

knows the location of 10 of the 20 terrorists suspected in the murders of these United States citizens. The Palestinian Authority has not honored Israel's formal requests for the transfer of many of these suspects. Their lack of compliance tremendously undermines the process envisaged by the Oslo Accords. Annex 4, Article 2, paragraph 7(f)(1). The United States must now invoke the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1987, which permits the transfer of individuals accused of murdering Americans abroad.

The time has come for the United States to stand up and fight for the families of victims killed overseas. No longer can we simply assume that American citizens abroad are safe. When unfortunately they are endangered or in this case killed, this Nation must utilize its laws properly to ensure that justice is carried out.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their attention and look forward to their support on the resolution.

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, today America has the opportunity to deliver a powerful and poignant message to terrorists: If you murder innocent Americans and tear innocent families apart, the United States of America will demand justice.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate this bill on the Floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, Israeli and PLO leaders are in Great Britain being pressured to come together for a lasting peace.

But since the PLO signed the Oslo Accords, ten Americans have been killed by Arab terrorists—one of them was a constituent of mine. Her name is Sara Duker. And the Palestinian leadership headed by Yassir Arafat has done nothing to bring her terrorist murderers to justice.

When my good friend JOHN FOX and I announced that we were going to fight for her killer's transfer to the United States, Sara's mother Arline came down to Washington to join us for the announcement. All Arline wants to see is justice. Her daughter was taken away from her. She should expect no less from us.

Since giving his word at Oslo, Yassir Arafat has made a total mockery of his written commitment to transfer to Israel for prosecution any terrorist who has killed innocent people. In fact, not one of the accused terrorists that Israeli authorities have identified and requested has been turned over to Israel for justice.

Justice cannot wait any longer. We must seek the terrorists' transfer to the United States before the trail of evidence dries up. To do any less would represent a serious failure of the United States government to safeguard the sanctity of our citizenry.

We cannot let the murder of American citizens anywhere in the world go unanswered. We must have our message heard loud and clear: Terrorists will never win.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, this important resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that the United States should demand that Palestinian Authority (PA) Chairman Yasser Arafat transfer the United States for prosecution the terrorists who have murdered

American citizens. The refusal by the PA to assist American in the fight against terrorism, calls into question its commitment to peace.

At least 10 U.S. citizens have been killed in Israel by Palestinian terrorists since the Oslo Accords were signed in 1993. About 20 Palestinians have been implicated in the attacks. Not a single terrorist implicated in the attacks has been transferred to Israel to stand trial as the Oslo Accords require. And in spite of sufficient evidence to do so, the U.S. Department of Justice has not indicted any of the terrorist involved in the spilling of American blood. The majority of the terrorists are believed to be living freely in territories controlled by Chairman Arafat. In a twist of irony, one terrorist, according to reports, is employed as a jailer at a Palestinian detention facility.

The Resolution continues the bi-partisan congressional effort to secure justice for the murdered Americans. I would briefly note some of the other attempts to prod the Administration to do its job and pressure Chairman Arafat to transfer the Palestinian murders.

On January 20, I drafted a letter with Representative JIM SAXTON, signed by 29 other Members of the House and four Senators, which called on Secretary of State Albright to direct U.S. efforts to obtain the transfer of those who have murdered American citizens.

The State Department's response of February 25 was woefully inadequate. The State Department responded that it would be permissible for the PA to prosecute the murderers of Americans. For the State Department to refer these cases back to the PA is a sad joke. The PA criminal justice system is a circuit of kangaroo courts. Everybody knows it's a revolving door of justice. The Secretary of State has in the past admitted as much. Representative SAXTON and I followed-up the State Department's non-response with a March 25 letter to Secretary Albright. In the letter, we demanded action, noting that: "That failure of the United States to do everything in its power to prosecute Palestinian killers of Americans puts other Americans at risk, and is contrary to longstanding U.S. policy to pursue territories most aggressively. The time has come for results." We also questioned why the U.S. continues to provide aid for the Palestinian Authority, and is not willing to impose economic sanctions against the PA, as it does in the case of Libya for its refusal to transfer the terrorists suspected of bombing Pan Am flight 103.

The State Department's letter was useful, however, in pointing out the role the U.S. Department of Justice and the FBI play in capturing terrorists. U.S. law makes it a capital offense to kill a national of the United States anywhere in the world. On April 28, Representative JIM SAXTON and I sent a letter to Attorney General Janet Reno that has been signed by a group of over 60 Members of the House, including Speaker NEWT GINGRICH (Senator ALFONSE D'AMATO also signed the letter), which states that: "The DOJ should pursue these killers of American citizens abroad with the same vigor it has pursued the murderers of Americans killed in terrorism attacks here in the U.S. Americans traveling or living abroad have often been desirable targets for terrorist attacks. If we are to deter such attacks in the future, it is essential that our law enforcement agencies pursue these cases aggressively and to the fullest extent of the law. It is our view that the DOJ must in-

vestigate, indict and prosecute these individuals without further delay."

I will conclude my remarks with an excerpt from a letter that Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu sent to me in February on the importance of punishing terrorists. "That murderers are allowed to go free and live without fear of prosecution in areas ruled by the Palestinian Authority is particularly worrisome. This is not just a travesty of justice but a very strong message to potential terrorists."

The blood of the victims cries from the dust for justice. Killers of Americans must be brought to justice. I commend Representative FOX for his sponsorship of the Resolution, and Chairman GILMAN's leadership in speedily bringing it to the floor.

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The question on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 220, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule 1, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SENSE OF THE HOUSE THAT THE UNITED STATES MUST REMAIN COMMITTED TO COMBATING ILLEGAL DRUGS

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 267) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the citizens of the United States must remain committed to combat the distribution, sale, and use of illegal drugs by the Nation's youth.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 267

Whereas recently released statistics demonstrate that America is not winning the battle to keep young Americans drug-free;

Whereas the results of these studies show that 29 percent of high school students state that a student in their school died from a drug-related or an alcohol-related incident in the last year;

Whereas 76 percent of high school students and 46 percent of middle school students claim drugs are kept, used, or sold on their school grounds;

Whereas studies show that 61 percent of high school students claim they can buy drugs within 1 day and 35 percent claim they can buy drugs within 1 hour or less;

Whereas it is reported that the use of heroin is increasing and that 90 percent of new heroin users are under 26 years old;

Whereas the use of drugs at a young age dramatically increases the risk of failure to complete high school, increases the likelihood of committing crimes, and reduces future prospects in education, athletics, and careers;

Whereas it is known that safe, drug-free, and orderly classrooms are key to an effective learning environment;

Whereas parental involvement is critical to helping young Americans resist the temptations of drugs and to establishing a healthy learning environment;

Whereas violent crime rates across the United States have declined due to strong parental involvement and cooperation among local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies;

Whereas the same unified effort and commitment are needed to fight drugs in our schools, playgrounds, and communities; and

Whereas Congress has the unique ability to provide leadership on this issue by raising awareness of the dangers of drugs in schools in every community across this great Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) all schools should be drug-free;

(2) the distribution, sale, and use of illegal drugs in the Nation's schools is unacceptable;

(3) all Federal, State, and local drug fighting agencies should work together with schools and parents to ensure that a renewed effort is made to fight the distribution, sale, and use of illegal drugs in our schools and to America's youth;

(4) all governmental leaders, educators, and parents share a role in raising the awareness of this issue and offering constructive alternatives to illegal drug use; and

(5) Congress and the President should work to end the distribution, sale, and use of illegal drugs in the Nation's schools and, work with local communities, schools, and parents to implement meaningful policies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire, is either gentleman opposed to the legislation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) opposed to the legislation?

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the legislation.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 7 minutes of my 20 minutes be controlled by the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ).

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be involved with this very important sense of the House resolution. Although this resolution is non-binding in nature, it is important. It sends a wakeup call to Americans.

By way of background, this resolution was introduced by the gentleman

from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS), my friend and colleague, last fall. I commend his leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor today.

H. Res. 267 enjoys the bipartisan support of 181 cosponsors, including most of the Republican members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, which reported out the resolution, as amended by the committee substitute, by voice vote on March 11.

Additionally, this bill has been endorsed by a variety of interest groups: The Partnership for a Drug Free America; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Youth to Youth; American Society of Addiction Medicine; National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence; D.A.R.E. America; and the Elks Drug Awareness Program.

Mr. Speaker, this simple resolution addresses a complex problem that plagues modern America: Illicit drug usage and trade. House Resolution 267 is clear and concise. It expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the citizens of the United States must remain committed to combat the distribution, sale and use of illegal drugs by the Nation's youth. If we fail to convey this vital message, our children's minds and bodies will continue to be poisoned by drugs.

Let me just say up front where I stand on the crisis of illicit drug use in America. I have addressed this body last week to explain my anti-drug amendment to the Higher Education bill and amendment to the underlying language offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON). In doing so, I challenged Congress to get serious about the epidemic of illicit drugs in this country.

As I emphasized last week on this floor, we have a major drug crisis in this country and the question is are we serious about it or not? It is too easy for us to criticize Mexico and Colombia for their apparent endless supply of poisonous drugs to this country. We must continue to find effective and creative ways to fight the demand problem within our own borders.

House Resolution 267 is a first step in sending a clear and concise message that we are serious about this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD some details of this crisis in particular, and not go into detail at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be involved with this very important sense of the House resolution. Although this resolution is non-binding in nature, it is important—it sends a wake up call to Americans.

By way of background, this resolution was introduced by my friend and colleague MIKE PAPPAS last fall. I commend his leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor today.

H. Res. 267 enjoys the bipartisan support of 181 cosponsors, including most of the Republican members of the Education and the Workforce Committee, which reported out the resolution, as amended by the Committee substitute, by voice vote on March 11th.

Additionally, this bill has been endorsed by a variety of interest groups: the Partnership for

a Drug Free America, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Youth to Youth, American Society of Addiction Medicine, National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence, D.A.R.E. America, and Elks Drug Awareness Program.

Mr. Speaker, This simple resolution addresses a complex problem that plagues modern America—illicit drug usage and trade. H. Res. 267 is clear and concise—it expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the citizens of the United States must remain committed to combat the distribution, sale, and use of illegal drugs by the Nation's youth.

If we fail to convey this vital message, our children's minds and bodies will continue to be poisoned by drugs.

Let me just say up front where I stand on the crisis of illicit drug use in America. I addressed this body last week to explain my anti-drug amendment to the Higher Ed bill. In doing so, I challenged Congress to get serious about the epidemic of illicit drugs in this country.

As I emphasized last week on this floor, we have a major drug crisis in this country, and the question is—are we serious about it or not?

It is too easy for us to criticize Mexico and Columbia for their apparent endless supply of poisonous drugs to this country. We must continue to find creative and effective ways to combat the demand problem within our own borders. H. Res. 267 is a first step in sending a clear and concise message that we are serious about this crisis.

The evidence of the drug crisis is in, and it is quite compelling. Consider these telling statistics:

DRUG AVAILABILITY & USE IS ON THE RISE

A majority of all high school seniors would say "yes," they've used an illegal drug in their short lifetime. In 1992, 40.7% had ever used an illicit drug; by 1997, the number jumped to 54.3%. (Source: December 1997, "Monitoring the Future Study" a.k.a. the "National High School Survey," University of Michigan's Survey Research Center)

Marijuana use is up. In 1992, one-out-of-three high school seniors (32.6%) had tried the drug—a mere six years later in 1997, nearly half of all high school seniors (49.6%) had experimented with pot. (Source: same as above)

The number of 4th–6th graders (9-to-12 year olds) experimenting with marijuana increased 71% from 334,000 in 1993 to 571,000 in 1997. (Source: April 13, 1998, "Partnership Attitude Study," Partnership for a Drug-Free America)

"Children's exposure to marijuana doubled from 1993 to 1997." In 1993, 7% of kids said that they had close friends who "use marijuana sometimes" to 14% in 1997. (Source: same as above)

72% of people in the U.S. and 65% of people in Latin America favor U.S.-imposed sanctions on countries that don't do enough to combat drug production or trafficking. (Source: same as above)

34% see drug interdiction as a top priority foreign policy issue—more than illegal immigration (22%), the threat of terrorism (22%), and free trade (17%). (Source: February 26, 1998, "America Assesses Drug Policy," Family Research Council)

Mr. Speaker, that's what we're up against. As the evidence suggests, we can no longer allow the use and trade of illicit drugs to continue unchecked.

It's time we send an unequivocal message to America that the House unequivocally opposes illicit drugs. If you are a drug user or

pusher—beware. We are watching and we will find innovative ways to combat what you are doing.

By the time the average teenager reaches age 18, 68% can buy marijuana within a day—nearly half within an hour. In fact, 42% find marijuana easier to buy than either beer or cigarettes. (Source: September 1997, "Back to School 1997," Center for Addiction & Substance Abuse)

By the time the average child reaches age 13, ONE-in-FOUR have attended a party in the last six months where marijuana was available. (Source: same as above)

Fewer than one-in-three teenagers under 18 say they attend a drug-free school. (Source: same as above)

A third of teenagers (33%) were offered drugs at school in 1997—a significant increase of 44% from 1993 (23%). For children 9-to-12 years old (4th–6th graders), almost three out of ten (28%) were offered drugs in 1997—a 47% increase since 1993 (19%). (Source: April 13, 1998, "Partnership Attitude Study," Partnership for a Drug-Free America)

THE UNTOLD COSTS

Drug abuse killed 14,218 Americans in 1995 at the cost of more than \$67 billion. (November 10, 1997, "What America's Users Spend on Illegal Drugs: 1988–1995," Office of National Drug Control Policy)

If this casualty rate should continue, 114,000 Americans—many of them youth—will die from drug abuse and overdose on President Clinton's watch. These numbers do not take into account deaths from drug-related crime and violence, which the Drug Enforcement Agency estimates would easily reach 20,000 Americans per year.

By the time a child reaches age 13, ONE-in-TEN will say they know a schoolmate who has died because of drugs or alcohol. (Source: September 1997, "Back to School 1997," Center for Addiction & Substance Abuse)

American taxpayers footed a \$150 billion bill for drug-related criminal and medical costs in 1997 alone. (November 10, 1997, "What America's Users Spend on Illegal Drugs: 1988–1995," Office of National Drug Control Policy)

That's more than what we spent in 1997's federal budget for programs to fund education, transportation improvements, agriculture, energy, space, and all foreign aid combined.

Illegal drug users in the United States spent more than \$57 billion on their street poisons in 1995 alone. American consumers could have more wisely used that money to purchase a four-year college education for one million kids; or 22 billion gallons of milk to feed babies; or, one year's worth of child care for 14 million children. (November 10, 1997, "What America's Users Spend on Illegal Drugs: 1988–1995," Office of National Drug Control Policy)

THE CRIMINAL ELEMENT

70% of all hard drugs and illegal narcotics found in the United States originally crossed the U.S./Mexican border. (CRS)

More than 1.5 million people were arrested from drug offenses in 1996 alone. That's more than the number of residents living in Montana and North Dakota COMBINED. (November 10, 1997, "What America's Users Spend on Illegal Drugs: 1988–1995," Office of National Drug Control Policy)

Between 70%–90% of all persons incarcerated in state prisons are there for drug offenses. (November 10, 1997, "What America's Users Spend on Illegal Drugs: 1988–1995," Office of National Drug Control Policy)

Street cops, our foot soldiers in the War on Drugs, say that reducing drug abuse would

have the greatest single impact on reducing violent crime. (Source: Fall 1997, "Drug Facts for the Record," House Government Reform & Oversight Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs & Criminal Justice briefing paper citing a 1995 study conducted by the University of Maryland)

PERCEPTIONS & REALITIES ABOUT DRUGS

Nearly 9 in 10 people (85%) believe solving our drug crisis is more urgent than less urgent. (Source: February 26, 1998, "America Assesses Drug Policy," Family Research Council)

82% oppose drug legalization. (Source: same as above)

Teenagers say drugs (35%) are their most important problem, far ahead of social pressures (19%), crime (12%), sexual issues (8%), academic pressures (8%), or family problems (3%). (Source: September 1997, "Back to School 1997," Center for Addiction & Substance Abuse)

45% of parents believe their son or daughter may have friends who smoke pot. Yet 71% of teens say they have friends who use the drug. (Source: April 13, 1998, "Partnership Attitude Study," Partnership for a Drug-Free America)

Just 21% of parents acknowledged the possibility that their teen might have tried marijuana, significantly lower than the 44% of teens who say they've done so. (Source: same as above)

Some 54% of parents say they talked with their teenagers about drugs at least four times in the last year, yet less than a quarter (24%) of those teens recalled those discussions. (Source: same as above)

Less than one-third of teens (28%) named parents as a source of drug information, while another third (31%) said that in the past year their parents had never talked to them about drugs. (Source: same as above)

A plurality of those surveyed in the U.S. (39%) say the primary objective of U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America should be to decrease drug trafficking. (Source: April 16, 1998, "A Meeting of Minds, From Peoria to Patagonia," The Wall Street Journal)

Mr. Speaker, these facts that we have been hearing about on this floor for the past week are what we are up against. As the evidence suggests, we can no longer allow the use and trade of illicit drugs to continue unchecked.

It is time we send an unequivocal message to America that the House opposes illicit drugs. Drug users and pushers, beware. We are watching and we will find innovative ways to combat what users and pushers are doing in every category of legislation that we are facing.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a simple, yet important first step putting the United States Congress on record.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, not so much in any objection to what the goals are. The goals are very laudable. The first time I read this resolution, I was in agreement with everything until the very end. Then I had some disagreements with it.

I have taken this time so I would have adequate time to explain my position and why I oppose this bill. Obviously, this country is facing a serious problem with drugs. As a physician, I

can attest to it. We have major problems in this country, something should be done. But I thought it was necessary to take some time to point out that what we have done for 20 to 25 years has not been all that good. And I see this resolution as an endorsement of the status quo, not an introduction of one single new idea about how to approach this problem. And it is for this reason that I have taken this time to try to get people to think about maybe an alternative some day that we might look at, because so far the spending of the money and the abuse of our civil liberties that has occurred with the war on drugs has not accomplished a whole lot.

I object strongly to the Federal approach to law enforcement. That is one of the major issues I have contention with. When we think about when we tried to make a better world in 1919, and we thought we should prohibit certain substances being used in this country, in those days we had enough respect for the Constitution that we actually believed then that we should amend the Constitution, and we did and we had an experiment and after 14 years of a failed program, we repealed that amendment on alcohol.

In 1937, it was decided that possibly we should restrict marijuana, even for medical use, and even then it was not assumed that this was a Federal prerogative. It was not banned, it was not outlawed. It was still assumed that it was the responsibility of the States to deal with problems of drugs and marijuana and law enforcement.

In 1937, and I am sure some of my conservative colleagues might be interested in this because it was the great FDR who decided to impose a great tax on marijuana, putting \$100 tax on a pound of marijuana, essentially making it illegal. And even today those States who would like to legalize marijuana even for the sick and dying AIDS patients and the cancer patients are not even permitted to. It is because we have carelessly assumed that all regulation and all controls and all policing activities should be done here in Washington.

I am here just to suggest quite possibly our attack on drugs has not been correct, that we have possibly made some mistakes. Maybe we spent some money that we have not gotten our dollars' worth. Maybe we are going in the wrong direction.

It is estimated that we have spent over \$200 billion in the last 25 years fighting drugs. And yet it is the same old thing again. Play on the emotions of the people, condemn drug usage, which I do. As I said as a physician, I know they are horrible. But as a politician and somebody in the legislature, we should think about the efficiency and the effectiveness of our laws.

The evidence quite frankly is not there to show that we are doing a very good job. And even though I commend the individuals who are promoting this legislation, the motivations are there,

the desires are there, but I think, in my view, that it is the same old program of the Federal war on drugs that has a lot of shortcomings.

The first "whereas" of this resolution, I strongly agree with. It says, "Whereas recently revealed statistics demonstrate America is not winning the battle to keep young Americans drug-free." This is my point. This is conceded by everyone. We are not winning this fight, so why pursue the same policies over and over again, and especially since there are some shortcomings with the policy. Not only have they not been effective, there are some serious shortcomings, shortcomings on civil liberty and property rights and other things.

□ 1445

We ought to put the war on drugs in a proper perspective. Yes, it is easy to talk about a heroin addict and a crime committed and people narrowing in on one instance, but we ought to look at this in a proper manner.

There is talk that there are 20,000 deaths with illegal drugs. But that, in the best of my estimates, includes all the violent drugs which, to me, are a consequence of the war on drugs.

I have statistics that say there is about 6,000 people who die from overdosing and taking illegal drugs. A horrible figure. It is horrible. Nobody should be using these drugs. But let us put this in a different perspective.

We lose 37,000 people on highways every year, government-managed highways. And 36,000 people die each year from guns. But we do not take the guns away from the innocent people because there are gun accidents and gun deaths. It is 36,000 in comparison to 6,000.

There is one other figure that is astounding that was in the media, recorded in the media here the last couple of days. The medical profession has a responsibility here. It is estimated that we are losing 106,000 people a year. These are reports from 1994; 106,000 a year from drug reactions, legal prescription drugs coming from doctors.

If we want to go after a problem, let us go after the highways, let us go after the guns, let us go after the drug reaction. What about alcohol? There are 200,000 deaths, approximately, from alcohol. But do we come here and propose that we go back to prohibition? No. We do not. It is a serious problem. It is really the big problem.

Cigarette killing may be up to 400,000 a year. But if we make the suggestion that we want to go after them, then we have a President that says, yes, we will go after the kids that are taking a puff on the cigarette and apply the same rules.

There are 10 million new cases of sexually transmitted diseases diagnosed each year. It is probably higher because most of those cases do not get reported. So that is a serious problem. I mean, look for serious problems.

To dwell on the drug war and casually and carelessly violate civil lib-

erties, as we so often do, and have confiscation and seizure of property that we just blow it off because we are fighting the drug war, I think we are going in the wrong direction. We need some new ideas and new proposals on this drug war. I hope today to have time to make some of these suggestions on what we might do about the drug war.

Former HEW Secretary Joseph Califano said, not too long ago, he was comparing the drug war to the problem of alcohol, he said: The drug war is a grain of sand compared to alcohol.

If we look at the college issue, the overwhelming drug that is a problem on college campuses is alcohol. Yet, 99 percent of our concerns and our expression of horror is directed toward a narrower group of people; that is, on the illegal drugs.

Why might it be that we dwell on the illegal drugs? Alcohol of course is legal, but why would it be that maybe this Congress might not be as aggressive against the abuses of alcohol and the deaths? If we have compassion, should we show less compassion to the 200,000 people dying of alcohol deaths or the 400,000 dying from cigarette deaths? But we do.

It just happens that those who produce alcohol happen to come to Washington quite frequently. They make donations to candidates. They have a lobby. They do have a presence here in Washington. Not only those who make the alcohol, but what about the hotels or the restaurants?

I mean, if we even thought about doing anything or saying anything about alcohol, of course we would hear from the hotels and the restaurants, and maybe rightfully so, if we argue that people have a right to have a glass of wine with their dinner in their hotel or restaurant. But the point I am trying to make is that we dwell on certain things out of proportion to its danger.

Also, one reason why we might not talk about the tremendous abuse with alcohol is the fact that, quite possibly, a few Members of Congress actually participate in using such a thing. There are now probably 13 million people in this United States suffering from abuse or alcoholism, a serious, serious number.

Now, there is a lot more that has to be said, especially if we can someday open up the debate and go in a new direction, have some new ideas dealing with the drug program. But I want to pause here for a minute, and I want to emphasize just one thing; that is, that, constitutionally, it was never intended that the Federal Government fight the war on drug. And they never did until recent years. For 25 years now, we have done it. We have spent \$200 billion.

It is failing, and we are not willing to stand up and say, hey, maybe we are doing something wrong. Maybe we ought to have another idea. Maybe we ought to have a new approach.

I think when we talk about not only looking at this outer perspective of other problems that we have in the

country, but also the serious consequences of the drug laws which we all should be concerned about because it involves property rights and civil liberty rights, maybe we can get around to the point of saying maybe could there be a new approach.

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the other side and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS) for bringing this resolution, of which I am a cosponsor, to the floor today.

I just want to take a second today to say that all of the "whereases" deal with much of the problem that the previous speaker outlined. But in the end, the resolve is a resolve that he talks about, because Congress, in a unique way, can bring leadership and emphasis to the people in the communities to take an extra effort to combat this horrible disease that exists in our communities today: drugs.

Obviously the extent of drug distribution, sale, or use by our Nation's youth today is extremely troubling. A joint effort by Republicans, Democrats, the President, and the American people really, I believe, is needed to fight this pressing issue.

Too many of our Nation's youth have come to the perils of drugs. And I would not compare alcohol, which is a legal distribution, to drugs, as an illegal distribution, as being necessarily the same thing. They are horses of a different color.

I want to commend the other side, and Representative PAPPAS, for bringing this resolution, of which I am a cosponsor, to the floor today. Obviously, the extent of drug distribution, sale, or use by our Nation's youth is extremely troubling and a joint effort by Congress, the President and the American people is needed to combat this pressing problem.

Too many of our Nation's youth succumb to the perils of drugs and this resolution sends a strong message that we must continue to commit ourselves to ending the tragedy caused by illegal drug abuse.

For those who have followed the legislative history of this resolution, you are aware that I offered an amendment during committee consideration of this measure to include language regarding the need to improve the infrastructure of school buildings and their grounds as a component of our efforts to fight drug abuse.

Anyone who has visited the schools in our Nation's worst drug plagued communities realize the impact that deteriorating buildings, lack of proper lighting and unmaintained grounds have on the likelihood of illegal drug sales and use. A well maintained, or newly constructed school is an important tool in the battles waged by local law enforcement and educators against youth drug abuse. In addition, the discussion of school infrastructure is a key component in our efforts both as a Congress, and a nation, to combat drug abuse by our Nation's youth. Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle did not support this amendment.

In closing, I do want to point out to all Members that this resolution is just that—a resolution. We as a Congress should be committing ourselves to providing the assistance and directive to providing the assistance and direction to solve the problems of illegal drug use. I will vote to support this resolution and I urge others to do so as well, but I would hope that this Congress, and the Republican leadership would begin to address the needs of our Nation rather than grandstanding for the purposes of election year politics. Mr. Speaker, very simply, this Congress needs to act upon solutions rather than resolutions.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS) for bringing forth this resolution. I strongly support it. It sends a clear, unambiguous message about Congress' commitment to removing drugs from our schools. Never before has this message been more urgently needed. And that includes alcohol.

I believe drugs are the single greatest threat facing our children. Drug usage with the very young is exploding. More kids are trying and using drugs than ever before, and they are starting earlier and earlier. Our schools, which used to be a safe haven, are now becoming a hostile territory because drugs are available there.

I have a granddaughter in fourth grade and granddaughter in eighth grade. It is not a matter of are they going to be exposed to drugs; it is how often and by whom. Because they are there, they have already been exposed.

Students in sixth and seventh grade are deciding to smoke pot before they drink beer. How did we get here? I believe throughout the 1990s, many leaders and role models in the position to set a good example have sent mixed signals about whether drug use is wrong.

Prominent national leaders have trivialized their own drug use as if it matters whether or not one inhales. Hollywood celebrities have glorified drugs, using them in the popular culture. And movies have been sending the wrong message to our young people. The behavior of many professional athletes has suggested that it is okay as long as they can get away with it.

This is why this resolution, and the larger Republican agenda to make America drug free, is so important. With it, we draw a line in the sand.

A couple quick statistics. The proportion of 12-year-olds who reported having a peer on hard drugs increased 12 percent just last year alone. National and State and local leaders must send a strong, clear message to our youth by an example.

Hollywood needs to divert from its glorification of drugs to be against drugs. Professional sport teams need to put a line in the sand that says we are going to make it clear that drug users are not welcome on our teams. It is

time that American celebrities set the example, and that includes all leaders, local, State, and national.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I said, in most of our history, the control of drug abuse has never been a Federal issue. This is only very recent. This does not diminish one's concern. It is respecting the Constitution. It is also emphasizing the fact that the more we have centralized our control and the more that we have tried to enforce the thing at the national level, the worse the problem has gotten.

I have many conservatives say we have an educational problem, and all they want to do is throw more money at it. I cannot see how this is different. Yes, we have a major problem. But it gets worse, and all we do is throw more money at it with exactly the same programs.

My goal today is just to suggest, just to bring it to the Congress' attention, that possibly we are not doing the right things. If we would ever come to admitting that, then maybe we will not have to suffer the abuse of how the war on drugs goes awry.

For instance, we have had this war on drugs, and there is no evidence even that we have been able to keep drugs out of our prisons. So maybe there is something we are doing wrong. Maybe we are treating a symptom rather than the cause of the problem. Maybe the cause is not legislatively correctable. That is a possibility. Obviously there is a problem there, but we need to think about it. We need to take a consideration, and not ever to write off those of us who might say we do not endorse the current approach as being one that might not be concerned about the issue.

Obviously I am concerned. I have five children, and I have 13 grandchildren. I am a physician. I have a great deal of concern. But I have also been involved and I have seen people who have suffered, and, therefore, I have probably a slightly different approach to the problem.

But I do think that we ought to look for a minute at the harm done with the war on drugs. So often there are victims from the war on drugs that go unnoticed. How often have we seen on television, how often have we read in our newspaper of a drug bust with hooded FBI agents and hooded DEA agents barging into the wrong apartment and really tearing the place up, confiscating property of people who have never committed a crime?

Why are we at the point now that we permit the war on drugs to be fought without due process of law? All they have to be is a suspect. All we have to do is have cash these days, and the government will come and take it from us. Then we have to prove our innocence. That is not the Constitution. We have gone a long way from the due process.

Our job here is to protect the civil liberties of individuals. Yes, we ought

to try to influence behavior. Yes, we ought to make laws against illegal behavior; national, when necessary, but local when the Constitution dictates it. At the rate we are going, we are making very, very little progress.

I have a suspicion that there are motivations behind the invasion of privacy. Because government so often likes to know what people are doing, especially in the financial area, this has been a tremendous excuse to accuse anybody who spends anything in cash of being a drug dealer, because they want to know where the cash is. This is part of the IRS collection agency, because they are worried about collecting enough revenues.

Yet we carelessly say, well, a little violation of civil liberties is okay, because we are doing so much good for the country and we are collecting revenues for the government. But we cannot casually dismiss these important issues, especially, if anything I suggest, that this war on drugs is, or the problem of drugs in perspective is not nearly what some people claim it to be, and that many people are dying from other problems rather than these.

I would like to suggest in closing some of the things that we can consider. First, let us consider the Constitution, for instance. We have no authority to create a Federal police force. That is not in the Constitution. So we ought to consider that. It is a State problem. It is a State law enforcement problem. Most of our history, it was dealt that way.

I think education is very important; people who know what is going on. We should, if anything, be emphasizing the educational process. Possibly my medical background influences me into what I am going to say next; and that is, could we conceive of looking at some of this problem of addiction as a disease rather than a criminal act? We do this with alcohol. Maybe that would help the problem.

□ 1500

Is it conceivable that we are looking at a symptom that the drug problem, the drug craze, is a reflection of moral values in the society?

We cannot get rid of teenage illegitimacy by writing a national law against teenage pregnancy. We are not likely, we have not been able to get rid of drug usage, teenage drug usage, by writing national laws and coming down with the armed might of the Federal Government. So I do not think the current process is going to work.

Kids go on drugs because they are seeking happiness, they are alone, they are in broken families. This is a problem that will not be solved by more laws and a greater war on drugs. We have 80,000 Federal policemen now carrying drugs. Character is what is needed. Laws do not create character. This does not dismiss us from expressing concern about this problem, but let us not make the problem worse.

In 1974, Switzerland passed a law that said that the doctor could prescribe

medication for addicts. I, as a physician, if an addict comes into my office and I agree to give him drugs which would support his habit, because I figure for him to go out on the street and shoot somebody for it is a little worse than me trying to talk him into a program by giving him drugs for a while, I am a criminal. I am a criminal today if I decide that somebody should use or could use marijuana if they are dying with cancer or AIDS and they are dying of malnutrition because they cannot eat. There should be a little bit of compassion in this movement.

Again, we cannot distract from the serious problem of the drug war, but I do beg and plead for my colleagues to just look at the truth. Let us read the news carefully, let us look at the Constitution, like we do when it is convenient, and let us consider another option. It cannot be any worse than what we are doing.

We have too many people on drugs, and this resolution makes my point. The war on drugs has failed. Let us do something different. Let us not pursue this any longer.

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

There is no doubt that we should do everything we can to discourage the sale and use of drugs by our Nation's youth, but we do the youth of our Nation a disservice by suggesting that they alone are responsible for the Nation's drug problem. And we do them an even greater disservice by coming to the floor with an empty political gesture that plays to the worst stereotype of young people, while at the same time the Republican leadership of this Congress refuses to lift a finger on behalf of this Nation's youth.

Today, the Congress will make this simplistic statement about a very complex problem. It will scapegoat our Nation's young people for the problem for which, in reality, we all should be taking responsibility for. It is not a question of America's public commitment to the war against drugs, to the commitment of the parents of our young children to the war against drugs; it is the problem of a very tired, outdated and ineffective war on drugs.

Let me also point out what this resolution and this Congress will fail to do. It will fail to reward the vast majority of youth who stay out of trouble, in many cases overcoming great obstacles, such as poverty or difficult family circumstances; it will fail to promise America's youth improved conditions in their schools, conditions which adults would never tolerate in their own workplaces; it will fail to tell America's youth that we want them to

share in the benefits of a boom economy and unprecedented prosperity by expanding their educational and economic opportunities; it will fail to promise them the protection of being victims of violence or abuse, either at the hands of their peers, in their own families or someone much older than themselves; it will fail to provide for after-school programs to make productive use of the time that young people have in the late afternoons.

The number one complaint among young people is there is nothing to do, and yet we see music programs, arts programs, and educational programs all scaled back. No alternatives. No alternatives to people just hanging out.

This Congress will fail to announce a commitment of stopping tobacco companies from targeting our young people by aggressively marketing their product that will ultimately kill more than every illegal drug combined. Instead, the most affluent generation of elders in this Nation's history will scold its youth and tell them they are bad and shirk its responsibility for making things better.

It is easy to bash teens. And while we should not minimize the very real problem of drug use by America's young people, let us make sure the record is straight about the entire drug problem. Teenagers account for less than 1 percent of illegal drug deaths. The adult drug death rate is nearly 10 times higher than that of adolescents.

While the use of illegal drugs by young people actually decreased between 1979 and 1994, for adults over the age of 35 it increased by 28 percent. The top three causes of death among youth are automobile accidents, homicides, and suicides. The drug that is the factor in most of those car crashes is alcohol, but it is not addressed by this resolution.

In fact, just a few short weeks ago we saw the leadership cave to the alcohol lobby. We were not allowed to have an amendment voted on by the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) to toughen laws against drunk driving.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this measure, as I expect all Members will, because I agree with most of what it says. But the things it does not say and the things it fails to do to provide hope and opportunity for this Nation's young people say more about where we are as a Nation and falling short on our responsibilities to our Nation's youth.

Finally, I would like to say that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) has raised a whole series of questions this Congress is afraid to debate. My colleagues should ask their constituents, the next time they are in a town hall meeting, if they believe the war on drugs is working. Tell them we have spent \$200 billion.

It may be the least effective program we have on the Nation's books. There is no other market in the world where we would spend \$200 billion interfering with the market and the price of drugs on the street would never change over

a two decade period of time. That is the testimony. The market every day turns in a report on the war on drugs, and the market says the cost of doing business has not gone up one scintilla.

We ought to start thinking about new tools and a new approach and we ought to stop pretending like this is only a problem for young people in this country.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), who has been a leader in the antidrug effort.

I would like to note also, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciate the support of the gentleman from California, the previous speaker, for this measure.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, which simply expresses the sense of Congress that we as Americans remain committed to the war on drugs.

Now, I want to commend my friend from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS), who has done an excellent job in leading this fight, and also my friend from Texas who has spoken against this resolution, and I want to address a couple of concerns that he has raised.

He says this resolution is an endorsement of the status quo. It is just the contrary. It is saying that the status quo is unacceptable. The present situation, where we have teenage drug use soaring, is not acceptable. We have to get off the dime. We, as a country, have to do something to remain committed.

The gentleman from California that just spoke, he started pointing fingers and being critical of this. Well, the status quo is whenever we take \$1 billion away from our efforts for interdiction; whenever Federal drug prosecutions fall 12 percent since 1992; whenever the DEA agents are cut.

How can we fight a war on drugs when we are cutting those types of resources? That is the status quo. We need leadership and we need to go in a different direction. This resolution says we welcome new ideas. We want a different approach. We want to do more, and we, as a Nation, must be committed, and that is the direction that we need to go.

The argument is we do not want to Federalize all law enforcement and make this a Federal issue. Certainly we need to fight this community to community. I have been in Gentry, a town of a thousand in Arkansas; I am going to Waldron, a town of 400 in Arkansas; and we were talking about what we can do as community, fighting this war community by community.

But there is a Federal role. And the argument is, well, the Constitution does not allow this. But the Constitution says that the United States Government must protect itself, it is its responsibility, from enemies, foreign and domestic. And this is an enemy that affects our national security, and it is a very appropriate role for our Federal Government to be involved in this battle.

The Federal Government and the communities have a job to do. We must

do it together. We must work together, both Democrats, Republicans, independents, all fighting together to win this. I ask for your support for this resolution.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to point out, once again, that up until just very recently in our history, it was assumed that the Federal Government did not have this authority. To assume that we do have this, I guess that is why we call it a war, to say that this is national defense.

But prohibition, obviously, when they passed that amendment to the Constitution, recognized that the Congress could not pass laws. And like I mentioned in 1937, when Roosevelt decided that we should attack medical marijuana, that he would do it through raising taxes. So it is only in recent history that we have decided that this is a Federal project. The record is just not very clear it has been very successful.

I am concerned not only about the drug usage, obviously, and the fact that the war has failed, but with those things that are so negative when it comes to violation of liberties.

The other day there was a story in the media that said there was a child suffering from an acute attack of asthma. Now, there was another asthmatic in the class, and she did what seemed to come natural to her: She went and gave her a whiff of her nebulizer and the girl immediately came out of her acute asthma attack. She was quickly apprehended under a Federal statute saying that she was disobeying the Federal law on the use of drugs.

Now, it might be advisable to caution a young child about giving medications to another, but this was very obvious and very clear. She happened to have been a hero with the other students and she was certainly a hero for the girl she helped.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C. (Ms. NORTON).

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

Drug-free schools should be a redundancy. I regret that the expression is not, and I hope that we are looking for ways to make it a redundancy instead of a slogan.

As it turns out, the best argument for the tobacco bill, or at least a good tobacco bill this year, may not just be tobacco but its role in other drugs. We have struck out so often on drugs, we might well look at tobacco.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to find a junkie that did not begin with tobacco or alcohol. That is the entryway to marijuana and to hard drugs. A youngster gets to feeling good off of a soft drug, like tobacco or alcohol, and he wants to find out more. Yet we have very little concentration there. And it looks like this Congress may actually go home without a tobacco bill.

I was just at the dedication of the Ronald Reagan Building and Inter-

national Trade Center and heard very moving remarks by Mrs. Reagan. I am not one of those who made fun of her notion "Just Say No," because I think that there are a significant number of youngsters who will say no if we stand up and say "Just Say No." But we must ask about the rest. What about those who need more; who is going to take responsibility for them? They are, after all, only children. I applaud her for beginning there. It is up to this body to go the rest of the way.

Who really needs our help are parents. They find competition from the media and from the streets often to be overwhelming.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

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

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

I rise today to underscore one of the greatest unnecessary obstacles to the education of our children: drugs. We all know the word; we all know the problem.

Drugs are a fact of life for America's children and we have to deal with that. Over half of all high school seniors have tried an illegal drug and nearly one in two can buy marijuana within an hour. There is not a community, a school, a family in this Nation that is immune to the destructive pervasiveness of drugs.

□ 1515

We all know it is past time to stop paying lip service and get on with the war on drugs and start with positive and specific action. Stalemate is unacceptable. The administration's effort to curb this trend has been sadly negligent. We know that. It ranges from "no commitment" to "wrong message."

While cocaine and heroin prices have steadily declined and teen drug has skyrocketed, the administration has cut international interdiction by \$1 billion and drug arrests have fallen by 12 percent. Let me tell my colleagues, as the chairman of the House Committee on Intelligence, that stopping supply is possible and it matters. We cannot continue to let drugs stand in the way of the safety and education of our children, obviously.

So we are committed to attacking the drug epidemic on all fronts, from production to the school room. Working together, I think we can reduce the flow of drugs in this country by 80 percent in the next few years. And then we are going to go after the remaining 20 percent, because we do not need drugs.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to myself.

I wanted to clarify a couple of things that were said here earlier. One is, in fact, when the government cut back its interdiction effort, we saw the street prices on cocaine and crack drop and

the epidemic swept across America. Another question is whether or not certain rights have been violated unintentionally or even intentionally. They should not be. We need to be careful of that.

But, in fact, the little 2-year-old in Fort Wayne and the 5-year-old who were shot down in a drive-by shooting had their rights violated as well. We have to get control of this drug epidemic in our homes, in our neighborhoods, and in our schools.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). All time has expired.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we have 2 additional minutes, divided equally between the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

It has been said here several times that we have not done enough in the fight on drugs, and certainly that is true. Anyone who has visited, though, the schools in our district realize that a lot of the drug activity in those schools that are plagued with the worst deterioration of their buildings and they lack proper lighting and unmaintained grounds which really are a breeding ground for drug sales and use.

I offered an amendment that would have added that into this resolution. Of course, that was defeated. Regardless, I will support the resolution because where so many of my colleagues have said we have not done enough and we are losing the fight on drugs, that may be true, but that is no reason not to do anything. And what we are trying to do with this resolution, especially in the resolve clauses, is demonstrate that we, as a Nation, feel we should be more committed to that fight.

And the results portion of the resolution talk about the coordination between Federal law enforcement and local law enforcement in the fight against drugs. It tries to bring everybody together, the resolution does. It says, "All Government leaders and parents share a role in raising the awareness of this issue and offering constructive alternatives to illegal drug use."

I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS), who has been a leader on this effort, who serves on the drug task force and who is the sponsor of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding, and I thank my colleagues for considering this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following two letters for the RECORD, one from the Partnership for a Drug-Free America and one from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, endorsing this resolution:

PARTNERSHIP FOR A
DRUG-FREE AMERICA,
New York, NY, January 29, 1998.

Congressman MICHAEL PAPPAS,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PAPPAS: The Partnership for a Drug-Free America strongly supports H.Res. 267 and any constructive efforts directed toward the goal of drug-free schools.

The Partnership is currently providing creative development, production, and programmatic support to the anti-drug media campaign being administered by the Office of National Drug Control Policy. The objective of the campaign is simple—to effectively reach young people and parents through media exposure at levels achieved during the late 1980's and very early 1990's—with the goal of reducing drug use in the 9 to 17 year old age group by 50 percent or more.

The media campaign is, of course, one piece of what must be a comprehensive effort to reduce and ultimately eliminate drug use among our young people. Effective programs to remove drugs from our nation's schools will provide yet another key component in creating an environment for youth in which drugs do not play a role.

Your leadership and support on this issue is greatly appreciated. Please let me know if the Partnership may be of any assistance as a resource for the development of school based anti-drug programs.

Sincerely,

RICHARD D. BONNETTE,
President and CEO.

U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, February 3, 1998.

Hon. MICHAEL PAPPAS,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PAPPAS: I was pleased to receive your letter and a copy of your bill H.Res. 267, calling on our country to eliminate illicit drugs from our nation's schools by the year 2000. The U.S. Chamber shares your concern about the use of drugs by students and by those in the workplace. In fact, we recently announced our policy priorities for 1998, including a greater involvement of the business community in efforts to crackdown on crime and drug use in their local communities and places of business. The fear and reality of crime saps the spirit and productivity of workers and is detrimental to the overall well being of all communities.

Therefore, on behalf of the more than three million members of the U.S. Chamber federation I am pleased to announce our support for H.Res. 267 and look forward to working with you to accomplish the goals it establishes.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. DONOHUE,
President and CEO.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 267 expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the citizens of the United States must remain committed to combat the distribution, sale, and use of illegal drugs by our Nation's youth. We must all remain committed to this cause, all of us.

When it came to the issue of sexual harassment, our society made it clear, "no" meant "no." When it came to reducing drunk driving, we were firm in our resolve that "If you drive drunk and risk the lives of others, you will be punished." So I stand here today with the same determination. When it comes to drugs, "no" means "no."

So let me put the pushers of drugs on alert. When they are caught, they will be arrested and found guilty and they will go to jail, period.

We are all in this together, to protect our schools, streets, neighborhoods and communities. In this fight, I am convinced that it will be local solutions that will solve this national problem. The poison, yes, the poison, that threatens our youth also threatens our Nation's future. We need to continue to push for efforts in this Congress that will deter the demand for drugs and end the supply. Beyond that, I will do whatever I can to highlight the success of local community programs that are on the front lines of this battle in our communities.

I often have the opportunity to meet with school groups visiting Washington, D.C., from my district. I also spend a great deal of time in New Jersey visiting classrooms and speaking with students of all ages. One of the things that I ask them is what is the most important issue facing them. Hands down, the number one issue that they tell me is drugs.

We cannot deny the problem. We cannot look the other way. We must accept its existence and face it head on from the bottom up, from each of our communities to those of us here in Washington, D.C.

Marijuana use among teens, as has been mentioned before, is on the rise because, by many, it is deemed "socially acceptable." Well, it is not acceptable and we need to say it. We all need to say it. The President, the Congress, we all need to say it. But if we work together, parents, public officials, and young people, we can ensure that the lives of our children are safer, more productive, and free of the drugs that cripple the mind and destroy the soul.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the indulgence of the House. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. We are making a statement. Talk is cheap, but I believe if this Congress does not make itself very, very clear that use of drugs among our young people, sale of drugs to our young people is not acceptable, we will not make progress.

This is a war that can be won, but we have to remain committed to do so. We have to speak so very, very clearly in a unified voice. And I certainly believe that this resolution is an important step in that process.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 267, legislation which states congressional support of fighting the effects of illegal drugs on our children.

The threat posed by illegal drugs is one of the major national security threats facing our

Nation. This is not empty hyperbole, but the cold truth. The vast majority of the illegal drugs in this country come from overseas. The sooner we realize that drugs are as much a foreign as a domestic problem, the more effective our response will be.

While opponents argue that we spend too much on combating drugs, I contend that we cannot ignore the true cost of drug use on our society. In addition to the costs associated with supply and demand reduction, drug use costs billions each year in health care expenses and lost productivity. Moreover, it has intangible costs in terms of broken families and destroyed lives.

As chairman of our House International Relations Committee, I have long been dedicated to fighting the scourge of illegal drugs. Regrettably of late, this is a battle which as a nation we are losing.

During the 1980's, we made remarkable progress in reducing teenage drug use, and eliminating the view that drugs and drug use were socially acceptance. Between 1979 and 1992, there was a 50 percent drop in "past month" drug users from over 25 million down to 12 million.

Our focus during this period was two-fold, and followed a dual track of reducing both supply and demand. Regrettably, this administration sharply curtailed interdiction funding and placed greater emphasis on demand reduction. The end result has been: a sharp increase in the supply of drugs available on our streets, the highest purity levels ever encountered, and a resurgence of teenage drug use. From 1992 to 1996, teenage marijuana use doubled. More disturbing is the data showing a significant rise in heroin use among our teenagers.

In essence, the Clinton administration's policy of focusing on demand reduction is being overwhelmed by the current state of the drug market. With many of our cities literally awash in heroin, the drug dealers are using supply to create demand.

In order to effectively combat the problem of illegal drug use, we must employ a balanced approach of simultaneously reducing supply and demand. In addition, it requires efforts by all levels of government and society.

This reduction emphasizes this approach and calls for Congress and the administration to work with local communities, schools and parents to develop and implement meaningful anti-drug policies.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this worthy piece of legislation. For too long we have had a disjointed approach to combating teenage drug use. If, as a nation, we are willing to reduce teenage use of tobacco, surely we can do the same for the use of illegal drugs.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution represents an important commitment by the House of Representatives. I am proud that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are willing to stand up and lead in the fight against drug use among our nation's youth.

Building on this good effort, I will be introducing specific bills that bolster efforts to reduce drug use and I hope my colleagues will join me in those efforts.

I have drafted a resolution to encourage every Member to establish or support an anti-drug coalition in their community. Last year when we passed the Drug-Free Communities Act to provide matching grants to such coalitions, I started an effort to get Members involved in such efforts. Both the Republican

Conference and the Democratic Caucus endorsed the idea, and, to date, 76 Members have committed to getting involved. I would like to increase that number to 435.

Later this week, I plan to introduce legislation to promote drug-free workplace programs among small businesses, including special programs for parents in the workplace to help them keep their kids drug-free. Later in the month, I will be introducing legislation to improve treatment in our prisons and jails so that inmates can return as drug-free members of society and, in many cases, set an example for their children. I look forward to working with other Members on their proposals to address this tremendous problem.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of House Resolution 267, a resolution which expresses our commitment to fighting the scourge of illegal drugs in our schools and Nation.

We hear on a regular basis about how drugs are destroying our schools and ripping apart families. Teenage years are hard enough without our children having to face the threat of drugs on a daily basis. A survey conducted for The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (CASA) found that 76 percent of high school students and 46 percent of middle school students say drugs are kept, used or sold on school grounds.

We also know that while marijuana use by 8th, 10th, and 12th graders declined from 1980–1992, from 1992–1996 such use dramatically increased—by 253 percent among 8th graders, 151 percent among 10th graders, and 84 percent among 12th graders.

Mr. Speaker, the survey also shows that 500,000 8th graders began using marijuana in the 6th and 7th grades, and that those who use marijuana are 85 times more likely to use cocaine than those who abstain from marijuana.

Former HEW Secretary and President of the National Center on Addiction and Drug Abuse, Joseph Califano, Jr., recently spoke on the gravity of the problem. He said “While our schools used to be sanctuaries for students, many have become candy stores of dangerous substances—cigarettes, alcohol, inhalants, marijuana, heroin, cocaine and acid—sold or used by classmates on the school grounds.”

It is important that we remain committed to eradicating the use of drugs from our schools and making sure that everyone—students, parents, teachers—know that there is zero tolerance when it comes to the use of illegal drugs.

I urge all my colleagues to join in supporting this important resolution.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of House Resolution 267, a resolution which expresses our commitment to fighting the plague of illegal drugs.

In a report released by the Office of National Drug Control Policy last December, statistics paint the picture of the extent of the drug problem in this country:

An estimated 12.8 Americans—about 6 percent of the household population aged twelve and older—have used drugs within the past 30 days.

Every year drug abuse kills 14,000 Americans and costs taxpayers nearly \$70 billion.

Drug abuse fuels spouse and child abuse, property and violent crime, the incarceration of

young men and women, the spread of AIDS, workplace accidents, motor vehicle accidents, and absenteeism.

Drug use among our Nation's youth has, unfortunately, increased 126 percent among eighth graders between 1991 and 1996.

Every day, an average of 6,488 American children and teens try marijuana for the first time; 1,786 try cocaine; and 386 try heroin.

Other surveys show:

More than one-half or 54.3 percent of our high school seniors have tried an illicit drug, and about one in four or 26.2 percent use illicit drugs on a regular or monthly basis.

And the prevalence of the problem cuts across all gender, race, and geographic groups.

As I've mentioned on other occasions, I believe one of the leading causes of the drug scourge in this country is the decline and break-up of the American family. If we can get our families back together, then I believe we will begin to make real progress in the war on drugs. It starts at this most basic unit of society. If we can turn the tide in the family, then we can turn the tide in the nation.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution represents one step in turning the tide. It sends a message that the distribution, sale and use of illegal drugs in schools will simply not be tolerated. It's a message that's much-needed and overdue.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution that expresses the sense of the House that all schools should be drug-free and that the sale, distribution and use of illegal drugs at school is unacceptable. I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this important resolution.

As the former Superintendent of North Carolina's public schools, I know firsthand that we cannot expect our children to learn in drug-infested surroundings. We cannot expect our teachers to provide quality instruction in an arena infiltrated by the scourge of drugs. And we cannot expect our families, parents, businesses and communities to support our public education system unless we are doing everything possible to make our schools drug-free.

A recent survey conducted for the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University found that seventy-six percent of high school students and forty-six percent of middle school students say drugs are kept, used or sold on school grounds. These appalling statistics are simply unacceptable.

House Resolution 267 also states that all federal, state and local drug fighting agencies should work together with schools and parents to ensure that a renewed effort be made to fight drug use; and that all governmental leaders and parents should share in raising the awareness of this issue. Finally, the resolution states that Congress and the president should set a goal to end the distribution, sale and use of illegal drugs in the Nation's schools by 2000, and to work with local communities and parents to achieve this goal.

I urge all my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans alike—to join me in passing this important resolution.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 267, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 267.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

□ 1700

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). Without objection, the minimum time for electronic voting on the first postponed suspension, House Concurrent Resolution 220, may be reduced to 5 minutes if that vote occurs without any intervening business, other than rising of the Committee after the last electronic vote in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 6.

There was no objection.

HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). Pursuant to House Resolution 411 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 6.

□ 1702

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole