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:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—223

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—195

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—14

Burton (IN)
Conaway
Costa
Davis (FL)
Evans
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Ford
Gonzalez
McKinney
Norwood
Salazar
Shays
Sweeney
Weiner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1128

Mr. TOWNS and Mr. MORAN of Virginia changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. GOHMERT changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced 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 consideration 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. 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. REHBERG). 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.

□ 1129

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 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.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

□ 1130

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 and abuse is a national crisis that affects the health of all of 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 of drugs in 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 bipartisan agreement. We aim 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 important element 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 parenting 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 campaign works, 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 of substance 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 attack the economic 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 bipartisanship was reflected in a unanimous vote to pass this bill out of our committee.

I am confident that we have put together a cohesive, effective piece of legislation that gives ONDCP the necessary tools to reduce elicit 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 Mr. 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 them. In addition to those addicted and their families, drug abuse affects all of us. Theft and violent crime are closely tied to drug abuse. In addition, billions of dollars are spent on health care due to drug abuse, a burden to the entire Nation.

In order to combat illegal drug use, the Federal Government must attack from different avenues using many agencies of the government. For example, the State Department works with other countries. The Drug Enforcement Agency enforces drug laws. The Department of Health and Human Services must deal with breaking addiction. ONDCP's mandate is to coordinate all of these efforts in a comprehensive strategy, coordinating with State, local, and international governments and institutions.

The bill before us today ensures that there is one place in the Federal Government that combats all aspects of the drug problem through drug prevention, treatment, enforcement, interdiction, and supply reduction. ONDCP has a vital role to play in our efforts to reduce the use of illegal drugs. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on passage of 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, and that is the increasing use and production of methamphetamines. 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 their top anti-drug priority 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. The great majority 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 just in the last year alone. In California, the figure is 80 percent.

Many States, and now the Federal Government through the Methamphetamine Epidemic Control Act, have taken decisive steps to strangle domestic meth production by cutting off the supplies of essential precursor chemicals like pseudoephedrine.

And with the passage of this law, we will also implement the following: require greater diligence on methamphetamine. The bill will require future installments of the National Drug Control Strategy to place greater emphasis on identifying emerging threats and properly preparing strategies to respond to such threats. This applies the lesson learned from the meth epidemic, which was allowed to spread from a regional to a national problem before any Federal response was made.

In this bill, we will target meth production through HIDTA. No less than $15 million will be specifically set aside for law enforcement initiatives against meth trafficking.

Those provisions alone show why this bill is so critically important in its reauthorization. This will help law enforcement and counties, and we pray it will help families, because if you have seen any of the articles about the abuse of methamphetamines, you see how a thriving human being became addicted to this drug and has devastated their life and their future.

So we work together in a bipartisan way to see if we can help local governments eradicate this scourge among our society. I thank Chairman SOUDER and the ranking member, Mr. CUMMINGS, for their team effort on solving some drug problems that face this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, as we stand here debating this important legislation before us today, illegal drug abuse, drug addiction, and drug-related violence are exacting an enormous toll on our society, destroying lives, tearing apart families and devastating entire communities. Nationwide, drug abuse will contribute to the loss of 50,000 lives, and more than 20,000 Americans will die as a direct consequence of illegal drug use this year alone.

In addition to the human toll, illegal drug abuse results in billions of dollars in cost to our Nation in health care costs and lost economic productivity, placing an enormous burden on the American people, State and local governments, businesses and other institutions.

This set of circumstances is simply intolerable in a compassionate Nation, and it is our duty as the people's representatives to formulate laws and policies to reduce the scope and severity of this problem.

To be sure, America's drug problem is national in scope and has international dimensions. But its impact, first of all, is personal and local. In one way or another, every one of us and everyone we know is touched by this problem. Unfortunately, I see the tragedy of drug abuse and drug violence play out all too starkly in my own inner-city Baltimore neighborhood and in the communities of Baltimore and Howard counties that I represent. I have made a deliberate choice to continue to live where I do because I am determined to see our efforts here make a difference in my community for the benefit of the people I call my friends and neighbors and people like them across this great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, no single event is more emblematic of the severe problems that inner-city Baltimoreans face than the horrific arson murder of Carmell and Angela Dawson and their five children in 2002. In the wee morning hours of October 16, 2002, a young drug dealer, upset with Angela Dawson's unrelenting efforts to report drug distribution activities occurring in front of her family's home, threw a fire bomb through the Dawsons' ground-floor window. The fire set the home ablaze, took seven lives, and sent a chilling message to the community: Don't snitch, don't cooperate with the police, and don't dare fight back.

The legislation we are considering today is a vital component of our Federal commitment to fight back against illegal drugs by mounting a comprehensive, coordinated effort to combat all aspects of the drug problem through drug prevention, treatment, enforcement, interdiction and supply reduction.

The Office of National Drug Control Policy, the drug czar's office, was created in 1988 and has been reauthorized twice, in 1993 and 1998. Its basic mandate is to coordinate and support the efforts of drug control agencies located in eight different Departments.

□ 1145

H.R. 2829 would reauthorize the drug czar's office and three key programs administered by it: the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program, HIDTA; the Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center, CTAC; and the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. HIDTA, CTAC, and the Media Campaign all play an important part in executing key aspects of the National Drug Control Strategy, and they deserve to be reauthorized.

H.R. 2829 was ordered reported by the Government Reform, Energy and Commerce, and Judiciary committees by voice vote with the bipartisan support of committee members. I am confident that this bill will strengthen ONDCP, its component programs, and our national comprehensive anti-drug effort by providing for increased interagency communication and cooperation, enhanced program and contractor accountability, and continuous evaluation of anti-drug programs and initiatives. This will result in more effective collaboration and let the administration, Congress, and the American people know in objective terms what approaches are working and what needs to be improved or rethought.

H.R. 2829 includes key bipartisan provisions that I strongly support, and most notably, the Dawson Family Community Protection Act. As amended by the manager's amendment adopted by the Judiciary Committee, this legislation, which I introduced with Chairman SOUDER in both the 108th and 109th Congresses, would annually provide at least $7 million in HIDTA funds to support neighborhood safety and community cooperation with police in areas severely affected by violent drug-trafficking activity.

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 to expand 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 advances the bipartisan, and I do emphasize that, bipartisan goal of supporting a strong, comprehensive, and coherent Federal anti-drug effort.

As the ranking minority member of the Government Reform's Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, I want to express my deep appreciation for the bipartisan support of Government Reform Committee Chairman TOM DAVIS of Virginia; ranking member HENRY WAXMAN; and Drug Policy Subcommittee Chairman MARK SOUDER. And I join them in strongly urging our colleagues to support this very important legislation.

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

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

Across America, individuals, families, and communities continue to be devastated by the scourge of drug abuse. It remains one of the most pressing and unforgiving problems our country faces.

Some have made comments, including on the floor earlier this morning, that we have made no progress in the war on drugs. That simply is not true. What we tend to do is go up and down as we do in any kind of battle. I do not believe we will ever get rid of the scourge of drug abuse any more than I believe we will get rid of what I believe is at its core, sin in other parts of America, whether it is spouse abuse, child abuse, rape.

But if we press and if we aggressively work together, we can reduce it. The fact is that when we backed off in the early 1990s and saw the Federal intervention dollars go down in the Andean region and the interdiction dollars go down, and the joke was even in prominent officials as ''I didn't inhale,'' we saw drug use go up so much that we have to reduce it 50 percent from 1993 until now to get back to where we were in 1992. That dramatic rise and falling, again, is somewhat typical of what has happened in American history in drug abuse.

We have had some steady progress in key indicators. There is not meth abuse if you can get at marijuana use because all meth users use marijuana. Marijuana is the gateway drug, along with tobacco and alcohol in high school, of all other narcotics abuse. Right now we are facing a meth epidemic in the United States that clearly, I believe, this administration has not responded to nearly aggressively enough. We also have prescription drug abuse. Oxycontin and other prescription drugs are actually causing the most deaths from any drug abuse in the United States. We have to be eternally vigilant.

This bill, introduced by TOM DAVIS, the distinguished chairman of the Government Reform Committee, and me, along with the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, ELIJAH CUMMINGS, and the full committee ranking member, HENRY WAXMAN, is a forceful and bipartisan recommitment to our broad national efforts to control drug abuse and to renew our support for a strong Office of National Drug Control Policy.

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 by an administration 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. I believe that, 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 do get more micromanagement.

We have actually 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 this we 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 us feel that there has been a lack 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 meth strategy. We have not had a 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, including 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 doing enough, for example, in Afghanistan if you do not have equal status. It is absurd to think a staff person in the White House could have the same clout as a fellow Cabinet member in reviewing budgets, at least most of the time. This does not interfere with the President's authority to determine the makeup of his Cabinet, but it does ensure that the director will be able to work with the Department heads on an equal basis.

It will improve effectiveness and accountability in drug treatment. There is page after page to try to make sure that our drug treatment programs and that SAMSA work directly with the ONDCP director to do that and it does not become arbitrary. We have had some very disappointing lack of communication from the ONDCP director with SAMSA, and this will help correct that.

It also requires international drug control certification, which we believe is important. It will deal with Colombia, Afghanistan, including microherbicides.

We have many different amendments inside this bill that have been put together by Members of both parties. It is a truly bipartisan effort. When people say we cannot work together, here

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 Government Reform, 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 never going to be able to address foreign terrorism on our shores.

□ 1200

So I thank you, and I thank you. I thank Mr. DAVIS and Mr. WAXMAN. I believe in a zero-tolerance policy, but we don't have a sense of urgency. Mr. SOUDER, I think you put it better than I could ever put it. This is an urgent problem, certainly nothing that started yesterday morning. It has been upon us.

The war on drugs is the original war on terror, one that we are fighting, and reauthorizing the Office of National Drug Control Policy is the least we can do, the least we can do, to continue the fight. I think it is a noble fight.

Illegal drug trafficking and use is a cancer on our society that destroys people, families, and even destroys neighborhoods. The bill takes a positive step in helping to restore the foundations of our community by authorizing more than $1.1 billion over 4 years to fight drug trafficking in high-intensity areas. I happen to live in one of those high-intensity areas, North Jersey/New York. This is an important investment that can be used by local, county, State and Federal agencies to collaborate information and root out the dealers and the traffickers.

In 2004, as a member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, Secretary Ridge appeared before us. We were talking about terror and elevating the alerts, if you remember the debates we had at that time and the color schemes, et cetera, et cetera, which, by the way, we still have. And I asked Secretary Ridge, who I had a great deal of respect for, I thought he did a good job with the cards that he was dealt; I asked him the question, ''Secretary Ridge, you were Governor of a State. Have you ever seen the terror on the faces of families and people who live in neighborhoods that are infested by drugs? Have you ever seen that terror?''

He said, ''I know exactly where you are going, Congressman, 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 a successful program. The 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 against the tragedy of 9/11, 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, Mr. SOUDER, for 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 some 2,000 of our troops in service. 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 from drug overdose in our communities, 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 acts that we see that are almost 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 measurable and accountable goals, 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 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 program.

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 the nineties, we finally got implemented. It is an incredible 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

this reauthorization does that. We do know that we must focus on good education programs, up-to-date prevention programs, interdiction, strong enforcement programs, and then treatment programs that we also have measurable results from.

So I am pleased to join my colleagues in speaking for this reauthorization, and I hope that the final product will do even more in addressing this serious problem our society faces.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), who is a member of our committee and who has worked on this issue, and is also a former mayor and very familiar with the drug issue in our country and in our cities.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for the opportunity to address this.

We are all concerned about drug policy and about drug control policy. We are concerned about the impact drug addiction has on individual lives and families. We are concerned about the ripple effects of addiction on communities.

But I would just like to make this observation as we prepare to vote on this bill: We have to be careful in our strategy to ensure that we do not mistake victims for enemies. We make a mistake when students are punished both through the legal system and then by denying them critical education provisions, as the drug provision of the Higher Education Act does. The recent scaling back of that provision by this Congress is a step in the right direction, but we must do more. Denying students the opportunity for a higher education does not solve the Nation's drug problems, nor does it provide drug treatment.

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 lives and 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 wanted to make this observation 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).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership, along with Mr. WAXMAN and 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 without ceasing 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 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 down. But for those who are 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 the work that 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 ages 12 to 17. We have seen a rising increase 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.

□ 1215

We know also that the scourge of cigarettes, though we find that the usage overall may be going down, is still attractive to children. You say no and they want to say yes.

And then, of course, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, we have consistently fought against the rising tide, the violent tide of methamphetamine use that started in our rural America, creeps into our cities; and the stories of blown up methamphetamine labs is a rage across America.

In fact, I remember one of the first legislative initiatives that I passed was to stand against or to stop the use of a date-rape drug which was being made in bathtubs across America.

So this is an important response to that, and I hope that we will have an opportunity to accept my amendment on the floor that hopes to provide an assessment of where we are as it relates to intervention; to Federal and State programs that deal with assessing the use of drugs by children ages 12 to 17, a very simple premise; and as well wants to give greater guidance to Federal, State and local authorities as to how they intervene, what is the value, the success story.

I hope my colleagues will join me with that support. It is clearly a road map to help us be more effective. I also want to make mention of the fact that this is a homeland security issue, because I believe Mr. SOUDER participated in hearings dealing with utilization of drugs as money that can be laundered for terrorist activity.

We are particularly focused on those areas in our borders around America. So we need to stop the violent tide of drugs. In fact, as a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration, we know that there are the combination of the smugglers of drugs with the huge cartels and the smugglers of human beings. They are intermixed and intertwined. They are there to do nothing but ill and evil. So these are important overlapping areas. I thank this committee for its leadership.

Let me mention an area, however, that I want to focus on, and I want to associate myself with Mr. KUCINICH and his concerns about the early incarceration, or trying juveniles as adults. That is why I want to have this assessment, because I believe it is important to be guided in the right procedures or right processes for our children, whether or not jail time, whether trying them as an adult is more effective than the intervention and good programs that are necessary.

Frankly, I think the good programs weigh more in stopping the tide of the utilization of drugs by our children. There should be some consideration to that.

And then let me, in conclusion, bring up Tulia, Texas, where, a, if you will, rogue cop was able to charge many, many of our constituents in Tulia, Texas, with false charges of drug use. In fact, most of the city found themselves charged with drug offenses down in the court house. This was a horrible episode of the utilization of the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program.

This was an abuse that is beyond our appreciation. I am grateful to the Congressional Black Caucus and various leaders of that caucus who saw the injustices. No, we are not here to promote the proliferation of drug use, but we are here to cite some of the failings of the rogue activities that come out of the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program, where there were innocent individuals who were, if you will,

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 until we were able to get our 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. As we stand here today, there are so many people who are becoming addicted to drugs; there are people who are literally robbing their own relatives and robbing their neighbors to get the funds for drugs.

There are even people who are seeking drug treatment and finding it difficult to get that treatment. But what we have tried to do here today through this bill is to address this problem as best we could. One of the things that I must express appreciation for is Mr. SOUDER's candor with regard to this whole issue. Consistently, even when there were instances where the President's priorities seemed to be, and ONDCP's priorities seemed to be, a little out of line with the things that we felt should be done to most effectively and efficiently address this problem, Mr. SOUDER, every step of the way stood up and said, look, we are going to do what is right.

We worked together very cooperatively. I really do appreciate it. It does mean a lot to me as a Member of this great body. I can say to all of our Members that this is legislation that we all should vote for. It should be a unanimous vote. I urge all Members to vote for the bill.

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, there are a couple of comments I want to make in closing general debate here. One is, just for the record, though it is not part of this legislation, we have clearly corrected the misinterpretation of the student loan bill.

The Clinton administration had falsely interpreted the House legislation. The Bush administration continued to do that. It has been corrected. 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 test 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 after 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 narcoterrorism 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 105,000 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 every day. We cannot forget and divert funds from the daily threat of narcoterrorism 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 source.

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 direct bill 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 have become 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 us 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 into drug use, supporting addiction, 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 its small 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 a participant is tested every 72 hours and a dirty test led to an immediate, unpleasant sanction—for example, 8 hours in a jury box or 24 hours in jail. Participants are simultaneously offered incentives such as drug treatment or other rehabilitative services.

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, one year 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 drugs and missed testing appointments, 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 with innovation. I commend ONDCP for the progress it has made, ask that the Director consider these recommendations and will support this legislation, H.R. 2829, to the reauthorize the Office.

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, right down to the individual neighborhood watchman, are making headway in the fight against meth. This drug epidemic must be fought on the front lines, 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 research 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 methamphetamines 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. The drug problem 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 scourge of methamphetamines 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 Byrne grants, JAG grants, and the COPS program. During my time in Congress, every single person involved with law enforcement has made it 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 commitment to safeguarding local communities. I don't think we can say enough about the men and women who use this funding to better patrol our streets, decrease the availability of drugs in our schools, and ensure that each and every citizen is safe and protected. I know that they, and their fellow officers across this nation, are committed to protecting all of us, just as I am committed to working in support of both homeland security and domestic security.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I submit the attached exchange of letters between Chairman BUCK MCKEON of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, Chairman PETER HOEKSTRA of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Chairman JAMES SENSENBRENNER of the Committee on Judiciary, and myself for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE
ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, March 3, 2006.

Hon. TOM DAVIS,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In recognition of the importance of expediting the passage of H.R. 2829, the ''Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005,'' the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence

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 House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's jurisdictional interest over this bill or any similar bill and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the Committee in the future. In addition, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence will seek conferees on any provisions of 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 House debate on H.R. 2829. 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,
Washington, DC, March 3, 2006.

Hon. HOWARD PETER HOEKSTRA,
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,
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, your committee has a valid jurisdiction interest in the intelligence and 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 conferees 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,
Washington, DC, March 3, 2006.

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. In the bill as reported by the Committee on Government Reform, Title II, the *Clean Sports Act*, specifically 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 fact that the bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary on March 2, 2006, which does not contain the Clean Sports Act, will be 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 prerogative 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 considered in a conference with the Senate, I would expect members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce 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. I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. ''BUCK'' MCKEON,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, March 3, 2006.

Hon. HOWARD P. ''BUCK'' MCKEON,
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 Education and the Workforce Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2829, the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2005. As you have stated, the provisions relating to high schools and collegiate athletics in Title II, the Clean Sports Act, as reported by my Committee are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Thank you for not requesting the continued referral of H.R. 2829. It is correct that the version of H.R. 2829, as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, that will be considered in the House does not contain the Clean Sports Act or other provisions related to collegiate and high school athletics. I agree that not considering this bill in committee does not prejudice the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Workforce Committee nor should it be considered as precedent for matters of jurisdictional interest in the future. In addition, I would support your request for conferees from your Committee should a House-Senate conference on these 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,

TOM DAVIS,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, March 3, 2006.

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
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,'' 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 so only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the jurisdictional interest and prerogatives 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,

TOM DAVIS,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, March 7, 2006.

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,'' on the floor. I agree 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, and it is my understanding that the Committee on Rules will make in order the version of the bill reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. I agree that this procedural. route does not prejudice the jurisdictional interests of the Committee on Government Reform.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and for your Committee's diligent work on this important legislation.

Sincerely,

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
Chairman.

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 grandmothers take off their shoes and infants discard their milk bottles prior to boarding airplanes, the War on Drugs might go down in history as the most ineffective program in the history of the United States.

We spend over $40 billion per year on the drug war and at least another $30 billion to keep over one million Americans in prison on drug charges. Yet, study after study shows that drugs are as readily available as ever and drug use rates have remained unchanged for the last decade. Incarcerating one person costs at least $30,000 per year, while a comprehensive residential drug treatment program costs about $7,000. Treating drug addiction as a criminal 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 obviously 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 assembled,

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''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Amendment of Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998.
Sec. 3. Repeal of termination provision.
Sec. 4. Amendments to definitions.
Sec. 5. Amendments relating to establishment of Office of National Drug Control Policy and designation of officers.
Sec. 6. Amendments relating to appointment and duties of Director and Deputy Director.
Sec. 7. Amendments relating to coordination with other agencies.
Sec. 8. Development, submission, implementation, and assessment of National Drug Control Strategy.
Sec. 9. High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program.
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 abstinence in chronic hard-drug users under community supervision through the use of drug testing and sanctions.
Sec. 16. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 17. Technical amendments and repeal.
Sec. 18. Requirement for disclosure of Federal sponsorship of all Federal advertising or other communication materials.
Sec. 19. Policy relating to syringe exchange programs.

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

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–277; 21 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF TERMINATION PROVISION.

Section 715 (21 U.S.C. 1712) is repealed, and the law shall read as if such section was never in effect.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS.

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

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (F);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (G) and inserting '', including the testing of employees;''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(H) interventions for drug abuse and dependence; and

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

(2) in paragraph (6), by adding before the period at the end: '', including any activities involving supply reduction, demand reduction, or State and local affairs'';

(3) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking ''Agency'' and inserting ''agency'';

(B) by striking ''National Foreign Intelligence Program,'' and inserting ''National Intelligence Program,''; and

(C) by inserting a comma before ''or Tactical'';

(4) in paragraph (9), by striking ''implicates'' and inserting ''indicates'';

(5) in paragraph (10)—

(A) by adding ''National Drug Control Program agencies and'' after ''among'' in subparagraph (B);

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B);

(C) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) domestic drug law enforcement, including domestic drug interdiction and law enforcement directed at drug users; and

''(E) coordination and enhancement of Federal, State, and local law enforcement initiatives to gather, analyze, and disseminate information and intelligence relating to drug control among domestic law enforcement agencies.'';

(6) in paragraph (11)—

(A) by inserting before the semicolon in subparagraph (A) the following: '', including—

''(i) law enforcement outside the United States; and

''(ii) source country programs, including economic development programs primarily intended to reduce the production or trafficking of illicit drugs'';

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) facilitating and enhancing the sharing of foreign and domestic information and law enforcement intelligence relating to drug production and trafficking among National Drug Control Program agencies, and between those agencies and foreign law enforcement agencies; and'';

(C) by striking ''; and'' at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting a period; and

(D) by striking subparagraph (D); and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

''(12) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—Except where otherwise provided, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Caucus on International Narcotics Control of the Senate and the Committee on Government Reform, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

''(13) LAW ENFORCEMENT.—The term 'law enforcement' or 'drug law enforcement' means all efforts by a Federal, State, or local government agency to enforce the drug laws of the United States or any State, including investigation, arrest, prosecution, and incarceration or other punishments or penalties.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 703(b)(3) (21 U.S.C. 1702(b)(3)) is amended—

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

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking ''through (C)'' and inserting ''through (E)'';

(B) by striking ''and subparagraph (D) of section 702(11)''; and

(C) by adding before the period at the end the following: '', and sections 707 and 708 of this Act''.

SEC. 5. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY AND DESIGNATION OF OFFICERS.

(a) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Paragraph (4) of section 703(a) (21 U.S.C. 1702(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) evaluate the effectiveness of the national drug control policy and the National Drug Control Program agencies' programs, by developing and applying specific goals and performance measurements.''.

(b) RANK OF DIRECTOR.—Section 703(b) (21 U.S.C. 1702(b)) is amended in paragraph (1) by adding before the period the following: '', who shall hold the same rank and status as the head of an executive department listed in section 101 of title 5, United States Code''.

(c) DEPUTY DIRECTORS.—Section 703(b) (21 U.S.C. 1702(b)) is amended in paragraph (3)—

(1) by striking ''Office—'' and inserting ''Office the following additional Deputy Directors—''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''who shall'' and inserting the following: ''who shall have substantial experience and expertise in drug interdiction operations and other supply reduction activities, and who shall serve as the United States Interdiction Coordinator and''.

SEC. 6. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO APPOINTMENT AND DUTIES OF DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR.

(a) DESIGNATION OF OTHER OFFICERS.—Section 704(a)(3) (21 U.S.C. 1703(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''permanent employee'' and inserting ''officer or employee''; and

(2) by striking ''serve as the Director'' and inserting ''serve as the acting Director''.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF DIRECTOR.—Section 704(b) (21 U.S.C. 1703(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''Federal departments and agencies engaged in drug enforcement,'' and inserting ''National Drug Control Program agencies,'';

(2) in paragraph (7), by inserting after ''President'' the following: ''and the appropriate congressional committees'';

(3) in paragraph (13), by striking ''(beginning in 1999)'';

(4) in paragraph (14)—

(A) by striking ''Appropriations'' and all that follows through ''Senate'' and inserting ''appropriate congressional committees''; and

(B) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(5) in paragraph (15), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) supporting the substance abuse information clearinghouse administered by the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental

Health Services Administration and established in section 501(d)(16) of the Public Health Service Act by—

''(i) encouraging all National Drug Control Program agencies to provide all appropriate and relevant information; and

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

(6) by inserting at the end the following:

''(16) shall coordinate with the private sector to promote private research and development of medications to treat addiction;

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

''(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 Congress on the impact of each Federal drug reduction strategy upon the availability, addiction rate, use rate, and other harms of illegal drugs.''.

(c) SUBMISSION OF DRUG CONTROL BUDGET REQUESTS.—Section 704(c)(1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) 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 for any drug control activity undertaken by that department, agency, or program, including demand reduction, supply reduction, and State and local affairs, including any drug law enforcement activities. If an activity has both drug control and nondrug control purposes or applications, the department, agency, or program shall estimate by a documented calculation the total funds requested for that activity that would be used for drug control, and shall set forth in its request the basis and method for making the estimate.''.

(d) NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL BUDGET PROPOSAL.—Section 704(c)(2) is amended in subparagraph (A) by inserting before the semicolon: ''and to inform Congress and the public about the total amount proposed to be spent on all supply reduction, demand reduction, State and local affairs, including any drug law enforcement, and other drug control activities by the Federal Government, which shall conform to the content requirements set forth in subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) of this subsection''.

(e) REVIEW AND CERTIFICATION OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAM BUDGET.—Section 704(c)(3) (21 U.S.C. 1703(c)(3)) is amended—

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

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

''(C) SPECIFIC REQUESTS.—The Director shall not confirm the adequacy of any budget request that—

''(i) requests funding for Federal law enforcement activities that do not adequately compensate for transfers of drug enforcement resources and personnel to law enforcement and investigation activities not related to drug enforcement as determined by the Director;

''(ii) requests funding for law enforcement activities on the borders of the United States that do not adequately direct resources to drug interdiction and enforcement as determined by the Director;

''(iii) requests funding for drug treatment activities that do not provide adequate result and accountability measures as determined by the Director;

''(iv) requests funding for any activities of the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program that do not include a clear antidrug message or purpose intended to reduce drug use;

''(v) requests funding to enforce section 484(r)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(r)(1)) with respect to convictions for drug-related offenses not occurring during a period of enrollment for which the student was receiving any Federal grant, loan, or work assistance;

''(vi) requests funding for drug treatment activities that do not adequately support and enhance Federal drug treatment programs and capacity, as determined by the Director;

''(vii) requests funding for fiscal year 2007 for activities of the Department of Education, unless it is accompanied by a report setting forth a plan for providing expedited consideration of student loan applications for all individuals who submitted an application for any Federal grant, loan, or work assistance that was rejected or denied pursuant to 484(r)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(r)(1)) by reason of a conviction for a drug-related offense not occurring during a period of enrollment for which the individual was receiving any Federal grant, loan, or work assistance; and

''(viii) requests funding for the operations and management of the Department of Homeland Security that does not include a specific request for funds for the Office of Counternarcotics Enforcement to carry out its responsibilities under section 878 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 458).'';

(3) in subparagraph (D)(iii), as so redesignated, by inserting ''and the appropriate congressional committees'' after ''House of Representatives''; and

(4) in subparagraph (E)(ii)(II)(bb), as so redesignated, by inserting ''and the appropriate congressional committees'' after ''House of Representatives''.

(f) 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''.

(g) POWERS OF DIRECTOR.—Section 704(d) (21 U.S.C. 1703(d)) is amended—

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

(2) in paragraph (9)—

(A) by inserting ''notwithstanding any other provision of law,'' after ''(9)''; and

(B) by striking ''Strategy; and'' and inserting ''Strategy and notify the appropriate congressional committees of any fund control notice issued;'';

(3) in paragraph (10), by striking ''(22 U.S.C. 2291j).'' and inserting ''(22 U.S.C. 2291j) and section 706 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291j–1); and''; and

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

''(11) not later than August 1 of each year, submit to the President a report, and transmit copies of the report to the Secretary of State and the appropriate congressional committees, that—

''(A) provides the Director's assessment of which countries are major drug transit countries or major illicit drug producing countries as defined in section 481(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291(e));

''(B) provides the Director's assessment of whether each country identified under subparagraph (A) has cooperated fully with the United States or has taken adequate steps on its own to achieve full compliance with the goals and objectives established by the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances and otherwise has assisted in reducing the supply of illicit drugs to the United States; and

''(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. 2291j), as provided in section 706 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291j–1), is warranted with respect to countries the Director assesses have not cooperated fully.''.

(g) FUND CONTROL NOTICES.—Section 704(f) (21 U.S.C. 1703(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) CONGRESSIONAL NOTICE.—A copy of each fund control notice shall be transmitted to the appropriate congressional committees.

''(5) RESTRICTIONS.—The Director shall not issue a fund control notice to direct that all or part of an amount appropriated to the National Drug Control Program agency account be obligated, modified, or altered in any manner contrary, in whole or in part, to a specific appropriation or statute.''.

(h) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 704 (21 U.S.C. 1703) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)—

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

(B) by inserting a comma before ''and Tactical''; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking ''Director of Central Intelligence'' and inserting ''Director of National Intelligence or the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency''.

(i) REQUIREMENT FOR SOUTH AMERICAN HEROIN STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive strategy that addresses the increased threat from South American heroin, and in particular Colombian heroin and the emerging threat from opium poppy grown in Peru and often intended for transit to Columbia for processing into heroin.

(2) CONTENTS.—The strategy shall include—

(A) opium eradication efforts to eliminate the problem at the source to prevent heroin from entering the stream of commerce;

(B) interdiction and precursor chemical controls;

(C) demand reduction and treatment;

(D) alternative development programs, including direct assistance to regional governments to demobilize and provide alternative livelihoods to former members of insurgent or other groups engaged in heroin, coca, or other illicit drug production or trafficking;

(E) efforts to inform and involve local citizens in the programs described in subparagraphs (A) through (D), such as through leaflets advertising rewards for information;

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

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

(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 presented to Congress separately from the rest of the strategy.

(j) REQUIREMENT FOR AFGHAN HEROIN 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 the Congress a comprehensive strategy that addresses the increased threat from Afghan heroin.

(2) CONTENTS.—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) destruction or other 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) measures to improve 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) an 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 presented 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 Drug Control Policy, with the concurrence of the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, a general counterdrug intelligence plan to improve coordination, and eliminate unnecessary duplication, among the counterdrug intelligence centers and information sharing systems, and counterdrug activities of the Federal Government, including the centers, systems, and activities of the following departments and agencies:

(A) The Department of Defense, including the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the joint interagency task forces.

(B) The Department of the Treasury, including the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN).

(C) The Central Intelligence Agency.

(D) The National Security Agency.

(E) The Department of Homeland Security, including the United States Coast Guard, the bureau of Customs and Border Protection, and the bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

(F) The Department of Justice, including the National Drug Intelligence Center (NDIC); the Drug Enforcement Administration, including the El Paso Intelligence Center (EPIC); the Federal Bureau of Investigation; the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force; and the Regional Information Sharing System.

(G) The Office of National Drug Control Policy, including the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program.

(H) The Counterdrug Intelligence Executive Secretariat.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the plan under paragraph (1) is to maximize the effectiveness 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 plan shall—

(A) articulate clear and specific mission statements (including purpose and scope of activity) 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 mechanisms 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 ''appropriate 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 International Relations, 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 obtaining, or sources of, intelligence 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 Drug Control Policy, the Director of National Intelligence, or the head of any Federal Government agency whose activities are described in the plan, 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.

(l) REQUIREMENT FOR SOUTHWEST BORDER COUNTERNARCOTICS STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every two years thereafter, the Director of National Drug Control Policy shall submit to the Congress a Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy.

(2) PURPOSES.—The Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy shall—

(A) set forth the Government's strategy for preventing the illegal trafficking of drugs across the international border between the United States and Mexico, including through ports of entry and between ports of entry on that border;

(B) state the specific roles and responsibilities of the relevant National Drug Control Program agencies (as defined in section 702 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1701)) for implementing that strategy; and

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

(3) CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—The Director shall issue the Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy in consultation with the heads of the relevant National Drug Control Program agencies.

(4) LIMITATION.—The Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy shall not change existing agency authorities or the laws governing interagency relationships, but may include recommendations about changes to such authorities or laws.

(5) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director shall provide 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 Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

(6) 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 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 presented to Congress separately from the rest of the strategy.

(m) REQUIREMENT FOR SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF MYCOHERBICIDE IN ILLICIT DRUG CROP ERADICATION.—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 the Congress a report that includes a plan to conduct, on an expedited basis, a scientific study of the use of mycoherbicide as a means of illicit drug crop elimination by an appropriate Government scientific research entity, including a complete and thorough scientific peer review. The study shall include an evaluation of the likely human health and environmental impacts of such use. The report shall also include a plan to conduct controlled scientific testing in a major drug producing nation of mycoherbicide naturally existing in the producing nation.

SEC. 7. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.

Section 705 (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 (3) of subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(3) REQUIRED REPORTS.—

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

''(B) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall, by July 1 of each year, submit to the

Director and the appropriate congressional committees information for the preceding year regarding the number and type of—

''(i) arrests for drug violations;

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

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

''(C) SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, by July 1 of each year, submit to the Director, the appropriate congressional committees, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on 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; and

''(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 Director, the appropriate congressional committees, the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, information for the preceding year regarding 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) TIMING, CONTENTS, AND PROCESS FOR DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMISSION OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY.—

''(1) 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 reducing the demand for illegal drugs, limiting the availability of illegal drugs, and conducting law enforcement activities with respect to illegal drugs.

''(2) CONTENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The National Drug Control Strategy submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

''(i) Comprehensive, research-based, long-range, and quantifiable goals for reducing illicit drug use and the consequences of illicit drug use in the United States.

''(ii) Annual quantifiable objectives for demand reduction, supply reduction, and law enforcement activities, specific targets to accomplish long-range quantifiable reduction in illicit drug use as determined by the Director, and specific measurements to evaluate progress toward the targets and strategic goals.

''(iii) A strategy to reduce the availability and purity of illegal drugs and the level of drug-related crime in the United States.

''(iv) An assessment of Federal effectiveness in achieving the National Drug Control Strategy for the previous year, including a specific evaluation of whether the objectives and targets for reducing illicit drug use for the previous year were met and reasons for the success or failure of the previous year's Strategy.

''(v) 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 at all levels of government.

''(vi) A general review of the status of, and trends in, demand reduction activities by private sector entities and community-based 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.

''(vii) An assessment of current illicit drug use (including inhalants and steroids) and availability, impact of illicit drug use, and treatment availability, which assessment shall include—

''(I) estimates of drug prevalence and frequency of use as measured by national, State, and local surveys of illicit drug use and by other special studies of nondependent and dependent illicit drug use;

''(II) illicit drug use in the workplace and the productivity lost by such use; and

''(III) illicit drug use by arrestees, probationers, and parolees.

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

''(III) the number of illicit drug manufacturing laboratories seized and destroyed and the number of hectares of marijuana, poppy, and coca cultivated and destroyed domestically and in other countries;

''(IV) the number of metric tons of marijuana, heroin, cocaine, and methamphetamine seized and other drugs; and

''(V) 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.

''(ix) An assessment of the reduction of the consequences of illicit drug use and availability, which shall include—

''(I) the burden illicit drug users place on hospital emergency departments in the United States, such as the quantity of illicit drug-related services provided;

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

''(III) the extent of illicit drug-related crime and criminal activity.

''(x) A general review of the status of, and trends in, of drug treatment in the United States, by assessing—

''(I) public and private treatment utilization; and

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

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

''(xii) A summary of the efforts made by Federal agencies to coordinate with private sector entities to conduct private 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.

''(xiii) Such additional statistical data and information as the Director considers appropriate to demonstrate and assess trends relating to illicit drug use, the effects and consequences of illicit drug use, supply reduction, demand reduction, drug-related law enforcement, and the implementation of the National Drug Control Strategy.

''(xiv) A supplement reviewing the activities of each individual National Drug Control Program agency during the previous year with respect to the National Drug Control Strategy and the Director's assessment of the progress of each National Drug Control Program agency in meeting its responsibilities under the National Drug Control Strategy.

''(B) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Any contents of the National Drug Control Strategy that involve information properly classified under criteria established by an Executive order shall be presented to Congress separately from the rest of the National Drug Control Strategy.

''(C) SELECTION OF DATA AND INFORMATION.—In selecting data and information for inclusion under subparagraph (A), the Director shall ensure—

''(i) the inclusion of data and information that will permit analysis of current trends against previously compiled data and information where the Director believes such analysis enhances long-term assessment of the National Drug Control Strategy; and

''(ii) the inclusion of data and information to permit a standardized and uniform assessment of the effectiveness of drug treatment programs in the United States.

''(3) PROCESS FOR DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMISSION.—

''(A) CONSULTATION.—In developing and effectively implementing the National Drug Control Strategy, the Director—

''(i) shall consult with—

''(I) the heads of the National Drug Control Program agencies;

''(II) Congress;

''(III) State and local officials;

''(IV) private citizens and organizations, including community- and faith-based organizations, with experience and expertise in demand reduction;

''(V) private citizens and organizations with experience and expertise in supply reduction;

''(VI) private citizens and organizations with experience and expertise in law enforcement; and

''(VII) appropriate representatives of foreign governments;

''(ii) with the concurrence of the Attorney General, may require the El Paso Intelligence Center to undertake specific tasks or projects to implement the National Drug Control Strategy;

''(iii) with the concurrence of the Director of National Intelligence and the Attorney General, may request that the National Drug Intelligence Center undertake specific tasks or projects to implement the National Drug Control Strategy; and

''(iv) may make recommendations to 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)(i), 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 research to be performed at the National Institutes of Health, including 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 measures and 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 measure 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) evaluates the contribution 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 treatment outcome monitoring systems 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; and

''(7) identifies the actions the Director shall take to correct any inadequacies, deficiencies, or limitations identified in the assessment described in paragraph (6).

''(c) MODIFICATIONS.—A description of any modifications made during the preceding year to the national drug performance measurement system described in subsection (b) 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 operations; and

''(D) supporting 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.

''(b) DESIGNATION.—The Director, upon consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Homeland Security, heads of the National Drug Control Program agencies, and the Governor of each applicable State, may designate any specified area of the United States as a high intensity drug trafficking area. After making such a designation and in order to provide Federal assistance to the area so designated, the Director may—

''(1) obligate such sums as are appropriated for the Program;

''(2) direct the temporary reassignment of Federal personnel to such area, subject to the approval of the head of the department or agency that employs such personnel;

''(3) take any other action authorized under section 704 to provide increased Federal assistance to those areas; and

''(4) coordinate activities under this section (specifically administrative, recordkeeping, and funds management activities) with State and local officials.

''(c) PETITIONS FOR DESIGNATION.—The Director shall establish regulations under which a coalition of interested law enforcement agencies from an area may petition for designation as a high intensity drug trafficking area. Such regulations shall provide for a regular review by the Director of the petition, including a recommendation regarding the merit of the petition to the Director by a panel of qualified, independent experts.

''(d) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In considering whether to designate an area under this section as a high intensity drug trafficking area, the Director shall consider, in addition to such other criteria as the Director considers to be appropriate, the extent to which—

''(1) the area is a significant center of illegal drug production, manufacturing, importation, or distribution;

''(2) State and local law enforcement agencies have committed resources to respond to the drug trafficking problem in the area, thereby indicating a determination to respond aggressively to the problem;

''(3) drug-related activities in the area are having a significant harmful impact in the area, and in other areas of the country; and

''(4) a significant increase in allocation of Federal resources is necessary to respond adequately to drug-related activities in the area.

''(e) ORGANIZATION OF HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS.—

''(1) EXECUTIVE BOARD AND OFFICERS.—To be eligible for funds appropriated under this section, each high intensity drug trafficking area shall be governed by an Executive Board. The Executive Board shall designate a chairman, vice chairman, and any other officers to the Executive Board that it determines are necessary.

''(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Executive Board of a high intensity drug trafficking area shall be responsible for—

''(A) providing direction and oversight in establishing and achieving the goals of the high intensity drug trafficking area;

''(B) managing the funds of the high intensity drug trafficking area;

''(C) reviewing and approving all funding proposals consistent with the overall objective of the high intensity drug trafficking area; and

''(D) reviewing and approving all reports to the Director on the activities of the high intensity drug trafficking area.

''(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, if that area's, region's or partnership's Executive Board does not apportion an equal number of votes between representatives of participating Federal agencies and representatives of participating State and local agencies. Where it is impractical for a equal number of representatives of Federal agencies and State and local agencies to attend a meeting of an Executive Board in person, the Executive Board may use a system of proxy votes or weighted votes to achieve the voting balance required by this paragraph.

''(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.

''(f) 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.

''(g) COUNTERTERRORISM ACTIVITIES.—

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

''(2) LIMITATION.—The Director shall ensure—

''(A) that assistance provided under paragraph (1) remains incidental to the purpose of the Program to reduce drug availability and carry out drug-related law enforcement activities; and

''(B) that significant resources of the Program are not redirected to activities exclusively related to terrorism, except on a temporary basis under extraordinary circumstances, as determined by the Director.

''(h) ROLE OF DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION.—The Director, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall ensure that a representative of the Drug Enforcement Administration is included in the Intelligence Support Center for each high intensity drug trafficking area.

''(i) ANNUAL HIDTA PROGRAM BUDGET SUBMISSIONS.—As part of the documentation that supports the President's annual budget request for the Office, the Director shall submit to Congress a budget justification that includes the following:

''(1) The amount requested for each high intensity drug trafficking area with supporting narrative descriptions and rationale for each request.

''(2) A detailed justification for each funding request that explains the reasons for the requested funding level, how such funding level was determined based on a current assessment of the drug trafficking threat in each high intensity drug trafficking area, 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.

''(j) EMERGING THREAT RESPONSE FUND.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director may expend up to 10 percent of the amounts appropriated under this section on a discretionary basis, to respond to any emerging drug trafficking threat in an existing high intensity drug trafficking area, or to establish a new high intensity drug trafficking area or expand an existing high intensity drug trafficking area, in accordance with the criteria established under paragraph (2).

''(2) CONSIDERATION OF IMPACT.—In allocating funds under this subsection, the Director shall consider—

''(A) the impact of activities funded on reducing overall drug traffic in the United States, or minimizing the probability that an emerging drug trafficking threat will spread to other areas of the United States; and

''(B) such other criteria as the Director considers appropriate.

''(k) EVALUATION.—

''(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Director shall, after consulting with the Executive Boards of each designated high intensity drug trafficking area, submit a report to Congress that describes, for each designated high intensity drug trafficking area—

''(A) the specific purposes for the high intensity drug trafficking area;

''(B) the specific long-term and short-term goals and objectives for the high intensity drug trafficking area;

''(C) the measurements that will be used to evaluate the performance of the high intensity drug trafficking area in achieving the long-term and short-term goals; and

''(D) the reporting requirements needed to evaluate the performance of the high intensity drug trafficking area in achieving the long-term and short-term goals.

''(2) EVALUATION OF HIDTA PROGRAM AS PART OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY.—For each designated high intensity drug trafficking area, the Director shall submit, as part of the annual National Drug Control Strategy report, a report that—

''(A) describes—

''(i) the specific purposes for the high intensity drug trafficking area; and

''(ii) the specific long-term and short-term goals and objectives for the high intensity drug trafficking area; and

''(B) includes an evaluation of the performance of the high intensity drug trafficking area in accomplishing the specific long-term and short-term goals and objectives identified under paragraph (1)(B).

''(l) ASSESSMENT OF DRUG ENFORCEMENT TASK FORCES IN HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, and as part of each subsequent annual National Drug Control Strategy report, the Director shall submit to Congress a report—

''(1) assessing the number and operation of all federally funded drug enforcement task forces within each high intensity drug trafficking area; and

''(2) describing—

''(A) each Federal, State, and local drug enforcement task force operating in the high intensity drug trafficking area;

''(B) how such task forces coordinate with each other, with any high intensity drug trafficking area task force, and with investigations receiving funds from the Organized Crime and Drug Enforcement Task Force;

''(C) what steps, if any, each such task force takes to share information regarding drug trafficking and drug production with other federally funded drug enforcement task forces in the high intensity drug trafficking area;

''(D) the role of the high intensity drug trafficking area in coordinating the sharing of such information among task forces;

''(E) the nature and extent of cooperation by each Federal, State, and local participant in ensuring that such information is shared among law enforcement agencies and with the high intensity drug trafficking area;

''(F) the nature and extent to which information sharing and enforcement activities are coordinated with joint terrorism task forces in the high intensity drug trafficking area; and

''(G) any recommendations for measures needed to ensure that task force resources are utilized efficiently and effectively to reduce the availability of illegal drugs in the high intensity drug trafficking areas.

''(m) ASSESSMENT OF INTELLIGENCE SHARING IN HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS—PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and as part of each subsequent annual National Drug Control Strategy report, the Director shall submit to Congress a report—

''(1) evaluating existing and planned intelligence systems supported by each high intensity drug trafficking area, or utilized by task forces receiving any funding under the Program, including the extent to which such systems ensure access and availability of intelligence to Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies within the high intensity drug trafficking area and outside of it;

''(2) the extent to which Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies participating in each high intensity drug trafficking area are sharing intelligence information to assess current drug trafficking threats and design appropriate enforcement strategies; and

''(3) the measures needed to improve effective sharing of information and intelligence regarding drug trafficking and drug production among Federal, State, and local law enforcement participating in a high intensity drug trafficking area, and between such agencies and similar agencies outside the high intensity drug trafficking area.

''(n) COORDINATION OF INTELLIGENCE SHARING WITH ORGANIZED CRIME DRUG ENFORCEMENT TASK FORCE PROGRAM.—The Director, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall ensure that any drug enforcement intelligence obtained by the Intelligence Support Center for each high intensity drug trafficking area is shared, on a timely basis, with the drug intelligence fusion center operated by the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force of the Department of Justice.

''(o) USE OF FUNDS TO COMBAT METHAMPHETAMINE TRAFFICKING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) REQUIREMENT.—The Director shall ensure that, of the amounts appropriated for a fiscal year for the Program, at least $15,000,000 is allocated to combat the trafficking of methamphetamine in areas designated by the Director as high intensity drug trafficking areas.

''(B) ACTIVITIES.—In meeting the requirement in subparagraph (A), the Director shall transfer funds to appropriate Federal, State, and local governmental agencies for employing additional Federal law enforcement personnel, or facilitating the employment of additional State and local law enforcement personnel, including agents, investigators, prosecutors, laboratory technicians, chemists, investigative assistants, and drug prevention specialists.

''(2) APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS.—

''(A) FACTORS IN APPORTIONMENT.—The Director shall apportion amounts allocated under paragraph (1) among areas designated by the Director as high intensity drug trafficking areas based on the following factors:

''(i) The number of methamphetamine manufacturing facilities discovered by Federal, State, or local law enforcement officials in the area during the previous fiscal year.

''(ii) The number of methamphetamine prosecutions in Federal, State, or local courts in the area during the previous fiscal year.

''(iii) The number of methamphetamine arrests by Federal, State, or local law enforcement officials in the area during the previous fiscal year.

''(iv) The amounts of methamphetamine or listed chemicals (as that term is defined in section 102(33) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(33)) seized by Federal, State, or local law enforcement officials in the area during the previous fiscal year.

''(v) Intelligence and predictive data from the Drug Enforcement Administration showing patterns and trends in abuse, trafficking, and transportation in methamphetamine and listed chemicals (as that term is so defined).

''(B) CERTIFICATION.—Before the Director apportions any funds under this paragraph to a high intensity drug trafficking area, the Director shall certify that the law enforcement entities responsible for clandestine methamphetamine laboratory seizures in that area are providing laboratory seizure data to the national clandestine laboratory database at the El Paso Intelligence Center.

''(p) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Office of National Drug Control Policy to carry out this section—

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

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

''(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 cited as 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 Carnell and Angela Dawson was firebombed in apparent retaliation for Mrs. Dawson's notification of police about persistent drug distribution activity in their East Baltimore City neighborhood.

(2) The arson claimed the lives of Mr. and Mrs. Dawson and their 5 young children, aged 9 to 14.

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

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

(5) Voluntary cooperation is difficult for law enforcement officials to obtain when citizens feel that cooperation carries the risk of violent retaliation by illegal drug 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 relatives, and neighbors will resist or refuse offers of relocation by local, State, and Federal prosecutorial agencies and because, moreover, the continued presence of strong individuals and families is critical to preserving 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 initiatives aimed 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 section 9, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(q) SPECIFIC PURPOSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall ensure that, of the amounts appropriated for a fiscal year for the Program, at least $7,000,000 is used in high intensity drug trafficking areas with severe neighborhood safety and illegal drug distribution problems.

''(2) REQUIRED USES.—The funds used under paragraph (1) shall be used—

''(A) to ensure the safety of neighborhoods and the protection of communities, including

the prevention of the intimidation of potential witnesses of illegal drug distribution and related activities; and

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

SEC. 11. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COUNTERDRUG TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT CENTER.

(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:

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

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

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

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

''(ii) electronic support measures;

''(iii) communications;

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

''(v) 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 initiatives, in 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 the effectiveness or availability of drug treatment;

''(C) make a priority ranking of such needs identified in subparagraphs (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; and

''(iii) the ability and willingness of potential recipients to evaluate transferred technology.

''(B) INTERDICTION AND BORDER DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT TECHNOLOGIES.—The Chief Scientist shall give priority, in transferring technologies most likely to assist in drug interdiction and border drug law enforcement, to State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies in southwest border areas and northern border areas with significant traffic in illicit drugs.

''(3) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.—The authority granted to the Director under this subsection shall not extend to the direct 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 requests 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 program, based on expected changes in 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 offered through the program.''.

(c) 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) preventing 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)(A).

''(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, including 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 management expenses.

''(2) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) CREATIVE SERVICES.—

''(i) In using amounts for creative and talent costs under paragraph (1)(B), the Director shall use creative services donated at no cost to the Government (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 obtained at no cost; or

''(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 $1,500,000 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 to meet urgent needs of the national media campaign with advance approval from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate upon a showing of the circumstances causing such urgent needs of the national media campaign.

''(B) TESTING AND EVALUATION OF ADVERTISING.—In using amounts for testing and 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 under this section 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—

''(i) 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

''(ii) 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 allocated to meet the stated goals of the national media campaign.

''(d) DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES AND FUNCTIONS UNDER THE PROGRAM.—

''(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 to meet 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 and recommend 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 all advertising to be used in the national media campaign, except advertisements that are—

''(I) provided by other nonprofit entities pursuant to subsection (f);

''(II) intended to respond to high-priority or emergent campaign needs 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;

''(III) intended to reach a minority, 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.

''(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 coalitions.

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

''(3) For partisan political purposes, or express advocacy in support of or to defeat any clearly identified candidate, clearly identified ballot initiative, or clearly identified legislative 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 213 of Schedule C of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

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

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

''(f) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts 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 70 percent of no-cost match advertising provided directly relates to substance abuse prevention consistent with the specific purposes of the national media campaign, except that in any fiscal year in which less than $125,000,000 is appropriated to the national media campaign, the Director shall ensure that at least 85 percent of no-cost match advertising directly relates to substance abuse prevention consistent with the specific purposes of the national media campaign.

''(3) NO-COST MATCH ADVERTISING NOT DIRECTLY RELATED.—The Director shall ensure that no-cost match advertising that does not directly relate to substance abuse prevention consistent with the purposes of the national media campaign includes a clear antidrug message. Such message is not required to be the primary message of the match advertising.

''(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 to purchase advertising time and space;

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

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

''(i) LOCAL TARGET REQUIREMENT.—The Director shall, to the maximum extent feasible, use amounts made available under this section for media that focuses on, or includes specific information on, prevention or treatment resources for consumers within specific local areas.

''(j) PREVENTION OF MARIJUANA USE.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

''(G) Marijuana smoke contains 50 to 70 percent more of certain cancer causing chemicals than tobacco smoke.

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

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

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

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

''(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Office to carry out this section, $195,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 and 2008 and $210,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011.''.

(b) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED PROVISIONS.—The Drug-Free Media Campaign Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 13. DRUG INTERDICTION.

(a) IN 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.

''(3) 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) LIMITATION.—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, to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services 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 of such seizures; and

''(iii) information for the previous 10 years regarding the number of air and maritime patrol hours undertaken 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 the public disclosure of which, as determined by the United States Interdiction Coordinator 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 presented to Congress separately from the rest of the plan.

''(b) INTERDICTION COMMITTEE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Interdiction Committee shall meet to—

''(A) discuss and resolve issues related to the coordination, oversight and integration of international, border, and domestic drug interdiction efforts in support of the National Drug Control Strategy;

''(B) review the annual National Interdiction Command and Control Plan, and provide advice to the Director and the United States Interdiction Coordinator concerning that plan; and

''(C) provide such other advice to the Director concerning drug interdiction strategy and policies as the committee determines is appropriate.

''(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The membership of the Interdiction Committee shall consist of—

''(A) the Commissioner of the bureau of Customs and Border Protection at the Department of Homeland Security;

''(B) the Assistant Secretary of the bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement at the Department of Homeland Security;

''(C) the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard;

''(D) the Director of the Office of Counternarcotics Enforcement at the Department of Homeland Security;

''(E) the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration;

''(F) the Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs;

''(G) the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict;

''(H) the Deputy Director for Supply Reduction of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, acting in his role as the United States Interdiction Coordinator;

''(I) the director of the Crime and Narcotics Center of the Central Intelligence Agency;

''(J) the Deputy Director for State and Local Affairs of the Office of National Drug Control Policy;

''(K) the Chief of the National Guard Bureau's Counterdrug Program; and

''(L) such additional persons as may be determined by the Director.

''(3) CHAIRMAN.—The Director shall designate one of the members of the Interdiction Committee to serve as chairman.

''(4) MEETINGS.—The members of the Interdiction Committee shall meet, in person and not through any delegate or representative, at least once per calendar year, prior to March 1. At the call of either the Director or the current chairman, the Interdiction Committee may hold additional meetings, which shall be attended by the members either in person, or through such delegates or representatives as they may choose.

''(5) REPORT.—Not later than September 30 of each year, the chairman of the Interdiction Committee shall submit a report to the Director and to the appropriate congressional committees describing the results of the meetings and any significant findings of the Committee during the previous 12 months. Any content of such a report that involves information classified under criteria established by an Executive order, or whose public disclosure, as determined 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.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002.—Section 878 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 458) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking ''Except as provided in subsection (d), the'' and inserting ''The''; and

(2) by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsections (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

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.

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 deterrent 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, three or more agencies or organizations, which 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 identifying the impact players in, and assessing the nature and dynamic of, the local drug market and its related crime through information gathering and analysis;

''(4) 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

''(5) 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.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2009.''.

SEC. 15. AWARDS 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.

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 COERCE 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 while under the supervision of the criminal justice system.

''(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 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, which 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 individuals 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 relating to drug abstinence (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 included in the eligible 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 identifies 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 2007 through 2009.''.

SEC. 16. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 716 (21 U.S.C. 1711), as redesignated by section 14 of this Act, is amended—

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

(2) by striking ''1999 through 2003'' and inserting ''2007 through 2011''.

SEC. 17. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS AND REPEAL.

(a) AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO REPLACE OBSOLETE REFERENCES.—Section 464P(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285o–4(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''under section 1002 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1501)'' and inserting ''under section 703 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1702)''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''under section 1005 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1504)'' and inserting ''under section 706 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1705)''.

(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. 712. 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—

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

''(2) 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 703(a) (21 U.S.C. 1702(a)) 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 109–387. Each amendment may be offered only in the order 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 not be subject to 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 109–387 offered by Mr. SOUDER:

Page 145, strike lines 3 through 9.

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

Page 145, line 15, strike ''(vii)'' and insert ''(vi)''.

Page 146, line 5, strike ''(viii)'' 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:

(1) by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

''(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. ''; and

(2) by amending subsection (h) to read as follows:

''(h) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as derogating the authorities and responsibilities of the Director of National Intelligence or the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency contained in the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 403a et seq.), or any other law.''.

Page 149, line 19, strike ''(i)'' and insert ''(j)''.

Page 151, line 14, strike ''(j)'' and insert ''(k)''.

Page 153, line 3, strike ''(k)'' and insert ''(l)''.

Page 158, line 7, strike ''(l)'' and insert ''(m)''.

Page 160, line 14, strike ''(m)'' and insert ''(n)''.

Page 183, line 18, strike ''The'' and insert the following: ''Subject to the availability of appropriations, the''.

Page 187, line 22, insert after ''Director'' the following: '', in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence,''.

Page 202, line 12, strike ''No'' and insert the following: ''Subject to the availability of appropriations, no''.

Page 204, line 21, strike ''For'' and insert the following: ''Subject to the availability of approprations, for''.

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, 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.

On 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.

□ 1230

Section 8021 of the Deficit Reduction Act, Public Law 109–171, 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

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 Office of 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 Prevention Act of 2004, Public Law 108–458, 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 as 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 so 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 Committee 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 the designee of the gentleman from Washington?

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 109–387 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 intensify and coordinate an effective international response in order to prevent methamphetamine production and precursor diversion.

(c) INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.—The Director shall encourage the negotiation, drafting, and ratification of multilateral or bilateral agreements that may contain information-sharing treaties concerning provisions for precursor importation and exportation and additional provisions for annual assessments of medical and scientific needs of each signatory country.

(d) MATTERS ADDRESSED BY THE SUMMIT.—The summit may address the following:

(1) The greater involvement of international policing and customs organizations, such as Interpol, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, and the World Customs Organization.

(2) Expanding resources and hired persons to track international shipments of ephedrine, pseudoephedrine, and other precursor substances as controlled by the International Narcotics Control Board.

(3) Working with the private sector and Federal agencies, as well as the World Health Organization, to support the research and development of substances that can effectively replace primary precursors used in the manufacture of synthetic drugs.

(e) DEADLINE.—The Director shall seek to convene the summit not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act and follow-up summits in subsequent years as the Director finds necessary.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director $1,000,000 to carry out this section.

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 ask unanimous consent to give my time to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington will control the time in support of the amendment.

There was no objection.

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

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, recent DEA reports 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. Chairman, 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 every day possible, every amendment possible.

Again, the gentleman from Washington has been the founder of the Meth Caucus and Congressman LARSEN, Congressman CANNON, and Congressman CALVERT in the Meth Caucus have been active in doing 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 antiterrorism 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 seen crystal meth come 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 to crystal meth. 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 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 things and 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 members and 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 put 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 other drugs in that you 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 they have to be literally taken 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 gentlewoman 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 coordinate 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 uses 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.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her eloquent remarks and for her leadership. In closing, I would like to reiterate my gratitude for Mr. SOUDER. He has been a champion of this issue. I also want to acknowledge, as he did, the Caucus to Control and Fight Methamphetamine, which is cochaired by my dear friend, RICK LARSEN from Washington State, along with LEN BOSWELL from Iowa, CHRIS CANNON, and KEN CALVERT.

It is truly a bipartisan, nationwide effort. And now what we need to do with this amendment is expand that effort internationally. If we can stop the international supply of these precursors, our communities will be safer, our families will be safer, and a lot of people whose lives would be ruined will never have to suffer that tragic fate.

I am grateful for the support of Mr. SOUDER for this amendment and I urge its passage.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment before us today calling for a global meth conference.

I commend Mr. Baird for working to bring this amendment to the floor. The amendment closely mirrors the bipartisan "Sense of the Congress" resolution I introduced in November calling for an international methamphetamine conference to develop a global strategy to control the trafficking of meth and its precursor chemicals.

I also would like to thank Chairman SOUDER of the Drug Policy Subcommittee for his support from the beginning of a global meth conference and his leadership on the Methamphetamine Epidemic Elimination Act which is set to be signed into law as part of the PATRIOT Act.

In my district in California's Central Valley, the meth epidemic has exacted a brutal toll on the environment, our children, and our communities. In the past 5 years alone, 15,000 children have been found at meth labs, not to mention the unknown number of children subjected to meth related domestic violence, abuse, and neglect.

Mr. Chairman, controlling the global trade in meth and its precursor chemicals, ephedrine and pseudoephedrine, is a critical part of any comprehensive strategy to fight the meth epidemic. A global meth conference is a logical next step that complements the international regulation provisions of the Meth Elimination Act.

It is about time that we develop a worldwide strategy to reduce illegal trade in meth and its precursor chemicals and stop the devastating impact that methamphetamine use is having on our children and our communities.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment.

Mr. BAIRD. 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.

□ 1245

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 evaluate similar programs in operation, such as the program operated in the Fourth Judicial District Drug Court, in Washington County, Arkansas.

(c) REQUIREMENT.—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.

(d) 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. BOOZMAN. 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 no effective National Drug Control Strategy would be complete 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 driver. He had been on 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 would be great if we could 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 alcohol or other 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 had on 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 experienced 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, when I practiced, is to represent a parent 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 piece 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 really push us to focus on methamphetamines. His district has been hard hit. Early on it was featured in People magazine. We did a congressional hearing in our subcommittee in his district where we heard from everyone, from drug court to people who were working directly with children and the impact on children.

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, overwhelms the child custody system, and overwhelms the criminal system. I very much appreciate this amendment.

I thank 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 109–387 offered by Mr. CHABOT:

Page 161, after line 2, insert the following:

(n) 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.

(o) 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 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), 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.

(p) 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 to Congress a report on the results of the study under paragraph (1). Such report shall include—

(A) an analysis of the best practices of the activities studied; and

(B) recommendations for establishing a national policy to address drug endangered children, based on the Drug Endangered Children programs administered by States.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term ''methamphetamine-related activity'' means any activity related to the production, use, or effects of methamphetamine; and

(B) the term ''drug endangered children'' means children whose physical, mental, or emotional health are at risk because of the production, use, or effects of methamphetamine by another person.

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

SEC. 20. NATIONAL METHAMPHETAMINE INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''National Methamphetamine Information Clearinghouse Act of 2005''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''Council'' means the National Methamphetamine Advisory Council established under subsection (c)(2)(A);

(2) the term ''drug endangered children'' means children whose physical, mental, or emotional health are at risk because of the production, use, or effects of methamphetamine by another person;

(3) the term ''National Methamphetamine Information Clearinghouse'' or ''NMIC'' means the information clearinghouse established under subsection (c)(1); and

(4) the term ''qualified entity'' means a State or local government, school board, or public health, law enforcement, nonprofit, or other nongovernmental organization providing services related to methamphetamine.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF CLEARINGHOUSE AND ADVISORY COUNCIL.—

(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—

(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 nongovernmental and nonprofit 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 in the Council shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) 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, use, or effects of methamphetamine and grants available for such programs.

(2) COMPONENTS.—The NMIC shall include—

(A) a toll-free 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 items to be posted on 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 agency efforts to combat the production, use or effects of methamphetamine;

(vi) allows public access to all information not in a restricted section; and

(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)—

(i) to evaluate and determine whether the item, as submitted or as modified, meets the requirements for posting; and

(ii) in consultation with the Director of National Drug Control Policy, to determine whether the item should be posted in a restricted section of the website.

(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) $1,000,000 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 usage by zip code based on information 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 BONUSES.

(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 received performance 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.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

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 and 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 hit 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 was 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 for 10 minutes.

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 cochairs of the Meth Caucus. It has been exhilarating that we can get something done; and the Meth Caucus, with your help, is making strides. 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 responsibility, one that values a solid education and a hard day's work. When 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 in Iowa was highlighted in a documentary by HBO called ''Crank.'' This detailed the meth problem of three Iowa families and showed the complete destruction this drug causes. This documentary shows how 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 ONDCP reauthorization bill by highlighting the continued commitment of this House in our national fight against methamphetamine.

Meth presents 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.

□ 1300

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 Congressman LARSEN, Congresswoman BOSWELL, Congressman CALVERT, and Congressman CANNON. Congressman CALVERT 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 Plaines, 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, yet there 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 oxycontin may be the problem, crack is in other cities and heroin is in other cities, that you try not to micromanage 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 a tin ear and not responded, this bill is going to have 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. But this would not be necessary 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 cochairs, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CALVERT, 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 availability 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 2005 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 Nation's 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 requires 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 reports will 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 agencies about meth's trafficking, abuse, treatment, and abuse 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 myself 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. 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 methamphetamines. I think the thing that struck me tremendously was the fact that these drugs could be easily manufactured 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 they 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 know 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'' information regarding 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 Congressman CHABOT and his staff for shepherding this important amendment to the floor, and also 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:

(n) STUDY OF PERSONS KIDNAPPED, KILLED, AND MISSING ALONG THE BORDER BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.—

(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) REPORT.—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 occurence 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.

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 cosponsoring 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 people have gone 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 the 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 cocaine, whether it is heroin, or whether it is marijuana.

The biggest bust in my hometown's history in Fort Wayne, Indiana, was in Laredo, headed up to Fort Wayne, and a very organized thing. We have had multiple hearings in El Paso, but I remember at one of the hearings in El Paso, the prisons in El Paso are full of people trying to ship drugs to other parts of the country, and they do not even arrest people with under 200 pounds anymore because their prisons are full. When we challenged that, he said, what are we supposed to do in Texas? Our prisons are full of people running drugs to Indiana and Maryland and Florida and everywhere else in the United States. There is only so much we can do.

Many problems along the border are related to immigration questions, but I do not think the violence in the southwest border is related to people coming up to work in manufactured housing in Indiana. The problem with violence at the southwest border is pretty directly related to drug trafficking; the assassinations we have seen on both sides of the border and how that spills in. Sometimes it is accidental, sometimes it is shootouts, sometimes it is kidnappings, sometimes it relates to people in law enforcement and other times it is individuals; whether it is at that Tohono O'odham reservation in Arizona that has been overrun, or 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 Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I wanted to just state that I wholeheartedly support the amendment. I think it makes a great bill an even better bill, and I thank the gentleman for sponsoring it.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas to close.

Mr. CUELLAR. Yes, I want to thank Mr. SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS once again for their leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. SOUDER. 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. 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 CONTENT RELATED TO DRUG TUNNELS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.—The Southwest Border Counternarcotics 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 a tunnel 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.

□ 1315

It was a very sophisticated tunnel the way it was constructed, the way it was shored up, 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 that are used to smuggle drugs, people, and could potentially be used to smuggle terrorists and their weapons, specifically between California and Mexico.

It gives the office authority to join in the development and implementation of a strategy to fight these subterranean border tunnels and requires that the office submit to Congress a recommendation for penalties for those involved either in digging or using these tunnels.

We have been dealing with this issue over many years. Eight tunnels between San Diego and Tijuana have been discovered this year alone, and there have been over 20 tunnels discovered in the last decade.

We know that with all of the fences that we are building, double fences, triple fences, walls, what we have here is an easy way under all of those fences that we are building. So we need to have a far more coordinated policy. There is not even a law against tunneling under the border! There are laws for smuggling and for other parts of the crime, but not specifically for tunneling under our international border. So we have to take note of them. We have to concentrate and focus our efforts. We have to understand that terrorism can find a whole new approach to getting into the United States through these tunnels underneath our international border. They are a threat to us and America. They allow drugs and people to come through.

These are busy times for the Border Patrol, the customs agents, immigration folks; but if we are going to send 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 DREIER who is taking the lead on a bill similar to Senator FEINSTEIN 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 get at. We have to try to get at 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 that to continue efficiently while stopping, in a more efficient fashion, the 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 scheme by 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

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 109–387 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 CONFERENCE.

(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 by 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, 2005, in Salt Lake City, Utah, titled the ''1st National Conference on Methamphetamine, HIV, and Hepatitis Science & Response''.

(b) ADDITIONAL MATTERS COVERED.—The report shall include a description of 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 713, 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 has devastated States such as mine. 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 where meth 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 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 taking the meth epidemic seriously and supporting efforts to prevent drug abuse, not the safe use.

My amendment is very simple. My amendment will demand 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 provided sponsorship 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 drugs users. The amendment presupposes 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 establishes the following conclusions: 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 aimed at achieving 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 very 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 serious 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. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. 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 Do Not 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 this.

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.

□ 1330

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

That is exactly what we are trying to do, Mr. Chairman, is just ask that taxpayer dollars be used responsibly and not for conferences such as this. We need to fight drugs, not show people that they can be used in a safe manner. I think that is ridiculous.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I submit these letters to further illustrate the matter raised by Mr. GRAVES.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, August 12, 2005.

Hon. MICHAEL O. LEAVITT,
Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC.

It has been my understanding, from several sources, that the Department of Health and Human Services has been the principal barrier preventing the Administration from formulating a policy to address the methamphetamine epidemic. And now I have learned that the Department of Health and Human Services is a primary sponsor of a conference controlled by the Harm Reduction Coalition and the Harm Reduction Project in your home state of Utah, on August 19 and 20, 2005.

I find this all to be deeply offensive.

I am enormously frustrated with your Department for dithering on the meth issue while the rest of America fights an epidemic that is viciously tearing apart families and communities throughout the country.

A foundational premise of the so-called ''harm reduction'' ideology promoted at the HHS-sponsored conference is that we should not be fighting a ''war on drugs,'' but rather limiting drugs' harmful effects. Harm reduction is, in fact, a vehicle drug legalization proponents have hijacked to pave the way to their ultimate objective.

Any claim that your Department is unaware of the pro-legalization agenda and ''soft'' approach to illegal narcotics of the

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 assorted harm reduction organizations sponsoring and participating in the conference.

Shockingly, 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 ideology that shuns an abstinence-based approach for at-risk communities: ''Tweaking Tips for Party Boys,'' and two sessions on engaging in sex without condoms, ''Barebacking: 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 seven presentations 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 donor George Soros, 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 its upcoming 2005 International Drug Policy Reform Conference. According to the Alliance's conference materials regarding who should attend this meeting: ''Anyone who believes the war on drugs is doing more harm than good!''

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 to ''lead 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 advocates such as Colonna, and 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. Tuesday, August 16, 2005:

(1) An official statement of why the Department of Health and Human Services is sponsoring 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 so we may conduct staff interviews.

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. See the attachment for a full definition of ''documents'' and ''relating to.''

Mr. Secretary, I have steadily worked for enhanced treatment and prevention funding and expanded treatment options. I was the House sponsor of the Drug Addiction Treatment Expansion Act just signed by President Bush. Treatment and prevention are not the issue here.

The issue is that the Administration has not yet put forth a strategy to address the meth epidemic, and your Department bears much of the responsibility for that failure. To procrastinate further while supporting the very people who advocate relaxed drug laws is unconscionable.

Sincerely,

MARK E. SOUDER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, Government Reform Committee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, August 19, 2005.

Hon. MICHAEL O. LEAVITT,
Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC.

Your August 17, 2005 response to my letter regarding the sponsorship by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) of this week's Harm Reduction Coalition/Harm Reduction Project ''methamphetamine'' conference in Salt Lake City, Utah, simply does not answer the questions I asked. In fact, it raises many more serious questions.

First, and most importantly, I am incredulous that, even as you insist that HHS is not ''sponsoring'' the conference, you admit that HHS provided taxpayer dollars for it, and that you are sending six employees to participate in it. I would like to learn how it is that you differentiate between providing financing and employees for an event, and ''sponsoring'' it.

In fact, I am inclined to agree with one of the event's primary organizers, Mr. Luciano Colonna, who told a reporter, ''They [HHS] were a sponsor and still are sponsors. If they weren't sponsors, why didn't they just say that nationally when attacked by Souder last week?'' I further note that, as of Friday, August 19, 2005 at 9 a.m., the first day of the conference, your Department's name remains on the conference program.

Your Department's support for, and participation in, this conference has already served to confer undeserved legitimacy on the drug legalization proponents who organized it. HHS participation and public sponsorship of the conference influenced the judgment of other government entities. For example, Oklahoma state agencies originally planned to send officials to the conference in large part because of the federal government's sponsorship.

Second, you did not respond to the second stated request of my letter asking for the names of all HHS staff attending the Harm Reduction Conference. This request stands and is reiterated at the end of this letter.

I am, moreover, bewildered by your assertion that six Centers for Disease Control (CDC) employees will attend the conference ''to learn how to reduce methamphetamine use.'' This conference, as the organizers clearly state, concerns so-called ''harm reduction'', that is, drug use maintenance. That is quite different from drug use reduction.

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 Lentine, 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 moving testimony to my Subcommittee 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, and announced your support for the Administration's anti-meth proposals. 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 Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. HOOLEY

Ms. HOOLEY. 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. 8 printed in House Report 109–387 offered by Ms. HOOLEY:

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

(n) 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 comprehenisve strategy that addresses the increased threat from methamphetamine.

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

(A) interdiction and precursor chemical controls;

(B) demand reduction and treatment;

(C) alternative development programs;

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

(E) an assessment of the specific level of funding and resources necessary to significantly to reduce the production and trafficking of methamphetamine.

(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 presented to Congress separately from the rest of the strategy.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

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

I would like to thank Chairman SOUDER for all of his incredibly hard work that he has done on methamphetamine and all the work he has done in committee.

In my three decades of public service, I do not think I have ever seen a problem as pervasive or as damaging as the methamphetamine epidemic that is sweeping our country. This epidemic is tearing apart families, neighborhoods, communities. More and more States are taking action to cut off pseudoephedrine sales to methamphetamine manufacturers who cannot make this poison without this common-cold medication.

While a number of States, including Oregon, have enacted tough rules to control the availability of pseudoephedrine, this has become a national problem. The States need strong Federal support if we are going to have a fighting chance against this epidemic, and yet this administration and ONDCP have not focused on the drug as they should.

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 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 precursor 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 one 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, 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 (Mr. SOUDER) 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 in 90 days 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 to 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 program that is 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 WALDEN 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 rips 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 is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

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:

(n) REQUIREMENT FOR AN ASSESSMENT OF ILLICIT DRUG AND ALCOHOL USE BY CHILDREN, AND APPROPRIATE INTERVENTION METHODS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Drug Control Policy shall complete an assessment of report materials, studies, and statistics with respect to the 5-year period before the date of enactment of this Act, to determine the extent to which children who are 12 to 17 years of age—

(A) experiment with and regularly use marijuana, alcohol, cigarettes, prescription drugs without a prescription, designer drugs (such as ecstasy), and other illicit drugs (such as cocaine); and

(B) have access to intervention services or programs, including drug testing, counseling, rehabilitation, legal representation, and other services or programs associated with prevention, treatment, and punishment of substance abuse.

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

(A) shall 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; and

(B) shall 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 regarding the assessment 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 information:

(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 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 criminal justice interventions are successful.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 713, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to acknowledge again Mr. SOUDER and Mr. CUMMINGS and certainly the members of the full committee, ranking member Waxman and Chairman DAVIS. We can all have our approaches to dealing with this fast-moving drug crisis in America, and it would seem that in 2006 we might be using other language other than ''drug crisis,'' because I recall the Select Committee on Narcotics. I was not a Member of this body, but it had a very high profile. That committee, of course, chaired by Congressman RANGEL, was at a time when drug use in urban centers of America was at a fast-moving pace.

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 in its simplicity says 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 we also need to 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 arrests in Houston, Texas, in 2003. In their lifetime, 32.9 percent of female and 48.9 percent of male Houston-area high school students will have a lifetime use of marijuana. In 2000 there were 115,589 Federal arrests made, 28 percent for drug offenses; 10.8 percent of youth 12 to 17 years old have used drugs in the past month alone. Among State prisoners, 83.9 percent were involved in alcohol or drugs at the time of their offenses; 53 percent of high school seniors reported using an illicit drug at least once in their lives.

These numbers are good for the record, but they impact people's lives. And frankly I believe that we have an opportunity to assess and report back to Congress on the programs that have been effective in preventing or responding to drug and alcohol use, the extent to which chronic use occurs in children, the extent to which schools and public institutions play a role in these programs, and the role of the Federal Government in these programs and the role of the criminal justice system.

Let me say that I am very grateful that this bill is silent on the issue dealing with scholarships because, unfortunately, we know that children and young people have used drugs but have straightened their lives up because of these intervention programs, and we want to make sure that they are not then thwarted and stopped from being able to finish their education. This, however, is a program that assesses the right kind of intervention. Certainly we know that we have drug courts. We want to know how effective they are. We know there is an amendment that has focused on that.

This focuses on, really, the kinds of programs that may be offered by nonprofits, the faith community, local governments so that funding can be both direct, correct, and effective.

Our children are our greatest resource. We are finding that they are victims, but also they are ripe for the target. They are ripe for amphetamines. They are ripe for over-the-counter drugs such as cough medicine. They are ripe for raiding their parents' prescription drugs in their medicine cabinet at home. So I am hoping that we can join together and understand the usage of these drugs, the alcohol in particular.

Now, let me make note of the fact that we know that smoking cigarettes or cigarettes and alcohol are legal aspects of potential addiction, but we believe that still the programs that deal with those elements, cigarette smoking, alcohol, are likewise equally involved in the idea of intervention and assessment of what programs work.

Let me conclude by simply saying a life saved, a life off the beaten path put on the straight path, is an investment in America's future. I believe this amendment helps us understand how to invest in America's future.

□ 1345

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.

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, 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 not already being conducted. We have tried 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 data. But I share her goals, and 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 than boys, 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 565,000 boys, and then the 675,000 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 amendment 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 effectiveness 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 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. 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 compared with 1.28 million boys.

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 decisionmaking. I hope you will agree that this is an urgent issue, and that this 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 decisionmakers.

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, State, 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 109–387 offered by Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

Page 161, after line 2, insert the following:

(n) MODEL STATE DRUG LAWS.—

(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, based 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 offered a 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 to advise 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 services 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

policies, coordinate funding streams to use resources effectively and efficiently and develop or strengthen multidisciplinary partnerships at the State and local level. That is absolutely necessary if we are going to make real progress on this war on drugs and war on other types of substance abuse. Just look at the number of States that addressed methamphetamine-related problems through legislation this past year alone. Many of them benefited from the services I mentioned.

Because effective and cost-efficient State drug laws and policies are vital components of a strong national effort to address substance abuse, this amendment is offered to authorize appropriations of $1.5 million for each of the fiscal years 2007 through 2011 to better ensure that these key functions in assisting States are retained in the national drug control effort.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, 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 do not oppose this amendment. I think it is an excellent amendment. Mr. LUNGREN of California, who I like to think of as the Charlie Weis of Congress in the sense that since he has come in, he has helped organize us in homeland security and organize us in narcotics issues based on his experience as attorney general, and once again showing why the University of Notre Dame produces such great graduates who grasp the issue.

He has worked at the State level. We need clearer model State drug laws. We need to establish laws that are effective. I appreciate his leadership in this effort in multiple committees, on the Judiciary and Homeland Security.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, we certainly join in support of the amendment. We think it is a good amendment.

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

Mr. LYNCH. 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. 11 printed in House Report 109–387 offered by Mr. LYNCH:

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 (21 U.S.C. 812).

(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 at 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 regarded the regulation 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 reason, the 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 the use of prescription drugs like OxyContin.

Iatrogenic addiction is addiction which occurs as a result of prescribed medical care. These are the accidental addicts, who, through no fault of their own, become hopelessly addicted to 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 problems of addiction. For this reason, it is necessary to have the information on addictiveness of drugs associated with iatrogenic addiction, including OxyContin.

I want to relate briefly, Mr. Chairman, a 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 had another tooth extracted, 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 create a detox center 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 malls 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 statement 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 pain killers 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 again 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. Chairwoman 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 of it, 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 methamphetamines through our control of pseudoephedrine and trying to get better control of the border at least someday in the future on crystal 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.

□ 1400

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 industries is how best 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 about it, because 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 issue. The 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 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 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 of 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:

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

SEC. 20. SUNSET.

After section 716, as redesignated by section 14 of this Act, insert the following:

"SEC. 717. 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 psychotropic 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 suggest to my colleagues 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 can be helpful 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 now 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 says 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 up until about 35 years ago. We had very few of these laws. Yet all we can notice now is that we have spent, in today's dollars, over $200 billion in the last 35 years, and we do not have a whole lot to show for it.

So I would grant you there is a serious problem. We should do whatever we can to help. I just do not think more legislation is required.

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

Mr. SOUDER. 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 most 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 through 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 goes forth.

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 most 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 positions to be put under this regulation. And it could, indeed, 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, unanimously 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 multiple different 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 seems 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 the State and locals 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.

When the 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.

It also says 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 happens to be true. We are reducing the flexibility because he has refused to respond to the counties of America that 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 this past week, even as we moved this bill through, continuing to resist the efforts of Congress to try to tackle the problems of methamphetamine.

Also they dislike that we have restricted their reprogramming ability. Yes 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's amendment passed and would not let us move forward with this bill.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¾ 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 this legislation in 5 years, if enacted.

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 need to get rid of it, and we need to get serious about doing something about drugs in America. We are sitting here talking about these HIDTAs. We are talking about advertisements while we have an unprotected border with the drug lords shooting it out with our sheriffs down in Texas and other places, bringing drugs into our country.

HIDTA does nothing to stop that. 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, at least review it. Why do you want to put it in law forever without the kind of reviews that are necessary to determine its effectiveness?

□ 1415

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 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 enforcement 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 ought 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 drugs, but what 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 kind 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, we had less 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 sunsetted. 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 reasons 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 retreating 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 has an impact 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 meth question. 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 10 PERCENT OF FUNDS FOR METHAMPHETAMINE ABUSE PREVENTION.—The Director shall ensure that, of the amounts appropriated under this section for the national media campaign for a fiscal year, not less than 10 percent shall be expended solely for—

''(A) the activities described subsection (b)(1) 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.

''(3) AUTHORITY TO USE FUNDS FOR OTHER DRUG ABUSE UPON CERTIFICATION THAT METHAMPHETAMINE ABUSE FELL DURING FISCAL

YEAR 2007.—With respect to fiscal year 2008 and any fiscal year thereafter, if the Director certifies in writing to Congress that domestic methamphetamine laboratory seizures (as reported to the El Paso Intelligence Center of the Drug Enforcement Administration) decreased by at least 75 percent from the 2006 level, the Director may apply paragraph (1)(A) for that fiscal year with respect to advertisements specifically intended to reduce the use of such other drugs as the Director considers appropriate.

Page 213, line 7, strike ''(k)'' and insert ''(l)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

First of all, let me begin by thanking 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 expended 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 problem if we identify it. We use a rifle-shot approach if we follow a model similar to what is happening in Montana. 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 ads. We are reaching each teen in Montana, on average, 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 originate 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 got going on in Montana.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

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 subcommittee 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 just 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 addressing methamphetamines.

I support the amendment.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each side be given 5 additional minutes, given the numbers 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 longlasting. Recent studies have demonstrated 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. Thousands of children 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 want to compliment Mr. REHBERG and 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 so 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 engaged.

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 if there is a reduction 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 in effect 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 epidemic; if local law enforcement is telling us that in big cities like Minneapolis and St. Paul or Omaha or Portland that the bulk of their people that are in jail, kids in child custody, are because of meth; if small rural towns 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?

□ 1430

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 enforcement 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 this drug for an extended period of time you tend 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 folks 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 bill. 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 the 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 failing.'' What this says is the drug czar has to show whether these nations, such as Mexico, whether the pseudoephedrine producers 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 their 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 spending on narcotics in multiple ways. For example, in prisons, they 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, which anybody who has been 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 drug 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 do 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 effect 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 have learned about 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 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 on this amendment 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 BAUCUS, Senator BURNS and myself, Governor Schweitzer.

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 to welcome you to the program, and 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 ought to have the ability to either grant to an organization like this or this organization. It is a 501(c)(3), so it is a not-for-profit, but it is a great idea. So what we want to do is provide the flexibility.

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 meth gives you more energy. Twenty-three percent of teens have close friends who use meth. 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. You lose 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 like September 11, and on a scale of 1 to 10 this is an 11. When it comes to issues that this country needs to deal with and this Congress needs to address, this methamphetamine use and drug use within our general population, especially among some of our most vulnerable, which are our teens, 13 to 17 or 12 to 17, we have got a program we would like to share with you as a pilot project.

There are many ideas out there coming up from all over the country, and what my amendment does is give the director the flexibility to try some new and creative things and require at least a simple 10 percent of the money for advertising be spent on methamphetamine.

Again, they have come in this year for a budget request of about $120 million. So this means at least $12 million would be spent. We are spending that much almost this year in Montana. So 10 percent is not enough.

Let me point out and thank at this time the other major players in this whole arena: television stations, radio stations, newspapers, the Internet. They are all voluntarily matching dollar for dollar every dollar that is being put in the Montana meth project. This is a tremendous volunteer organization and a tremendous advertising program. I think you will like it if you see it.

Again, I hope you will support the amendment; and to all my colleagues 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. 1706)

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am fortunate to represent more Native Americans than any other district in Congress, and this amendment addresses the needs for the tribes and the Office of National Drug Control Policy to work together to combat drug trafficking throughout Indian Country.

The purpose of HIDTA is to enhance and coordinate drug control efforts among local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies; and the HIDTA has proved to be an effective tool, and yet tribal governments need to play a greater role.

Our amendment will do just that. It requires a report from the director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy on the representation of tribal governments in the HIDTA process. The report would detail a list of tribal governments represented. It would explain the rationale for the level of tribal inclusion and would ask for recommendations to increase the number of tribal governments participating in the program.

I represent the Navajo Nation, the White Mountain Apaches, the San Carlos Apaches, the Yavapai Apaches. Their reservations alone are roughly the same size as the States of Maryland, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Vermont all combined.

□ 1445

These large land masses provide an ideal safe haven for drug smugglers, felons on the run, and these drug dealers. The reservations consist of vast rural areas, with little or no law enforcement to help provide protection. In addition, there is an abundance of tribal youth who in the eyes of these drug dealers serve as perfect innocent drug users.

In recent years, the choice of drugs on these reservations and throughout my district has been methamphetamines. It has destroyed the rule of law among the reservation people. It is killing our tribal youth in this country. More than 90 percent of the meth that comes into Arizona comes in through Mexico, and yet we have superlabs on the reservation that produce some of the purest form of highly addictive blend of toxics that make up methamphetamine. And the meth that is produced in these superlabs on the reservation sells for cheaper value on the street than the meth that is produced off the reservation.

My colleagues, I have to thank Chairman SOUDER. He has been out to northern Arizona. He is a champion of those among Indian country, particularly on this issue as it relates to helping so many of our youth combat the drug issue. I commend his efforts and I would ask my colleagues to help us with the most impoverished of our Nation and help our tribal youth say no

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 America, and it has been historic in fetal alcohol syndrome and other challenges.

What is astounding to me is that the administration's Attorney General Gonzalez recently 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 lead for the northern tribes in Montana, 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 taking 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 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 again thank the chairman for coming out to Arizona and seeing it firsthand, and I will end with 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time on behalf of Mr. TERRY to offer his amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 109–387 offered by Mr. SOUDER:

Page 143, after line 11, insert the following:

(1) Section 704(c)(2) is amended by inserting ''and the head of each major national organization that represents law enforcement officers, agencies, or associations'' after ''agency''.

Page 143, line 12, strike ''Section 704(c)(2)'' and insert the following:

(2) Section 704(c)(2).

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, Congressman LEE TERRY brought this amendment to the Rules Committee, and I strongly support this amendment. One of the things I should point out is that this has been an unusual day. We have been asking for some time to be able to have a meth day. Clearly, this has turned into a meth day, as well as when we did the terrorism bill. We had methamphetamines as part of that. And the reason is because we are hearing from the grass roots and they want to tackle the methamphetamine issue.

Earlier today, interestingly, we had the Meth Caucus and others who were not able to come to the floor because there was a major press conference with DEA and other agencies to talk about the bill that we passed earlier this week, the largest methamphetamine act in the United States' history as part of the terrorism bill. And Mr. TERRY and other Members, including Coach OSBORNE and others who come to the floor regularly on meth, are over at the White House for the signing ceremony on the methamphetamine bill. So I have been here on the floor today, and some Members have been able to make it over, but this has been a meth day and beyond on the House floor, and it is meth day at the White House as well as throughout Capitol Hill.

This particular amendment directs the director of ONDCP, the ''drug czar'' to consult with the head of each major national organization that represents law enforcement officers, agencies, or associations. That would include, for example, Ron Brooks of the National Narcotics Officers Associations Coalition, the Fraternal Order of Police, the national HIDTA directors. He must consult them prior to making recommendations to the President on national budget for drug control enforcement each year.

So why would we need this kind of amendment in this bill? I would think that this is what the director does for a living. But when we had a hearing and asked why the HIDTAs were being moved to the Justice Department at this hearing, we had the director of the narcotics officers who said they hadn't been consulted. We had the director of the Chicago HIDTA, the Speaker's HIDTA, and he said he hadn't been consulted. We had the directors of the Southwest border HIDTA, and they

said they had not been consulted. We had the director of the Baltimore-Washington HIDTA, and he said he had not been consulted. We had the director of the Missouri HIDTA, the sheriff of our Whip ROY BLUNT's home area, and he said he had never been consulted.

The question is: Who did they consult? If they didn't consult the HIDTA directors, any of them, if they didn't consult the narcotics officers, if they didn't consult the police officers, on what grounds are they making recommendations to in effect gut these programs and move them to other departments? On what grounds are they proposing to wipe out the Byrne grants and the drug czar be silent or actually supportive? On what grounds are they proposing to wipe out the meth hot spots?

I think it would be just basic good procedure that the director would talk to these groups before he would make these recommendations. Yet all these groups say he has never had a meeting with them. He is not meeting with them before he makes these recommendations. I think, quite frankly, it is a sad day when the United States Congress has to put into a bill that the director meets with the people who are on the street fighting the drug war, which he should be doing as part of his job.

But I strongly commend Mr. TERRY for this amendment, because we need the director. If we are going to have a director, a drug czar who is going to make recommendations that impact State and local law enforcement all over the country, that impact our HIDTAs all over the country, we ought to at least know, and he can still make whatever recommendations he wants, and the President can still make whatever recommendations he wants, but we would like to know before that recommendation comes over that he has at least talked to the people doing the job at the grassroots level.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I do support this amendment.

Let me go back for a minute, though. I agree with Mr. SOUDER in that I think it is unfortunate that we have to come to the floor of the House to ask ONDCP to consult with law enforcement. There is a thin blue line. We have our officers come in and ask us for all kinds of things in our subcommittee. And I always say that these are the people who are on the front lines. They are the ones who so often have to burst into houses when they do not know what is behind that door. They are the ones who leave home so often in the morning not knowing whether they are going to return to their families. They are the ones, for example in HIDTA, who sit down with the locals and the State folk and the Federal folk and come up with all kinds of strategies. They know what they need to do the job.

I have often heard the President say that when it comes to the war in Iraq, he wants to make sure he gets advice from the people that are on the ground. These are the folk that are on the ground.

But if I had my say about this amendment, I would expand it not only to our law enforcement folk but also to those people who day after day work, for example, in the drug-free communities effort, citizens who are working hard every day sacrificing their time and their resources to make their communities better. Hopefully, this will send a message, a very strong message to the drug czar.

What has happened is we have found ourselves, and I can understand our committee's frustration, because we get policies coming down from the White House which seem contrary to the very things that the people who are on the ground say that they need and the way they would like to see us proceed. Then we have to then change the White House policy so as to fit what is the reality on the ground. There just has to be a better way.

Again, one of the things we are concerned about, and I have said it many times, I think Republicans and Democrats can agree on one major thing, and that is that we want the people's tax dollars to be spent effectively and efficiently. And when the HIDTA folks came in and said to us, person after person, HIDTA after HIDTA, that they could not understand why it was that they were being shifted to the Justice Department and part of their budget was being taken away, I never got the impression for one second that it was just about a turf war or it was about just being petty in any way.

□ 1500

But I got the impression because they deal with this every day, they wanted to make sure that they had the tools and had the atmosphere and what they do, they could most effectively and efficiently do their job.

So like I said, it is unfortunate that we have to come to this point to basically mandate that consultation take place. But so often in our society we have a tendency to talk about each other and not talk to each other. I think perhaps, just perhaps by forcing folks to come together and at least talk, we will be able to address these problems more effectively so we do not have to go through this process over and over and over again.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each side be given 5 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. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think Mr. CUMMINGS' point is a fitting conclusion as we move to the end of this debate. Our frustration is that since there has not been an authorization, the director of ONDCP has proposed a number of changes which would greatly undermine what this Congress intended.

When we set up the High Intensity Drug Trafficking programs, the HIDTA, it was meant initially to focus on the Southwest border, which has not been particularly effective. In case anybody noticed, we do not have great control there, partly because we do not have an integrated Southwest border strategy. We have starts, we have a Southwest border HIDTA, but we need a Southwest border strategy.

In these High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas, we move to the biggest cities and say, this is how the drugs come in and move into Indiana from Chicago and Detroit. You need the Baltimore-Washington HIDTA and the Los Angeles HIDTA, the Phoenix and the Houston HIDTAs behind the border.

Other States then saw the effectiveness. What made HIDTA effective? The idea was if the Federal Government tried to do everything through DEA, FBI, Coast Guard, Border Patrol, Customs, it would not work. Sometimes even our Federal agents were arresting each other, and we were not getting integrated with State and local law enforcement.

So the goal in HIDTA was if we put a 1 million, $2 million into an area, first off, we would require all of the Federal agents to be there and they would get half the votes, and then we would get the States and locals and they would get half the votes, and they would feel actual ownership of it. If they felt ownership, they would participate.

As the head of the Phoenix Police Department told us at a hearing, it was moved over to OCDETF. It has done wonderful work, but OCDETF talks to supposedly State and local law enforcement, but State and local law enforcement do not get a vote. So they get put on a board, and they come to a meeting once in a while. HIDTA actually gives them a vote. The head of the Phoenix Police Department said his city council asks him on a regular basis, can you justify this, can you justify that. He has kept three officers in the HIDTA because he sees how that HIDTA money gets leveraged with the State police, with the U.S. Attorney's Office, with the U.S. Marshals, with the FBI, DEA, and with everybody else.

Why, when we finally get a program that works at the State and local levels that leverages these dollars, would we gut it without even talking to the people involved? The Phoenix police chairman said he would pull his three officers out of the narcotics effort if it

was moved. So did Chicago. So did city after city. And it is so exasperating that they continue to persist on this. But it shows it has done a great job of educating the HIDTAs.

The New York City HIDTA is integrated completely with terrorism, and it is an amazing operation as we see those to links occur. The national ad campaign we are addressing throughout this bill because we think it has been effective and we need to make it more effective, and it needs to include meth.

The administration was also proposing dramatic changes to the technology center. It is one of the most valuable things to State and local law enforcement because not only do we give them goods, but it is a model for what we are trying to do on homeland security, that is, when a police department says I would like this kind of radio, night goggle, protective gear, they analyze it. In my district, take Albion, 1,500, Kendallville is 10,000 people, Fort Wayne is 230,000 people. They can go through their list and say we would like these goggles, but then it goes through a review process and they say this is probably not what you need in Albion. Unless you can make a defense, you don't get that. You have to submit what kind of drug challenges you have, what types of things you need, and the Technology Assessment Center then, off of your list, you match up what your departments need.

Everybody in homeland security gets this pool of money, and now they have all kinds of things that they may not ever need and mismatches. Now we are trying to have the State say, what is your homeland security plan; to have the locals say, what is your homeland security plan. Then in a technology center, we should have it work like in the drug czar's office, except the drug czar wants to get rid of his own Department.

It is baffling why there is this persistent goal in the administration to wipe out the things that most benefit State and local and keep the parts that are nationally under their control.

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. We have all been able 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.

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 Mr. SOUDER has. They 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 have 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 just 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 interdiction, 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.

It is our police officers and our sheriffs and then our State patrol that are on the front lines. It was they 2 years ago who were telling me that some of the gangs in Omaha that had cocaine or marijuana were changing their product of distribution away from those drugs to crystal meth made in Mexico.

Mr. SOUDER held a hearing with Mr. Walters a year ago, who was really, I am not exaggerating here, flabbergasted that some of the grant moneys that the administration had zeroed out was actually being used for task forces against methamphetamines and these gangs, and yet my police department knew about it 2 years ago.

I know that this amendment that I have drafted sounds almost nonsensical in its common sense. Why would the national director of our drug policy not be communicating with local police officers who are our front line in this battle? But the reality is they have detached themselves and are advancing a policy to move all of this over to the Justice Department where there will be even less communication with those on the ground that know exactly what is occurring in our communities and what then we must do on the national level to make sure that we arm them correctly to protect our families from these international drug lords.

This is a commonsense amendment that I would encourage all of my colleagues to support.

Mr. CUMMINGS. 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.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. CHABOT of Ohio.

Amendment No. 8 by Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. PAUL of Texas.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. REHBERG of Montana.

□ 1515

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). 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.

The Clerk redesignated 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 2, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

AYES—403

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—2

Flake
Paul

NOT VOTING—27

Bachus
Burton (IN)
Cantor
Costa
Davis (FL)
Deal (GA)
Evans
Ford
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Honda
Jenkins
Linder
Norwood
Oxley
Pallone
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Price (GA)
Reynolds
Royce
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Shays
Sweeney
Tancredo
Westmoreland

□ 1540

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 gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The 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 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

AYES—403

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)

Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—3

Flake
Paul
Taylor (NC)

NOT VOTING—26

Bachus
Brady (TX)
Burton (IN)
Cantor
Costa
Davis (FL)
Deal (GA)
Evans
Ford
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Jenkins
Linder
Norwood
Oxley
Pallone
Peterson (PA)
Price (GA)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Shays
Sodrel
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1548

So the amendment was agreed to.

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 demand for a recorded vote on 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.

The Clerk redesignated 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—ayes 85, noes 322, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

AYES—85

Abercrombie
Alexander
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Boustany
Boyd
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Campbell (CA)
Capuano
Conaway
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Delahunt
Doggett
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor
Gohmert
Hayworth
Hensarling
Hinchey
Holt
Honda
Hostettler
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jindal
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
King (IA)
Kingston
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lee
Lofgren, Zoe
Mack
Manzullo
Markey
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McGovern
McKinney
Meehan
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Neal (MA)
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Otter
Paul
Payne
Poe
Pombo
Rohrabacher
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Slaughter
Stearns
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tierney
Watson
Wilson (SC)

NOES—322

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Oberstar
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—25

Bachus
Burton (IN)
Cantor
Costa
Davis (FL)
Deal (GA)
Dicks
Evans
Foley
Ford
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Jenkins
Linder
Norwood
Oxley
Pallone
Peterson (PA)
Price (GA)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Shays
Sweeney
Tancredo
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1556

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 the 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.

The Clerk redesignated 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—ayes 399, noes 9, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

AYES—399

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—9

Delahunt
Flake
Kennedy (RI)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Paul
Scott (VA)
Velázquez
Watt

NOT VOTING—24

Bachus
Burton (IN)
Cantor
Costa
Davis (FL)
Deal (GA)
Evans
Ford
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Jenkins
Linder
Markey
Norwood
Oxley
Pallone
Peterson (PA)
Price (GA)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Shays
Sweeney
Tancredo
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1604

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 the 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 rises.

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 previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 399, noes 5, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

AYES—399

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay

Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—5

Frank (MA)
McDermott
Paul
Stark
Waters

NOT VOTING—28

Bachus
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Burton (IN)
Cantor
Costa
Davis (FL)
Deal (GA)
Evans
Flake
Ford
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Linder
Norwood
Oxley
Pallone
Peterson (PA)
Price (GA)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Shays
Smith (WA)
Sweeney
Tancredo
Westmoreland

□ 1622

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, "aye" on recorded vote No. 35, "no" on recorded vote 36, "aye" on recorded vote 37 and "aye" on recorded vote 38.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I was not present to cast my votes on rollcall votes 34 through 38 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 this up next week to bring it to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. From what you have said, it is my presumption then that 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. Wednesday, and possibly Thursday.

Mr. HOYER. So would that 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.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 13, 2006 AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2006

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 14, 2006, for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.