whose public disclosure, as determined by the Director or the head of any relevant National Drug Control Program agency, would be detrimental to the law enforcement or national security activities of any Federal, State, or local agency, shall be submitted to Congress separately from the rest of the strategy.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the plan under paragraph (1) is to ensure that the strategic assessment of the centers and activities referred to in that paragraph in achieving the objectives of the National Drug Control Strategy promulgated under 21 U.S.C. 1705. In order to maximize such effectiveness, the strategy—
(A) articulate clear and specific mission statements (including purpose and scope of activities) for each counterdrug intelligence center, system, and activity, including the manner in which responsibility for counterdrug intelligence activities will be allocated among the counterdrug intelligence centers and systems;
(B) specify each government agency (whether Federal, State, or local) that participates in each such center, system, and activity, including a description of the extent and nature of that participation;
(C) specify the relationship between such centers, systems, and activities;
(D) specify the means by which proper oversight of such centers, systems, and activities will be assured;
(E) specify the means by which counterdrug intelligence and information will be forwarded effectively to all levels of officials responsible for United States counterdrug policy; and
(F) specify measures to ensure that State and local law enforcement agencies are apprised of counterdrug intelligence and information acquired by Federal law enforcement agencies in a manner which—
(i) facilitates effective counterdrug activities by State and local law enforcement agencies; and
(ii) provides such State and local law enforcement agencies with the information relating to the safety of officials involved in their counterdrug activities.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subsection—
(A) the term ‘‘center’’ refers to any center, office, task force, or other coordinating organization engaged in counterdrug intelligence or information analyzing or sharing activities;
(B) the term ‘‘system’’ refers to any computerized database or other electronic system used for counterdrug intelligence or information analyzing or sharing activities; and
(C) the term ‘‘approplicable congressional committees’’ means the following:

(i) The Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Caucus on International Narcotics Control, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(ii) The Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Government Reform, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(4) LIMITATION.—The general counterdrug intelligence plan shall not—
(A) change existing agency authorities or the laws governing interagency relationships, but may include recommendations about changes to such authorities or laws; or
(B) include any information about specific methods of such intelligence gathering or information, or any information about specific individuals, cases, investigations, or operations.

(5) CLASSIFIED OR LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION.—Any content of the general counterdrug intelligence plan that involves information classified under criteria established by an Executive order, or whose public disclosure, as determined by the Director of the Office of National Intelligence, or the head of any relevant National Drug Control Program agency, would be detrimental to the law enforcement or national security activities of any Federal, State, or local agency, shall be submitted to Congress separately from the rest of the strategy.

(m) REQUIREMENT FOR SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF ILLEGITIMATE ILICIT DRUG CIRCULATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress a report that includes a plan to conduct, on an expedited basis, a scientific study of the use of mycrocobia as a means of illicit drug crop elimination by an appropriate Committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Caucus on International Narcotics Control, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

(5) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director shall present a copy of the Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy to the appropriate congressional committees (as defined in section 702 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1701)), and to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

(E) TREATMENT OF CLASSIFIED OR LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION.—Any content of the Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy that involves information classified under criteria established by an Executive order, or whose public disclosure, as determined by the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Program agency, would be detrimental to the law enforcement or national security activities of any Federal, State, or local agency, shall be submitted to Congress separately from the rest of the strategy.

SECTION 7. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.

Amendments (21 U.S.C. 1704) is amended—
(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking ‘‘abuse’’;
(2) in subsection (a)(2)(A), by striking ‘‘Director of Central Intelligence’’ and inserting ‘‘Director of National Intelligence’’;
(3) in subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking ‘‘Director of Central Intelligence’’ and inserting ‘‘Director of National Intelligence and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency’’;
(4) by amending paragraph (1) of subsection (a) to read as follows:

(1) REQUIRED REPORTS.—
(A) SECRETS OF THE INTERIOR AND AGRICULTURE.—The Secretary of the Interior and Agriculture shall, by July 1 of each year, jointly submit to the President, the appropriate congressional committees, the Committee on Agriculture, and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, a report that includes a plan to conduct controlled scientific testing in a major drug producing nation of mycrocobia naturally existing in the producing nation.

SEC. 8. AMENDMENTS TO PROVIDE COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.
Director and the appropriate congressional committees information for the preceding year regarding the number and type of—

(i) arrests for drug violations;

(ii) convictions for drug violations by United States Attorneys; and

(iii) seizures of drugs by each component of the Department of Homeland Security and the Attorney General on its behalf, 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, the appropriate congressional committees, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report on the Department of Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, information for the preceding year regarding—

(i) the number and type of seizures of drugs by each component of the Department of Homeland Security 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 that Department primarily dedicated to drug supply reduction missions.

(D) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall, by July 1 of each year, submit to the appropriate congressional committees, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, a report on drug enforcement, including—

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

(5) in subsection (b)(2)(B), by striking “Program,” and inserting “Strategy,”; and

(6) in subsection (c), by striking “in” and inserting “on.”

SEC. 8. DEVELOPMENT, SUBMISSION, IMPLEMENTATION, AND ASSESSMENT OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY.

Section 706 (21 U.S.C. 1705) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 706. DEVELOPMENT, SUBMISSION, IMPLEMENTATION, AND ASSESSMENT OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY.

(a) Timelines and Contents, and Process for Development and Submission of National Drug Control Strategy.—

(I) In general.—Not later than February 1 of each year, the President shall submit to Congress a National Drug Control Strategy, which shall set forth a comprehensive plan for reducing illicit drug use and the consequences of illicit drug use in the United States by meeting the demand for illegal drugs, limiting the availability of illegal drugs, and conducting law enforcement activities with respect to illegal drugs.

(ii) The National Drug Control Strategy shall include the following:

(I) A general review of the status of, and trends in, international, State, and local drug control activities to ensure that the United States pursues well-coordinated and effective drug control activities at each level to counter the flow of drugs and the proceeds of drug violence at home and abroad.

(II) A general review of the status, of and trends in, demand reduction activities by private sector entities and non-profit organizations, including faith-based organizations, to determine their effectiveness and the extent of cooperation, coordination, and mutual support between such entities and organizations and Federal, State, and local government agencies.

(iii) An assessment of current illicit drug use (including inhalants and steroids) and availability, which assessment shall include—

(A) the quantities of cocaine, heroin, marijuana, methamphetamine, ecstasy, and other drugs available for consumption in the United States;

(B) the amount of marijuana, cocaine, heroin, methamphetamine, ecstasy and other chemicals and other drugs entering the United States;

(C) the number of illicit drugs manufactured in the United States;

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

(E) the number of metric tons of marijuana, heroin, cocaine, and methamphetamine seized and destroyed;

(F) changes in the price and purity of heroin, methamphetamine, and cocaine, changes in the price of ecstasy, and changes in tetrahydrocannabinol level of marijuana and other drugs; and

(G) an assessment of the reduction of illicit drug availability, as measured by—

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

(ii) the number of illicit drug users on place on hospital emergency departments in the United States, as the quantity of illicit drug-related services provided;

(iii) the annual national health care cost of illicit drug use; and

(iv) the extent of illicit drug-related crime and criminal justice system expenditures.

(ii) The National Drug Control Strategy shall include—

(I) a general review of the status of, and trends in, of drug treatment in the United States, by assessing—

(A) the number of persons in treatment;

(B) public and private treatment utilization; and

(C) the number of illicit drug users the Director estimates meet diagnostic criteria for treatment.

(ii) A review of the research agenda of the Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center to reduce the availability and abuse of drugs.

(ii) A summary of the efforts made by Federal agencies to coordinate with private sector entities to conduct surveys of research and development of medications to treat addiction by—

(I) screening chemicals for potential therapeutic value;

(ii) developing promising compounds;

(iii) conducting clinical trials;

(iv) seeking, where appropriate, Food and Drug Administration approval for drugs to treat addiction;

(v) marketing, where appropriate, the drug for the treatment of addiction;

(vi) urging physicians, where appropriate, to use the drug in the treatment of addiction; and

(vii) encouraging, where appropriate, insurance companies to reimburse the cost of the drug for the treatment of addiction.

(iii) recommendations for the Secretary of Health and Human Services on research that supports or advances the National Drug Control Strategy.

(B) COMMITMENT TO SUPPORT STRATEGY.—In satisfying the requirements of subparagraph (A)(iv), the Director shall ensure, to the maximum extent possible, that State and local officials and relevant private organizations commit to support and take steps to achieve the goals and objectives of the National Drug Control Strategy.

(C) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Recommendations under subparagraph (A)(iv) may include recommendations of Federal, State, and local governments, as well as recommendations of the National Institutes of Health, the National Institute on Drug Abuse, or any other appropriate agency within the Department of Health and Human Services.

(D) INCLUSION IN STRATEGY.—The National Drug Control Strategy under this subsection
shall include a list of each entity consulted under subparagraph (A)(i).

“(4) SUBMISSION OF REVISED STRATEGY.—The President may submit to Congress a revised National Drug Control Strategy that meets the requirements of this section—

“(A) at any time, upon a determination by the President, in consultation with the Director, that the National Drug Control 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, as part of the National Drug Control Strategy, a description of a national drug control performance measurement system that—

“(1) develops 2-year and 5-year performance measurement targets for each National Drug Control Strategy goal and objective established for reducing drug use, drug availability, and the consequences of drug use;

“(2) describes the sources of information and data that will be used for each performance measurement incorporated into the performance measurement system;

“(3) identifies major programs and activities of the National Drug Control Program agencies that support the goals and annual objectives of the National Drug Control Strategy;

“(4) describes the distribution of demand reduction and supply reduction activities implemented by each National Drug Control Program agency in support of the National Drug Control Strategy;

“(5) monitors consistency of drug-related goals and objectives among the National Drug Control Program agencies and ensures that each agency’s goals, objectives, and budgets support and are fully consistent with the National Drug Control Strategy; and

“(6) coordinates the development and implementation of national drug control data collection and reporting systems to support policy formulation and performance measurement, including an assessment of—

“(A) the quality of current drug use measurement instruments and techniques to measure supply reduction and demand reduction activities;

“(B) the adequacy of the coverage of existing national drug use measurement instruments and techniques to measure the illicit drug user population and groups that are at risk for illicit drug use; and

“(C) the adequacy of the coverage of existing national drug control data collection programs to measure the effectiveness of drug abuse treatment in reducing illicit drug use and criminal behavior during and after the completion of substance abuse treatment.

“(7) identifies the actions the Director shall take to correct any inadequacies, deficiencies, or limitations identified in the assessment described in paragraph (a).

(c) MODIFICATIONS.—A description of any modifications made during the preceding year to the national drug performance measurement system shall be included in each report submitted under subsection (a)."

SEC. 9. HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS PROGRAM.

Section 707 (21 U.S.C. 1706) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 707. HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS PROGRAM.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—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’).

“(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Program is to reduce drug trafficking and drug production in the United States by

“(A) facilitating cooperation among Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to share information and implement coordinated enforcement activities;

“(B) enhancing intelligence sharing among Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies;

“(C) providing reliable intelligence to law enforcement agencies needed to design effective enforcement strategies and to implement coordinated law enforcement strategies which maximize use of available resources to reduce the supply of illegal drugs in designated areas and in the United States as a whole.

“(D) coordination of Federal, State, and local law enforcement and other government agencies in support of the National Drug Control Strategy goal and objective established by the Director for reducing drug use, drug availability, and the consequences of drug use;

“(E) performing drug production, manufacturing, importation, and other activities related to drug trafficking.

“(F) factors for consideration.

“(G) appropriations.

“(H) high intensity drug trafficking area or expand an existing high intensity drug trafficking area.

“(I) research and development.

“(J) emerging threat response fund.

“(2) ANNUAL HIDTA PROGRAM BUDGET SUBMISSION.—As part of the budget submission that supports the President’s annual budget request for the Office, the Director shall submit to Congress a budget justification that includes the following:

“(A) the amount requested for each high intensity drug trafficking area with supporting narrative descriptions and rationale for each request.

“(B) a detailed justification for each funding request that explains the reasons for the requested funding level, how such funding level would be used to address the threat of drug trafficking in each area, and how such funding will ensure that the goals and objectives of each such area will be achieved, and how such funding supports the National Drug Control Strategy.

“(3) BOARD REPRESENTATION.—None of the funds appropriated under this section may be expended for any high intensity drug trafficking area, or for a partnership or region of a high intensity drug trafficking area, or a region or partner’s Executive Board does not apportion an equal number of votes between representatives of participating Federal agencies and State and local agencies.

“(4) NO AGENCY RELATIONSHIP.—The eligibility requirements of this section are intended to ensure the responsible use of Federal funds. Nothing in this section is intended to create an agency relationship between individual high intensity drug trafficking areas and the Federal Government.

“(5) USE OF FUNDS.—The Director shall ensure that no Federal funds appropriated for the Program are expended for the establishment or expansion of drug treatment programs and shall ensure that not more than five percent of the Federal funds appropriated for the Program are expended for the establishment of drug prevention programs.

“(6) COUNTERTERROISM ACTIVITIES.—(A) Assistance Authorized.—The Director may use or authorize the use of the Program to assist Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies in investigations and activities related to terrorism and prevention of terrorism, except where such investigations and activities are also related to drug trafficking.

“(B) Limitation.—The Director shall ensure that assistance provided under paragraph (a) that assistance provided under paragraph (a) remains incidental to the purpose of the Program to reduce drug availability and carry out drug-related law enforcement activities.

“(7) REPORTS.—The Director shall annually report to Congress on the expenditures of the Program.

“(8) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Director shall ensure that not more than five percent of the funds appropriated under this section may be apportioned in one Executive Board in any given fiscal year for purposes of information sharing, except that an Executive Board may petition for designation of an Executive Board to receive information on national and international drug trafficking in accordance with the criteria established under paragraph (a).
(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be entitled the “Dawson Family Community Protection Act”.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following: 

(1) In the early morning hours of October 16, 2002, the home of Carolyn 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 five children, aged 9 to 14.

(3) The horrific murder of the Dawson family is dark example of drug-related violence.

(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 drug trafficking organizations and their affiliates.

(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 neighbors, and neighbors who refuse offers of relocation by local, State, and Federal prosecutorial agencies, the lack of, and because, moreover, the continued presence of strong individuals and families is critical to preventing and strengthening the social fabric in such communities.

(8) Where (as in certain 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 that supplementary High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program funds be committed to support other efforts at making the affected communities safe for the residents of those communities and encouraging their cooperation with local, State, and Federal law enforcement efforts to combat illegal drug trafficking.

(c) FUNDING FOR CERTAIN HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS.—Section 707 (21 U.S.C. 1706) as amended by this section—

(1) $280,000,000 for fiscal year 2007;

(2) $290,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009;

(3) $300,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2010 and 2011.”.

SEC. 10. FUNDING FOR CERTAIN HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be entitled the “Dawson Family Community Protection Act”.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following: 

(1) A UTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS. 

(2) R EQUIRED USES .

(3) SEC. 10. FUNDING FOR CERTAIN HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS.
amended to read as follows:

SEC. 11. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COUNTER-DRUG RELATED ACTIVITIES.

(a) CHIEF SCIENTIST.—Section 708(b) (21 U.S.C. 1707(b)) is amended—
(1) in the heading by striking “Director of Technology” and inserting “Chief Scientist.”; and
(2) by striking “Director of Technology,” and inserting “Chief Scientist.”;

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

“(a) 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 surveil lance, tracking, and radar imaging;
(ii) electronic support measures;
(iii) communication techniques;
(iv) data fusion, advanced computer systems, and artificial intelligence; and
(v) chemical, biological, radiological (including neutron, electron, and graviton), and other means of detection;

(B) identify demand reduction (including drug prevention) basic and applied research needs and consultation with affected National Drug Control Program agencies, including—
(i) improving treatment through neuroscientific advances;
(ii) improving the transfer of biomedical research to the clinical setting; and
(iii) in consultation with the National Institute on Drug Abuse and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and through interagency agreements or grants, examining addiction and rehabilitation research and the application of technology to expanding addiction and rehabilitation research, and the application of technology to treating drug abuse among young people in the United States;

(C) make a priority ranking of such needs, identified in paragraphs (A) and (B) according to fiscal and technological feasibility, as part of a National Counterdrug Research and Development Program;

(D) oversee and coordinate counterdrug technology initiatives with related activities of other Federal civilian and military departments;

(E) provide support to the development and implementation of the national drug control performance measurement system established under subsection (b) of section 706;

(F) with the advice and counsel of experts from State and local law enforcement agencies, oversee and coordinate a technology transfer program for the transfer of technology to State and local law enforcement agencies; and

(G) pursuant to the authority of the Director of National Drug Control Policy under section 704, submit requests to Congress for the reprogramming or transfer of funds appropriated for counterdrug technology research and development.

(2) PRIORITIES IN TRANSFERRING TECHNOLOGY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chief Scientist shall give priority, in transferring technology under paragraph (1)(F), based on the following criteria:

(i) the need of potential recipients for such technology;

(ii) the effectiveness of the technology to enhance current counterdrug activities of potential recipients;

(iii) the ability and willingness of potential recipients and other Federal civilian and military departments; and

(B) INTERDICATION AND BORDER DRUG ENFORCEMENT TECHNOLOGIES.—The Chief Scientist shall give priority, in transferring technologies most appropriate for interdiction and border drug law enforcement, to State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies in south- border states and adjoining areas with significant traffic in illicit drugs.

(3) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.—The authority granted to the Director under this subsection shall be limited to the management of individual projects or other operational activities.

(4) REPORT.—On or before July 1 of each year, the Director shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that addresses the following:

(A) The number of requests received during the previous 12 months, including the identity of each requesting agency and the type of technology requested.

(B) The number of requests fulfilled during the previous 12 months, including the identity of each recipient agency and the type of technology transferred.

(C) A summary of the criteria used in making the determination on what requests were funded and what were not funded, except that such summary shall not include specific information on any individual requests.

(D) A general assessment of the future needs of the programs and changes and trends in the technology, threats, expected technologies, and likely need from potential recipients.

(E) An assessment of the effectiveness of the technologies transferred, based in part on the evaluations provided by the recipients, with a recommendation whether the technology should continue to be transferred in a program.

(F) ASSISTANCE FROM SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—Section 708(d) (21 U.S.C. 1707(d)) is amended by inserting “, the Secretary of Homeland Security,” after “The Secretary of Defense”.

SEC. 12. NATIONAL YOUTH ANTIDRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 709 (21 U.S.C. 1708) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 709. NATIONAL YOUTH ANTIDRUG MEDIA CAMPAIGN.

(a) In General.—The Director shall conduct a national youth anti-drug media campaign (referred to in this subtitle as the ‘national media campaign’) in accordance with this section for the purposes of—

(1) presenting drug abuse among young people in the United States;

(2) increasing awareness of adults of the impact of drug abuse on young people; and

(3) encouraging parents and other interested adults to discuss with young people the dangers of illegal drug use.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts made available to carry out this section for the national media campaign may only be used for the following:

(A) The purchase of media time and space, including the strategic planning for, and accounting of, such purchases.

(B) Creative and talent costs, consistent with paragraph (2)(B).

(C) Advertising production costs.

(D) Testing and evaluation of advertising.

(E) Evaluation of the effectiveness of the national media campaign.

(F) The negotiated fees for the winning bidder on requests for proposals issued either by the Office or its designee to enter into contracts to carry out activities authorized by this section.

(G) Partnerships with professional and civic groups, community-based organizations, included faith-based organizations, and government organizations related to the national media campaign.

(H) Entertainment industry outreach, interactive outreach, media projects and activities, public information, news media outreach, and corporate sponsorship and participation.

(I) Operational and administrative expenses.

(2) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) CREATIVE SERVICES.—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 (including creative services provided by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America) wherever feasible and may only procure creative services for advertising—

(I) responding to high-priority or emergent campaign needs that cannot timely be obtained at no cost; or

(II) intended to reach a minority, ethnic, or other special audience that cannot reasonably be reached at no cost;

(III) the Director determines that the Partnership for a Drug-Free America is unable to provide, pursuant to subsection (d)(2)(B).

(ii) No more than $2,500,000 may be expended under this section each fiscal year on creative services, except that the Director may expend up to $2,000,000 in a fiscal year on creative services for campaign needs that cannot timely be obtained at no cost with advance approval from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate upon a showing that circumstances so require such urgent needs of the national media campaign.

(B) TESTING AND EVALUATION OF ADVERTISING.—In using amounts for advertising production costs, evaluation of advertising under paragraph (1)(D), the Director shall test all advertisements prior to use in the national media campaign to ensure that the advertisements are effective and meet industry-accepted standards. The Director may waive this requirement for advertisements using no more than 10 percent of the purchase of advertising time purchased in a fiscal year and no more than 10 percent of the advertising space purchased under this section in a fiscal year, if the advertisements respond to emergent and time-sensitive campaign needs or the advertisements will not be widely utilized in the national media campaign.

(C) EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF MEDIA CAMPAIGN.—In using amounts for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the national media campaign under paragraph (1)(E), the Director shall designate an independent entity to evaluate annually the effectiveness of the national media campaign based on data from—

(I) 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; and

(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

(III) ensure that the effectiveness of the national media campaign is evaluated in a manner that enables consideration of whether the national media campaign has contributed to reduction of illicit drug use among youth and such other measures of evaluation 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 national media campaign, subject to the following exceptions:

(A) In any fiscal year for which less than $125,000,000 is appropriated for the national media campaign, not less than 82 percent of the amounts appropriated under this section shall be used for the purchase of advertising time and space for the national media campaign.
“(B) In any fiscal year for which more than $195,000,000 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 national media campaign.

“(c) ADVERTISING.—In carrying out this section, the Director shall ensure that sufficient funds are appropriated to meet the stated goals of the national media campaign.

“(d) DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES AND FUNCTIONS.—

“(1) In general.—The Director, in consultation with the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, shall determine the overall purposes and strategy of the national media campaign.

“(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—

“(A) DIRECTOR.—The Director shall be responsible for implementing a focused national media campaign with the purposes set forth in subsection (a), and shall approve—

“(i) the strategy of the national media campaign;

“(ii) all advertising and promotional material used in the national media campaign; and

“(iii) the plan for the purchase of advertising time and space for the national media campaign.

“(B) THE PARTNERSHIP FOR A DRUG-FREE AMERICA.—The Director shall request that the Partnership for a Drug-Free America—

“(i) develop strategies to achieve the goals of the national media campaign, including addressing national and local drug threats in specific regions or States, such as methamphetamine and ecstasy;

“(ii) create advertising to be used in the national media campaign, except advertisements that are—

“(A) provided by other nonprofit entities pursuant to subsection (f);

“(B) intended to respond to high-priority or emerging drug threats that cannot timely be obtained at no cost (not including production costs and talent reuse payments), provided that any such advertising material is reviewed by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America;

“(C) intended to reach a majority, ethnic, or other special audience that cannot be obtained at no cost (not including production costs and talent reuse payments), provided that any such advertising material is reviewed by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America; or

“(IV) any other advertisements that the Director determines that the Partnership for a Drug-Free America is unable to provide.

“(C) MEDIA BUYING CONTRACTOR.—The Director shall enter into a contract with a media buying contractor to plan and purchase advertising time and space for the national media campaign. The media buying contractor shall not provide any other service or material, or conduct any other function or activity which the Director determines should be provided by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America; or

“(IV) any other advertisements that the Director determines that the Partnership for a Drug-Free America is unable to provide.

“(e) PROHIBITIONS.—None of the amounts made available under subsection (b) may be obligated or expended for any of the following:

“(1) To supplant current antidrug community-based programs.

“(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, clearly identified ballot initiative, or clearly identified legislature or regulatory proposal.

“(4) To fund advertising that features any elected officials, persons seeking elected office, cabinet level officials, or other Federal officials employed pursuant to section 231 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.

“(f) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) In general.—No amount made available under subsection (b) for media time and space shall be matched by an equal amount of non-Federal funds for the national 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 at least 85 percent of no-cost match advertising provided directly relates to substance abuse prevention consistent with the specific purposes of the national media campaign.

“(g) FINANCIAL AND PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY.—The Director shall cause to be performed—

“(1) audits and reviews of costs of the national media campaign pursuant to section 304C of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254d); and

“(2) an audit to determine whether the costs of the national media campaign are allowable under section 306 of such Act (41 U.S.C. 256).

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

“(1) the strategy of the national media campaign and whether specific objectives of the media campaign were accomplished;

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

“(3) plans for purchasing advertising time and space;

“(4) policies and practices implemented to ensure that Federal funds are used responsibly to purchase such advertisements that cannot timely be obtained at no cost (not including production costs and talent reuse payments), provided that any such advertising material is reviewed by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America; or

“(IV) any other advertising that the Director determines that the Partnership for a Drug-Free America is unable to provide.

“(i) LOCAL TARGET REQUIREMENT.—The Director shall, to the maximum extent feasible, use advertising for each National Drug Control Program to link national media that focuses on, or includes specific information on, prevention or treatment resources for consumers within specific local areas.

“(j) PREVENTION AND 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 grown marijuana, are significantly higher than in the past, rising from under 1 percent 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 annual trip of one year drive while under the influence of illegal drugs, including marijuana.

“(G) Marijuana smoke contains 30 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 suggesting that trade in illegal marijuana products is linked to criminal organizations in hard drugs, including heroin.

“(j) Federal law enforcement agencies have identified possible links between trade in cannabis products and financing for terrorist organizations.

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

“(l) RELATIONSHIP OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“The Congress finds the following:

“(1) I n general.—Subsections (a) and (b) of section 711 (21 U.S.C. 1710) are amended to read as follows:

“(a) UNITED STATES INTERDICTION COORDINATOR.—

“(1) In general.—The Deputy Director for Supply Reduction in the Office shall serve as the United States Interdiction Coordinator, and shall perform the duties of that position described in paragraph (2) and such other duties as may be determined by the Director with respect to coordination of efforts to interdict illicit drugs from entering the United States.

“(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The United States Interdiction Coordinator shall be responsible to the Director for—

“(A) coordinating the interdiction activities of the National Drug Control Program agencies to ensure consistency with the National Drug Control Strategy;

“(B) on behalf of the Director, developing and issuing, on or before March 1 of each year and in accordance with paragraph (3), a National Interdiction Command and Control Plan to ensure the coordination and consistency described in subparagraph (A);

“(C) assessing the sufficiency of assets committed to illicit drug interdiction by the relevant National Drug Control Program agencies; and

“(D) advising the Director on the efforts of each National Drug Control Program agency to implement the National Interdiction Command and Control Plan.

“(2) STAFF.—The Director shall assign such permanent staff of the Office as he considers appropriate to assist the United States Interdiction Coordinator to carry out the responsibilities described in paragraph (2) and, may also, at his discretion, request that appropriate National Drug Control Program agencies detail or assign staff to the Office of Supply Reduction for that purpose.

“(4) NATIONAL INTERDICTION COMMAND AND CONTROL PLAN.—

“(A) PURPOSES.—The National Interdiction Command and Control Plan shall—

“(i) set forth the Government’s strategy for drug interdiction;

“(ii) state the specific roles and responsibilities of the relevant National Drug Control Program agencies for implementing that strategy; and

“(iii) identify the specific resources required to enable the relevant National Drug Control Program agencies to implement that strategy.

“(B) CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—The United States Interdiction Coordinator
shall issue the National Interdiction Command and Control Plan in consultation with the other members of the Interdiction Committee described in subsection (b).

"(C) The Deputy Director for the National Interdiction Command and Control Plan shall not change existing agency authorities or the laws governing interagency relationships, but may include recommendations about changes to such authorities or laws.

"(D) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—On or before March 1 of each year, the United States Interdiction Coordinator shall provide a report on behalf of the Director to the appropriate congressional committees, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, which shall include—

"(i) a copy of that year's National Interdiction Command and Control Plan;

"(ii) information for the previous 10 years regarding the number and type of seizures of drugs by each National Drug Control Program agency conducting drug interdiction activities, as well as statistical information on the geographic areas in which such patrol hours took place.

"(E) TREATMENT OF CLASSIFIED OR LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION.—Any content of the report described in subparagraph (D) that involves information classified under criteria established by an Executive order, or whose disclosure, by determination by the Director, the chairman, or any member, would be detrimental to the law enforcement or national security activities of any Federal, State, or local agency, shall be presented to Congress separately from the rest of the report.

"SEC. 713. AWARDS FOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS BY LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS TO SHUT DOWN ILLICIT DRUG MARKET HOT-SPOTS BY DETERRING DRUG DEALERS OR ALTERING THE DYNAMIC OF DRUG SALES.

Sections 713 and 714 (21 U.S.C. 1711) are redesignated as sections 715 and 716, respectively, and after section 712 (21 U.S.C. 1710) insert the following new section:

"SEC. 713. AWARDS FOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS BY LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS TO SHUT DOWN ILLICIT DRUG MARKET HOT-SPOTS BY DETERRING DRUG DEALERS OR ALTERING THE DYNAMIC OF DRUG SALES.

(a) AWARDS REQUIRED.—The Director shall make competitive awards for demonstration programs by eligible partnerships for the purpose of shutting down local illicit drug market hot-spots and reducing drug-related crime through evidence-based, strategic problem-solving interventions that deter drug dealers or alter the dynamic of drug sales.

(b) USE OF AWARD AMOUNTS.—Award amounts received under this section shall be used—

"(1) to support the efforts of the agencies, organizations, and researchers included in the eligible partnership;

"(2) to develop and field a directed and credible deterrence threat; and

"(3) to strengthen rehabilitation efforts through such means as job training, drug treatment, or other services.

"(c) ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIP DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'eligible partnership' means a working group whose application to the Director—

"(1) identifies the roles played, and certifies the involvement of, two or more agencies or organizations that may include—

"(A) State or local agencies (such as those carrying out police, probation, prosecution, courts, corrections, parole, or treatment functions);

"(B) Federal agencies (such as the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, and United States Attorney offices); and

"(C) community-based organizations;

"(2) includes a plan for identifying the impact players in, and assessing the nature and dynamics of, the local drug market and its related crimes through information gathering and analysis;

"(3) includes a plan for developing an evidence-based strategic intervention aimed at quickly and sustainably eradicating the local drug market by deterring drug dealers or altering the dynamic of drug sales; and

"(4) includes a plan that describes the methodology and outcome measures proposed for evaluating the impact of that strategic intervention on drug sales, neighborhood disorder, and crime.

"(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

"(1) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than June 1, 2009, the Director shall submit to Congress a report that identifies the best practices in drug market eradication, including the best practices identified through the activities funded under this section.

"(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than June 1, 2010, the Director shall submit to Congress a report on the demonstration programs funded under this section, including on the matters specified in paragraph (1).

"(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS. This authorization is to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2009.

"SEC. 15. AWARDS FOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS BY LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS TO COERCER ABSTINENCE IN CHRONIC HARD-DRUG USERS UNDER COMMUNITY SUPERVISION THROUGH THE USE OF DRUG TESTING AND SANCTIONS.

After section 713, as inserted by section 14 of this Act, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 714. AWARDS FOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS BY LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS TO COERCER ABSTINENCE IN CHRONIC HARD-DRUG USERS UNDER COMMUNITY SUPERVISION THROUGH THE USE OF DRUG TESTING AND SANCTIONS.

(a) AWARDS REQUIRED.—The Director shall make competitive awards to fund demonstration programs by eligible partnerships for the purpose of reducing the use of illicit drugs by chronic hard-drug users living in the community under criminal justice system supervision.

(b) USE OF AWARD AMOUNTS.—Award amounts received under this section shall be used—

"(1) to support the efforts of the agencies, organizations, and researchers included in the eligible partnership;

"(2) to develop and field a drug testing and graduated sanctions program for chronic hard-drug users living in the community under criminal justice system supervision; and

"(3) to assist individuals described in subsection (a) by strengthening rehabilitation efforts through such means as job training, drug treatment, or other services.

"(c) ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIP DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'eligible partnership' means a working group whose application to the Director—

"(1) identifies the roles played, and certifies the involvement of, two or more agencies or organizations that may include—

"(A) State or local agencies (such as those carrying out police, probation, prosecution, courts, corrections, parole, or treatment functions);

"(B) Federal agencies (such as the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, and United States Attorney offices); and
“(C) community-based organizations; 
“(2) includes a qualified researcher; 
“(3) includes a plan for using judicial or other criminal justice authority to administer drug tests to and to describe in the plan described in subsection (a) at least twice a week, and to swiftly and certainly impose a known set of graduated sanctions for non-compliance with community-release provisions related to substance abuse (whether imposed as a pre-trial, probation, or parole condition or otherwise); 
“(4) includes a strategy for responding to a range of substance use and abuse problems and a range of criminal histories; 
“(5) includes a plan for integrating data infrastructure among the agencies and organizations with a suitable partnership to enable seamless, real-time tracking of individuals described in subsection (a); 
“(6) includes a plan to monitor and measure the progress toward reducing the percentage of the population of individuals described in subsection (a) who, upon being summoned for a drug test, either fail to show up or who test positive for drugs. 

“(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.— 
“(1) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than June 1, 2009, the Director shall submit to Congress a report that describes the best practices in reducing the use of illicit drugs by chronic hard-drug users, including the best practices identified through the activities funded under this section. 
“(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than June 1, 2010, the Director shall submit to Congress a report on the demonstration programs funded under this section, including on the matters specified in paragraph (1). 

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.— There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011. 

“SEC. 17. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS AND REPEAL. 

(a) AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO REPLACE OBSOLETE REFERENCES.—Section 451(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 245l(c)) is amended— 


(b) REPEAL OF SPECIAL FORFEITURE FUND.—Section 6073 of the Asset Forfeiture Amendments Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1509) is repealed. 

“SEC. 18. REQUIREMENT FOR DISCLOSURE OF FEDERAL SPONSORSHIP OF ALL FEDERAL ADVERTISING OR OTHER COMMUNICATION MATERIALS. 

Section 712 is amended to read as follows: 

“SEC. 715. REQUIREMENT FOR DISCLOSURE OF FEDERAL SPONSORSHIP OF ALL FEDERAL ADVERTISING OR OTHER COMMUNICATION MATERIALS. 

“(a) Requirement.—Each advertisement or other communication paid for by the Office, either directly or through a contract awarded by the Office, shall include a prominent notice informing the target audience that the advertisement or other communication is paid for by the Office. 

“(b) ADVERTISEMENT OR OTHER COMMUNICATION.—In this section, the term ‘advertisement or other communication’ includes— 

“(i) an advertisement disseminated in any form, including print or by any electronic means; and 

“(ii) a communication by an individual in any form, including speech, print, or by any electronic means.” 

“SEC. 19. POLICY RELATING TO SYRINGE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS. 

Section 707(c) (21 U.S.C. 1705(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following: 

“When developing the national drug control policy, any policy of the Director relating to syringe exchange programs for intravenous drug users shall be based on the best available medical and scientific evidence regarding their effectiveness in promoting individual health and preventing the spread of infectious disease, and their impact on drug addiction and use. In making any policy relating to syringe exchange programs, the Director shall consult with the National Institutes of Health and the National Academy of Sciences.” 

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is in order except those printed in House Report 109-567. Each amendment may be ordered printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall be debatable for the time specified in the amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. 

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER. Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. 

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment. 

The text of the amendment is as follows: 

Amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 109-567 offered by Mr. SOUDER: 

Page 145, line 3 through 9, 

Page 145, line 10, strike “(vi)” and insert “(v)”. 

Page 145, line 15, strike “(vii)” and insert “(v)”. 

Page 146, line 5, strike “(vii)” and insert “(vii)”. 

Page 148, line 19, strike “(g)” and insert “(h)”. 

Page 149, line 7, strike “(h)” and insert “(i)”. 

Page 149, strike lines 9 through 18 and insert the following: 

“(g) INAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—The provisions of this section shall not apply to the National Intelligence Program, the Joint Military Intelligence Program, and Tactical and Related Activities unless such program or an element of such program is designated as a National Drug Control Program: 

“(1) by the President; or 

“(2) jointly by— 

“(A) in the case of the National Intelligence Program, the Director and the Director of National Intelligence; or 

“(B) in the case of the Joint Military Intelligence Program and Tactical and Related Activities, the Director, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Secretary of Defense.” 

Page 217, strike lines 14 through 19 and insert the following: 

“Director, the Director of National Intelligence, or the head of any Federal Government agency the activities of which are described in the plan, would be detrimental to the law enforcement or national security activities of any Federal, State, or local agency. Such program shall be presented to Congress separately from the rest of the report.” 

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes. 

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana. 

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

Mr. Chairman, the manager’s amendment makes technical and conforming changes to account for changes in the law within the jurisdiction of those committees that waived formal business meetings on H. R. 2829, the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005. 

Page 145, the manager’s amendment strikes the mandatory restrictions on certification of budgets related to enforcement in certain contexts of section 484(r)(1) of the Higher Education Act, more popularly known as the Drug-Free Student Loan provision. 

The provision made students convicted of drug offenses temporarily not eligible to receive student loans. However, a significant problem had arisen in the Department of Education, beginning during the Clinton administration and continuing during the current administration, because they have misinterpreted the clear language of that statute to improperly deny loans to students whose drug convictions predated their enrollment in school.

Section 8021 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1993, Public Law 103-160, signed into law on February 8, 2006, contained language that altered the interpretation of a provision included in the Higher Education Act, and therefore obviated
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the need to address this matter in H.R. 2829.

The manager’s amendment changes made on pages 149, 187, and 217 and the related conforming amendments are based on technical recommendations made by the Director of National Intelligence through the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The technical amendments were thought desirable to make the ONDCP authorization reflect changes made by the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevenction Act of 2004, Public Law 108–468, and related authorizations.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Maryland opposed to the amendment?

Mr. CUMMINGS. No. As a matter of fact, I support the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland may control 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment. I think it is a step in the right direction. There are too many young people who find themselves getting into difficulty with drugs. The fact is when it predated their getting Federal funding for schooling, that is one thing; it is another thing when it happens during the time that they are getting the Federal funding. I would like to see it all eliminated, but the fact still remains that I think this is a good amendment. It is a step in the right direction. It is one that I have heard a lot of concern. Every time I do a town hall meeting on scholarships, this issue comes up. I support the gentleman’s amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out again the effect of taking that language out means the bill is now silent on the drug loan provision. The other changes had to do with the Intelligence Community and other committees that waived jurisdiction.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any Member rise to offer amendment number 2, designated to be offered by the gentleman from Washington or a designee?

Mr. SOUDER. I will introduce the Baird amendment. I am a cosponsor of the Baird amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Washington a designee?

Mr. SOUDER. Yes, I am acting as his designee.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 109–367 offered by Mr. SOUDER:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 20. INTERNATIONAL SUMMIT ON METHAMPHETAMINE THREAT.

(a) SUMMIT REQUIREMENT.—The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy in the Executive Office of the President shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the United States Trade Representative, seek to convene an international summit on the threat of methamphetamine and synthetic drug precursor chemicals.

(b) PARTICIPATION OF OTHER COUNTRIES.—
The Director shall seek to convene the summit with the participation and involvement of government leaders at the highest level from all countries that are direct sources of precursor chemicals and from all countries that are affected by methamphetamine production, trafficking, and use, to intensity and coordinate an effective international response in order to combat methamphetamine production and precursor diversion.

(c) INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.—The Director shall encourage the negotiation, drafting, and ratification of multilateral or bilateral agreements that may control 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The amendment was agreed to.

There was no objection.

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

I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER). I appreciate the courtesy and I appreciate very much his leadership on this legislation and on the broad issue of methamphetamine in general.

Our Nation is truly safer for the efforts of Mr. SOUDER, and it has been a pleasure to work with him on the amendment we offer today. I also want to compliment my good friend and colleague, Mr. CARDOZA of California, and Ms. HOOLEY from Oregon.

Recent articles, a series in the Oregonian and also a Frontline special, have articulated the challenges that we face in fighting methamphetamine due to international supply of the methamphetamine precursor, pseudoephedrine and ephedrine.

We have done good work just recently with the passage of the Combat Meth Act to curtail the supply coming directly into the United States, but transshipment of pseudoephedrine, ephedrine, and other precursors is a terrific problem that is really leading to the supply increases that we are seeing on our streets.

The good news on the meth front is that we are seeing a reduction of the local clandestine labs. The bad news is that the international trafficking has increased. Indeed, reports from all countries show that the purity of methamphetamine on the streets has reached the 70 percent level. Now, we know from clinical and historical data that what happens in that case is an increase in the number of addictions, an increase in the number of drug-related crimes, of hospital admissions, et cetera.

For that reason, we are offering today’s amendment, and what it does is quite simple. It asks the administration to conduct an international summit to work with the other methamphetamine precursor producing countries to try to reach international accords that would curtail the production and shipment of pseudoephedrine and ephedrine and other precursors that would ultimately be manufactured into methamphetamine. It is a commonsense amendment. I think this is a drug that we can actually defeat if we can choke off the air supply of the precursors.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry. Has anyone claimed the time in opposition?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
Mr. SOUDER. I do not oppose this amendment and we are willing to accept this amendment. This amendment seeks to strengthen the bill by highlighting the problem of methamphetamine. I think it is very important that this House continue to go on record and do everything possible, every amendment possible.

Again, the gentleman from Washington has been the founder of the Meth Caucus and Congressman Larsen, Congressman CANNON, and Congressman CUMMINGS, the gentleman from Maryland, have been active in this. I think it is important to look at an international summit.

Clearly, as we dealt with the major methamphetamine bill that is part of the anti-terrorism bill, we realize that as we get control of pseudoephedrine behind the counter, this becomes much more of an international problem. In Oklahoma, which was the first State, really, to enact tough legislation, they have meth labs behind in behind and become a scourge on their State. We see it in Oregon and Washington, other States around the country. As you crack down on the so-called "mom and pop labs" and the "Nazi labs" you move the flow behind, that is better for local law enforcement but bad for the individuals because it is even more potent.

Crystal meth is coming from an international market. It started over in Asia. There are nine basic facilities, as I have seen, in Asia. They are meth labs in the world, the Czech Republic has closed theirs, but Germany as well as China and India. Much of it comes across our border from Mexico, and without cooperation on an international basis, without working with the U.N. antinarcotics efforts, we cannot tackle this in the United States.

We have attempted to put up walls in the Combat Meth Act. We had things for the spot market. We had new measuring for the flow so on, but ultimately that is just trying to put up a wall around the United States. We have to figure out how we are going to cooperatively work with India, China, and Mexico and other countries.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. First of all, I want to compliment Mr. BAIRD and the other cosponsors of this amendment. There is no doubt about it, Mr. SOUDER and I, over and over again we see, as the Ranking Members of our subcommittee, so many of our members coming to us and telling us about the problems with methamphetamines in their districts. We have traveled across the country and listened to the testimony of various police and law enforcement folks and people who are trying to address this problem. And it is, in fact, a growing problem.

While we have seen a lot of emphasis on it, I think that this amendment goes very far to try to shine even more light on this tragic problem. And one of the things that we found so interesting about the whole methamphetamine situation, it is a little different than what you have to have to have a clean-up. We spent a lot of money for clean-up. And we find many instances where children are tremendously affected because they have to be placed in foster care programs, because children are out of the house, the house usually has all kinds of problems, and they end up basically with no parents that are available to take care of them.

So it has been a tremendous strain on our law enforcement agencies, our foster care agencies. I see this as a step in the right direction, and I would trust that we would support this amendment. I want to thank Mr. SOUDER for yielding.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) who has been a champion of the meth issue and has been a leader in passing legislation that would help combat this drug.

Ms. HOOLEY. I thank my colleague for yielding me time and for all the hard work that has gone on with methamphetamine, and I rise today in support of the Baird-Cardoza-Hooley amendment.

As meth has spread across this Nation, more and more States are taking action to cut off pseudoephedrine sales to meth makers who cannot make the poison without this common cold medication. But when 65 percent of the meth in this country comes from Mexico, drug cartels, we cannot solve this problem through domestic means alone.

This amendment requires that our drug office join with other affected countries to request an effective international response in order to prevent methamphetamine production and precursor diversion.

In a revealing investigation, the Oregonian newspaper determined that Mexico imports roughly 100 tons of pseudoephedrine more than is needed to fill its need for cold medicine. The rest, narcotic officials guess, is diverted from legitimate users and turned into meth. Since roughly 200 tons of pseudoephedrine is needed to produce all the meth sold in the United States, this pseudoephedrine from Mexico can produce half of our Nation's supply of this deadly drug.

This amendment will bring together international leaders so they can work together and collaborate on a broad-based strategy that will not only keep meth away from our communities and families but would limit production and use of this deadly drug worldwide. I urge the support of this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BOOZMAN

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BASS). The Clerk will designate the amendment. The text of the amendment is as follows:
Amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. BOOZMAN:
Page 168, line 17, strike “and”.
Page 168, line 19, strike the period at the end and insert: “(and)”.
Page 168, after line 19, insert the following: “(IV) the effect of illicit drug use on children of substance abusers.”
Page 170, line 12, insert after “drug use” the following: “(including the effects on children of substance abusers).”

At the end of the bill add the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 20. STUDY ON DRUG COURT HEARINGS IN NONTRADITIONAL PLACES.
(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that encouraging drug courts and schools to enter into partnerships that allow students to see the repercussions of drug abuse by non-violent offenders may serve as a strong deterrent and promote demand reduction.
(b) STUDY.—The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall conduct a study on drug court programs that conduct hearings in nontraditional public places, such as schools. At a minimum, the study shall (1) evaluate similar programs in duration, such as the program operated in the Fourth Judicial District Drug Court, in Washington County, Arkansas, at the same time the President submits to Congress the National Drug Control Strategy due February 1, 2007, pursuant to section 706 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (b). The report shall include an evaluation of the results of the study and such recommendations as the President considers appropriate.
(c) DEMAND REDUCTION.—In this section, the term “demand reduction” has the meaning provided in section 702(1) of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1701(1)).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

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

I appreciate this opportunity to offer an amendment which will strengthen the hand of Congress in the future as we work to protect the most vulnerable children in our society and as we work to deter the abuse of drugs in our culture.

This amendment would provide for two simple actions by ONDCP. First, the amendment would require the Director of ONDCP to include in the National Drug Control Strategy statistical data and information to demonstrate and assess trends relating to the effects of illicit drug use on children of substance abusers. This information will assist Congress, as well as States, local governments and private groups, as we work to protect these children.

As we all know, one of the greatest tragedies of drug abuse is the terrible effect these crimes have on the most vulnerable members of society, children. Children of substance abusers are the innocent victims of drug abuse, and research shows that these children are much more likely to become drug abusers themselves when they reach adolescence or adulthood. Congress should do all it can to protect these innocent children, while we have the chance; and the effect of illicit drug use on children of substance abusers would be completely without considering the effects on children of substance abusers and how we can help prevent the cycle of drug abuse.

We all know from experience that children who have grown up in homes in this sort of condition are much more likely to use drugs themselves. In Arkansas, State, local, and private groups are working hard to assist meth-endangered children, kids who are some of the most vulnerable, of substance abusers. Several years ago, I visited with a high school young lady whose parent had recently committed suicide as a result of being high on meth. He was a truck driving to kids about the drug for many, many years; and she was being a model student. There was really nothing, there was no agency, there was no help for her. So, again, I think this is very, very important and something that if we can study and then use that information to go further.

The second part of this amendment requires the director of ONDCP to conduct a study on drug court programs that hold hearings in nontraditional public places, such as schools. As you all know, the mission of a drug court is to provide an alternative to incarceration for nonviolent persons convicted of drug-related charges. In order to reduce demand and deter our kids from getting involved in illegal drugs, we must make sure they understand the consequences of drug abuse. We spend a lot of time and money talking to kids about the repercussions of drug abuse, but this type of program allows us to show them the consequences.

In my congressional district, I have seen firsthand the strong impact that such a program has. I went to school-age kids. Judge Mary Ann Gunn of the Fourth Judicial District Drug Court in Washington County, Arkansas, has been taking her program into the schools for several years with the strong support of school administrators and the community. She uses the opportunity to visit with students about the drug problem, and it has had a profound effect on many kids. Experience has shown that her program is a strong deterrent for young people, and it strongly promotes demand reduction among our youth.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to reduce the harm caused by children of substance abusers and to study drug court programs that could be a tremendous deterrent to young people nationwide. These two items may seem small, but they are critical steps in saving future generations from the harm caused by drug abuse.

I commend Chairman SOUDER for his work on this very important bill. I appreciate the hard work that he and his staff and the other members of the committee, both Democrat and Republican, have put into this effort. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition to the bill?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to use the time in opposition to support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

I just want to thank the gentleman for this amendment. It is a very important amendment, and I have no doubt that it makes the bill a better bill.

One of the things we have seen in my district and all over the country is that there are these cycles of drug addiction; and I think one of the saddest things, and I saw this as a lawyer, too, was the kids who were great students, would get into trouble, and then a few years later see a child come in. They both have been drug users. So the cycle of drug addiction keeps going around and around. So I think that is a very, very important thing that we need to look at, how the children are affected.

As far as the nontraditional places with regard to drug courts is concerned, I think that is another good idea. I think what happens too often is that you have young people who will experiment or they get involved, but there are even a lot of times you do not think about consequences. They do not think about how they may have to very well come in contact with our judicial system. I think that this is an excellent way that we need to look at that, figure out ways by which we might do that; and I support the gentleman’s amendment.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I also strongly support this amendment. I appreciate the gentleman from Arkansas being one of the first Members to realize that we need to look at that, figure out ways by which we might do that; and I support the gentleman’s amendment.

At another hearing in Minnesota, at the request of a number of Members, we heard in Ramsey County, which is St. Paul, that they went from zero to 80 percent of the kids in child custody in the welfare department being addicts of meth. From nothing to 80 percent, in 6 months.
When methamphetamine hits your area, it takes over and overwhelms your juvenile systems, overpowers the child custody system, and overwhelms the criminal system. I very much appreciate this amendment. I yield the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 109-367 offered by Mr. CHABOT.

Page 161, after line 2, insert the following:

(p) REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT NATIONAL SYNTHETIC DRUGS ACTION STRATEGY.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress the National Synthetic Drugs Action Strategy outlined in the National Synthetic Drugs Action Plan submitted by the Director in October 2004.

(q) REQUIREMENT FOR STUDY OF STATE PRECURSOR CHEMICAL CONTROL LAWS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Director of National Drug Control Policy shall conduct a study of State laws with respect to precursor chemical controls.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit a report to Congress on the results of the study under paragraph (1), including—

(A) a comparison of the State laws studied and the effectiveness of each such law; and

(B) a list of best practices observed with respect to such laws.

(r) REQUIREMENT FOR STUDY OF DRUG ENDANGERED CHILDREN PROGRAMS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Director of National Drug Control Policy shall conduct a study of methamphetamine-related activities that are conducted by different Drug Endangered Children programs administered by States.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit a report to Congress on the results of the study under paragraph (1).

(i) a comparison of the effectiveness of such activities; and

(ii) a list of best practices observed with respect to such activities.

(s) REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT NATIONAL METHAMPHETAMINE INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE.—

(1) CLEARINGHOUSE.—There is established, under the supervision of the Director of National Drug Control Policy, an information clearinghouse to be known as the National Methamphetamine Information Clearinghouse.

(2) ADVISORY COUNCIL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There is established an advisory council to be known as the National Methamphetamine Advisory Council.

(B) MEMBERSHIP.—The Council shall consist of 10 members appointed by the Director of National Drug Control Policy. The Council shall include—

(i) not fewer than three of whom shall be representatives of law enforcement agencies;

(ii) not fewer than four of whom shall be representatives of non-governmental and non-profit organizations providing services related to methamphetamine; and

(iii) one of whom shall be a representative of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(C) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—Members shall be appointed for three years.

Any vacancy shall not affect the powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(t) NMIC REQUIREMENTS AND REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The NMIC shall promote sharing information regarding successful law enforcement, treatment, environmental, social services, and other programs related to the production, distribution, and consumption of methamphetamine and grants available for such programs.

(2) COMPONENTS.—The NMIC shall include—

(A) a toll-free national number; and

(B) a website that—

(i) provides information on the short-term and long-term effects of methamphetamine use;

(ii) provides information regarding methamphetamine treatment programs and programs for drug endangered children, including descriptions of successful programs and contact information for such programs;

(iii) provides information regarding grants for methamphetamine-related programs, including contact information and links to websites;

(iv) allows a qualified entity to submit its information to the website regarding successful public or private programs or other useful information related to the production, use, or effects of methamphetamine;

(v) includes a restricted section that may only be accessed by a law enforcement organization that contains successful strategies, training techniques, and other information that the Council determines helpful to law enforcement; and

(vi) allows public access to all information not in a restricted Act.

(vii) contains any additional information the Council determines may be useful in combating the production, use, or effects of methamphetamine.

(3) REVIEW OF POSTED INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of submission of an item by a qualified entity, the Council shall review an item submitted for posting on the website described in paragraph (2)(B) to determine whether the item, as submitted or as modified, meets the requirements for posting; and

(B) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 45 days after the date of submission of an item, the Council shall—

(i) post the item on the website described in paragraph (2)(B); or

(ii) notify the qualified entity that submitted the item regarding the reason such item shall not be posted and modifications, if any, that the qualified entity may make to allow the item to be posted.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

There are authorized to be appropriated—

(A) for fiscal year 2007—

(i) $10,000,000 to establish the NMIC and Council; and

(ii) such sums as are necessary for the operation of the NMIC and Council; and

(b) for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011, such sums as are necessary for the operation of the NMIC and Council.

SEC. 21. REPORT ON SCHOOL DRUG TESTING.

(a) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—The Director of National Drug Control Policy shall prepare a report on drug testing in schools. The report shall include a list of secondary schools that have initiated drug testing from among those schools that have attended conferences on drug testing sponsored by the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

(b) DEADLINE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress the report required under subsection (a).

SEC. 22. REPORT ON METHAMPHETAMINE EPIDEMIC.

(a) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—The Director of National Drug Control Policy shall prepare a report on methamphetamine usage in the United States. The report shall describe the production, distribution, and consumption obtained from industrial and school drug testing and seizures of clandestine laboratories.

(b) DEADLINE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress the report required under subsection (a).

SEC. 23. REPORT ON ONDCP PERFORMANCE BONUS.

(a) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—The Director of National Drug Control Policy shall prepare a report on performance bonuses at the Office of National Drug Control Policy. The report shall include a list of employees who have received bonuses and the amount of such bonuses, for the period beginning on October 1, 2004, and ending on the date of submission of the report.

(b) DEADLINE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress the report required under subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
I rise today in support of a bipartisan amendment that I have drafted with several Members of the Meth Caucus to address the national methamphetamine epidemic our Nation faces. I have offered this amendment along with Representatives BOSWELL, CALVERT, CANNON, Larsen of Washington; and I would like to thank all of these gentlemen for their leadership in not only drafting this amendment but in working very hard in this fight against drugs in our country.

Specifically, I wanted to highlight the provisions of the amendment that would create a National Methamphetamine Information Clearinghouse. Several communities in my State have expressed the need to obtain and share information related to methamphetamine abuse and addiction. The national database would promote sharing of best practices among the law enforcement, prevention, treatment, and social services communities.

The database will be governed by an advisory council comprised of members from a variety of agencies and organizations. This council will be responsible for monitoring these submissions to the clearinghouse and making sure that information found on the site is accurate, up to date and useful.

The methamphetamine problem has grown at a dramatic rate and is now considered the most significant drug abuse problem in the country, surpassing marijuana. The impact of this problem has been felt by local law enforcement and communities with dramatic, direct, and collateral consequences.

The National Association of Counties recently published a survey that shows that 60 percent of responding counties stated that methamphetamine was their largest drug problem, 60 percent of these. Sixty-seven percent reported increases in meth-related arrests.

I will continue to support measures such as these and the Meth Elimination Act that has been included in the PATRIOT Act to crack down on meth users and give local law enforcement and the public at large tools to help fight this national epidemic.

I would like to thank all those sponsors, Mr. BOSWELL and others who have been very active in this effort, for being cosponsors and supporters of this particular legislation.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition to the bill?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to use the time in opposition to support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I fully support this amendment, and I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) who is a member of the Meth Caucus and has been just a tremendous leader with regard to this issue and so many others, too.

Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding me the time. I appreciate it very much, and I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for his willingness to work with the co-chairs of the Meth Caucus. It has been exhilarating that we can get something done; and the Meth Caucus, with your help, is moving strikings. I appreciate it very much.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) for his strong leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I represent Iowa. Sometimes we have referred to it as the Belt Buckle of the Heartland. Iowa is a small State, one that prides itself on a shared sense of community and responsibilities, one that values a solid education and a hard day's work. When someone like one thinks of Iowa, they might imagine vast fields of corn or soybeans, or they might imagine a small-town Main Street. Unfortunately, they might also imagine meth. A couple of years ago, the meth epidemic was highlighted in a documentary by HBO called "Crack." This detailed the meth problem of three Iowa families and showed the complete destruction this drug causes. This documentary shows how to meth had taken hold in Iowa, but it just as easily could have been filmed in Missouri, Illinois, California, Washington, Oregon, Oklahoma, Nebraska, or any other State in the Union that has seen meth steadily infiltrate our communities.

I am sure everyone in this great House has heard the stories from their districts about meth. Meth does not care how much money you have, what kind of education you have, where you live, what color your skin is, how old you are, how young you are. Meth is quite simply an equal-opportunity destroyer. I am sure all of my colleagues here have seen all the pictures repeatedly shown by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) which have shown the life of this young woman and how she deteriorated so fast.

I rise today in strong support of the Chabot-Boswell-Calvert-Cannon-Larsen amendment. This amendment will strengthen the 5-year authorization bill by highlighting the continued commitment of this House in our national fight against methamphetamine.

Meth poses unique challenges to law enforcement, social services, and public health agencies. As such, the Congress must have extensive information on this epidemic from across the Nation. I believe this amendment will move us in that direction. By commissioning the reports outlined in this amendment, the Congress will be able to increase the information available to it on a wide range of issues, from the differing State precursor control laws to the Drug Endangered Children programs that have become all too valuable to the people we represent.

Furthermore, we must have the ability to quickly share information with Federal, State, and local governments. The National Methamphetamine Information Clearinghouse created by this amendment will provide us with the one-stop shop we need to share information on best practices in areas such as law enforcement, treatment, prevention, and social services.

The proposals in this amendment before you were crafted with close bipartisan cooperation and consultation. When dealing with the issue of meth, I have found this is the only approach to take. This drug does not care what side of the aisle you are on.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), who has been such a strong leader in the fight against drugs in this country.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my distinguished colleague from Ohio on the Judiciary Committee for his great work on this and so many other issues, on constitutional issues and on crime issues in this country, and I want to put this amendment a little bit in context.

First, we have a very strong Meth Caucus in this House, led by Congressmen CHABOT, Boswell, Calvert, and Cannon. Mr. BOSWELL was one of the early leaders because in California we saw these super labs, just like in Washington State and Oregon. Actually, they started in Hawaii. Moved from Asia into Hawaii, into the west coast, into the Plains, then into the Great Lakes States. It has now moved through the whole country.

Part of the reason the Meth Caucus is so frustrated and you will see so many amendments today, and even in the overriding bill, is because of an exasperation that while this is tearing up the grass roots, the Congress of Counties in the United States has said it is the number one drug problem in America; we have the HIDTAs coming in and saying it is, State and local law enforcement coming in and saying it is, the emergency rooms reflecting that, you have the DEA saying it has been no coordinated anti-meth strategy.

The challenge we have when we do a bill like this, which is a 5-year bill, which may mean at different times that oxycodone may be the problem, crack is in other cities and heroin is in other cities, that you try not to micro-manage any particular drug in a 5-year bill. But what has happened here is, because the Office of ONDCP in particular, as well as HHS for the most part, have had the ear and not rebuffed the Congress, this bill is going to throw a lot more micromanagement in it than you normally would in a 5-year authorization.
I believe methamphetamine will be around in 5 years. I don’t believe we are going to get rid of it in 5 years. It originally was in the form of crack and was not that widespread. But as it spread, whether it is mom-and-pop labs or crystal meth, it will be here for 5 years. We should not be surprised if they already had a clearinghouse. I can’t believe we don’t already have a clearinghouse. It wouldn’t be necessary if we already had in the schools different programs like this amendment is prescribing.

The administration this morning said they oppose this bill because it ties their hands too much. I am sorry, when you do not respond to the crisis in America, when the American people are rising up in every county, every law enforcement organization, this is exactly what we need to do in legislation when you do not respond.

I strongly support this amendment and I hope the entire Congress will support this amendment.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), another leader in the Meth Caucus.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment today, and I want to thank my fellow Meth Caucus cochair, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SCHAEFFER, and Mr. CANNON, and also the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for their work in drafting this critical amendment.

Methamphetamine is a highly dangerous drug that is wreaking havoc on families and communities throughout this country. The drug’s use is spreading across the United States. And while meth produced in home-grown labs has actually decreased in certain parts of the country, meth use has exploded with the influx of crystal meth from superlabs from places like Mexico.

Meth impacts every aspect of our community, every aspect of our neighborhoods, of our businesses, of the environment, and of our children. According to a 2006 survey by the National Association of Counties, 58 percent of the counties across the country reported meth as their greatest drug problem. The Federal Government needs to treat our new meth problem with the same urgency and commitment that our State and local governments have been treating it for years.

We must provide for local law enforcement, treatment professionals, and prevention experts with the tools they need to combat this deadly drug. Our amendment is a step in the right direction. For the past several years, the Meth Caucus has worked to engage the Office of National Drug Control Policy on this issue. We have tried to get their attention that meth is a strong, comprehensive Federal policy. While some gains have been made, ONDCP must take meth more seriously and devote more resources to its eradication.

Our amendment calls on ONDCP to increase reporting on several critical meth issues, including State Drug Endangered Children programs and State laws and access to meth precursors. These programs help us develop a coherent and comprehensive national strategy to fight meth. It is also creates the National Methamphetamine Information Clearinghouse to provide current information to Federal, State, and local governments about the trafficking, abuse, treatment, and prevention.

I want to conclude quickly by thanking the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) for working with us to craft this important amendment. I also want to thank him for his willingness to work with the Meth Caucus to get good meth policy passed. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time we have? The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield now of such time as I may consume. Let me just say this.

I want to congratulate Mr. CHABOT and all the members of the Meth Caucus, because I think they have done, I know that they have done an outstanding job. And I certainly congratulate Mr. SOUDER, too.

We have seen meth and the effects of meth, and I can tell you that while I am from the inner city of Baltimore, I have seen the effect that crack cocaine and heroin and various other drugs have had on populations; but I was, to be very frank with you, a bit shocked at the effects of methamphetamine. I think the thing that struck me tremendously was the fact that these drugs are very addicting and that somebody could actually, literally, look at a Web site and put together these drugs and the next thing you know you have got quite a few people using them.

We had testimony that came forward during one of our field hearings in Indiana, I think it was, where they were talking about how one person would learn how to create the lab, and then the next thing you know, they teach somebody else. And you teach somebody else, and the next thing you have a whole string of them.

I give Mr. SOUDER and all the members of our subcommittee a lot of credit. We try to address all of these problems, whether it is meth in the rural areas of our great country, or whether it is crack cocaine in urban areas. And here, this is another effort, as I said a little earlier, for us to address the problems of drugs in our country and the fact that it is destroying so many families, so many communities, and so many people.

A lot of people don’t realize it, but when somebody becomes addicted to a drug, it not only affects them but it affects their families and it affects support agencies and it affects their entire neighborhood. And we have seen those effects.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment and I congratulate the sponsors.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I will be very brief, but I want to thank all the Members that have been so involved in passing this particular amendment and working on the entire bill. There are an awful lot of people, I think, in the House that realize what a scourge drugs are in this country and particularly in the last few years with methamphetamine.

This bill, whereas it is not a panacea, it will not solve the problem, it is at least a step in the right direction, and I want to thank my colleagues for their support.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan amendment which will strengthen the Office of National Drug Control Policy’s, and in turn our nation’s, efforts against methamphetamine, the deadliest and most devastating drug that faces our communities today. As a founding member and Co-Chair of the Congressional Caucus to Fight and Control Methamphetamine, commonly known as the Meth Caucus, I have seen our Caucus membership enrollment grow just as the meth epidemic has grown.

From a couple dozen Members representing Western states in 2001 to 140 today, the Meth Caucus membership hails from all regions of this country and across the political spectrum. Even the Senate has established their own Meth Caucus which is modeled after the House Caucus. Each of these Members recognize the meth epidemic that is ravaging our communities on so many levels—from its toll on individual users, to the significant social costs it thrusts onto our law enforcement, prisons, hospitals, social and child welfare systems, and the environment.

As Mr. CHABOT stated, the amendment, through commissioned studies and reports, will provide information critical to assisting the Administration and the Congress in developing necessary and up-to-date policies to address the meth epidemic. In addition, the amendment would create an online National Methamphetamine Information Clearinghouse to serve law enforcement and the broader community with a forum for sharing of “best practices,” meth epidemic research, successful anti-meth programs and activities. These measures will only strengthen the reauthorization bill and ensure that the Federal response to the meth epidemic does not waver.

I would like to express many thanks to Congressman SOUDER for his support on this amendment. He has been, with his staff, relentless in their work to improve federal drug control policy and I appreciate their readiness and eagerness to involve the Meth Caucus in their activities. I also want to thank Congresswoman SHAW for her support on this amendment. It is not only my fellow Meth Caucus Co-Chairs, Representatives CANNON, LARSEN and BOSWELL and their staff for their constant vigilance on this
issue and their efforts to make this one of the most proactive and effective Caucus in the House. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment and the reauthorization bill.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CUELLAR

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. CUELLAR:

Page 161, after line 2, insert the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Drug Control Policy shall study the specific impact on citizens of the United States of violence related to drug-trafficking along the international border between the United States and Mexico.

(2) NOT LATER THAN 180 DAYS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress a report, including recommendations on methods to solve the offenses described in such paragraph and to reduce the occurrence of such offenses.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House resolution 713, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS, and I also rise in favor of this particular bill. I want to thank Mr. SOUDER for the leadership he has taken on this very important bill that is so important to us and, again, Mr. CUMMINGS, also for the work you both have been doing, your leadership and your bipartisan approach.

I also want to thank my colleague from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for co-sponsoring this amendment. My amendment to H.R. 2829 directs a study on the incidence of kidnapped, killed, and missing Americans along the United States-Mexican border. Within 180 days, the Commission will submit a report to the U.S. Congress with recommendations on how to prevent these types of crime.

According to the FBI, 41 Americans have been kidnapped in Mexico since August of 2004. Two have been killed, some have been returned, but there are still 22 missing Americans that we have not been able to find answers to. Last year, we witnessed a positive reaction from our country when we mobilized the resources to find the missing American in Aruba. It is my hope that we can also give the same type of attention to the missing Americans along the U.S.-Mexican border where many more are missing.

I fully understand that the Office of National Drug Control Policy is not an enforcement or investigative agency, but I believe, very strongly, that this office can be another group of minds that can help us try to find initiatives to help prevent American citizens from suffering the same or similar fate in the future.

Since I have taken office, I have been asked by many of the mothers and fathers and their children of the missing Americans to help resolve the status of their loved ones. I believe that if we bring in many resources together that we can help to ensure we put a stop to these crimes, and hopefully give the families of these missing Americans some closure.

Again, congratulations to Mr. SOUDER for the leadership that he has taken, and Mr. CUMMINGS also, for coming together in a bipartisan approach. I believe this amendment is acceptable to both Mr. SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I strongly support this amendment by the gentleman from Texas. Without a doubt, our number one challenge is the southwest border, whether it is meth, whether it is ranches that have been overrun, or whether literally in El Paso it is assassinations that have occurred inside the city.

The drug czar's office does have the ability to do this kind of study. They are the overarching agency. We may also need to look, just like we need to look at legislation on these tunnels, what specific legislation may need to come from this, but first we need to know what the facts are. I appreciate the gentleman bringing the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. FILNER:

Page 159, after line 5, insert the following new paragraph (and redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

(3) SPECIFIC CONTEXT RELATED TO DRUG TUNNELS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.—The Southwest Border Counter-narcotics Strategy shall include—

(A) a strategy to end the construction and use of tunnels and subterranean passages that cross the international border between the United States and Mexico for the purpose of illegal trafficking of drugs across such border; and

(B) recommendations for criminal penalties for persons who construct or use such an illegal or subterranean passage for such a purpose.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House resolution 713, the gentleman
from California (Mr. FILNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to thank Chairman SOUDER and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for bringing us this bill, and I have an amendment based on my experience as the Congressman that represents the whole California-Mexico border.

Just a few weeks ago, we discovered almost a mile-long tunnel, half on each side of the border, in my district. We all like to take credit for things in our district, but this is one that I do not take credit for.
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It was a very sophisticated tunnel the way it was constructed, the way it was bored out, the way it drained water, and it was even air-conditioned. We found 2 tons of marijuana that was left behind. Who knows what went through that tunnel, whether it was people, drugs or potentially weapons of mass destruction?

Thinking about that and looking at the reaction we had in San Diego over those tunnels, I thought we should slightly amend this bill to authorize the ONDCP to coordinate with all relevant agencies to combat border tunnels, and such time as you dig tunnels underneath them. Some of these tunnels have gone into other businesses, some into homes, some into open areas. It has shown a gap in our legislation.

I want to thank Mr. GRAVES for his leadership on this issue, these agencies to fight a war on drugs, to fight a war against illegal behavior, we have to send them the proper tools. I believe this amendment will do it.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

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

I rise to support this amendment. I do not oppose this amendment. I think it is a good amendment. It is a phenomenon we have dealt with for some time, and I appreciate Mr. FILNER's long, aggressive leadership with how best to deal with the southwest border in his district. We have worked together on border questions.

This has recently been in the news because there have been more tunnels discovered in the last period than we have had for some time. The gentleman is absolutely correct, it does not do any good to build fences if you dig tunnels underneath them. Some of these tunnels have gone into other businesses, some into homes, some into open areas. It has shown a gap in our legislation.

I am working with Chairman BREER who is taking the lead on a bill similar to Senator FEINSTEIN's and Senator KYL's bill to try to come up with appropriate laws that we need regarding these tunnels.

Clearly, if you catch the ton of marijuana going through, that is clearly a violation of the law; but even the tunnel itself and digging the tunnel under an international border should have stiff penalties.

I spoke yesterday with the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Julie Myers, and she is head of ICE and has been working directly with them in trying to do more of the tunnel enforcement. They have stepped up DHS efforts, and Assistant Secretary Myers is fully aware of this. We need to develop whatever legislation is required.

What we need is our ONDCP director, and ideally he would have already submitted proposals to us. This says come up with proposals, and it gives him authority to develop implementation of a strategy and coordinate the other agencies. Some of this may be Department of Justice, EPA. That is why we have an Office of National Drug Control Policy to coordinate the different agencies that may be involved in this tunnel.

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to thank the chairman for his leadership on these issues, for coming personally to the border to see the situation. Through my district, Mr. Chairman, every day 300,000 people go back and forth legally. That is the movement of a major amount of people, and we have to do that efficiently. But within that amount of movement, people take advantage with illegal movement. That is what we have to try to stop. We have to catch the illegal while making it efficient for all of those people going back and forth for trade, shopping, family visits, for schooling, for cultural visits. We have to allow to that continue efficiently and ideally, in a more efficient fashion, that illegal activity.

I thank both Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. SOUDER for their support.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a wonderful and very appropriate amendment. I think many Americans were shocked when they learned of this tunnel. As Mr. FILNER said, heaven knows what may have gone through it.

But I see another benefit, not only dealing with the drug issue, but certainly we are concerned about making sure that our homeland is properly secure. As he said, 300,000 to 400,000 people go across the borders legitimately every day. The fact with someone or any persons coming up with this sort of system which to go around the system that we have created, it cries out for ONDCP to look at it and I am sure other agencies are looking at it, too.

I support the amendment and thank the gentleman for offering it.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

The amendment was agreed to.

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. GRAVES.

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 109-367 offered by Mr. GRAVES: At the end of the bill, add the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 20. REPORT ON GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED METHAMPHETAMINE TREATMENT PROJECT.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to Congress a report explaining the rationale and circumstances leading to the sponsorship of the Department of Health and Human Resources, and the participation by employees of such department, in a conference conducted by the Harm Reduction Coalition and the Harm Reduction Project on August 19th and 20th, Salt Lake City, titled the “1st National Conference on Methamphetamine, HIV, and Hepatitis Science & Response.”

(b) ADDITIONAL MATTERS COVERED.—The report shall include a report on the management and reporting systems of the Office of National Drug Control Policy that are in
place or that will be put in place to ensure that the policy of the Federal Government is consistently supportive of efforts to prevent the use of methamphetamine.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 113, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES).

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not have to tell you about the epidemic abuse of methamphetamine that has swept this country. It United States since the 1980s. Missouri has one of the worst meth problems in the country. From 1995 to 2002, Missouri reported a 97.4 percent increase in methamphetamine-related admissions to emergency rooms. In 2003, Missouri had the highest number of meth lab seizures in the country.

Missouri is not alone. Meth abuse impacts every community, there is no State that cannot be found. In 2005 alone, approximately 5,000 meth labs were seized by law enforcement officials. This serious epidemic requires a serious response, and I believe we have to ensure that all agencies are vigorously fighting the meth epidemic.

This includes agencies such as the Department of Health and Human Services. HHS sponsored and participated in a conference promoting the ideology of reducing the negative impact of drugs, or the safe use of drugs, rather than stopping the use of illegal drugs. We need to take seriously the meth epidemic sweeping our Nation. Now is not the time to be lax on drug enforcement. We need to take a hard approach to fight this menace and ensure that the administration and agencies are following the meth epidemic seriously and supporting efforts to prevent drug abuse, not the safe use.

My amendment is very simple. My amendment demands that the Office of National Drug Control Policy conduct a report to explain how it happened that the Department of Health and Human Services sponsored this pro-meth conference and what management and reporting systems the Office of National Drug Control Policy will change to ensure that the Department of Health and Human Services is anti-meth and supportive of efforts fighting the meth epidemic.

I ask all members to support this amendment. This is a serious issue in combating a very dangerous drug, and obviously the meth epidemic.

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

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

The Graves amendment requires ONDCP to produce a study on why the Department of Health and Human Services has been failing to support and sent HHS employees to a 2005 conference on methamphetamine and harm reduction. In my opinion this amendment is totally unnecessary. The information sought could be obtained through regular oversight channels, and the request does not belong in an authorization statute. In addition, the amendment is an implicit ideological attack on harm reduction efforts, such as needle exchange programs.

The purpose of needle exchange programs is to reduce the risk of transmission of HIV among injection drug users. The premises that needle exchange and prevention are incompatible, and that HHS participation in a harm-reduction conference cannot be constructive. That assumption is simply false. HHS, the National Institutes of Health, the World Health Organization, and other health organizations have conducted comprehensive reviews of the research on needle exchange. Their research concludes the following conclusion: Needle exchange programs reduce the risk of transmission of HIV among injection drug users; they do not increase or encourage drug use; and they can be an important bridge to treatment and abstinence from drug use. Needle exchange can be an effective component of a strong, comprehensive drug reduction program. HHS and its drug prevention agencies have valuable expertise. HHS can and should provide information on treatment and prevention in settings where those subjects are discussed. For those reasons, I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) be able to reclaim the balance of his time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple. It is not going to take much. It will just ask that the National Office on Drug Control Policy explain to us their participation in this conference and show us that they are seriously about the fight on drugs, they are serious about fighting this epidemic. It gives a report to Congress. That is all it does.

I would like an explanation for this action. I would like an explanation for what took place. Again, it is a very simple amendment, and I do not think it is asking too much.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOURDER).

Mr. SOURDER. Mr. Chairman, we will include for the RECORD a series of letters that we have written to Secretary Leavitt. One of the panels on this conference was: We Don’t Need a War on Methamphetamine.

Another title was: You Don’t Have to Be Clean and Sober or Even Want to Be. Sexual topics were also there. Harm Reduction: Tweaking Tips for Party Boys; Barebacking: A Harm Reduction Approach without Condoms; Harm Reduction: Unprotected Sex, Gay Men and Barebacking.

It was awful, done with our tax dollars. But what is particularly outrageous, when we look at narcotics, is how can our Department of HHS be participating in something named “We Don’t Need a War on Methamphetamine.” That is why we are asking ONDCP to investigate.

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

Again, I reiterate. I think there are other ways to get this information. What is said during these conferences is not the responsibility of HHS, and I just think when we are in a situation where we are trying to make sure that we use our tax dollars efficiently and effectively, to go at trying to acquire this kind information through this method, an amendment on a very significant bill, I think is just inappropriate.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.
harm reduction advocates is utterly implausible. This agenda is readily apparent from the conference topics sprinkled throughout the program, as well as the very websites of the harm reduction organizations sponsoring and participating in the conference.

Shocking—Major Session IV of the HHS-sponsored Harm Reduction Coalition and Harm Reduction Project conference next week is entitled, “We Don’t Need a ‘War’ on Methamphetamine.”

Other conference topics include, “You Don’t Have to Be Clean & Sober. Or Even Want to Be!” and sexual topics consistent with the harm reduction philosophy of offering an abstinence-based approach for at-risk communities: “Tweaking Tips for Party Boys,” and two sessions on engaging in sex without condoms, “Barbecuing: A Harm Reduction Approach. And “Without Condoms: Harm Reduction, Unprotected Sex, Gay Men and Barebacking.”

Among the speakers and moderators at this conference sponsored by your Department, five are identified in the program as representatives of the Drug Policy Alliance, giving them speaking roles at the conference.

The Drug Policy Alliance describes itself as “the nation’s leading organization working to end the war on drugs.” Along with its major sponsor, the HHS, the Drug Policy Alliance helped produce It’s Just a Plant, a pro-marijuana children’s book. Marsha Rosenbaum, who is also presenting at the HHS-sponsored conference, wrote the epilogue for this disturbing book.

Both the Harm Reduction Coalition and the Harm Reduction Project are partners with the Drug Policy Alliance for an upcoming 2005 International Drug Policy Reform Conference. According to the Alliance’s conference materials regarding who should attend to “end the war on drugs,” the Drug Policy Alliance helped produce It’s Just a Plant, a pro-marijuana children’s book.

Marsha Rosenbaum, who is also presenting at the HHS-sponsored conference, wrote the epilogue for this disturbing book.

The program for the HHS-sponsored conference next week also includes a “Special Thank You” to a handful of people, including HHS employee Dr. Glen Hanson, of the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). As you know, NIDA’s mission is “to lead the Nation in bringing the power of science to bear on drug abuse and addiction.” To what end is the Department’s goal of “leading the nation with harm reduction and drug legalization partners?”

Luciano Colonna, Executive Director of the Harm Reduction Project and host of the DHHS-sponsored conference, and one reported as briefing your aides in advance of the conference, is quoted as stating that, “For a lot of people, meth use is a rite of passage and it really does increase sexual pleasure.”

That Administration officials from your Department are consulting with harm reduction organizations, sponsoring conferences controlled by the harm reduction network, completely undermines the work of the President, the Congress, and the men and women who work in law enforcement across the nation who are trying desperately to fight the meth epidemic.

Please provide the following materials no later than 5:00 p.m. Friday, August 26, 2005:

(1) All documents relating to the Department of Health and Human Services’ involvement, including its role as a primary sponsor, for the August 19-20 Harm Reduction Conference in Salt Lake City, and how such participation furthers the Administration’s stated goal of reducing drug use.

(2) The names of all Department of Health and Human Services staff attending the August 19-20 Harm Reduction conference in Salt Lake City, and their contact information at staff interviews.

Please provide the following materials no later than 5:00 p.m. Friday, August 26, 2005:

I believe that your Department’s participation in this conference is a slap in the face to the federal, state, and local law enforcement, child welfare services, treatment and prevention, and other personnel who work so hard to stop meth trafficking, abuse, and addiction, and to clean up the wreckage left by this terrible drug.

To give you a specific example, Danni Mardelli, one of the CDC employees, will be moderating a panel discussion at the conference entitled, “DeMythologizing Methamphetamine Manufacture: Don’t Believe the Hype” on Saturday, August 20. The very title of this discussion suggests that the law enforcement and child welfare services personnel, who have provided多年 testing and teaching to my Subcommittees, of the deadly health hazards posed to police officers and children at meth lab sites, are perpetrating a “myth.” That, Mr. Secretary, is disturbing, particularly when the Administration has proposed drastic cutbacks in federal programs that help state and local law enforcement agencies find and deal with meth lab sites.

Yesterday, you joined Attorney General Alberto Gonzalez and Director John Walters of the Office of National Drug Control Policy in announcing your Department’s new antimeth policies. Your words, however, ring rather hollow when your Department is providing aid and support for the very people who undermine antimeth policies.

I am attaching the same questions I put to you last week. I request that you provide the answers as soon as possible.

Thank you for your attention to this serious matter.

Sincerely,

MARK E. SOUDER
Chairman, Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice, House of Representatives

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Ms. HOOLEY

(Amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. GRAVES)

Page 161, after line 2, insert the following new subsection:

(2) REQUIREMENT FOR METHAMPHETAMINE STRATEGY.

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

(2) MATTERS COVERED.—The strategy shall include:

(A) an introduction and precursor chemical controls;

(B) demand reduction and treatment;

(C) alternative development programs;

(D) an overview of efforts to prevent the diversion of precursor chemicals on an international level; and

Sincerely,

MARK E. SOUDER
Chairman, Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.
The meth epidemic is impacting all of us. Children in particular can face some of the most devastating effects, with tens of thousands of children suffering the consequences of their family’s meth habit. When parents crash after speeding on meth, their children are left to fend for themselves, sometimes for days. Parents can become abusive, and their children are exposed to highly toxic chemicals. The cost is overwhelming both in terms of human lives and financial resources needed to take care of our children.

Meth also brings increased crime to a community. A district attorney in Clackamas County, which is in my district, estimates that 99 percent of all ID thefts and 90 percent of all property crimes are related to meth.

This amendment would require the Office of National Drug Control Policy to submit to Congress a comprehensive strategy to address the increased threat of methamphetamine. The strategy would include interdiction and pre-cursor chemical controls, demand reduction and treatment, efforts to prevent the diversion of precursor chemicals on an international level, and an assessment of the funding and resources necessary to significantly reduce the production and trafficking of methamphetamine.

ONDCP must make fighting meth a top priority; and this amendment would ensure that they did. The spreading of methamphetamine is a multifaceted problem ranging from the mom-and-pop labs to the sophisticated illegal drug factories in foreign countries. It is a crisis that requires a multifaceted solution. We must take action to control the supply of, and access to, its ingredients both on a domestic and international level, which we have begun to do with the Combat Meth Act. But we also need to reduce the demand for this drug by educating our youth about the dangers of methamphetamine and ensure that addicts get the treatment they need.

The stated role of the Office of National Drug Control Policy is to establish policies, priorities, and objectives for the Nation’s drug-control program. Their job is to reduce illicit drug use, manufacturing, and trafficking, drug-related crime and violence, and drug-related health consequences; and yet they refuse to devote the resources or attention that is needed to fight our meth epidemic while more and more Americans become addicted to this deadly drug.

As any cop in America will tell you, methamphetamine is destroying our communities; and fighting the production and importation of this dangerous drug has been one of my top priorities as a Member of Congress. It is long past time for ONDCP to join in the fight, and this amendment will require them to do so, so we have a fighting chance in this battle.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlelady from Indiana (Ms. HOOLEY) will control the time in opposition.

There was no objection.

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

I do not oppose this amendment. It is an excellent amendment. It requires ONDCP to come up with a comprehensive strategy addressing the threat of methamphetamine.

In this bill we already require a coordinated strategy to combat South American and Afghan heroin, which we have not had. We already require a Southwest border narcotics strategy, which has not been effective.

But there has been nothing on meth, and this not only requires a strategy for the supply side, how it gets in internationally through the border, but the demand side as well. The National Ad Campaign has basically been absent, part of the ONDCP, on the meth issue; yet we have reduced the funding here. But this House clearly showed they would increase the funding on the National Ad Campaign if they put it in meth, and then they wonder why they cannot get more dollars for the National Ad Campaign.

We have had to do meth hot spots to try and address that at the grass-roots. That was opposed by the administration. We have now authorized that as part of the terrorism bill in the Combat Meth Act. An amazing individual in the State of Montana has put together a private sector that is much more effective in fighting meth than we have been able to come up with in the public sector.

This amendment will help direct and force the Department of ONDCP, the drug czar’s office, to address in a coordinated way meth strategy.

I commend the gentlewoman from Oregon. The Portland Oregonian has been a champion nationally and internationally in identifying this. She has championed this issue in Oregon; as well Congressman MCHENRY in the eastern side of Oregon that has been hit so hard; and we really appreciate all the efforts of those in the Northwest as this drug rip through the rest of the country, into Congressman PETERSON of Pennsylvania’s district. Titusville, Pennsylvania is the capital of meth in Pennsylvania, ripping into North Carolina. We are doing a hearing with Congressman MCHENRY in the next few weeks. As we see it march into the East, this has now become a national problem; and we appreciate the leadership from the Northwest.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I too stand in support of Ms. HOOLEY’s amendment. We have spent a tremendous amount of time in our subcommittee on methamphetamine. We see it as a problem that is spreading in many instances like wildfire. And I want to thank Ms. HOOLEY for her leadership and for the amendment.

We have expressed on numerous occasions to the drug czar the fact that we see methamphetamine and addressing the methamphetamine problem should be a major, major priority. And I think that this just helps us along the way with regard to addressing this very significant problem, and again I congratulate the gentlewoman and support this amendment.

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

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon will be postponed.
Amendment No. 9 offered by Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas: Section 6 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

(2) ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE.—In completing the assessment under paragraph (1), the Director shall:

(A) consider relevant public health and academic research materials and studies, and may also consider relevant statistics concerning illicit drug and alcohol use, and criminal convictions related to such use;

(B) make findings, based on the information considered under subparagraph (A), regarding the nature and extent of illicit drug and alcohol use among children who are 12 to 17 years of age, and the availability of preventative, intervention, and rehabilitation services and programs to such children.

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit a report to Congress on the assessment undertaken under this subsection and the findings under paragraph (2)(B). Such report shall include, with respect to children who are 12 to 17 years of age, the following:

(A) Services and programs that have been effective in preventing such children from experimenting with and beginning the regular use of illicit drugs and alcohol.

(B) The extent to which chronic drug and alcohol use occurs in such children;

(C) The extent to which schools and other public institutions provide intervention for such children who are chronic users of illicit drugs and alcohol, the specific roles such schools and institutions play, and the extent to which such interventions are successful;

(D) Additional resources schools and other public institutions need to provide successful intervention to such children, including funding;

(E) The role of Federal agencies in providing intervention to such children who are chronic users of illicit drugs and alcohol, and the extent to which such Federal agency intervention is successful;

(F) Additional resources Federal agencies need to provide successful intervention to such children, including funding;

(G) The role of the Federal, State, and local criminal justice systems in providing intervention to such children who are chronic users of illicit drugs and alcohol, and the extent to which such criminal justice interventions are successful.

My amendment is one that seeks to be a tool for intervention, a guidepost for the right kinds of programs that can affect our youth. This is an amendment that I strongly say that we know that drug use among the ages of 12 to 17, and in many instances girls, is going up. The data is clear. We also know that there are many programs, a lot funded by this agency, of course, but the problem is we do not have a complete understanding of the assessment of these programs, how they can be effective in local, State, and Federal governments.

Mr. Chairman, a recent Washington Post article from this past February describes how girls are trying alcohol and drugs at higher rates than boys. The National Survey on Drug Use and Health found that 730,000 girls between the ages of 12 and 17 started smoking cigarettes in 2004, compared with 565,000 boys; and 675,000 girls started using marijuana, compared with 577,000 boys; 14.4 percent of girls and 12.5 percent of boys in this study reported misusing prescription drugs; 1.5 million girls started drinking alcohol in 2004, compared to 1.28 million boys.

We also know that our particular communities have seen that, at least, if it has not increased, it is still the same. There were 20,692 drug-related prescriptions in 2003. In 2004, they were 22,107. In 2005, they were 23,157. In 2006, they were 24,304.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have some serious reservations with this amendment, not with the goals, but whether many of these studies are already being conducted. We have the right to work with the gentlewoman from Texas to sort that through. I have agreed to support this amendment and accept this
amendment on the condition that we will continue to work in conference and to the degree there is not duplication, because I agree with two fundamental underlying points. One is that we have seen a rise in drug use among girls and women; in methamphetamine in particular we have seen a startling rise. Secondly, in our prisons, we need to continue to look at that.

I believe there are a number of private sector studies in addition to what ONDCP does that will reach much of that same data. And then some of the reasons that I share her goals, and I will continue to work in conference to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Cummings).

Mr. Cummings. Mr. Chairman, I strongly, by the way, support this amendment. Ms. Jackson-Lee talked about a recent Washington Post article from February 10 describing how girls are trying alcohol and drugs at a higher rate, and then she went on to talk about the national survey on drug use and how it found that some 730,000 girls between the ages of 12–17 started smoking cigarettes in 2004, and it got compared with 560,000 boys, and then 280,000 girls starting to use marijuana compared to 577,000 boys. It seems that there is something going on here that we definitely need to look at.

I know the chairman will work in conference to try to make sure that we address all of these problems. I would definitely support the amendment.

Mr. Souder. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Cummings, and I want to thank the chairman very much.

I look forward to making sure as we work our way to conference and through conference that we, too, have an effective comprehensive approach that addresses the concerns that we are all mutually concerned about: this ascending rate of usage by girls and boys, but by girls, and, of course, making sure we have an assessment of the effective programs. I look forward to working with the chairman, and I thank the chairman very much.

Mr. Chairman, and fellow members of the committee, I would like to draw your attention to an amendment that I think is crucial in ensuring the work and dedication of our Office of National Drug Control Policy domestically. A recent Washington Post article from February 10 described how girls are trying alcohol and drugs at a higher rate than boys. The National Survey on Drug Use and Health found that 730,000 girls between the ages of 12–17 started smoking cigarettes in 2004, compared with 565,000 boys, and 675,000 girls started using marijuana, compared with 577,000 boys. In this study, 14.4 percent of girls and 12.5 percent of boys reported misusing prescription drugs. In 2004, 1.5 million girls started drinking alcohol for the first time.

This is appalling, and saddening, and my amendment would directly address this by asking the Director of the ONDCP to assess the drug usage by children, as well as the existing preventive and treatment programs.

We can’t let our children poison themselves—but in order to take decisive and effective action, we must know more about what the current situation is, and inform our decision-making. I hope you will agree that this is an urgent amendment begins the search for a solution.

Thank you for your consideration and your support, and thank you Mr. Chairman.

Rebuttal to the argument that the National Youth Media Campaign addresses this issue and the amendment would be redundant. This amendment first and foremost requires the ONDCP to document and produce solid research on the occurrence of this problem nationwide. At this point in time, we have a single survey and anecdotal evidence. I think it is crucial to get the ONDCP to take responsibility for this issue and begin to inform decision-makers.

The amendment specifies items to assess that were not considered by the National Survey on Drug Use and Health such as the role of Federal and local criminal justice systems in providing interventions.

I would like to believe that the ONDCP can be considered an authority on matters having to do with drug use and abuse by children, and this amendment simply asks for an assessment and a report to Congress on the matter.

There were 20,692 drug related arrests in Houston in 2003 (ONDCP). In their lifetime, 32.9 percent of females and 48.9 percent of male Houston area high school students will have a lifetime use of marijuana (ONDCP). In 2000, there were 115,589 federal arrests made—28 percent for drug offenses.

In the past month alone, 10.8 percent of youth 12–17 years old have used drugs. Among State prisoners, 83.9 percent were involved with alcohol and drugs at the time of their offense.

Fifty-three percent of high school seniors reported using an illicit drug at least once in their lives.

White House office of National Drug Control Policy—130 member group led by John Walters. Some estimates say that the U.S. consumes 60 percent of the illicit drugs in the world. Fiscal year 2007 budget request—35 percent for reducing demand of drugs, 65 percent for crackdown of supplies.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. Jackson-Lee).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. DANIEL E. LUNGREN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Daniel E. Lungren of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 109–367 offered by Mr. Daniel E. Lungren of California.

Page 161, after line 2, insert the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall provide for a corporation that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code to—

(A) advise States on establishing laws and policies to address alcohol and other drug issues on the model State drug laws developed by the President’s Commission on Model State Drug Laws in 1993; and

(B) revise such model State drug laws and draft supplementary model State laws to take into consideration changes in the alcohol and drug abuse problems in the State involved.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from California (Mr. Daniel E. Lungren) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. Daniel E. Lungren of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in 1992, while serving as California’s attorney general, I was privileged to be appointed by President George H.W. Bush to be a commissioner on the President’s Commission on Model State Drug Laws. This was a congressionally established commission that was charged with creating a model code of laws to help States effectively address alcohol and other drug abuse.

This commission conducted a thorough process which included five public hearings, 25 working sessions, travels around the country for that purpose, and input from hundreds of individuals and organizations working at the State and local levels, to address substance abuse.

The result of that commission was 44 model drug laws and policies which offer comprehensive continuum of responses and services to address substance abuse problems. We had people from various disciplines in the mental health arena, in the law enforcement arena, in the educational arena, in the social services arena, all coming together to see whether or not they could come up with a continuum of responses to this terrible problem.

Since fiscal year 1995, Congress has provided funding for a nonprofit entity charged with States on laws and policies to address alcohol and other drug issues using as its base the model acts crafted by the President’s Commission on Model State Drug Laws, to revise these model State drug laws and to draft supplementary model acts to meet changes in State substance abuse problems. They actually work with the States. They work with local governments to come up with these comprehensive approaches.

Having these resources available to the States has been an enormous asset in combating substance abuse as States introduce and pass newer enhanced drug laws, create new guidelines and
At the end of the bill, add the following (and make such conforming changes as may be necessary to the table of contents):

**SEC. 20. STUDY ON PRESCRIPTION DRUGS ASSOCIATED WITH IATROGENIC ADDICTION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall request the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences to enter into an agreement under which the Institute agrees to conduct a study examining certain aspects of prescription drugs associated with iatrogenic addiction, including oxycodone hydrochloride controlled-release tablets.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The study conducted pursuant to this section shall evaluate—

(1) the rate and impact of iatrogenic addiction associated with the use of prescription drugs described in subsection (a); and

(2) the relative addictiveness of prescription drugs described in subsection (a) when compared with other opioids and other substances included in schedule I or II of the schedules of controlled substances established by section 202 of the Controlled Substances Act.

(c) REPORT.—The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall ensure that the agreement under subsection (a) provides for the submission of a report to the Congress, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the results of the study conducted pursuant to this section.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Maryland on their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have offered simply requests that the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy ask the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study to examine certain aspects of iatrogenic addiction, which is associated with prescription drugs like OxyContin.

Back in September, our Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs for Government Reform held a field hearing in Boston and it regulated the study of prescription drugs such as OxyContin. One of the primary concerns raised at those hearings by the experts was that they testified that the lack of information on the addictiveness of these type of drugs has created a great problem in society.

For this amendment calls for a study that would first look at the rate and impact of iatrogenic addiction; that is, addiction to properly prescribed prescription drugs, which is associated with prescription drugs like OxyContin. One of the objectives of the study of prescription drugs like OxyContin, and in effect these individuals become customers for life.

Because there are some legitimate medicinal uses for some of these painkillers, it is increasingly difficult to balance the need of those people who are desperately in need of these drugs, to try to balance that against the problem of addiction. It is my view that it is absolutely necessary to have the information on addictiveness of drugs associated with iatrogenic addiction, including OxyContin.

I want to relate briefly, Mr. Chairman, the story of a young woman, and this is just one example of thousands, a young woman in my district from a good family who went to the dentist's office with tooth pain.

After the tooth extraction, she was given a prescription of OxyContin, and, after completing that, exhausting that prescription, she went back again for an additional prescription. Sometime thereafter, she went back in, complaining of additional tooth pain and other toothache, and again was given another prescription of OxyContin. It happened a third time.

To make a long story short, I met this young woman during an effort to combat the opioid crisis in my district, and she confesses now in rehab that she had become addicted to the first couple of prescriptions and she went back, falsely claiming tooth pain, just so she could get additional prescriptions for OxyContin. She became hopelessly addicted to OxyContin through no fault of her own.

Another observation in my own district, it is quite common, traveling to pharmacies in the halls or drugstores in my local downtown area, it is not uncommon to see big signs in the front windows of my pharmacies that say, "We do not carry OxyContin on the premises." In other words, please don't rob us.

There have been so many robberies trying to acquire this drug of addicts that now the pharmacies are just saying we don't carry it on the premises, do not rob us. I think it is a sad state of the addictive quality of this drug and also our inability to police it.

At this point, there are no studies that help us understand why certain people become addicted, while others don't, to drugs like OxyContin. By conducting this study, we will be better able to understand how the brain interacts with this drug.

Secondly, the study will look at the relative addictiveness of prescription drugs such as OxyContin when compared with other painkillers as well as other controlled substances under Schedule I and Schedule II of the Controlled Substances Act.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. Souder and Mr. Cummings and all for their leadership on this effort. I think they too are shining examples of bipartisanship on an issue that is very important to the American people.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.
The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to this amendment; it is an excellent amendment, and I wanted to address the subject for a few minutes.

Mr. LYNCH has been a leader in this, as he has also been in the steroids battle, in the committee. I appreciate that. Chairman CANDICE MILLER conducted a hearing in his district on this subject. We worked together as committees, although I could not be at the hearing.

We also conducted a hearing on OxyContin down in Orlando. OxyContin has also hit my districts hard. There was a series of bank robberies and other robberies of pharmacies in the area, I think 19 total, that when people become addicted to this or become distributors, it can lead to other sorts of crime and organized crime in many areas of the country.

It is a little known fact that cocaine is not the number one killer in America through drug abuse, nor is heroin, nor is methamphetamine. It is abuse of prescription drugs. It is very hard for us, and we are going to see, as we make progress on methamphetamine through our control of pseudoephedrine and trying to get better control of the border at least someday in the future on methamphetamine and some of the other drugs, that legal drugs are going to be possibly our biggest challenge.

One of the struggles with this, as we found out in the hearing in Orlando, that many of the medical community, not only are we fighting the pharmaceutical community, as we did in the methamphetamine bill and pseudoephedrine, we are also fighting the medical community.

Here we got in a very testy exchange about how we define pain control, and that comes as to how we regulate this, and what constitutes one person's pain control may not be another's, and it becomes an excuse for having no regulations on OxyContin.
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So we had therapists opposed to us; we had certain medical communities opposed to us, who may have legitimate uses. But the bottom line is that we have an epidemic of abuse occurring with this and other prescription drugs.

We do not need to hear how not to regulate it. What we need to work with these groups is the best way to regulate it, and part of that is getting a study on accuracy of how this addiction works. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership with this. I will support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, support this amendment. I want to thank Mr. LYNCH for his leadership. OxyContin is something that we have taken a look at, and we realize that it has had, as Mr. LYNCH has described, just all kinds of damaging effects. I think that the good thing is that this gives us an opportunity to get more information. I think it is almost impossible to truly make good policy unless you have an adequate amount of information. So I think this will be helpful to our subcommittee as we move forward in trying to address this interesting thing that we note is it seems as if from time to time, and depending on the area in the country, certain drugs seem to become the drug of the time.

And so what we are constantly trying to do is make sure that we have every bit of detail that we possibly can so that we can create the kind of policies to effectively counter the abuse of certain drugs.

So, again, I applaud Mr. LYNCH. Thank you for bringing this to us. I thank you for yielding me time.

Mr. SOUDER. Reclaiming the balance of my time, as Mr. CUMMINGS just said, this shows the diversity of things that we tackle in our committee, in our narcotics areas across the United States. We saw new shocking revelations yesterday on Barry Bonds. Masking agents are increasingly a challenge in trying to deal with steroids and other vitamin supplements and things that people are using in excess quantities to create artificial advantages in competition.

How this thing goes down to young people whose bodies cannot handle this, as we heard in our steroids hearing, watching OxyContin, which is one of the most effective painkillers being used by people, taking people's lives, and it becomes a way that people rob banks and pharmacies and violence in society, abuse of other prescription drugs.

In addition to cocaine, heroin, methamphetamines different areas will have different things come up at different times. But we need to know the science behind it. We need to know how it affects the human brain. We need to know the best ways to fight this. We need comprehensive efforts.

That is what the Office of National Drug Control Policy is supposed to do. I commend the gentleman and support this amendment from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the last two points in closing: we have had to in my district open up two brand-new adolescent, one adolescent boys facility to deal with this problem and one adolescent girls facility.

I have the extensive waiting lists at both facilities trying to deal with this problem. I think that somewhere down the line we have to address the fundamental question in this country about how addictive, how addictive are we going to let drugs become that are sold over the counter commercially. Because, eventually, we have to realize that there is a commercial advantage to selling an addictive drug.

And those drug companies, they are creating customers for life here who have no other alternative.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER from Florida). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. PAUL.

On page 1, line 13, after the end of the bill, add the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 20. SUNSET.

"This Act shall not be in effect after September 30, 2011."

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. I thought it would be very noncontroversial, because it merely sunsets our provision. We have just gone through a period of time of 2 years where there has been no authorizations, but we have done appropriations as necessary.

The amendment merely says, this act shall not be in effect after September 30, 2011. So that is 5 years, which I think is very adequate. But I would want to express my agreement with the authors of this particular bill, because we do have a very serious problem in this country with drugs.

I, as a physician, am very much aware of the seriousness of it. I also agree that prescription drugs are probably every bit as bad or much worse, because there is so much dependency on psychiatric drugs.

But, nevertheless, I come down on the side of saying no matter how good legislation like this is, it backfires; there are too many unintended consequences. In such a short period of time, all I can say is that prohibition in the ultimate sense was tried with alcohol.

And alcohol is still now a severe problem in this country. And we knew
that Prohibition produced many more problems than the alcohol itself. I think that is true with drugs. I think we have allowed ourselves to be carried away, to a large degree, because now we have laws that lack compassion. We do know, in the medical field, that marijuana is useful to cancer patients and AIDS patients can be helped where our drugs are not helpful; and to me this is just sad that we override State laws that permit it.

The overwhelming number of people in the country are saying that we ought to allow marijuana to be used for very sick patients. Not too long ago, just this week, I had a meeting with a student that came from a central Asian country. He was an exchange student. He says the big subject at his school was, what is the age limit when I can drink alcohol? They would ask him that and he said, there is no age limit.

So I asked him, I said, is there a drinking problem in your country? And he said no. He says it is uneventful. It is the excitement of something being illegal that actually makes the problem a lot worse.

And even in our country, we had a grand experiment from the beginning of our country until about 35 years ago. We had very few of these laws. Yet we have a whole lot to show for it. We had very few of these laws. Yet we have laws that lack compassion. We have a whole lot to show for it.

It would be tragic if we got in the position where each Department, if Congress could not decide on the exact wording of the authorization bill, the office suddenly disappeared, and we would not have a national anti-drug media, we would not have the HIDTA programs, we would not have the technology that you have talked about.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume. On the surface it looks fairly mild, but it is actually an attempt to eliminate the drug czar's office.

The gentleman from Texas is certainly the principled Libertarian that we have in the Congress and probably one of the most principled Libertarians in the country. I presume he would favor sunsetting most Departments in the Federal Government. The question is, why would we single out the drug czar's office?

We have many programs that are unauthorized. That is an unfortunate thing. I believe all programs should, in fact, be authorized; and that is why we are going to get this authorization. It got lost at the end of the last session in the Senate side, and we are proceeding again with Senate support.

It would be tragic if we got in the position where each Department, if Congress could not decide on the exact wording of the authorization bill, the office suddenly disappeared, and we would not have a national anti-drug media, we would not have the HIDTA programs, we would not have the technology that you have talked about.

Dr. Paul and I have deep differences on the effectiveness of narcotics. We both share a skepticism in the ability of government to solve things. But I believe in the drug policy area we can at least make a difference. And I believe it is an important difference.

He and I have our deep philosophical differences on this, but I very much respect his consistent opposition, basically to this legislation that comes forth in front of Congress. But I need to oppose this amendment.

This amendment would have the effect of singling out the Office of National Drug Control Policy solely among Cabinet level officials to be put under this regulation. And it could, in fact, like many other programs that we do not get reauthorization, such as juvenile justice, such as Head Start, has at times not had its authorization, we have many different programs that do not get authorized.

We would not want to fold those programs merely because the two bodies could not agree on their final wording. I also would like to at this time, I got a copy of the administration's statement of policy of why they oppose this bill, in spite of the fact it has gone unanimously through the subcommittee, unanymously through the full committee, gone with complete support of multiple other committees in Congress.

It is, quite frankly, a relatively insulting document. It says, for example, that it infringes on the prerogatives of the executive by designating ONDCP as a Cabinet level official. As we explained earlier, that is not what the law says it does.

It says it has to be treated like a Cabinet-level position. Which, by the way, was what Congress passed in the beginning. It was a congressional designation. The bill duplicates the drug certification process, is another one of their complaints at the State Department. That is true. But ONDCP is a narcotics agency, and they should be advising the State Department, which has many concerns when they do certification. It complains about the interdiction coordinator in the Department of Homeland Security being under a national drug control strategy, which means odd that ONDCP would be objecting to this being in their Department.

Once again, it reiterates that they want to move the HIDTAs away right now in the Justice Department from ONDCP. The reason we have them there is because they were drawn into HIDTA relationship where they had a vote and could have influence in the decision-making.

The administration's proposals would gut the funding, over half of it; would take away the vote of State and local officials, all of whom said unanimously they would withdraw from the program if the administration persists with this, which was denied in both Houses last year, denied overwhelmingly again by their own people. And narcotics officers of America unanimously oppose this, when the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas unanimously oppose it, how can the administration keep sending up this type of document? They are supposed to be the leaders of the world on narcotics, not fighting every police officer in America, every State trooper in America, every HIDTA in America. I do not understand this.

I believe that we are reducing its flexibility in the National Anti-drug Media Campaign. We certainly are. Because we are frustrated that they have not dealt with the problem of methamphetamine. So that allegation that this would be true and that the overall amount is not dealt with the problem of methamphetamine is their number one problem in America, to the HIDTAs; and particularly he has been after the methamphetamine HIDTAs that were created, the Rocky Mountain HIDTA, the Missouri HIDTA, the Iowa HIDTA.

It has been very frustrating to see this persistent, persistent, even after we passed the Methamphetamine Act that we have restricted their reprogramming ability. Because every time the local HIDTAs or others try to deal with the methamphetamine problem, they want to reprogram the money away from the problem. So we have given them most of the flexibility there.

But while some of their charges are true, they fail to point out why the House and Senate unanimously from both parties are so frustrated that we have had to go forth with this. It would be tragic if my friend from Texas' amendment passed and would not let us move forward with this bill.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 114 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, Ms. WATERS.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from Texas that calls for the sunset of the HIDTAs. I do not think this is a bad idea.

You know, I have heard a lot from the other side of the aisle about poverty programs that did not work, and I saw a lot of work to get rid of those programs. This is a program that does not work. We have the deaths from overdoses from methamphetamines, crack cocaine, cocaine, pills, Ecstasy, heroin, marijuana, you name it. And we are doing nothing. America can do better than this.
Why should we keep a program without reviewing it, just put it into law forever? This is what you are trying to do. We need to sunset it. Period. As a matter of fact, I would get rid of it; it would not even be authorized. But if you insist on reviewing it, you can do it, but you want to put it in law forever without the kind of reviews that are necessary to determine its effectiveness?

This does not work. It is costing the American taxpayers $870 million to run this ineffective program. I think we should get rid of it, and I support the gentleman’s amendment.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each side be given 2 additional minutes.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself to the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, earlier I mentioned that prohibition was a total failure with alcohol and that it is very similar, and I think the gentleman from Indiana helped make my point. He is a bit frustrated with the failure of the laws on the books, and for what reason I do not know, but we certainly ought to be frustrated with the results. But the laws are difficult to enforce and I understand and sense his frustration with this.

One of the major reasons why I object to this approach is not only the cost. The cost is pretty important and I think it is pretty important to realize it does not work very well, if at all; but we also have to look at the damage done with our mistaken thoughts that this is doing a lot of good.

Once a war is declared, whether it is a war overseas or whether it is a domestic war on some evil here, that is when the American people should look out for their civil liberties. There, the issue of privacy is attacked. So now we have a war on terrorism and we have the PATRIOT Act and all these other things that intrude on the civil rights and civil liberties of Americans, and, at the same time, not achieving a whole lot of good results.

This is what happens when there is a war on. Those people who are trying to avoid taxes, all law-abiding citizens have to obey all these laws. So as soon as there is a war, look out for your civil liberties and your privacy. The war on drugs has done a great deal of harm to our right of privacy.

Once again, I agree with the argument, there are a great deal of problems in this country with the illegal use of marijuana. I am saying is it does not help to have this type of a war on drugs because it tends to distort things. It raises prices artificially high.

It causes all kinds of ramifications that actually cause more killing and dying. This is why prohibition of alcohol was stopped, because people died from drinking bad alcohol, and the gangs sold the alcohol. The same thing happens today.

Like I mentioned, that student that lived in the country, and he was 16 years old, and there were no rules or laws against teenagers drinking beer or alcohol and there was no problem. Kids did not drink. It was not exciting to do it. So there is a certain element of truth to that. Kids smoking cigarettes is against the law. You sneak off and smoke cigarettes. That happens to be what teenagers do.

So no matter how well-intended legislation like this is, it tends to have too many unintended consequences, it costs too much money. And we fail to realize that we in this country live with a greater amount of personal liberty and respect for State and local law enforcement than drug problems. Think about it. Through the latter part of the 18th century, the 19th century, the early part of the 20th century, essentially no laws, and we had a lot less problems.

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

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

Mr. Chairman make no mistake about it, this amendment is whether you support the director’s office or not. The fact is that we sunset everything every year, because if we do not appropriate, they do not have any dollars. If it never gets reauthorized and then you do not appropriate, it is sunnseted. We have sunset provisions in every piece of legislation we pass. All we have to do is not fund it. Then they do not have any staff. They do not have any offices. They do not have any rent.

This is a legitimate debate about whether the Federal Government should be involved in drug law enforcement.

I disagree with my colleague from Texas, across the board. We do not even agree on prohibition. Quite frankly, prohibition reduced alcohol abuse. It reduced spouse abuse. It reduced child abuse. People wanted to drink and we had a history of drinking. And it came back in mostly for political reasons, not because of all the other side arguments you have heard. In fact, it accomplished its goals; it just had a side goal, given the history of alcohol use in the United States. And ever since then we have been trying to control it even down to the point of now regulating bartenders who serve drinks to people who have consumed too much.

We still see the ravages of alcohol abuse. We see States that have passed liberal marijuana laws repealing those laws. Denmark and The Netherlands are treating because when they legalized marijuana, it was not like the drug traffickers disappeared. They just moved to harder drugs and started to sell those. The marijuana that we see today isn’t the ditch weed we used to have in Indiana or the sixties’ marijuana. It is this hydroponic marijuana with 30 to 40 percent THC that sells on the streets much like crack cocaine. It is a drug that is impinging on your brain much like crack cocaine.

The fact is that this is a great danger to this country, that we have made progress. The keen attitudes towards marriage have consistently declined.

The cocaine in the United States has shown some movement based on what has happened in Columbia. Right now we have a problem that we cannot control the heroin out of Afghanistan. We are tackling the marijuana. In fact, we have seen a broad move across the United States that has reduced drug abuse. It is important that we have a director there. We just want to see the director being more effective.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL). The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. REHBERG

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. REHBERG:

Page 213, after line 6, insert the following new subsection:

(k) Prevention of Methamphetamine Abuse and Other Emerging Drug Abuse Threats.—

(1) Requirement to use 15 percent of funds for methamphetamine abuse prevention.—The Director shall ensure that, of the amounts appropriated under this section for fiscal year, not less than 15 percent shall be expended solely for—

(A) the activities described subsection (b) with respect to advertisements specifically intended to reduce the use of methamphetamine; and

(B) grants under paragraph (2).

(2) Grant Authority.—The Director may award grants to private entities for purposes of methamphetamine media projects. Any such project—

(A) shall have as its goal the significant reduction of the prevalence of first-time methamphetamine use among young people; and

(B) shall focus solely on the prevention of methamphetamine use, through, at a minimum, public service messages that are based on research showing what is effective in substantially reducing such use among young people, including public service messages in both print and electronic media and on websites.

—}
Mr. SOUDER for his tremendous leadership on this issue, and in taking a look at this amendment, this is an extremely important amendment.

What the amendment does is it ensures that no less than 10 percent of the national media campaign funds will be used on advertisements specifically intended to reduce methamphetamine use, and it allows the director to award grants to private entities.

I heard the joke not long ago that said, creativity is nice but plagiarism is a whole lot quicker. Usually plagiarism is not a good thing, but in this particular case I want to talk about a project in Montana that is worthy of copying in all the other 49 States.

Some of you computer nerds might recognize the name Siebel. Tom Siebel sold his business to Oracle, so he is out of that business. He set up a 501(c)(3) called The Meth Project in Montana. The Montana Meth Project is the first affiliate.

We are spending currently about $10 million just on methamphetamine use alone, trying to get a targeted message to 12- to 17-year-olds. Our children are using meth. We need to get to it.

It is a fabulous program. We do not need to recreate the wheel. What we do need to do is allow the director the opportunity to have the flexibility to grant monies from this program to other entities to prove that there are other advertising strategies out there.

When you go to the doctor with an illness, usually you go to a family practitioner; but when you finally find out what is wrong, you will probably go to a specialist. Methamphetamine is a cancer. We can carve out surgically the tumor. Let me use the numbers. Within the last 6 months we have had 30,000 minutes of television, 30,000 minutes of radio advertising, print, billboards, Internet advertising. On average in Montana, 3 times a day. It is phenomenal and we are seeing the numbers drop.

These are the kinds of exciting programs that, once you make the determination that not all good ideas originated in Washington, D.C., there are ideas throughout the Nation, the rest of the country will be jealous. They will want the opportunity to copy what we have done in Montana.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. I think we have a situation where I have been a big proponent of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, but I think we have to be very careful in how we spend our money.

There are parts of our country that are suffering tremendously with regard to methamphetamine. And I do not think it is unreasonable to take that 10 percent and make sure it is directed towards that problem. The fact still remains, and one of the things that I do like about this amendment is that if there is a decrease in the methamphetamine labs, then that money is then put back to be used for other purposes. I think that makes sense. Perhaps we ought to do that more in other legislation that we pass out of this House.

I support the gentleman. Our sub-committee has been very, very concerned about methamphetamines. This is just another way that perhaps we can prevent some of our young people from going that route.

During much of the testimony by the way that we received, there was a lot of testimony with regard to young people now looking more and more at ads, by the way, on the Internet. And I think that is a situation that as we have to adjust when we find that certain drugs become the drug of the day or the drug of the year, we have to adjust our methodology, too, and the amount of money that we are spending with regard to, like I say, a program like this for advertising methamphetamines.

I support the amendment.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I make an additional 2 minutes, given 5 additional minutes, given the number of speakers that we have on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Montana (Mr. Rehberg) for working with me on this issue.

Meth abuse is prevalent in all the States and imposes a high cost on society. Mr. Chairman, Meth is highly addictive and its effects are severe and long-lasting. Recent studies have demonstrated that meth causes more damage to the brain than heroine, alcohol, or cocaine. Its abuse impacts not only the users but also the user’s family and the general public. Tens of thousands of citizens across the country have been taken away from their meth abusing parents, placed with relatives, or shifted into the already overcrowded foster care system.

It is our duty in Congress to ensure that the public is informed and educated about the dangerous effects of this drug, and that is why I helped introduce this amendment.

This amendment is an important tool to fight the meth epidemic. It will require that at least 10 percent of the media budget for the Office of National Drug Control Policy be spent on advertising fighting meth abuse. With this minimum percentage we can ensure that the public is educated about the dangers and risks of this deadly drug and help prevent its further abuse.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I would like to compliment the group of cosponsors who have all been active in the anti-meth efforts. Montana has been truly a model of what the private sector can do.

The campaign that Mr. Rehberg was talking about is using much more dramatic than what we have seen out of the Federal Government. It is extremely disappointing that we need to look at how to use this Montana model in how to get our national ad campaign expanded.

As has been pointed out, there are some risks when you designate a percentage of the national media campaign to be devoted to one particular drug. But this says reeducation and there is a proven reduction, then that requirement will not be there. Plus, if the Congress of Counties in the United States say this is the number one drug problem in America, if we are hearing about it in basically in all 50 States now, but 37 States have heard about it so aggressively that they are banning pseudoephedrine or moving to ban pseudoephedrine. And we just passed a bill in the United States Congress to significantly reduce cold medicines from 120 choices down to 20 because of the ravages of meth, if we are willing to take those drastic strategies; if the county officials across the country say meth is the number one drug in the Midwest and the West are hard hit by meth, California has these super labs that are there; if we are seeing it move into Pennsylvania and
North Carolina and down into Florida, and now getting into New England; if this is that big of a problem, is this so outrageous to ask that 10 percent of the national ad campaign be devoted to fighting meth?

Where have they been? I thank the gentleman who brought this amendment forward and strongly support the amendment.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), one of the sponsors.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. REHBERG, and we have really enjoyed working on this. I rise also in strong support. The only reservation I have at all is perhaps 10 percent is not enough. We are dealing with a situation that in Arkansas, started in the Midwest, started in Arkansas. States like that, very rapidly spread across the country.

When I talk to anybody in enforced in my State, they tell us that 65 to 70 percent of crime in Arkansas now is directly attributed to methamphetamine. Our shelters are full. When you use the term n-arco in Arkansas, you get a lot of people who can’t be there, because you have to get paranoid. You start beating up your family, and it is at an age when the children are invariably involved because it is in your 20s to 40s.

While I was waiting to come and speak on this, I went in and talked to my MediVac folk who are out there that wanted to tell me about their issues in transporting patients. I mentioned I was going to come here and speak on this. They started relating story after story of transporting burn patients, children, men and women that had been injured as they were cooking meth that exploded.

So, again, I appreciate the chairman and ranking member and strongly support this amendment.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for the time.

I want to add that I, too, believe it should be more than 10 percent. Of course, the ONDCP director has that flexibility.

I would also like to additionally comment a little bit more on the statement of administration policy and the bill in general that shows our frustration.

I mentioned in the State Department on the certification process that the State Department has certification, but there are many other variables. In fact, that clause has been weakened to say “demonstrably falling.” What this says is the drug czar has to show whether these nations, such as Mexico, whether these are dependable partners such as India and China are fully cooperating, because we need to have the drug czar say what is happening on narcotics, and the State Department can make its own rulings.

Furthermore, we have a big debate about how the budget should be counted. We believe that the administration has been misrepresenting what we are actually paying for narcotics in multiple ways. If the prisoners, if you count treatment as the only part of the prisons that is counted in the drug control budget. Well, we know many people are in jail because of narcotics. It leads to us not understanding what the actual costs of what we are doing are.

Now, I support all that. I am not trying to say it should be cut, but understating it does not give Congress an accurate impression of what we are spending on narcotics. Similarly, in the Department of Homeland Security.

So we are pushing in this legislation to address a wide range of things, and this particular amendment addresses one of the most egregious problems we have had, and I feel watching this full debate sees, one amendment after another coming up on meth. That is because the people are speaking out. It is not just in the rural Midwest.

It started out in Hawaii, in Honolulu, had to fumigate certain apartments because you can endanger the children and the people moving in the next time. When we did a hearing in Congressman Turner’s district in Wilmington, Ohio, that very day in Dayton, Ohio, which is a large city, they found a string of seven houses that had the drugs labs internally because you can smell it. That is partly why people go to rural areas, but they found the first big bust in Dayton because they brought up a string of houses so they could not smell it, much like they did with hydroponic marijuana. This is a thing with not only the crystal meth but even the drug labs are hitting the big cities. This is something that needs to be tackled.

This is one where we can win. This is one when you show the ads, like are shown in Montana, they capture the people. They understand the danger of this drug, and what we need to do is make sure our national ad campaign includes that.

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

Let me just say this: I think that Mr. SOUDER makes a very good point. One of the things that I think we probably need to see, and particularly our young folk, is the devastation of meth and to see what it causes people to do to themselves and the evil that it has had on communities. I am convinced that if our young people just had any idea of what happens to people when they use meth, I think some of them would turn around.

During one of our hearings, we were shown numerous pictures of young people. One picture was taken before they used meth and then another taken even sometimes two or three months later, and the difference was incredible. Many of them looked like they had aged about 10 years in about three or four, five months. Many of them looked very drawn and, I mean, just had all kinds of blisters and marks on their faces and their bodies. If there is one thing that we would do, it is certain actions of young people, many of them want to continue to look good. We discovered that when we dealt with the whole issue of steroids.

So I think it is important. We have not seen the kind of reduction that we would like to see in methamphetamine use. As a matter of fact, it is pretty stable, but we would like to see it go down, and I think that this is the appropriate approach.

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

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) who has played a very, very important role in the whole meth issue, and I thank him for helping to cosponsor this.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. REHBERG for leading on this amendment and giving me an opportunity to participate in this.

I would like to also thank the Chairman, Mr. SOUDER, for the intensive work that he has done on meth. It has been a real catalyst for all of us that have joined together on this team.

This amendment would dedicate a minimum of 10 percent of the funds to the anti-meth ad campaign to win the war on meth. Meth destroys our rural communities from the inside out. We need to make sure that people, especially our young people, get the message: meth kills.

In Iowa, we are turning the tide in the war on meth with an 80 percent reduction in the number of meth labs after passing a tough precursor law. Unfortunately, meth continues to pour in from our southern border, primarily Mexico. The dedicated dollars in this amendment will help stop young people, especially, from using meth in the first place.

Meth is more than 10 percent of the illegal drug problem in America. Spending 10 percent on this ad campaign is the minimum that we should commit.

I thank you.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

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

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank everybody, everybody who has talked on the issue today, everybody who has been involved in this, the leaders of this bill and the bill as well. Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SOUDER, your leadership on the whole drug issue has been very important to this country.

We are lucky in Montana. We have 930,000 people. We have 147,000 square miles, and we decided to make ourselves the pilot project to see if it could work, if we could have a massive
campaign run like pretty much a political campaign. We have polling. We have focus groups. We have monitoring to see if our advertising is effective. We have both Senators, Senator BACUS, Senator BURNS and myself, Governor SCHWARZENEGGER.

We have the State legislature, law enforcement, district courts, Supreme Court, the judges and the U.S. Marshal all involved in this issue. It is the most phenomenal program I have ever seen, and I want you to come see the programs that I would like to share with you, as well, if you are interested in seeing the ads, if you would like a presentation, it is the kind of program that will make a government program that is already funded here in Washington even better.

We are not trying to replace it. All we are trying to do is present the idea to the drug czar, to the administration, to the director and say if you are interested in something like this, you have to have the ability to try the program, you have to have the ability to share with you, as well, if you are interested in seeing the ads, if you would like a presentation, it is the kind of program that will make a government program that is already funded here in Washington even better.

Forty-four percent of teens believe meth helps you lose weight. Thirty-nine percent of teens believe that meth makes you feel happy. Thirty-five percent of teens believe that meth makes you feel high. Twenty-three percent of teens believe meth makes you feel high. It scares me to death. I have a teenage daughter. I have one coming up shortly behind. Our children will tell you they are confronted by this problem every day at school. We did not have the fear that they do of going to school and being confronted with something that you use it once and it is proven it stays in your brain for many, many years, a drug that makes you want to pull your hair out, pick your skin off. You start bleeding your teeth.

This is the kind of thing we cannot allow in our country. There are a lot of issues we deal with on a daily basis in Congress. Sometimes we name post offices. Other days we deal with issues that spoke today, that worked on this amendment, thank you for giving us the consideration that you have. Please favorably look at this amendment and vote ‘yes.’

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG).

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

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. RENZI

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 109-387 offered by Mr. RENZI.

At the end of the bill, add the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 20. REPORT ON TRIBAL GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATION IN HIDTA PROCESS.

(a) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall prepare a report for Congress on the representation of tribal governments in the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program and in high intensity drug trafficking areas designated under that Program. The report shall include—

(1) a list of the tribal governments represented in the Program and a description of the participation by such governments in the Program;

(2) an explanation of the rationale for the level of representation by such governments; and

(3) recommendations by the Director for methods for increasing the number of tribal governments represented in the Program.

(b) DEADLINE.—The report prepared under subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program’ means the program established under section 707 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1701).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.
to methamphetamine and be included in the HIDTA process.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and, as I said, I do not oppose this amendment. It is an excellent amendment.

We have known for a long time that drug and alcohol abuse has been particularly devastating where there is lack of job opportunities on many of the reservations of our Indian nations in Arizona, New Mexico, and in the southwestern United States. There has been, in fact, a fetal alcohol syndrome and other challenges.

What is astounding to me is that the administration's Attorney General Gonzales made the statement that meth is an epidemic, but the office that is supposed to control all this, the drug czar's office, continues to downplay meth and has actually said that it is not growing. Yet on the ground, none of us are hearing this.

For example, in the Indian nations, where it is relatively quiet in the sense of the national knowledge of what Mr. Just described, at a hearing in Minnesota, the U.S. Attorney was there. He is the northern tier of Minnesota, North and South Dakota and so on, and he said that meth is tearing through the Indian nations in a way they haven't seen in other narcotics; at reservation in the southern part of Arizona, which is right on the border, and there they are right on the front lines of all kinds of narcotics as well, as the crystal meth that is going to come across.

This meth is going to move into upstate New York, where we have the reservation, the historic Mohawk reservation up on the Saint Lawrence Seaway, which once again is at a critical border point. And as we watch meth tearing through these Indian nations, we need to make sure when we put together these High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas that are under this, that those tribal nations are included as representatives.

I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona. It is a unique moment that we are looking the lead and making sure that as we have in these urban areas, whether it be in Arizona, whether it be in Minnesota, whether it be the Rocky Mountain HIDTA, or whether it be the northern upstate New York and other areas where we have major Indian nations, that they are included as we try to tackle drug trafficking and as we particularly get at the new scourge of methamphetamines.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I take this moment to support the amendment. I think it is a very good amendment.

Our dealings in the subcommittee with HIDTA is that HIDTA allows for all of our law enforcement agencies to come together and to address the issue of drugs. And certainly where there is a problem, we want to make sure that law enforcement is there.

I have often said that we cannot deal with drugs just from a law enforcement standpoint, but we have to couple that with effective treatment and try to prevent folks from even going on drugs. But the fact is I think it is a good amendment and it makes our bill a better one.

I think that what the gentleman has done through the amendment has brought something to the attention of the committee and certainly sort of shined a little light on so that perhaps we can more effectively deal with those problems in those tribal areas.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I want to again compliment the gentleman from Arizona. The Navajo nation is in northern Arizona and spills over into New Mexico and is a huge dominant entity, and he has worked aggressively to defend their interests and to make sure they are included in efforts like this, where sometimes they are forgotten.

Oklahoma, which has been ravaged by narcotics, and as we see it go into the mountains of North Carolina, clearly the Cherokee nation and other nations are at risk with this, too. The gentleman's amendment will help in many of these areas as we try to tackle meth and other narcotics.

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

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland for his kind words and his bipartisanship on this issue. It truly is bigger than any one party.

Also, I want to add that I thank the chair for coming out to Arizona and seeing it firsthand, and I will end this message: What alcohol did to our Native Americans in the late 1800s is now what is occurring with the methamphetamine pandemic across Indian country in our Nation.

These gentlemen and their committees stand in the gap to stop that. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

The amendment was agreed to.
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Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to this amendment for just a second. When I think about the entire process here and our subcommittee, we realized that there are experts in the area of narcotics, and we bring them before us all the time to seek their advice. In seeking their advice, we learn a lot. One of the things that we also realize is that this world of drugs is ever-changing from day to day, from hour to hour. We also realized, as we moved throughout the country, that there are various law enforcement methods that may be effective against one drug versus another.

I think we have a situation here when we talk about the drug czar consulting with, and that is ONDCP consulting with law enforcement, there is a certain level of respect that many of these officers have said that they simply desire, respect for what they do every day. I think a lot of times when they come to us and they come shaking their heads, one of the things that I know our subcommittee worries about is their morale when they are out there putting their lives on the line. And I have talked to these officers. I know the drug czar will say to us, we are doing the best we can with what we have got. They say in most instances, we do not have enough; but if you are going to take away some of the tools that we do have, it is going to become even more difficult for us to do our job.

Basically, what they are asking for is simply to be consulted, somebody to sit down and say, How is it going in Idaho or Baltimore, or, How is it going in California? And we have learned so much from these HIDTAs because they have an opportunity to work on all levels of government. So they can bring things I would think to the drug czar’s office that the drug czar may not be aware of.

That is why I am so supportive of this amendment; but I have to say, I do feel it is very unfortunate that we have to go through this process. I would hope that perhaps by doing this it will open those doors of communication so that these great men and women who courageously put their lives on the line and who have taken a phenomenal amount of time and energy to learn law enforcement, to understand it, to understand how the drug trade works, to understand the methods of combating folks who want to violate our drug laws, that we would have the benefit, that the drug czar would have the benefit of their knowledge and expertise so when we have legislation, we can use it from the very, very best.

I must tell you that I do believe that we have some of the best law enforcement in the entire country. But again as I have said to Mr. Souder, I wish that it went beyond the local law enforcement, because I think if we are going to address the whole issue of drugs in consultation with the drug czar, it must also be with all of those people who are out there dealing in the area of prevention, dealing in the area of interception, addressing our children, dealing with methamphetamines and so on.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each side be given an additional 2 minutes.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana and probably the leader in Congress in helping fight our war against drugs in our communities across this Nation.

I stand with my colleagues here in discussing a problem in our towns and our neighborhoods, particularly in Nebraska, and it is methamphetamines. Also, our teenagers are experimenting with prescription drugs where they can get a hold of them.

So I think this bill will comprehensively address a whole series of those concerns. I am pleased that we have been able to do this. The Meth Caucus has been bipartisan; this subcommittee has been bipartisan with Mr. Cummings and the full active membership of subcommittee all been supportive to bring a bill forth and move through the full committee unanimously, Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, Education, and Intelligence committees all participated in this process, individual Members with their amendments as well as the Meth Caucus.

I hope this bill will receive unanimous support. Three of the amendments we need a “yes” on. There is one amendment that would get rid of ONDCP, and I urge a “no” vote on that.

Mr. Cummings. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.
So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

**AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. HOOLEY**

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

**RECORDED VOTE**

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 3, not voting 27, as follows:

|ayes 403 |
|— |

---

**NOES—27**

| Paul |

---

**NOT VOTING—27**

| — |

---

**AYES—403**

| — |

---

**RECORDED VOTE**

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 3, not voting 27, as follows:

|ayes 403 |
|— |

---

**NOES—27**

| Paul |

---

**NOT VOTING—27**

| — |

---

**AYES—375**

| — |

---

**RECORDED VOTE**

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 3, not voting 27, as follows:

|ayes 403 |
|— |

---

**NOES—27**

| Paul |

---

**NOT VOTING—27**

| — |

---

**AYES—375**

| — |

---

**RECORDED VOTE**

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 3, not voting 27, as follows:

|ayes 403 |
|— |

---

**NOES—27**

| Paul |

---

**NOT VOTING—27**

| — |

---

**AYES—375**

| — |

---

**RECORDED VOTE**

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 3, not voting 27, as follows:

|ayes 403 |
|— |

---

**NOES—27**

| Paul |

---

**NOT VOTING—27**

| — |

---

**AYES—375**

| — |

---

**RECORDED VOTE**

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 3, not voting 27, as follows:

|ayes 403 |
|— |

---

**NOES—27**

| Paul |

---

**NOT VOTING—27**

| — |

---

**AYES—375**

| — |

---

**RECORDED VOTE**

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 3, not voting 27, as follows:

|ayes 403 |
|— |

---

**NOES—27**

| Paul |

---

**NOT VOTING—27**

| — |

---

**AYES—375**

| — |

---

**RECORDED VOTE**

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 3, not voting 27, as follows:

|ayes 403 |
|— |

---

**NOES—27**

| Paul |

---

**NOT VOTING—27**

| — |

---

**AYES—375**

| — |
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes, noes, 322, not voting 25, as follows:

SO THE AMENDMENT WAS AGREED TO.

SO THE AMENDMENT WAS REJECTED.

NOT VOTING—25

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed his vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:
Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 36 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “No.”

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. REHBERG

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is a demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye s 399, noes 9, not voting 24, as follows:

[A list of members voting aye, no, or not voting is provided here.]

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—all ayes 399, noes 5, not voting 28, as follows:

[A list of members voting aye, no, or not voting is provided here.]

Mr. DELAHUNT changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There being no other amendments, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the committee amendment is in order.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting 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. 2829) to reauthorize the Office of National Drug Control Policy Act, pursuant to House Resolution 713, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, or is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the bill (H.R. 2829)? If not, the question is on the amendment. If yes, the question is on the passage of the amendment.

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.
So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the Table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, I was in Connecticut and, therefore, missed six recorded votes.

I take my voting responsibility very seriously and would like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on recorded vote No. 33, "aye" on recorded vote No. 34, "no" on recorded vote No. 35, "aye" on recorded vote No. 36, "no" on recorded vote No. 37, "aye" on recorded vote No. 38, "aye" on recorded vote No. 39, and "no" on recorded vote No. 40.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I was not present to cast my votes on rollcall votes 65 through 74 earlier today, March 9, 2006. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the Chabot amendment—rollcall 34, "aye" on the Hooley amendment—rollcall 35, "no" on the Paul amendment—rollcall 36, "aye" on the Rehberg amendment—rollcall 37, and "aye" on final passage of H.R. 2829—rollcall 38.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the distinguished majority leader, for purposes of telling us what the schedule for the coming week is.

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Next week, Mr. Speaker, the House will convene on Tuesday at 12:30 for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of those bills will be sent to Members' offices by the end of the week. Any votes called on these measures will be rolled until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will take up consideration of the emergency supplemental appropriations bill.

Finally, we will consider H.R. 1606, the Online Freedom of Speech Act. The Committee on House Administration completed consideration of this bill this morning, and we expect that the Rules Committee will take up this next week to bring it to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. From what you have said, it is my presumption that then the Online Freedom of Speech Act will be the last order of business?

Mr. BOEHNER. It will be considered, we believe, on Wednesday, possibly Thursday, but probably on Wednesday.

Mr. HOYER. And the emergency supplemental appropriation, you say Wednesday or Thursday?

Mr. BOEHNER. So that would mean that we might consider the Internet bill prior to the supplemental? I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. That is a possibility. Mr. HOYER. With respect, Mr. Leader, to the budget, I know there was some talk about doing it prior to our break, but you had indicated last week it might roll over. Do you have a guess?

Mr. BOEHNER. It appears that my guess last week was correct.

Mr. HOYER. Obviously. Can you tell us when you think the budget might come before the House? I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank my colleague for yielding.

I would hope that the House would complete its consideration of the budget in those 2 weeks that we are back after the March recess, sometime in that 2 weeks.

Mr. HOYER. So in the latter part of March or third or fourth week in March?

Mr. BOEHNER. And before April 8.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the information that he has given to us.