

measure progress with its Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test.

The state is requiring schools to target students who fail to meet math and reading standards, a chronic problem. In Orange and Osceola counties, for example, at least 30 percent of eighth-graders scored below the 25th percentile on reading and math achievement tests. That means they did worse than 75 percent of kids across the country.

There is a push to get kids up to speed early on, particularly in reading. A state law that takes effect next year won't allow grade school kids who don't read well enough to be promoted. Seminole County has new elementary school tests to diagnose reading problems. In Lake County, there are 250 reading volunteers in elementary schools. Orange County this year will have summer school in at least 19 low-achieving elementary schools—more than double the number last year.

[From the Orlando Sentinel Online]

TEACHER'S DIARY: 'APPARENTLY, I SPEAK A DIFFERENT LANGUAGE THAN THEY DO'

Today, I gave a test. As always, the students were allowed to use their notes. The way I see it, I serve them better by honing their note-taking and comprehension skills, as opposed to their memorization skills. I have been giving open-note tests since day one.

Even so, every time I lecture, I have to remind them to copy what I write on the board. They have been in class for 150 days. When will they catch on that it will be beneficial to have notes?

Last week, I put a note on the board about when the test would be. Every day since, I reminded them. Yesterday, I gave them a list of the topics that would be covered. Last night, I put a reminder on my homework hotline.

Apparently, I speak a different language than they do, because a quarter of them came in this morning and said, "We have a test today? You didn't tell us we had a test today! Can we use our notes?"

Now, it's 8 o'clock and I have just finished grading the tests. My spouse has gone into the other room, tired of hearing me yell, "How many times did we go over this!?" as I drew a line through another wrong answer.

More frustrating than the students who answered incorrectly are the ones who don't even attempt an answer.

I explain to them before every test that I will give them partial credit if I can see they knew at least a little about the answer.

Even if their answers are different from what we discussed in class, I will give credit if they can explain their point of view.

Believe it or not, I have had students choose to take a zero because they left their notes at home. What do they do in other classes? What were they doing for the last week when we were learning about the ideas that test covers? Where is their survival instinct?

I encourage what is known as "thinking out of the box." I want my students to disagree with me. I want them to think, to seek alternatives. Sadly, most of them just can't. Sadder still, many don't want to. They want to be given the answer; they want to write it on the test from memory; and then they want never to think about it again.

I think that the theory that high expectations will cause kids to rise up to meet those expectations is only true if the kids already have some foundation to stand on. But by the time they reach the upper grades, their feet are already mired in quicksand.

One foot is stuck in their own inescapable kid-ness, which causes them to try and get out of as much work as possible.

But the other is mired with teachers who don't expect them to do anything but memorize. I have kids who are about to go to college whose teachers actually give them a copy of the upcoming test to use as a study guide.

And do you know what? Even after that, some of them fail. Why should I try to teach them to think?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ACTIVITIES DURING THE DISTRICT WORK PERIOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, this evening I would like to go through a number of issues. Wednesday evening is the opportunity for the freshmen Republican class to spend a little time on the House floor and brief our colleagues and, indeed, the rest of the country on some of the activities that we are pursuing throughout America in our respective districts.

I know for me out in the Fourth District of Colorado that I represent, which is essentially the eastern plains of the country, I spent the last two weeks over the Easter break working pretty hard, actually. It was not much of a break at all. We did a lot of town meetings and a lot of visits at school sites throughout the district and so on.

I wanted to spend a little bit of time tonight just telling my colleagues about some of the activities that I had pursued with the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities that made a site visit out to my district recently, and report back on some of the comments that we received at that subcommittee.

It was a subcommittee of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations led by the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA). They came out to the town of Timnath, Colorado, which is a little bit east of Fort Collins, and Timnath is a community that includes an elementary school that we went to visit, Timnath Elementary School.

The school was a unique one and one that I think provided perhaps the best snapshot of education in my district as far as at the elementary level, because this particular community is located just on the outskirts of a bigger city, the City of Fort Collins, but still has a large rural component. So we have an interesting mesh of children from urban as well as rural settings, and of

course that is representative of the district overall.

We met for a day-long hearing of the subcommittee, again, part of the Crossroads in Education program of the committee which has taken place in several States throughout the country under the leadership of the committee.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, about some of the individuals that we heard from. Our focus was asking local leaders about what works and what is wasted in public education today. We heard from Don Unger, who is the superintendent of the Poudre School District in the town of Fort Collins.

He cited one of the biggest problems that he is confronted with as a superintendent of a relatively large school district in Colorado. He said that we continue to receive increased Federal mandates. What he focused on, for example, were the changes made in the IDEA bill last summer, which are taking well over 100 hours of staff time with no new resources provided to support this additional mandated requirement.

He also spoke about parent and staff litigation against the school district which he said caused a major demand on staff and dollars. These litigations are coming from three areas, he said: the Office of Civil Rights; right to due process under IDEA; and through parental and staff complaints to the State government.

□ 1930

He said that some of the things that are working very well are the efforts here in the Congress to consolidate Federal programs, and, in fact, this Congress accomplished that in the last session with a number of education titles that we reviewed and consolidated here. He spoke about some of the literacy programs that we have promoted as a Republican Congress, and commented that they are working very well in his district.

Secondly, we heard from a woman named Pat Chase. She is the president of the Colorado Association of School Boards, and she takes in a perspective in her testimony of the entire State and all of the school boards that she represents, which are 176 in number, of locally elected school board members, and all very dedicated to education.

She says that the efforts in the State to lead local school districts in establishing standards are being received very positively, and have had a very positive impact on local schools. She, once again, hit on the issues of public school mandates, and described the Federal mandates that we are handing down to school districts as being particularly detrimental. She said the Omnibus Transportation Employee Testing Act has been somewhat of a problem that imposes drug and alcohol testing requirements on school bus drivers, and she said that the mandate has the best of intentions. And on a State level and local level it is something that, in fact, Colorado would

most likely support anyway without the mandate from the Federal level.

However, the Federal mandate just being in existence compels States and local school districts to fill out a lot of paperwork; spend a lot of time complying with the Federal mandate. Here is a mandate that is pretty obvious. You want to make sure that the people driving buses and being around kids are free from drugs, and pass the drug tests. And as I mentioned, Colorado is no different than many other States in that it would accomplish this objective on its own; left to its own devices and its own laws, but again the Federal Government's intrusion on something that is rather obvious results in nothing more in Colorado than more paperwork and more headaches for school board members throughout the State, and in the end detracts from getting dollars to classrooms where they are also needed most.

We also heard from Dr. Randy Everett. Randy Everett is a urologic surgeon. He and his wife have been very involved in establishing education opportunities for children throughout northern Colorado where they were instrumental in establishing a school that focuses on the Hirsch "Core Knowledge" curriculum or the "Core Knowledge" sequence designed by Dr. E. D. Hirsch. And they started that school as an alternative school, and it resulted in a huge waiting list of parents who wanted to get their children into that kind of an education setting.

This school is one that is created around a sequential curriculum, very well ordered, and very logical in terms of one lesson building upon the previous one. It is built around a concept called mature literacy and cultural literacy, which is one step above just basic functional literacy; the whole notion that children should be able to read for meaning and be able to understand all of the historic and scientific and cultural context of things that they read, and the way they understand the world.

A curriculum that is being used throughout the world, certainly throughout the United States with great success, this was the first school that was established in Ft. Collins. Dr. Everett then went on to establish a second school under Colorado's charter school law. That school, as well, the Liberty Common School, is one that is enjoying tremendous success in its first year and Dr. Everett was on hand to give us testimony about the success of that institution.

We also heard from Mr. Clair Orr, who is an individual from Greeley, Colorado. He serves on the State board of education, was elected to that position from throughout my Congressional District in the Fourth District. He spoke about a number of issues. The huge variances that we have in Colorado, very large school districts, down to small school districts that have in some cases 60 students total. And he spoke very directly, again, about the

Federal Government taking on several responsibilities and duties for which it does not pay. And at one point in time our Federal Government mandated a number of requirements upon school districts, and over the years the size of the U.S. Department of Education has been broadened and flattened out, and there are too many programs now, far more than the district is able to fund.

We heard from Jane Anderson, a parent at Liberty Common School. Jane Anderson spoke about school choice and the positive impact that that has on parental involvement. Many, many parents, far more parents than seems to be typical are getting involved in education delivery right at the classroom level when empowered by school administrators to do that, and again spoke about how wonderful that seems to work in Colorado.

We heard from Bob Selle, a superintendent from east Yuma County school district, RJ-2, way off in the eastern part of Colorado, almost out near Kansas. He spoke about, once again, about some of the, about some of the very difficult challenges that rural communities have. They spend a disproportionate amount of money on transportation because they have to transport their children from such far distances to get to some of the rural schools, and spoke about the success of some of the reading programs that the Federal Government helps initiate.

One of the most memorable portions of our hearing involved testimony from a teacher, science teacher named Pam Schmidt. She is Colorado's 1997 Teacher of the Year and she teaches at Thunder Ridge Middle School in Cora, Colorado. That is in the Cherry Creek school district, a very inspirational teacher.

What struck me most about Pam's comments and testimony was her desire to see teachers treated like real professionals. That is a term that I use quite frequently, and I asked her about a system that we have today, largely dominated by union politics at the National Education Association and the Colorado regimen being the Colorado Education Association. This union has secured a contract essentially that treats all teachers the same, regardless of their professional abilities and their ability to contribute to an education system and process; in fact, a system that results in the absolute worst teacher in the district being paid the same as the absolute best.

She and I agreed that we ought to create a system throughout the country where teachers are rewarded as real professionals, and, in fact, allowing the very best teachers to become wealthy in carrying out the services that they render to children, which if we as a society agree, and I think we mostly would, that this process of public education is of paramount importance, truly then those who are the best and who are those who excel in their profession and field ought to be rewarded financially as well as professionally on

that basis. And conversely, those who fail to perform well ought to be persuaded to find a new line of work.

That, according to Pam, does not happen in public schools today. The worst teachers seem to be protected most by laws that certainly do not have the best interests of children first and foremost in their intent.

We heard from Dan Balcerak, principal of Timnath Elementary School. First of all, let me say he was very gracious, and we certainly appreciated his hospitality in opening up his school for a day to the Congress and to the State of Colorado. Principal Balcerak mentioned that public education serves the needs of a wide variety of students, so teaching methods need to include accommodations for a wide spectrum of learning styles.

He spoke about how local control being the best way to accomplish that, not centralizing curriculum in Washington, D.C., as many people here in Washington would suggest needs to occur. You find most of those folks over in the U.S. Department of Education and in the Clinton administration. And we assured Dan Balcerak that on the Republican side of the aisle, we are working very hard to liberate public schools throughout the country, and honor the freedom under which they operate best.

We heard from Bill Moloney, the Commissioner of Education of the State of Colorado. He spoke about many things that seem to work very well. He said that technology, for example, is having a remarkable impact upon public education. He spoke about the Core Knowledge movement as being very positive, a rigid strategy toward testing and accountability that is occurring in Colorado; pointing out where the real problems are, and allowing professionals to go to work on improving those particular aspects of our school system. And he again spoke about the unfunded Federal mandates, and the real need for this Congress to work forcefully to liberate public schools at the State and local level, and free them from these burdensome rules and regulations that are again largely unfunded.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to go through that report for the benefit of the Members here and also for those who wonder what it is we do when we take these breaks from Congress. In this case, which is a snapshot of one day, we spent considerable amount of time bringing other Members of Congress from other parts of the country out to Colorado to consider the contributions and the problems that we are dealing with in a part of my State where the rural areas are, come up against some urban areas.

I see the gentleman from South Dakota has joined me here. The gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) is one of the outstanding leaders of the freshman class. I appreciate him joining us here tonight.

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) to present whatever point he needs to bring to our attention tonight.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding to me. I might add that as you traveled across your State of Colorado, I would suspect that many of the concerns that you heard were not unlike the ones I hear in traveling my State of South Dakota, because I think our congressional districts are very much alike in many respects, and as I spent the better part of 2 weeks, actually all of 2 weeks traveling across South Dakota, I had the occasion to visit with a wide range of groups from economic development groups, to agricultural groups to education groups, and to discuss with them a wide range of issues; all of which I think are very relevant as we look to the future, and what some of the needs are that are out there.

It is sort of ironic. I was listening to the debate today on the tax limitation amendment here on the House floor, and there was a lot of invoking, I guess you would say, of our Founding Fathers and what their intentions were with respect to taxes and whatnot. And there was the suggestion, the notion that somehow because our Founding Fathers did not include in those original documents a supermajority requirement to raise taxes, that in their wisdom they had excluded that, and they talked about, I heard the discussion of the Articles of Confederation and whatnot, and it occurred to me, I guess, that in my reading of history that the Articles of Confederation were, in fact, they relied upon the States to raise revenue, and it became clear that the States were not going to do it. And so they came up with a way in which they could raise revenue for the national government.

But that, nevertheless, I would also argue that our Founding Fathers probably never anticipated that we would be looking at \$5.5 trillion in debt. In fact, if our Founding Fathers had known that we were going to run the country \$5.5 trillion in debt, they probably would have moved back to Europe and forgotten the whole thing to start with.

The fact of the matter is that there is an inertia in government to spend, and one of the things that the tax limitation amendment does, it says in very straightforward terms that if, in fact, the government is going to raise taxes, that the representative form of government that we have, that they elect people to make these decisions; that it will take a two-thirds majority, supermajority to raise taxes. I think that is something that is very much in the interest of the people in this country so that we can get away from this built-in inertia toward big government to spend dollars.

I look at our State of South Dakota, which I think is a good case in point. We have in our Constitution a balanced

budget amendment. We balance our budget every year. We have a requirement for a supermajority.

In fact, in 1996, on the ballot almost 75 percent of the voters in South Dakota voted in favor of making it a two-thirds requirement in order to raise taxes in our State. And more and more States are moving in that direction because the people of this country, I think, have realized what we already know and what you cannot help but realize after you have been in this town for a very short time: that there is an incredible inertia in this city and in government generally to continue to spend and spend and spend. So this afternoon we had the vote on that.

I think it was a significant vote for the people of this country, and for your voters in Colorado, and the folks in Michigan. And the gentleman from Michigan has just joined us, but certainly for the people in South Dakota, interestingly enough, as I traveled across our State, and we dealt with, again, a wide range of issues. We talked about corn prices and wheat prices and cattle prices, and there is not a whole lot to be happy about in agriculture today. A little bit about supporting ethanol, making sure that we have opportunities to add values to our raw commodities in South Dakota and across the agricultural sector of this country.

We also talked a lot about retirement issues, a lot about education issues, drug issues, which is an incredible problem in many small communities across South Dakota today. But interestingly enough, one incident in particular that stuck out to me, as I stopped at a gas station in Aberdeen, South Dakota and the young lady at the counter said to me, as I walked in, she said, Congressman, working families need lower taxes. And she said, my husband and I both work. We are raising kids, paying the bills, trying to educate our kids, put aside a little bit for retirement, and we are writing these big checks to Uncle Sam.

□ 1945

"And the best thing that you can do to make our lives easier and to allow us to make to have more control over our futures is to lower taxes on working families."

In fact, I would like to just briefly mention a couple of bills that I introduced some time ago which would do just that. The Taxpayer Relief Act was one, H.R. 3151; the Taxpayer Choice Act, which is H.R. 3149, lowered the tax burden on working people in this country in a way that addresses a couple of principles that I think we ought to be concerned about when we talk about lowering taxes. And one is, not further complicating the Tax Code.

We have 480 forms, and we put them on a scale one day at one of the meetings I had in South Dakota. 34½ pounds of tax code and instructions and all that. So, clearly, we need to move in a direction towards simplification so the

people who pay this rate in this country can understand what it is, the Tax Code, that they are supposed to comply with in the first place; and, secondly, we ought to do something that is broad based.

Now, this administration has forever seemed smitten with the notion that we have to do things in a targeted way so that Washington can identify and pick winners and losers. And the legislation that we introduced drops more people out of the 28 percent bracket down to the 15 percent bracket, in fact, 10 million filers in this country. Altogether, 29 million Americans would pay lower taxes as a result of lowering that.

What in effect it does is it says to the people of this country that, instead of each additional dollar that they earn we are going to tax them at 28 cents, we are only going to take 15 cents. That is an incredible incentive to work harder, earn more, produce more, be more productive, and improve their lot in life. Today I think as people grow into higher tax brackets we continue to penalize them and to take away the incentive.

The other bill, very simply, raises the personal exemption from \$2,700 to \$3,400, and that does affect in a broad based way everybody across this country who pays taxes, and it brings real relief. We talk about giving people more education when it comes to child care and education and health care and retirement.

Giving money back to people or allowing them to keep more in of what they earn in the first place and making the Federal budget smaller and the family budget bigger does that in a very meaningful way because it allows families the freedom to make decisions that affect their lives. And they can determine how best to meet those needs, to make that house payment, to make that car payment, to pay for child care, to pay for health care. But it is doing it in a way that is consistent with the principle and the value which I think we in the Chamber all share, and that is to allow people in this country to make those decisions, rather than bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

So I commend those particular bills to your consideration, and as we get into this budget debate I hope they will be on the table.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) in just a second.

Because it is interesting, at the crossroads hearing that we had in my district that I mentioned, the topic, of course, was education, but one of the State Board of Education members, an elected official, in speaking about a variety of education issues, mentioned the marriage tax penalty that existed where a married couple, where two individuals who are earning incomes get married, they move into a higher tax bracket or a portion of their income does. But he spoke about, just on a

philosophical basis, how this Federal Government consistently beats up on families that are the most central and social unit in America and makes it difficult for a variety of reasons.

And he looked to that particular example of a fallacy in our tax code and was able to show very dramatically to the chairman and I, who is here now, about the direct impact that that has on local education, on families, on just the ability of families to be functional in America today, whether it is health care, whether it is keeping their children on the straight and narrow or educating them appropriately in school.

The chairman is here with us tonight, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA). And that was one of the most memorable portions, in my opinion, of that hearing that we had. And I want to publicly say I sure appreciate the gentleman for bringing the committee out to my district, and those in my community appreciate his attention as well.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank both of my colleagues for being here and also for the work that they have helped us accomplish in this Congress.

We are talking about education. We are talking about the budget. We are talking about where we go with spending and tax cuts. And because of the work of Members like my colleague, we here now in Washington I think really are at a crossroads on a number of issues, on education, where we have got these series of hearings, we have gone to 17 different States, and we are at a crossroads I think in Washington about deciding how we deal with education in America.

We know that, since 1979, with the Education Department, we have been bringing more power and more funding, more rules and regulations to Washington and saying we need to improve education in America, and the way to do that is to move more money and power to Washington and allow the Education Department to dictate to local schools and to local parents and local administrators how best to educate their kids.

After 19 years of following down that path and seeing that our children's test scores are not up and seeing that Washington defines "education" as being 760 programs going through 39 different agencies, and there is 34 pounds of rules and regulations in the IRS code, I can tell my colleagues that when we took a look at all of the forms that schools have to fill out for these 760 different programs, we had about four or five stacks that were four or five feet high and it is like wow, and what that means is when we spend a dollar to Washington for education, only 65 cents gets back to the classroom.

What we found in our 17 hearings around the country is what is the leverage points for improving education in the local school in Colorado, in New York, in Michigan. It is parents, it is local teachers, it is local administra-

tors identifying the needs for their kids. So I think here in Washington now we are going to have some votes on this on the floor, we are going to have some votes in committee about we are at the crossroads.

The President does not agree with the gentleman, because the President wants to spend more of the money that comes here. He is not in favor of tax cuts. He believes bureaucrats here ought to define what school districts get more money for school construction, which schools get money for technology, which schools get money for lowering class size. He wants that money to come here and not stay in the district.

So we are going to have to make the decision. Are Washington bureaucrats going to make more of those decisions or are we going to take these programs, consolidate it, move it back to local teachers and administrators and parents and say, hey, here is a check, if you want to use this to reduce class size, use it to reduce class size? If you need technology, you decide where you are going to spend it.

So I think we are at a crossroads. There is a group here in Washington that says we need to spend more and we need to tell people what to do, and there is a group that came out and said, we have gone around the country, we have gone to these places, the energy and innovation and the effectiveness, the good things that are happening in education in America today, and there are lots of them, it is happening because there are people at the local level who have a passion for helping their kids and they know what to do and we have got to unleash their potential and follow the roles of the States with charter schools, with innovation. That is the key crossroads in education.

We are going to have the same types of questions on the budget. I know that we do not have a surplus as good as we would like to have and it is only a surplus in Washington terms, but it is a significant change. There are some that want to spend it. I think some of us want tax reduction and pay down the debt. That is another crossroads. Are we going to use it to grow government or are we going to use this to take the opportunity to rethink programs and move the power back to the American people?

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Shrinking the size of the Federal Government has benefits not only for education but for everything we do as Americans and for the constituents we represent back home.

Right now, the Federal budget is \$5½ trillion.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman would further yield, the debt is \$5.6 trillion. And we spend \$1.6 trillion, \$1.7 trillion.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Right. I am sorry if I misspoke.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I always get beat up at my town meetings between getting the deficit and the debt confused.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. The debt is \$5½ trillion for the national debt. The amount we spend every year, \$1.7 trillion to run the Government this year, for example. But that \$5½ trillion debt that we consistently run up, even with this surplus that we talked about that we have here in Washington, we have to realize and remind people that this is only a surplus the way the Federal Government does its accounting.

We are still moving in the right direction. There is no question about that. We are able to put more resources into relieving some of these debt issues.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. My colleague talks about moving in the right direction. When I first came here in 1993, the deficit as Washington counted it for 1998 was projected to be \$300 billion per year. We are on the path now to have a \$40 billion to \$50 billion surplus. This is a switch of \$350 billion to the positive.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Well, whatever we can do to lower the size of that effective debt and move not only authority but real wealth back to the States and the people allows us to speak more forcefully and more seriously about improving our local schools, about improving local economies, the ability to pour capital back into the private sector rather than hoard it here in Washington, either held as debt or spent on a number of government programs is a choice that we just have to make in favor of States and the people.

And we talked about education a lot tonight. The problem we are really dealing with the U.S. Department of Education is the disagreement that we have, and the debate that is at the center of education issues is not about whether resources ought to be spent in classrooms. On that point we all agree. The question is, how do we do that?

For those of us who are conservatives here and try to figure out how to make our government operate more efficiently and really improve classrooms, our big concern is the 40 to 60 percent of the money that we are spending right now out of the Federal budget never makes it to a classroom. It gets soaked up by bureaucrats here in Washington, never leaves the city. When it goes back to the States it gets soaked by various Federal bureaucrats and State bureaucrats at the local level.

We believe very firmly that in order to reduce class sizes, in order to allow technology to be used appropriately in classrooms, in order to allow for innovations in education to occur at the classroom level, we just need to get the Federal Government out of the way and allow the wealth that the country is generating to be spent on its legitimate intended purpose, which is to help children. It is not occurring today, and we are fighting very hard to make that happen.

Mr. THUNE. If I might add, we look at the Washington model, which is obviously, I think we would all concur, in

many respects a failed model and the message that Washington sends to our young people. And would we not be much better served if we had our parents and teachers and administrators and people plugged into the local levels and all just issue a recent incident of this that I think needs to be talked about later on today?

But Washington, D.C.'s idea of how to help our young people is to give them free needles and to tell them to go ahead and shoot up. And that is a mixed signal when Washington gets in the middle of something affecting the young people in America today.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Is this the same Washington that is going to stop our kids from smoking but we are going to give them free needles? Somewhere in here there is a contradiction. We can stop our kids from smoking through Washington programs, but we cannot keep them off drugs so we are going to give them free needles.

Mr. THUNE. If the gentleman would yield on that, because that is an important point, and we are talking about an important issue. Tobacco is an important issue, and it is something that we are going to pass legislation which prevents teens from starting smoking.

But the issue, the reason that they are talking about at the White House the tobacco issue not the drug issue is because it is a money issue. It is all about money. It is about bringing more money in here to create new government, Washington-based spending programs. That is what the issue is. And if the objective ultimately is to help young people, to get them to stop smoking, to get them to stop quit using drugs, that is exactly the wrong message to send. We do not want to hand them free needles.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I will yield time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) in a minute.

What I have here in my hand is about 2 days' worth of responses to a public opinion survey I sent out in my district about the topic of education. And my colleagues can pour through these. And we have to respect the confidentiality of those who sent them. I do not want to disclose any names.

But just in general, I asked about a number of education topics. But in the comments people wrote in, it was alarming to go see how many times parents expressed real concern for drugs in their schools, that their concern, the most precious things in the lives of these parents are their kids and they send them to schools to learn and they have these great hopes and ambitions for their children and their families.

We ought to be, when it comes to schools, talking about class size and curriculum and the real issues that are confronting our children in schools. But to see the concerns of parents over and over and over again expressed in a way that goes right to this drug issue, it is a tremendous problem throughout

the country. And parents in America should not have to worry about sending their children to a public school and having them confronted with the reality of drug addiction, drug abuse, and illegal drugs at all.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) is here, who is one the foremost leaders in the Congress on trying to reduce the rate of drug abuse in America, especially among children. I would yield to him at this point.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I would thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding. And certainly this is a real issue. I appreciate him talking about what happens when government has too much money. And when they have too much money there, there is a lot of ideas that people have about how to spend that money.

Unfortunately, one of the ideas that this administration has was, well, it was a good idea to hand out free needles to drug addicts.

□ 2000

Now we have to look at this issue. You know, drugs are not legal. Marijuana, heroin, crack, cocaine, all those are against the law. But, yet, the paraphernalia, needles and other things that are used to inject those drugs into a human body all of a sudden are not just legal, all of a sudden, you have the Federal Government with a plan to use taxpayer dollars, Federal dollars to hand those needles to drug addicts.

I am saying, you know, maybe we have got something wrong. We talked about trying to stop kids from smoking cigarettes. I think that is something we should do. I mean, we should send a message. We should have the moral courage to talk about this issue. Certainly teen smoking is not a good thing. But I question when we take a cigarette out of a kid's mouth and stick a needle in his arm, I mean, where are we going? What is the issue here? How can you justify that and morally move that idea forward?

I think we have a bad message, certainly a bad message to drug addicts to all of a sudden say it cannot be too bad. The Federal Government is giving me the paraphernalia to put these drugs in my veins.

And certainly the message to parents, and I think as a parent myself, and a teacher, the worst thing that I would ever want to happen is to think about my kids using drugs. I think most parents think of that, boy, one of the things I do not want to see ever happen in my family is to have my kids use drugs. Yet, the Federal Government is actually saying, oh, by the way, if you need free needles to use drugs, you cannot use drugs. That is bad. That is illegal. But if you want the free needles to use them, here they are.

I do not quite understand that. The logic is not there. You know, it is the wrong message. I am particularly frustrated in what signal, in what message we are sending to the kids in this coun-

try, the parents of this country, the schools of this country, our foreign neighbors.

I was just down in Chile last weekend attending the President's Summit down there in South America on issues that are relevant. One of the things, one of the messages we are trying to get across to our South American neighbors is that we need to stop drugs. We need to have them stop growing drugs in South America and in Colombia and Peru and Bolivia and other countries. We need to stop having them move those drugs or transit those drugs across their countries and across through Mexico and on to our borders.

But when we are saying it is our job, too, to take care of the demand in this country, but, oh, by the way, we are against people using drugs, and we want to stop the demand because we know the demand in some sense drives supply and vice versa, here, by the way, here is what we are doing. We are instigating a program. We are giving away needles so people can use drugs. The message is wrong, very, very wrong.

I think this Congress needs to stand up. They need to say it is wrong. They need to convince this administration that it is a wrong-headed policy. That is our job.

I think, you know, one of the reasons we are talking tonight and trying to get involved in this and have talked to the American people is to get people to react. I am not sure if there are many people in this country who realize that the Federal Government wants to instigate a program that starts giving away taxpayer-paid needles to drug addicts.

I think in the heart of hearts of some people, the reason they are going to do that is that because there is a high incidence of AIDS among drug addicts, and they want to stop AIDS. But do you know what the facts are? In both the Montreal study and in the Vancouver study and in the Chicago study, and I would like to enter those studies into the RECORD.

What it says is, you know, people who get free needles pass these needles around anyway. The drug is such, especially the purity of heroin that we have today, is such a driving need for those people, once they become addicted, is that they do not care; they just have needles. They do not care if they are clean needles or dirty needles. Once they get that drug buy, they do not want to go more than 100 feet away from where they are at to inject the drug. They will take a dirty needle. They will take a needle from a friend.

The statistics are amazing that, in programs where you do not give needles away, 38 percent of the people trade needles. In programs where you give needles away, such as they did in a study in Montreal and Vancouver and in Chicago, 39 percent of the people trade needles. So it does not make any difference. As a matter of fact, it exacerbates the problem.

What else you find is, when there are free needle programs, it does not do away with drug addicts. The percentage of drug addicts in a neighborhood actually rise. More people are using drugs. And do you know what? The whole issue is to do away with HIV. And do you know what? You have more incidents of HIV. Plus crime increases.

So you have all these dynamics that happen that certainly are not good.

Another interesting thing, too, in New York City, we had a hearing last September, as a matter of fact, September 18, 1997, and it was a hearing on the needle exchange and legalization and the failure of the Swiss heroin experiments. In this study, we found out that, in New York City, for every 40 needles given away, only one needle was actually exchanged. Let me explain that.

The idea of a needle exchange is, you give one needle to the person; he gives you the dirty needle back. Here in New York City, they give 40 needles away and get only one dirty needle back. So the exchange means you just put out more needles in the universe and certainly something that just perplexes me.

Interesting, I have a constituent in my district who heads up the Illinois Drug Educational Alliance, a woman by the name of Judy Kreamer. Ms. Kreamer says needle exchange programs are offered as a way to prevent the spread of HIV, AIDS. However, studies have shown that such programs increase the spread of HIV, AIDS.

In addition, needle exchange programs encourage drug use and pose a serious threat to the health and safety of innocent people, and I will attach support.

Mr. Speaker, I include the documents referred to for the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 22, 1998]

CLEAN BUT NOT SAFE

FREE NEEDLES DON'T HELP DRUG ADDICTS

(By James L. Curtis)

Donna Shalala, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, wanted it both ways this week. She announced that Federal money would not be used for programs that distribute clean needles to addicts. But she offered only a halfhearted defense of that decision, even stating that while the Clinton Administration would not finance such programs, it supported them in theory.

Ms. Shalala should have defended the Administration's decision vigorously. Instead, she chose to placate AIDS activists, who insist that giving free needles to addicts is a cheap and easy way to prevent H.I.V. infection.

This is simplistic nonsense that stands common sense on its head. For the past 10 years, as a black psychiatrist specializing in addiction, I have warned about the dangers of needle-exchange policies, which hurt not only individual addicts but also poor and minority communities.

There is no evidence that such programs work. Take a look at the way many of them are conducted to the United States. An addict is enrolled anonymously, without being given an H.I.V. test to determine whether he or she is already infected. The addict is given a coded identification card exempting him or her from arrest for carrying drug para-

phernalia. There is no strict accounting of how many needles are given out or returned.

How can such an effort prove it is preventing the spread of H.I.V. if the participants are anonymous and if they aren't tested for the virus before and after entering the program?

Studies in Montreal and Vancouver did systematically test participants in needle-exchange programs. And the studies found that those addicts who took part in such exchanges were two to three times more likely to become infected with H.I.V. than those who did not participate. They also found that almost half the addicts frequently shared needles with others anyway.

This was unwelcome news to the AIDS establishment. For almost two years, the Montreal study was not reported in scientific journals. After the study finally appeared last year in a medical journal, two of the researchers, Julie Bruneau and Martin T. Schechter, said that their results had been misinterpreted. The results, they said, needed to be seen in the context of H.I.V. rates in other innercity neighborhoods. They even suggested that maybe the number of needles given out in Vancouver should be raised to 10 million from 2 million.

Needle-exchange programs are reckless experiments. Clearly there is more than a minimal risk of contracting the virus. And addicts already infected with H.I.V., or infected while in the program, are not given antiretroviral medications, which we know combats the virus in its earliest stages.

Needle exchanges also affect poor communities adversely. For instance, the Lower East Side Harm Reduction Center is one of New York City's largest needle-exchange programs. According to tenant groups we have talked to, the center, since it began in 1992, has become a magnet not only for addicts but for dealers as well. Used needles, syringes and crack vials litter the sidewalk. Tenants who live next door to the center complain that the police don't arrest addicts who hang out near it, even though they are openly buying drugs and injecting them.

The indisputable fact is that needle exchanges merely help addicts continue to use drugs. It's not unlike giving an alcoholic a clean Scotch tumbler to prevent meningitis. Drug addicts suffer from a serious disease requiring comprehensive treatment, sometimes under compulsion. Ultimately, that's the best way to reduce H.I.V. infection among this group. What addicts don't need is the lure of free needles.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 22, 1998]

CLEAN NEEDLES MAY BE BAD MEDICINE

(By David Murray)

The Clinton administration on Monday endorsed the practice of giving clean needles to drug addicts in order to prevent transmission of the AIDS virus. "A meticulous scientific review has now proven that needle-exchange programs can reduce the transmission of HIV and save lives without losing ground on the battle against illegal drugs," Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna Shalala announced.

The administration is not unanimous, however; the drug czar, Gen. Barry McCaffrey, who opposes needle exchange, was out of the country Monday. Who's right? As recently as a month ago, HHS had restated needle-exchange programs, "We have not yet concluded that needle exchange programs do not encourage drug use," spokeswoman Melissa Skolfield told the Washington Post March 17. By Monday the department had reached that conclusion, though the scientific evidence that needle exchanges don't encourage drug use is as weak today as it was a month ago.

In fact, the evidence is far from clear that needle-exchange programs protect against

HIV infection. Most studies have had serious methodological limitations, and new studies in Montreal and Vancouver have revealed a troubling pattern: In general, the better the study design, the less convincing the evidence that clean-needle giveaways protect against HIV.

The Montreal study, the most sophisticated yet, found that those who attended needle-exchange programs had a substantially higher risk of HIV infection than intravenous drug addicts who did not. In a much-discussed New York Times op-ed article two weeks ago, Julia Bruneau and Martin T. Schechter, authors of the Montreal and Vancouver studies respectively, explained the higher risk this way: "Because these programs are in inner-city neighborhoods, they serve users who are at greatest risk of infection. Those who didn't accept free needles . . . were less likely to engage in the riskiest activities."

Dr. Bruneau is apparently rejecting her own research. For her study had statistical controls to correct for precisely this factor. In the American Journal of Epidemiology, Dr. Bruneau wrote: "These findings cannot be explained solely on the basis of the concentration around needle-exchange programs of a higher risk intravenous drug user population with a greater baseline HIV prevalence."

Even more troubling, Dr. Bruneau reported that addicts who were initially HIV-negative were more likely to become positive after participation in the needle exchange. Dr. Bruneau speculated that needle-exchange programs "may have facilitated formation of new sharing networks, with the programs becoming the gathering places for isolated [addicts]."

Janet Lapay of Drug Watch International says needle-exchange programs often become "buyer's clubs" for addicts, attracting not only scattered users but opportunistic dealers. Not everyone agrees. Dr. Schechter says that when he asked his study's heroin users, they reported meeting elsewhere. But a delegation from Gen. McCaffrey's office returned from Vancouver in early April with some startling news: Although more than 2.5 million clean needles were given out last year, the death rate from illegal drugs has skyrocketed. "Vancouver is literally swamped with drugs," the delegation concluded. "With an at-risk population, without access to drug treatment, needle exchange appears to be nothing more than a facilitator for drug use."

The problem for science is that no study has used the most effective method for settling such issues—a randomized control trial. Moreover, needle-exchange programs are usually embedded in complex programs of outreach, education and treatment, which themselves affect HIV risk. A 1996 study showed that through outreach and education alone, HIV incidence in Chicago-area intravenous drug users was reduced 71% in the absence of a needle exchange.

Peter Lurie of the University of Michigan argues that "to defer public health action on those grounds [awaiting better research] is to surrender the science of epidemiology to thoughtless empiricism and to endanger the lives of thousands of intravenous drug users." But Dr. Lurie's reasoning appears circular. Only someone convinced that needle-exchange programs are effective at preventing HIV can claim that addicts are jeopardized by further testing.

And drug use carries risks besides HIV infection. A recent article in the Journal of the American Medical Association warned that the arrival of a new drug from Mexico called "black-tar-heroin," cut with dirt and shoe polish, is spreading "wound botulism." This potent toxin leads to paralysis and agonizing death, even when injected by a clean needle.

Thus, dispensing needles to the addicted could produce a public health tragedy if this policy does indeed place them at greater risk for HIV or enhances the legitimacy of hard drug use. Simply put, the administration's case is not proven.

#### NEEDLE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS HAVE NOT BEEN PROVEN TO PREVENT HIV/AIDS

Outreach/education programs have been shown to be very effective in preventing HIV/AIDS. For instance, a Chicago study showed that HIV seroconversion rates fell from 8.4 to 2.4 per 100 person-years, a drop of 71%, in IV drug addicts through outreach/education alone without provision of needles. i (1) Needle exchange programs (NEPs) add needle provision to such programs. Therefore, in order to prove that the needle component of a program is beneficial, NEPs must be compared to outreach/education programs which do not dispense needles. This point was made in a Montreal study which stated, "We caution against trying to prove directly the causal relation between NEP use and reduction in HIV incidence. Evaluating the effect of NEPs per se without accounting for other interventions and changes over time in the dynamics of the epidemic may prove to be a perilous exercise." ii (2) The authors conclude, "Observational epidemiological studies . . . are yet to provide unequivocal evidence of benefit for NEPs." An example of this failure to control for variables is a NEP study in *The Lancet* which compared HIV prevalence in different cities but did not compare differences in outreach/education and/or treatment facilities. iii (3)

Furthermore, recent studies of NEPs show a marked increase in AIDS. A 1997 Vancouver study reported that when their NEP started in 1988, HIV prevalence in IV drug addicts was only 1-2%, now it is 23%. iv (4) HIV seroconversion rate in addicts (92% of whom have used the NEP) is now 18.6 per 100 person-years. Vancouver, with a population of 450,000, has the largest NEP in North America, providing over 2 million needles per year. However, a very high rate of needle sharing still occurs. The study found that 40% of HIV-positive addicts had lent their used syringe in the previous 6 months, and 39% of HIV-negative addicts had borrowed a used syringe in the previous 6 months. Heroin use has also risen as will be described below. Ironically, the Vancouver NEP was highly praised in a 1993 study sponsored by the Centers for Disease Control. v (5)

The Vancouver study corroborates a previous Chicago study which also demonstrated that their NEP did not reduce needle-sharing and other risky injecting behavior among participants. vi (6) The Chicago study found that 39% of program participants shared syringes vs 38% of non-participants; 39% of program participants "handed off" dirty needles vs 38% of non-participants; and 68% of program participants displayed injecting risks vs 66% of non-participants.

A Montreal study showed that IV addicts who used the NEP were more than twice as likely to become infected with HIV as IV addicts who did not use the NEP. vii (7) There was an HIV seroconversion rate of 7.9 per 100 person years among those who attended the needle program, and a rate of 3.1 per 100 person-years among those who did not. The data was collected from 1988-1995 with 974 subjects involved in the seroconversion analysis. There was a cumulative probability of 33% HIV seroconversion for NEP participants compared to 13% for non-users.

It is important to note that the Chicago, Montreal, and Vancouver studies followed the same group of addicts over an extended period of time, measuring their seroconversion from HIV negative to HIV

positive. This has not been the case in previous studies which have purported to show the success of NEPs, such as a New York study which combined results in different populations viii (8) or the New Haven study which was based on a mathematical model of anonymous needles. ix (9)

Some authors have suggested that the increase in HIV in NEP users in Vancouver and Montreal is because NEPs attract high-risk IVDUs. If this is true, then most IVDUs are at high risk, since 92% of Vancouver IVDUs used the NEP. However, an alternative hypothesis was posed by the authors of the Montreal study who postulated that NEPs may serve to facilitate the formation of "new [needle] sharing groups gathering together isolated IVDUs." x (10) This evidence is supported by information that NEPs serve as buyers' clubs and facilitate drug use. Pro-needle activist Donald Grove has written, "Most needle exchange programs actually provide a valuable service to users beyond sterile injection equipment. They serve as sites of informal (and increasingly formal) organizing and coming together. A user might be able to do the networking needed to find good drugs in the half an hour he spends at the street-based needle exchange site—networking that might otherwise have taken half a day." xi (11) By cutting down on the search time, i.e. the time necessary to find drugs, an addict again is able to inject more frequently, resulting in increased drug use, dependency, and exposure to HIV/AIDS through needle sharing or sexual behavior.

#### FACILITATION OF DRUG USE LEADS TO RISE IN COCAINE AND HEROIN

This facilitation of drug use, coupled with the provision of needles in large quantities, may also explain the rapid rise in binge cocaine injection which may be injected up to 40 times a day. Some NEPs are actually encouraging cocaine and crack injection by providing so-called "safe crack kits" with instructions on how to inject crack intravenously. xii (12) This increases the addict's drug dependency and irrational behavior, including prostitution and needle sharing. In some NEPs, needles are provided in huge batches of 1000, and although there is supposed to be a one-for-one exchange, the reality is that more needles are put out on the street than are taken in. For instance, on March 8, 1997, Nancy Sosman of the Coalition for a Better Community, NYC, accompanied by a reporter from the New York Times visited the Manhattan Lower East Side NEP requesting needles. xiii (13) Even though they had no needles to exchange and were not drug-users, they were promptly given 60 syringes and needles, little pans for cooking the heroin, instructions on how to properly inject drugs into their veins, and a card exempting them from arrest for possession of drug paraphernalia. They were told that they did not need to return the needles. This community has requested that the NEP be closed.

NEPs also facilitate drug use because police are instructed not to "harass" addicts in areas surrounding these needle programs. Addicts are exempted from arrest because they are given an anonymous identification code number. Since police in these areas must ignore drug use, as they are instructed not to "harass" these program participants, it is no wonder drug addiction is increasing. In Vancouver, Lynne Bryson, a Downtown Eastside resident, notes that large numbers of addicts visit the exchange, pick up needles, and "shoot up" nearby. She has watched addicts buy heroin outside the NEP building "and inject it while huddled against buildings in nearby alleys." xiv (14) As the presence of law enforcement declines in these areas, it is not surprising that the sup-

ply of drugs also rises, with increased purity and lower prices. This also serves to hook new young users. With addictive drugs, increased supply creates increased demand. Surprisingly, the response in both Vancouver and Montreal to the above-mentioned reports was to increase the amount of needles provided.

Many drug prevention experts have long feared that the proliferation of NEPs, now numbering over 100 in the US, would result in a rise in heroin use, and indeed, this has come to pass. This rise in drug use was ignored by all the federally-funded studies which recommended federally funding NEPs. The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University reported August 14, 1997 that heroin use by American teens doubled from 1991 to 1996. In the past decade, experts estimate that the number of US heroin addicts has risen from 550,000 to 700,000. xv (15)

A 1994 San Francisco study falsely concluded that there was no increase in community heroin use because there was no increase in young users frequenting the NEP. xvi (16) The rising rate of heroin use in the community was not measured, and the lead author, needle provider John Watters, was found dead of an IV heroin overdose in November 1995. According to the Public Statistics Institute, hospital admissions for heroin in San Francisco increased 66% from 1986 to 1995. xvii (17)

In Vancouver, heroin use has risen sharply: deaths from drug overdoses have increased over five-fold since 1988 when the NEP started. Now Vancouver has the highest heroin death rate in North America, and is referred to as Canada's "drug and crime capital." xviii (18)

The 1997 National Institutes of Health Consensus Panel Report on HIV Prevention praised the NEP in Glasgow, Scotland, but the report ignored Glasgow's massive resultant heroin epidemic. Currently, as revealed in an article entitled "Rethinking 'harm reduction' for Glasgow addicts," Glasgow leads the United Kingdom in deaths from heroin overdose, and the incidence of AIDS is rising. xix (19)

In Boston, illegal NEPs were encouraged after the well-known, long-time needle provider Jon Stuenkel was acquitted in 1990 amidst much media publicity. xx (20) Then in July 1993, NEPs were legalized, and the city became a magnet for heroin. Logan Airport has been branded the country's "heroin port." xxi (21) Boston leads the nation in heroin purity (average 81%); and heroin samples of 99.9% are found on Boston streets. xxii (22) Boston now has the cheapest, purest heroin in the world and a serious heroin epidemic among the youth. xxiii (23) The Boston NEP was supposed to be a "pilot study" but there was no evaluation of seroconversion rates in the addicts nor of the rising level of heroin use in the Boston area. xxiv (24)

Similarly, the Baltimore NEP is praised by those who run it, but the massive drug epidemic in the city is overlooked. For instance, the National Institutes of Health reports that heroin treatment and ER admission rates in Baltimore have increased steadily from 1991 to 1995. "At one open-air drug supermarket (open 9 a.m. to 9 p.m.) customers were herded into lines sometimes 20 or 30 people deep. Guarded by persons armed with guns and baseball bats, customers are frisked for weapons, and then allowed to purchase \$10 capsules of heroin." xxv (25) Baltimore's mayor Kurt Schmoke is a pro-drug legalizer on the Board of the Drug Policy Foundation. He favors not only NEPs but also heroin distribution. xxvi (26)

Any societal intervention which encourages drug use will also result in increased AIDS rates. It is important to note that needle sharing is not the only way drug users



are infected with AIDS since they are at high risk for acquiring AIDS sexually through promiscuity or prostitution. For instance, a study of non-needle using NYC crack addicts showed a high incidence of HIV/AIDS.xxvii(27) Addicts often fund their addiction through prostitution and trading sex for drugs. Furthermore, addicts commonly support their habit by selling drugs to other addicts, and by recruiting new addicts. They target the youth, often providing free samples and free needles to hook their clients. By enabling addicts to stay addicted, NEPs serve to increase the numbers of new young addicts.

Recently, many communities have been attempting to defeat these NEPs before they start or to close them once they have started. In Willimantic, Connecticut, community opposition to its NEP arose as many discarded needles were observed along with increased open drug use. One man, having received needles from NEP, fatally overdosed after his friend unsuccessfully tried to get help from the exchange. Also, a toddler was stuck by a needle discarded near the NEP which was finally shut down. xxviii(28) In New Bedford, Massachusetts, there was a referendum, and the people voted down NEPs by a margin of over 2-1. xxix(29) A 1997 survey done by the Family Research Council found that Americans overwhelmingly oppose NEPs and believe giving an endless supply of needles to drug addicts is irresponsible, representing an official endorsement of illegal drug use which encourages teenage drug use.

RATHER THAN ENCOURAGE DRUG USE,  
TREATMENT SHOULD BE MANDATED

By providing needles to addicts, NEPs enable the addict to continue self-destructive illegal behavior. With regard to treatment outcomes, NEPs should be compared to mandatory treatment programs, such as drug courts, which serve to force addicts into treatment whether they are "ready" or not. An addict under the influence of a mind-altering drug does not think clearly and may overdose before he/she ever concludes that treatment is the best choice. Indeed, most persons in treatment are there because of an encounter with the criminal justice system, and studies show that involuntary treatment works as well as voluntary treatment. Thus addiction specialist Dr. Sally Satel writes that "For Addicts, Force is the Best Medicine." xxx(30) Even worse is the fact that, as pointed out by addiction expert Dr. James L. Curtis, NEPs often serve to lure recovering addicts back into injecting drug use. xxxi(31) Since outreach/education programs and mandatory treatment programs are safe and effective in preventing both drug use and HIV/AIDS, these programs should be encouraged and funded. NEPs should be discontinued since they are not safe or effective and since they result in increased drug use and HIV/AIDS.

REFERENCES

1. Weibel WW et al, J. AIDS and Human Retrovirology 12:282-289, 1996.
2. Bruneau J et al, American J Epidemiology 146:1007-1010, 1997.
3. Hurley SF et al, The Lancet 349:1797-1800, 1997.
4. Strathdee SA et al, AIDS 11:F59-F65, 1997.
5. The Public Health Impact of Needle Exchange Programs in the United States and Abroad, U. Cal, 1993.
6. National Research Council/Institute of Medicine, Preventing HIV Transmission: the Role of Sterile Needles and Bleach, National Academy Press, Washington DC, p. 302-304, 1995.
7. Bruneau J et al, American J Epidemiology, 146:994-1002, 1997.
8. DesJarlais D et al, Lancet 348:987-991, 1996.
9. Heimer K et al, American Journal of Medicine 95:214-220, 1993.
10. Bruneau J et al, American Journal of Epidemiology 146:1007-1010, 1997.
11. Grove D, The Harm Reduction Coalition, NYC, Harm Reduction Communications, Spring 1996.
12. Ehrenfeld, Rachel, Insight, December 29, 1997.
13. The New York Times Magazine, October 15, 1997.
14. British Columbia Report, August 1997.
15. USA Today 5/21/97.
16. Watters JK et al, Journal of the American Medical Association 271:115-120, 1994.
17. The Boston Globe "Overdoses swamp San Francisco ERs" February 1, 1998.
18. The Washington Post 4/24/97.
19. The New York Times 8/18/96.
20. Boston Globe 1/10/90.
21. The Boston Globe 8/5/93.
22. The Boston Globe Magazine 8/2/93.
23. The Boston Globe Magazine 6/8/97.
24. Final Report: First Year of Pilot NEP in MA, The Medical Foundation, Boston, October 1995.
25. Epidemiologic Trends in Drug Abuse, Community Epidemiology Work Group, National Institute on Drug Abuse, June 1997, p. 21.
26. The Boston Globe, May 22, 1997.
27. Edlin BR et al, The New England Journal of Medicine 331:1422-7, 1994.
28. The Hartford Courant, March 11, 1997.
29. Standard Times, November 6, 1996.
30. Satel, Sally, Wall Street Journal, January 6, 1998.
31. Letter from Dr. Curtis to Reverend Edgar L. Vann, April 11, 1996.
32. Curtis JL, National Press Club, August 20, 1997.
33. Curtis JL, The Black Leadership Commission on AIDS, June 4, 1997.
34. Mr. Speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR), has done a lot of work in this area.
35. Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR).
36. Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding. I also thank the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished Chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security on which I have the honor of serving and which has really been on the forefront on the war against mind-altering drugs, both here domestically as well as in the international manifestations.
37. We have, in recent years, as we know and, Mr. Speaker, as you know, become a Nation deeply concerned with the messages that we, as adults, send to our children. We yearn for the athlete whose poster hangs above our child's bed to be as good a citizen as to be a ball player. We want our teachers to practice what they preach, and we want our government to provide an environment by which our children can truly learn safely.
38. Unfortunately, our government, at the direction of the President, is failing miserably. Drug use among America's children is on the rise. This was confirmed recently in a study, Substance Abuse and the American Adolescent, released by the National Center for Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University.
39. What is more, surveys have found that 23.5 percent of 12-year-olds personally now know a drug user, whereas, 2 years ago, in 1996, 10.6 percent of 12-year-olds personally knew a drug dealer. That is an increase of 122 percent. Drug overdoses and emergency room treatment of drug patients are also increasing.
40. Now, Mr. Speaker, the President and his Secretary of Health and Human Services would have us believe that giving needles to drug users is sound policy and good for our Nation's children. This is pure lunacy.
41. In the wake of this ill-advised policy, we now have evidence that America's children are drinking, smoking, and using mind-altering drugs at the youngest ages ever.
42. The war on drugs should only be thought of in one way, a war for the very lives of our children. I am constantly dismayed that many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who rarely introduce legislation without claiming that it is for America's children would support any legislation or initiatives that in any way encourage drug abuse, particularly since initiatives have proved to be destructive in other nations that have similarly experimented with the lives of their



children. Mr. Speaker, we must never experiment with the lives of children in America.

As the distinguished subcommittee chairman indicated, Switzerland has gone through this very same policy with devastating results. I had the opportunity just last year to visit Switzerland where such an experiment has taken place. It has failed. Drug use in Switzerland has not decreased. It has increased. America will rue the day when you can walk down a city street in Atlanta or Washington or Indianapolis or Boulder and next to a Coke machine find a machine that distributes needles or, more accurately, death in a box, indiscriminately, to any man, woman, or child, with the only qualification to getting that out of the machine is that you are tall enough to drop the coins into the slot.

The proponents of this medicinal use of marijuana or needle exchange programs which, as the distinguished subcommittee chairman said, is really a needle giveaway program, know that this is simply the first step towards legalizing drugs in our Nation. For our children, this must never happen.

In Switzerland each year, their needle distribution programs have given out more, not fewer drug needles. It does not take a rocket scientist to conclude that more, not fewer people, are using drugs under the Swiss experiment. Of course, the initial logic behind these distribution programs was suspiciously benign: to help combat the spread of HIV.

In 1986, the Swiss started a needle exchange program in a park in Zurich. In the beginning, they exchanged about 300 needles a day. By 1992, that number had swelled to 12,000. We should not, we must not be fooled.

This is part of a strategy to legalize drugs in the United States. First, it starts with needles. Then it moves to distributing the drugs. To be sure, there will be some clever reason why this should be done. There is always an excuse, always a rationale.

Were I to support this needle giveaway program, how could I or any of us ever look a mother in the eye who comes to us in a town hall meeting or visits us in our office and says to us that her child is shooting up drugs and what can we do to help? How could any of us tell that parent that that needle that child is using could be a needle that was bought and paid for by our government? Her tax dollars at work, in the hands of her child, in the form of a needle, containing a recipe for death. What a cruel twist of fate.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no compromise in the lives of our children. As the saying goes, the buck does stop here. Not one single penny of Federal tax dollars, not one should ever be used to help addicts continue their destructive and deadly work on the streets, in the homes, in the schools, and in the businesses of these United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado for yielding, and

I want to once again thank the gentleman from Indiana for the distinguished leadership that he has provided as chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security.

If the gentleman from Colorado would continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I want to insert into the RECORD with my remarks the following editorial which appeared on April 22, 1998, by James L. Curtis in the New York Times, entitled *Clean But Not Safe*.

Mr. Curtis is a professor of psychiatry at Columbia University's Medical School and the director of psychiatry at Harlem Hospital. He has written a very eloquent, very eloquent, indeed, opinion piece on this matter which he concludes as we do here that needle exchange or needle giveaway programs are not a cure. They are simply one more way of getting death and destruction into the veins of our citizens.

The editorial is as follows:

[From The New York Times, Apr. 22, 1998]

CLEAN BUT NOT SAFE

(By James L. Curtis)

Donna Shalala, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, wanted it both ways this week. She announced that Federal money would not be used for programs that distribute clean needles to addicts. But she offered only a halfhearted defense of that decision, even stating that while the Clinton Administration would not finance such programs, it supported them in theory.

Ms. Shalala should have defended the Administration's decision vigorously. Instead, she chose to placate AIDS activists, who insist that giving free needles to addicts is a cheap and easy way to prevent H.I.V. infection.

This is simplistic nonsense that stands common sense on its head. For the past 10 years, as a black psychiatrist specializing in addiction, I have warned about the dangers of needle-exchange policies, which hurt not only individual addicts but also poor and minority communities.

There is no evidence that such programs work. Take a look at the way many of them are conducted in the United States. An addict is enrolled anonymously, without being given an H.I.V. test to determine whether he or she is already infected. The addict is given a coded identification card exempting him or her from arrest for carrying drug paraphernalia. There is no strict accounting of how many needles are given out or returned.

How can such an effort prove it is preventing the spread of H.I.V. if the participants are anonymous and if they aren't tested for the virus before and after entering the program?

Studies in Montreal and Vancouver did systematically test participants in needle-exchange programs. And the studies found that those addicts who took part in such exchanges were two to three times more likely to become infected with H.I.V. than those who did not participate. They also found that almost half the addicts frequently shared needles with others anyway.

This was unwelcome news to the AIDS establishment. For almost two years, the Montreal study was not reported in scientific journals.

After the study finally appeared last year in a medical journal, two of the researchers, Julie Bruneau and Martin T. Schechter, said that their results had been misinterpreted. The results, they said, needed to be seen in the context of H.I.V. rates in other inner-city neighborhoods. They even suggested

that maybe the number of needles given out in Vancouver should be raised to 10 million from 2 million.

Needle-exchange programs are reckless experiments. Clearly there is more than a minimal risk of contracting the virus. And addicts already infected with H.I.V., or infected while in the program, are not given antiretroviral medications, which we know combats the virus in its earliest stages.

Needle exchanges also affect poor communities adversely. For instance, the Lower East Side Harm Reduction Center is one of New York City's largest needle-exchange programs. According to tenant groups I have talked to, the center, since it began in 1992, has become a magnet not only for addicts buy for dealers as well. Used needles, syringes and crack vials litter the sidewalk. Tenants who live next door to the center complain that the police don't arrest addicts who hang out near it, even though they are openly buying drugs and injecting them.

The indisputable fact is that needle exchanges merely help addicts continue to use drugs. It's not unlike giving an alcoholic a clean Scotch tumbler to prevent meningitis. Drug addicts suffer from a serious disease requiring comprehensive treatment, sometimes under compulsion. Ultimately, that's the best way to reduce H.I.V. infection among this group. What addicts don't need is the lure of free needles.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Majority Whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I really appreciate the gentleman for taking this special order and allowing us to participate, and I really appreciate my Chief Deputy Whip for all the fine work that he has done on drug abuse. Everybody that has spoken, I greatly appreciate it. I want to just take a few minutes, if I could, to express my opinion about the drug war and the lack of emphasis that the White House is making.

You know, when a mother sends her son off to a foreign war, she worries ceaselessly about his safety. Yet, every day, millions of mothers put their children on a school bus and send them off into a domestic drug war zone. Teen drug abuse has reached epidemic proportions. And few places, least of all the classroom, are safe havens from this insidious modern plague.

Let us not mince any words here. Drugs are everywhere. They are in the lockers and bathrooms and playgrounds of America's children's schools and parks and on the streets of our towns. Their poison, no longer confined to the inner city, has burst the damn and flooded the suburbs.

□ 2015

Marijuana and hard narcotics are no longer the province of beatniks, punks and gangsters. The new drug abusers look a lot like Beaver Cleaver. Truth is, drug users do not just look like your son or daughter, drug users may very well include your son or daughter.

So, Mr. Speaker, the facts speak for themselves.

Overall teenage drug use has nearly doubled, nearly doubled in the 1990's, and perhaps most frightening of all,

nearly half of all 17-year-olds say that they could buy marijuana within an hour, and that is according to a survey by Columbia's highly respected Center for Addiction and Substance Abuse. For those under 18, marijuana has become as accessible as beer or cigarettes, and with the President who did not inhale and a generation of baby boom parents nostalgic about their own youthful drug use and who too often considered marijuana benign, our children have been getting mixed messages for years.

It does matter, character does matter. That is not to say that President Clinton or any national figure can be held individually responsible for the drug habits of our children, but the Clinton administration has made the fight against drugs its last priority and then abandoned ship mid-storm. No wonder teen drug use is on the rise.

Wherever American children turn, in the schools, in the neighborhoods, parties, movies, rock concerts, even at home where household products can double as inhalants, they will find drugs available. Children rate drugs their No. 1 problem, and every single child in America is at risk of falling prey, regardless of race, ethnicity or economic status.

So where is our war on drugs? Where is our political courage? Where is our sense of responsibility? Where is our leadership? Where is our shame?

Too often we find that people who should be leading us out of this crisis are leading us deeper and deeper into it. Just this week Bill Clinton, the President of the United States, publicly embraced the outrageous practice of supplying hypodermic needles to drug abusers. On the one hand he wants to take cigarettes away from teenagers, and on the other hand he wants to give them condoms and needles.

What kind of anti-drug policy is that? Instead of providing those addicted to drugs with assistance in kicking their habits, Bill Clinton is actually promoting the practice of providing drug addicts with the necessary tools needed to sustain their addiction. The issue is not whether our children are going to be tossed into the sea of drugs; the issue is how we will teach them to swim while we drain the pool.

But there is a solution, multiple solutions in fact. We wish to solve the drug crisis. We will start with the family. If we want to solve the drug crisis we will start with the family and the school and with our churches and synagogues. Teens with families that eat together, play together and pray together are the ones least likely to try drugs. Teens with parents who assume responsibility for their children and do not blame society at large, teens who have an active religious life, these are the teens least likely to use drugs.

Now, unfortunately there is an ever-increasing minority of our children. If the battle against drug abuse is waged at home, the war is only half won. Parents and children must also demand

that their schools and their communities be made drug-free and take the actions necessary to keep them that way.

We need to encourage kids to report drug dealers to their teachers even when those drug dealers are their classmates. We need to empower teachers so that when they know who the drug dealers are there is actually something they can do about it, and we must demand absolute accountability and zero tolerance by principals for any drug use on school grounds whatsoever. Only when our teachers and principals are enlisted in the anti-drug effort can we make our schools truly drug-free.

The good news is that our children seem ready to enlist. More than 80 percent say that if their classmates went along they would make a pledge promising not to smoke, drink or use illegal drugs at school.

Now some communities should consider assigning a full-time police officer to each school. They could walk the hallways like they would walk the beat, passing lockers, checking the parking lot, becoming a presence in the cafeteria. It is happening in some places already and it is working. Officers are bonding with the students because the students know that the cops are there to help. The drugs are kept out of the school and the kids are kept out of harm's way.

Now there is even a role for the Federal Government. We can be more aggressive in guarding our borders, we can be more proactive in helping our neighbors to the south with their anti-drug efforts, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) is so good at doing, and we can be more vigilant in our policing, arresting and prosecution of anyone, anyone who sells this poison to our children.

But it is time for the policy-makers to acknowledge to parents and their children that while Washington must use the bully pulpit to set an example, the drug crisis cannot be solved here in Washington. It must be solved in our homes, in our schools, in our neighborhoods, and in every other place where children make decisions about whether or not to use illegal drugs.

It is time for parents to say, "We're mad as hell and we're not going to take it any more." It is time for them to send their kids a unequivocal message that they do not want them to try marijuana or any other illegal drugs and they will not tolerate it if they do. There is nothing wrong with being judgmental when it comes to the lives of our children, and I call upon every parent, Mr. Speaker, every parent to be intolerant and judgmental when it comes to drug use. It is time for parents to exert tough love for their children before these children become a physical threat to themselves and society at large.

And it is time for us to take a stand against those in the community that preach the life-threatening notion that drugs are harmless. Shame on the en-

tertainment industry for glorifying drug abuse. Shame on the sports stars who use drugs and fail to live up to their responsibility as role models. Shame on the drug legalizers who profit from addicting innocent children and citizens. And, yes, I even say shame on us, the parents, the teachers, the principals and the politicians who have passed the buck and turned a blind eye for too long.

For the sake of our children we cannot afford to be shy any longer about calling drug abuse what it is, a moral crisis that must be addressed both immediately and over the long term. Drug use is wrong because it is immoral, and it is immoral because it enslaves the mind and destroys the soul. People addicted to drugs neglect their duties, their family, their friends, their education, their jobs, everything important, noble and worthwhile in life. In the end the drug problem is nothing so much as a manifestation of weakness, weakened families, weakened communities, weakened institutions.

People turn to drugs in an attempt to escape the realities of life with all its richness and suffering. Drugs may numb the pain, but they also flatten the world and cause it to lose all texture.

The question that the drug crisis poses is no less than the question of our civilization's future. Can humanity survive freedom and influence? Can we meet the challenge of liberty or must we, absent political bonds, find a way to enslave ourselves chemically? I decline to accept the dim view that man cannot retain the old virtues, the old values in this modern age. I decline to accept the notion that humanity is not suited for freedom.

America can overcome the drug problem, but it will not simply go away on its own. No, the cure for drugs lies in the hearts and the minds of America's families and communities. It is time for us to act.

By combining national leadership with community activism, we can and we will save America, one child and one neighborhood at a time. Working together with the American values of family, faith and sacrifice close at hand, we can ensure that the lives of our children are safer, more productive and free of the drugs that cripple their minds and destroy their souls. They, our legacy, deserve nothing less.

I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado taking this special order and the gentleman from Illinois for all the fine work that they have done in this regard. It is just a shame, as far as I am concerned, that our own President and our own administration seems to care less about what is happening to our children when it comes to drugs.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. I have about a minute left, and I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado yielding time to me, and the eloquence of the whip from Texas, a very nice presentation.

But the sad story is that we have 20,000 people who die of drugs in this country every year, 14,000 directly from drugs. They die because of overdose, they die because of gang violence. They are our kids. They are dying today at our street corners in the darkest parts of our cities. We should not help them die. We should work to stop the drug menace in this country.

#### BELLA ABZUG, A WOMAN AHEAD OF HER TIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent most of the district once represented by the late Bella Abzug in Congress, and as such I come forward today together with my friend from the District of Columbia and with the Congressional Women's Caucus to say a few words about a departed legend. I would like to thank Congressman OWENS of New York for so kindly giving us this special order time which he had reserved.

□ 2030

Not only was she driven to do the right thing, but she demanded the same of everyone she came in contact with.

She was not expected to win her 1970 campaign for the House. I remember when she ran the first time, I campaigned for her. I just graduated from college; we had run against the same incumbent every 2 years since 1962, and we lost in 1962, and we lost in 1964. We lost in 1966; we lost in 1968; and no one expected any different in 1970.

But Bella changed the mode. Bella didn't just try to get out her vote and up the percentage a few percentage points and hope that more of our vote would come out than theirs. Bella went into the opposition stronghold and cracked it, and made them vote for her and changed the whole tone and the whole model of politics in lower Manhattan.

I remember the astonishment when she won that June day in 1970. She changed the mode and the model of how New York politics was looked at.

Then she got here, and, of course, she made an immediate impression. It is hard to realize, she was such an inspiration to an entire generation. She made such an impression that we still remember today that it is hard to realize she served in this House for only three terms, for only 6 years.

But in that time, what a difference she made, what a difference she made for the emerging feminist movement, what a difference she made for the rights of women, for civil rights, for civil liberties, for social justice, for the struggle for economic justice. What a boost she gave to the opposition to an unjust war in Vietnam, and what a difference she made in so many different subjects.

People remember her as a great speaker, and a great leader, and a great expositor, and a great example. But sometimes I think they do not remember that she was also a great legislative crafts person.

She, for example, crafted the interstate transfer amendment under which 32 States gained billions and billions of dollars for mass transit systems from highways whose construction they had changed their minds about. And she enabled them to trade in unwanted highways on the map for new mass transit systems, or for improved mass transit systems.

In my own city of New York, we got \$1.7 billion for the mass transit system by trading in the West Way Highway, about which city and State government changed their minds.

So she was a great legislative crafts person, and she was a great leader on a host of issues. And she never, never thought that enough was enough.

I remember whenever I would talk to her, she would say to me, are you doing enough? Are you doing enough? Whatever it was I was doing, are you doing enough?

And then occasionally, almost begrudgingly, very occasionally, she would say, well, you are doing okay. And I would leave our conversation feeling as if I had received the greatest compliment one could ever receive.

That is one of my memories of Bella, and I am sure many Members of Congress have others they would like to share. That is why we are holding this special order so that those of us who still remain at this late hour can come forward and give former Representative Bella Abzug the tribute which is surely her due.

Let me add one other thing. She made as great a contribution to the people of this country, to the people of this world, after she left the House, and unfortunately she was not elected to the Senate, but after she left the House, as she did before. As the Representative of the United States to the United Nations, to various conferences, to women's conferences, abroad, she made a great contribution, and it will be long remembered.

Finally, regarding my colleague, I can only conclude with this: When Bella Abzug left this House, this chamber became a poorer place. Likewise, with her passing, the world became a poorer place, though all of us are immensely richer for her presence on this planet.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for organizing this special order for Bella Abzug.

Perhaps it was fitting that we lost one of the world's greatest women's rights leaders at the end of March. March was Women's History Month. It

was a time when we recalled the great contributions made by women for women, and Bella, my friend and my mentor, was a great contributor.

I would like to say that Bella Abzug will not only be remembered for her flamboyant, colorful hats, but for what was under them; her wonderful mind and the voice with which she spoke it and her inspired heart.

I am deeply indebted to Bella, and I know many women feel the same way. But I also know that there are many young women who may just take Bella's work and the work of other women before them for granted. I invite them to get to know Bella's memory, because without it we could lose ground. If we begin to take her hard-fought victories for granted, we will lose sight of the work that lies ahead.

There is not an American woman alive today who does not command more respect or enjoy more opportunity as a result of Bella's work. Because of Bella Abzug, women today stand a little taller, walk a little prouder, and accept nothing less than what they deserve.

Bella broke through barriers; she shattered glass ceilings, she rattled cages, and she set women free. Even in her last years when she was confined to a wheelchair, no woman stood taller in the fight for women's rights, for women's equality, than Bella Abzug.

Bella was a pioneer on so many levels. She was a legislator, a peace activist, a labor lawyer, a lecturer, a news commentator, a civil liberties advocate, and the first woman to be elected to Congress, not under the banner of a particular party, but on a banner based on women's rights and a peace platform.

She cofounded the National Women's Political Caucus, which celebrates this year its 21st anniversary. She coauthored the Freedom of Information and Privacy Acts. She cast one of the first votes for the Equal Rights Amendment, which still has not been enacted into law in this country. She presided over the Women's Congress for a Healthy Planet. She organized the first National Women's Conference in Houston, Texas, and organized this past year the 20th anniversary of remembrance of the accomplishments of that conference. She authored Women's Equality Day, and she cofounded the Women's Environment and Development Organization.

She had an impressive resume. However, the whole of Bella's life was much more than the sum of its parts. She is now a historical figure, a cultural icon. She changed how people thought, how they looked at the world, and how they lived their lives.

Bella was a firebrand orator. One of my favorite Bellarisms goes like this: "Women will change the nature of power, rather than power changing the nature of women."

She proclaimed just last year, "We are building a women's movement, and we have been making it larger and