

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):

FOIA Number:

S

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential Library Staff.

Record Group/Collection: George H.W. Bush Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Grant, Mary Kate, Files
Subseries: Subject File, 1988-1991

OA/ID Number: 13879
Folder ID Number: 13879-013

Folder Title:
Drug Strategy [2]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	19	2	7	4

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

January 25, 1990

PRESS BRIEFING
BY

DIRECTOR FOR NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY WILLIAM BENNETT

The Briefing Room

2:16 P.M. EST

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Good afternoon. I am joined by my deputies: Stanley Morris, Deputy Director for Supply; Herbert Kleber, Deputy Director for Demand; and Judge Reginald Walton; Deputy Director for State and Local Affairs; John Walters, my Chief of Staff; and my Director of Budget, Bruce Carnes. This is the National Drug Control Strategy II.

Let me be brief in my opening comments so we can welcome your questions.

First, I'd like to say this: I am more optimistic about our prospects for this war on drugs than I was when I first took this job. This is not Mission Impossible. People said this job was not doable, this mission not possible, or the object not attainable. All of that is wrong. The object is attainable. This war is winnable. The scourge, in fact, I believe, is beginning to end. It isn't over, yet, by any means. There's a long way to go, but the momentum has clearly shifted.

Overall use is going down in America. Public attitudes continue to harden against drug use. Arrests are up. Seizures are up. And traffickers are on defense more and more. We are starting to get ahold of this beast. The progress is being made in many of place worst afflicted by drugs, in neighborhoods and communities all over this country. Overseas, the Medellin Cartel declared war on the government of Colombia last August. Now we hear of they are suing for peace. We're seeing record amounts of traffickers and dealers assets being seized and given to the good guys.

As you know, in the last year, the Department of Defense has significantly stepped up its efforts against drugs and we're delighted. International cooperation against traffickers and illegal money laundering has increased. And, again, all across America more and more Americans are saying they will no longer tolerate the use of illegal drugs in their schools, their work places and their neighborhoods. If we keep it up we're going to there. We can and will make things better. But in the meantime, no wavering, no compromise, and by all means, no surrender.

Just a few highlights of Strategy II. It builds on, it particularizes and it deepens the principles set out in Strategy I. Those principles are: user accountability, treatment assistance, a strong emphasis on prevention, tough law enforcement, international initiatives, and research and intelligence efforts.

For Fiscal Year 1991, it's clear that the President is serious about this issue. Let's take a look at money. The administration is seeking \$10.6 billion in drug-related budget authority; \$10.6 billion in BA, budget authority. A \$4.3 billion increase since President Bush took office 12 months ago and a \$1.1 billion increase over Fiscal Year '90. Actual spending, that is budget outlays for fiscal '91, will increase by \$2.8 billion over fiscal 1990. Details on the budget recommendations will be made

MORE

available on January 29th. And the detailed description of the plan, of course, is in here.

But just a few quick things -- in the areas of criminal justice, we'll see a dramatic increase in the number of DEA activities; DEA agents and support personnel. And we will see an increase in our effort to attack domestic marijuana. An increase in the Department of Justice grants to state and local law enforcement. A 228-percent increase to state and local law enforcement since President Bush took office. Substantial funds, \$403 million went for drug-related activities within the federal court system, including clerks, administrators, court officers and the like.

In the area of treatment, we will add almost 16,000 slots to the block grant. With the increase that we propose in treatment, we believe as many as 1.7 million people could be served from funds provided by all treatment sources -- all payment sources -- 1.7 million people. As Dr. Kleber has written before he took this job, as a professor at Yale and since he has been at this job, we estimate the number of people in need of treatment -- who could benefit from treatment -- to be something like two million, so we are fast approaching that number.

Given the problems of trying to train people and get them up to professional standards to work effectively in treatment, we think this is tremendous progress. Special grants for programs to improve outreach efforts for pregnant addicts and for cocaine babies. Developing some ideas for -- innovative ideas for drug treatment, such as the treatment campus idea, and doing more research and treatment.

Very quickly, in education and community action, we will increase grants in the drug-free schools area. Emergency grants to urban and rural education agencies; community incentive grants -- a 50 percent increase to \$150 million for public housing drug elimination programs. We will develop model legislation for the states on drug-free workplaces. In the area of interdiction, we will, again, enhance the role of the Department of Defense.

We will focus a great deal on the southwest border where we see increasing amounts of traffic. And we will improve our efforts in money laundering and the like. More money for research and a major new addition, the creation of National Drug Intelligence Center to consolidate and coordinate all the law enforcement information; to find out something more about the nature of the criminal drug trafficking organizations, so we can pursue our goal of dismantling those organizations.

Finally, two last things. The administration has designated the following areas of the country as high-intensity drug trafficking areas: they are New York, Miami, Houston, Los Angeles and the Southwest order. This means concentrated federal law enforcement assistance, hundreds of additional DEA and FBI agents, more border patrol and custom inspectors. And because of overall increases, we will see additional funds for treatment and prevention to those areas as well as to the rest of the United States.

And finally, the administration will be sending to the Congress a proposal to apply the death penalty to three additional categories of drug-related offenders -- major drug kingpins; second, drug kingpins who attempt to kill in order to obstruct justice that is interfering with the judicial process; and third, federal drug felons whose offenses result in death.

To sum up Strategy II, it, again, we believe deepens and particularizes and implements a great deal of what we talked about by way of principle in Strategy I. It builds on what works. And if the Congress adopts it -- in those areas where we need Congress to adopt it -- we believe that we will continue to show progress. Things will get better if we stay at it. And from our side, we certainly plan to stay at it. Thank you very much.

Q Do you think the Drug Czar ought to be a Cabinet level agency?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: I don't care. It doesn't matter. It's the least of my worries. We get our calls returned. I get to spend as much time with the President as anybody in this administration; spend a lot of time. And, in fact, the first time I was asked about this question I said, you know, when I call my colleagues in the Cabinet they return my calls. And I have to tell you, when I call the President, he returns my calls, and that's even more important. So we're not suffering from any lack of attention. We get a lot of it and we're getting the support. We could not do things that we regard as critical to do without the President's deep support and involvement. I can't order the Secretary of Defense to get more significantly involved. I can urge it and give the arguments for it; but in the end, he'll listen to the Commander-in-Chief. And he has.

Q Given the connection between guns, violence and drugs, why don't you make a more aggressive proposal about gun control in your strategy?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Well, I think that the proposals that are on the books now to increase the sentences for people who use weapons, guns in the commission of drug crimes is a very positive thing. And second, additional proposals that we will make to add to that -- that is, to make some of the sentences longer and to broaden the applicability so that people who are committing drug felonies and using guns will now suffer additional penalties, will do much longer time under mandatory sentencing. That's the way to get at it, in my view.

Q You mentioned that you're trying here to build on what works. Could you give us some specific areas where you're seeking more funds -- precisely because what the funds are to go for have proved over these past months to work?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Sure. We can start with law enforcement. The whole designation of the high intensity drug-trafficking areas and what we plan to do with that designation and federal funds will be to build on what works. And what works is, we are seeing successful federal efforts being made by U.S. attorneys and FBI and DEA and other federal personnel in making the cases against major drug dealers in this country, such as you had here in Washington with the Rayful Edmonds case, and you've had in many other places around the country where federal resources from U.S. attorneys and the law enforcement people go after the organization, build a case, and are able to get a conviction and disrupt the organization. That works; we need more of it.

Lots of people have told me that since the passage of the acts in 1988, we're really beginning to see a change in the disposition of the drug criminals out there. Many people are now being arrested, getting convicted, and doing very serious time. And that's progress which we want to build on.

Stan, do I have that right?

MR. MORRIS: Cross-designation is another.

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Go ahead.

MR. MORRIS: We've also -- organized crime drug enforcement task forces collapse all of the investigative powers of the federal government -- IRS, ATF, DEA and the like -- and the President has just gotten agreement from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General to add 1,000 new investigators in the drug area who are currently Customs inspectors, but we've broadened their power, so we have new tools available without extra resources.

DIRECTOR BENNETT: In the treatment area -- would you like to speak a second about the treatment area? What works for prevention -- Dr. Kleber.

DR. KLEBER: In the prevention area, one of the things that's been very successful over the last six months has been the initiative by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation -- Fighting Back. They're going to give over \$26 million to approximately eight to 12 communities who have organized enough -- and we know that prevention needs to work at the community level. Over 300 communities applied for that; only 12 are going to get funding. We are going to be putting significant millions of dollars into the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention to fund many more of those communities so that they can organize at the local level.

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Let me just add -- the sort of thing that many of you saw earlier this week in Kansas City -- that kind of effort of that group -- community group -- that works. That's clearly having a positive effect. That's the sort of thing we ought to get behind and support.

A last one I'd mention would be the education area. We're beginning to see some very encouraging reports based on the research of some education programs that seem to work. Like the DARE program, where you bring police officers into the schools and they talk to the little kids about these efforts. So all of those things we think are things that work.

Q On the issue of money-laundering, a number of representatives of banking associations think that too much pressure is being put on them to be accountable for putting restraints on money-laundering, especially in international wire transfers. What's your response to that? Do you have a --

DIRECTOR BENNETT: No. I would say that we do need accountability there. As we said last time, we might subtitle the strategy, "Everybody Must Do Something." And the money goes to the banks, and that means the bankers have to be paying more attention. And we know that money is the lifeblood of these organizations, and as long as they are able to launder money easily, that's going to create a great obstacle for us. So no, we don't think that we're placing an undue burden. We want to work with the community, obviously, to do it in a way that doesn't distort or frustrate their usual way of doing business. But they've got to play. They have got to play. And indeed, I think the FINCEN operation, or the financial crimes effort thing is going to show some progress.

Q Speaking of money, given the billions of dollars in profit in the drug business, what makes you think that applying the death penalty to drug kingpins is going to be any deterrent to these people?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Well, we'll sure deter the guy who gets it. I mean, there isn't any question about that.

Q But if it's ever carried out, number one --

DIRECTOR BENNETT: If it's ever carried out, and we would certainly have intention to carry it out.

Q But as people have pointed out, death is one of the business factors that these people deal with every day. I mean, why would the death penalty deter somebody, especially these people making the kind of profits that they do? Why do you think that would deter them?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Well, this notion that it is just an idle thing to many of them, I think it's probably true. But I think as people get closer to the recognition that they actually may die because of their actions, it may become less an idle thought about a

cost of doing business and more something to discourage them.

I have to tell you, I think some of the people in Colombia who noticed and read the report of Mr. Rodriguez Gacha may have had additional thoughts about mortality since that occurred.

I think that these efforts, these additions suggest several things and they mean several things. As the President said in Kansas City, that this is what is deserved, given the nature of the offense, that this is a matter of justice. Whether it deters anyone or not, it is a matter of justice and what is deserved.

And second, we think that if the cases are brought -- and remember, we did not ask for the death penalty as a matter of course; the Attorney General would have to approve, I think, in every case, requesting the death penalty. And if this did occur, I think it would send a very clear message about our seriousness about it.

Look, a year ago, two years ago, three years ago, people were saying, this government, this administration isn't really serious about the drug problem. What people are saying now about this and about some other things is, gee, maybe we're too serious about the drug problem. I'll take the criticism that way, particularly when I think we can defend what it is we're doing on the basis of logic and public policy. There are lots of ways in which you indicate and which I think you speak for the American people and say, we're sick and tired, we're not going to take it anymore, we're really going to go to work on this issue.

Q Your first high intensity drug area -- the area you designated for special attention was the District of Columbia. And despite the Rayful Edmond trial that you mentioned, the level of violence in the city has not decreased, the price of cocaine has not risen, and its availability has apparently not been curtailed. What specific examples can you cite of the success of your approach in the first area that you designated?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Well, look, technically, we did not designate the District of Columbia a high intensity drug trafficking area. Many people thought we did, but we did not. What we did was say we thought the situation in Washington, D.C. was desperate and that somebody ought to do something. And in addition to others, we thought we ought to do something. We didn't do it because we thought it was going to be an easy win. We didn't know whether it was going to be a win at all. We said we have to do it because the city was bleeding, and in some places, bleeding to death. And we felt we had to do something. I am pleased at what we've done. We have delivered on what we have promised. But you can't do this by yourself. The federal government can't do it.

Q Can you give some examples --

DIRECTOR BENNETT: I'm getting to it. We threw the rope to the city drowning, and we found a lot of knots got tied, but there wasn't enough pulling to get up. We'd still like to work with the District of Columbia; we'd still like more steps to be taken to get out of this problem. We have not had the kind of civic resolve in local government here that we think is appropriate to the circumstances.

There are some encouraging signs despite these absences. There is a dramatic decrease in the people who are arrested testing positive for drugs, which is regarded by people in the field as a very important fact which may be a predictor of overall drug use. But you're right -- the problem still remains serious -- deadly serious. There are still a lot of problems. I will say again I think it's going to get better. It will get better faster if we get more action from the local government.

Q What is the single most important achievement in your first phase?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: I don't know. I think the thing that we're -- I think the victories here are America's victories. I think that it is probably the hardening of public attitudes about drug use that is the most encouraging thing.

If we had to talk about the last year of things we have done, I think you would say the achievement of a coherent strategy with the support -- the clear public support of the President of the United States -- that it works. We're working together. Again, people said we couldn't do it. We couldn't get people to work in concert. Couldn't get the Defense Department to work with the other agencies. That's working. It's going. That may sound too bureaucratic to bring tears to one's eyes, but you get to sense that the enterprise is now together and we're moving in one direction. I think that's very encouraging. But there are encouraging signs everywhere. Again, I think that last year, a year ago, people were talking about the cartel as if they were invincible and as if the kingpins would never be caught. I think that situation has changed

Q The President said that he was going to increase the budget without touching the deficit or raising taxes.

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Right.

Q Have you had to cut other programs in order to get your program increased -- education, health, the Justice Department?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: No. No.

Q None at all, anywhere?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: But that's not my job. I mean, my job is to come forward --

Q When I said you I meant the greater you.

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Oh, I don't know. You'd have to talk to Brother Darman about that.

Q You must know.

DIRECTOR BENNETT: I don't know. (Laughter.) No, I am -- you don't understand. I am not cosmopolitan. I am not a man for all seasons. I am obsessive. I am tunnel-visioned. I have one thing to worry about now.

Q Can you ask your budget person if other programs in education --

DIRECTOR BENNETT: He knows. He's not supposed to know. He's supposed to be as tunnel-visioned as I am. Right?

MR. CARNES: Yes.

DIRECTOR BENNETT: But go ahead.

Q Right.

DIRECTOR BENNETT: But since you're more cosmopolitan, speak freely.

MR. CARNES: To be quite frank with you, I don't exactly know what every agency's budget is. I think that -- this is the truth -- I think there are going to be pluses and minuses in agencies all over government. What we did was recommend a drug budget. It had to be OMB's job to figure out how to pay for that.

Q On the high intensity areas, did you come under what we might call political pressure to designate certain areas over other areas -- New York over Detroit or something like that?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: We had tons of phone calls and letters and -- from the Hill and elsewhere to designate --

Q To follow up on that --

DIRECTOR BENNETT: -- but we didn't yield to it.

Q Okay. Do you have a formula --

DIRECTOR BENNETT: I don't. Didn't do it at Education; don't do it here..

Q Okay. Now, to follow up, how did you decide, for example, to include Nassau County and not Westchester County, to get real parochial here, in the New York area?

MR. MORRIS: Those are suggested areas that appeared to us on the tentative look at the problem to constitute the counties that were in fact most involved in the drug trafficking issues that the law underlying this requires. But those are simply suggestive. Where we are at present is, we did not go through any consultation with the state and local law enforcement. We simply took a look at the national data and picked these areas. The next step is to basically concentrate more closely; talk with Lee Brown, talk with the others involved in this area -- he's the new PC in New York -- and that's what we will be doing.

Q Okay. And political interest didn't play anything.

MR. MORRIS: Absolutely none.

Q What difference does a few million dollars make?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Well, I mean, it will make a difference. Remember, you've got to count a lot of different things here. This is not -- when you talk about \$50 million, this is not the total of what an area or what the five areas get from the federal government in terms of fighting drugs. This is an additional \$50 million on top of something like \$1.4 billion, Bruce, in '91 which these areas will get in all categories for fighting drugs. But with \$50 million, you can buy a couple of hundred or more -- Stan, you may want to come in with the exact numbers here, or estimates -- federal prosecutors, federal investigators, to do the job which we intend to do with this designation, which is go after the major trafficking organization.

What was the number you gave me this morning -- \$250 million?

MR. MORRIS: Yes. We're adding a quarter of a billion dollars in these areas strictly for law enforcement. We are increasing this year by 25 percent the number of prosecutors, investigators and interdiction personnel in these areas, and that's out of both '90 appropriated and '91 presidential requests. So this is a very significant increase to deal with what the law requires, which is the drug-trafficking centers in America. I can't give you the number, but we are now far beyond -- I think I can say this confidently -- tell me if I can't -- far beyond in terms of the commission of federal resources. The involvement of federal agents and prosecutors in pursuing this -- way beyond anything we saw with the French Connection or the Pizza Connection or any of those earlier operations; this is a much, much bigger thing. Remember what you're doing is going after the trafficking organizations. We now have an army -- really a small -- medium-sized army of federal investigators and prosecutors going after the cartel. And that's going to bear some good results.

Q Mr. Bennett, was Mayor Barry one of the knots in that rope that you threw the District? You talked about lack of cooperation somewhat. Are you referring to the Mayor as well?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: I don't have any comment on the Mayor. Obviously, I don't want to say anything about that; none of us should. But look I don't think it's any secret that the District of Columbia has had some problems in getting things off the ground in regard to this problem. We want to work with the District -- I like Sterling Tucker a lot. I think he's a serious guy, the drug czar of DC. But we have this agreement. We did everything we said we were going to do. If you take a look at the money that goes to the District of Columbia, more goes to the District of Columbia per capita than any other city in the country. I think by a factor of twice as much as the next city. More should be going on, and I hope more will go on. I'm confident that things will improve.

But I'll tell you -- you go in -- I've been to 35 cities now since March, and you go into a community and one of the things you see is that the community needs to act for itself if things are going to get better. And you go into a lot of places, and most places you talk to a group of people, you got the mayor sitting there, and you got the police chief, and you got somebody from the schools, and law enforcement, and a couple of feds there, and people from the treatment world, and the prevention world and they give you their plan. And in most cases what you get is: you know the drug problem is serious; we're doing something about it; we got a plan; here's how it works; we could sure use some more federal funds; we could sure use some advice on this or that, but we're going after it here in Tulsa, or we're going after it here in Dallas, or we're going after it here in Seattle -- all real-life examples, by the way, of people who are really going after it.

And then when your money goes in you can see it's going into something that's moving. They got a plan. Then you go into some other communities and people say, "we don't know what to do; we don't have the foggiest idea. Come in here and save us." Or, "there's no way we can get this bureaucracy to work."

Federal funds can help a lot and additional federal funds such as we're proposing can help, but nothing can replace that local effort. People have to get their act together on the ground or we're not going to get there.

Q Does the fact that the Mayor is under indictment though hurt your effort to fight the drug war?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Again, I don't want to comment on that. I don't want to comment on it specifically.

Q -- have to do with the perception of the Mayor of the Nation's Capital. Is that damaging to your efforts?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: People have said -- I would just refer you to reports where people have said this event, given the attention and publicity it received, might be one of these watershed kind of events which changes people's attitudes and makes people really realize they have to do something.

As the President said a little earlier today, just a few minutes ago, he was sad for the children. And I think those reports, whatever happens now in court, are sad and sad for the children. We don't need for our children to be disillusioned in this effort.

Q What's your analysis of Biden's program, which among other things calls for spending more money than this?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Well, the fact that Senator Biden would come forward with a program calling for more money was no surprise to us. As I said this morning, I don't know what the Senate Appropriations Committee position is on this, but I guess I said this morning, "It's ten o'clock, Senate Appropriations Committee, do you know where Joe Biden is and do you know what he's saying?" He's calling for an additional \$5 billion. In terms of the large areas,

we agree.

You know, we are all disciples of the National Drug Control Strategy now. Including Joe Biden. He may say he is not, but he is. The broad outlines are there. Now, this was from the mountain top and a lot of this is what most people who have studied this problem would agree to. But we all agree we need to do better in law enforcement, more efforts there, and interdiction offshore, and prevention, and treatment and so on. And we all agree on that. And Biden says some very nice things about us in his report; thinks we've made progress. And that's good. The main areas are areas of agreement.

We say 380 additional DEA agents; Biden says 500. Big deal. I mean this is not a fundamental matter of principle. Biden says that we focus on the casual user and we shouldn't. That I disagree with for two reasons; one, the casual user is important. Every time in the last 15 years people have talked about an effort against drugs, the casual users have been forgotten. And if you talk to people in the field they will tell you this is the person who is driving the whole enterprise.

But we don't put a whole lot of resources in the federal government trying to bring the casual user around to good sense and better behavior. This is essentially a job for local government, and we think that's appropriate. But if you neglect the casual user and just focus on the addict you're missing the point. Addicts come from casual users. Most people do not wake up in the morning and say, I want to become a burned-out drug addict. They just want to fiddle around with it and then they become addicts. So if you don't focus on the user you are not focusing on the point of entry.

But that -- you know -- and I'm sure Biden would say he takes the casual user serious, just a matter of emphasis. So I think there are large areas of agreement. Now comes what I call budget ball. We threw the ball out they say, no, that's good enough. Three billion more. And now we'll have this somewhat heated, somewhat muted debate for the next three months.

We'll see. Look, I mean this is very serious money we're talking about. This is a -- our proposal is a 69-percent increase since George Bush took office.

Q Zero --

DIRECTOR BENNETT: It was five -- six-three, to nine-five, to ten-six.

Q How much more did you want?

(Laughter.) DIRECTOR BENNETT: Everything. I asked for everything. I said, Darman, how much do you have? I want it all.

Q Were those your exact words? (Laughter.)

Q Of the five high-intensity drug-trafficking areas -- how will that \$50 million be divided between them? And secondly, when do you hope to see it having some impact on these areas?

MR. MORRIS: Again, let me clarify in the high-intensity drug-trafficking areas. There's two parts of the program. First is the allocation of federal resources into these areas. That's \$250 million -- nearly 2,000 agents and prosecutors in these areas. We've figured out where to put those resources. The other money -- the \$25 million that's available, the \$50 million, the 100 percent increase the President's requesting -- that, we are going to be working with the state and locals to figure out what gaps are left, given the level of commitment we've made and the activities that they've made. Those consultations will begin immediately

Q Mr. Bennett, a few months ago you characterized the

MORE

District of Columbia as a city out of control. As a city out of control. You said it was being poorly served by its government. Has anything changed in that time? Without prejudging the case, could the arrest and charging of the Mayor be an advance in the war on drugs? There's been a lot of criticism in this country about not going after politicians and other folks who use drugs.

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Right. We'll see. I think anybody who is here -- well, even anybody who isn't -- any American has to weep a little bit for this and for this city and for the fact that it's the murder capital of the country. And it's a very sad situation. And we've got to get to work to make it better. But you just can't do that from the outside. It has to be done inside. Regeneration comes from within. And I think there are an awful lot of people in this town who want to make it better and who may take recent events as the occasion to really turn that anger and that frustration into something positive.

Judge Walton, would you like to comment on that?

JUDGE WALTON: Yes. I've been working very closely with Sterling Tucker, and I think one positive thing that has happened is the fact that he's been put in charge of this effort. As a result of that, he has assembled a number of community leaders who are working together very closely, and I understand they expect to present a plan to him of attack in March or April. And once that is put forward, I think that will be a good move towards healing the Nation's Capital's problems.

Q Mr. Bennett, by announcing the death sentence for drug lords, are we presenting danger to the President as he's planning to go to Colombia?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Oh, no. You mean -- oh, no. They already know we mean business. I think word about Gacha has gotten out and about other things; I don't think there's any question about it. But if anybody has any doubts about George Bush's seriousness about the drug issue, they ought to reflect about his interest and willingness and determination to go to this meeting in Cartagena.

Q What about my question of interdiction, Mr. Bennett?

Q -- extradition treaties --

DIRECTOR BENNETT: No. I mean you'd have to adjust to those. In those circumstances where the extradition treaty is based on an agreement not to apply the death penalty, you wouldn't.

Q But doesn't it bother you as a matter of equity that the major kingpins in Colombia, if they were extradited, couldn't get more than 30 years in prison while you want to put to death kids on the streets of Washington and other cities who you catch dealing drugs?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Well, I think -- again, it would be a matter of discretion, and we wouldn't ask for it in every case where it would be possible to ask for it. You'd only ask for it in those severe cases.

As a matter of equity, it would bother me a little bit. But this is part of the international agreement. And it is much better to have the extradition agreement even with a hard 30 years as the maximum than not to have it at all. But maybe the situation and the extradition agreements may change. And as you no doubt observed, the fate of all the kingpins -- the fate of other kingpins in Colombia may not be that of a 30-year sentence. It may resemble what happened to Mr. Gacha. Mr. Barco is serious, and as I understand, the pursuit by the police and the military in Colombia, the orders are to take them anyway they can.

Q Your remarks at the beginning of this briefing were

remarkably upbeat. You talked about the scourge beginning to end, and the war that's winnable.

DIRECTOR BENNETT: Yes, it is.

Q You've rattled off a long list of successes. For a program that's been in effect -- what -- for four months, you've barely had time to get agents trained and into the field.

DIRECTOR BENNETT: I know.

Q My question would be, is it turning out that the problem is less serious than you thought it was in the beginning?

DIRECTOR BENNETT: No, I think the problem is as serious as we thought. But it's not just a matter of the federal program or the federal strategy. Things that are at work are things that are at work because of the American people. They decided to stop using drugs and decided to put pressure on neighbors, friends, children, spouses and employees. They have cut drug use down.

Now, the serious effort on the part of the federal government should be able to help those efforts of the American people. But I think things are different now than they were a year ago for a lot of reasons. And some of them I mentioned. We now do have a plan and a strategy. We've made some progress in this country without a plan and a strategy. Now, with a plan and a strategy, a 69 percent increase in resources, the Department of Defense seriously involved, some of the cartel on the run, much greater international agreement, a hardening of the public's attitude -- did you see the survey of the college students the other day? Moving to the left, they said, on everything except drugs? You talk to somebody about David Musto, professor at Yale, who I think is America's most distinguished scholar, historian of this issue, and he'll tell you these are all very, very positive signs.

There's still a long way to go, and there's still some reluctance in some quarters to do what needs to be done. I mean, I wish every school principal, I wish every employer, I wish everybody who sets policy in the public would step up to it the way some have; we'd just end it all that much sooner. But you go around to these communities, and you see people like Al Brooks in Kansas City and other people around the country, and what people in those communities are learning is that they can fight back and have some success, and they can prevail. They can win. They can regain some streets, regain the neighborhood. And we're not out of the woods yet, but I think the scourge is beginning to end. I think we do have momentum. We've still got this ridiculous distraction of the legalization debate, but happily it's still not having much of an impact on the American people. The legalization debate, is, there's Godzilla; let's just give him a license and a collar and a big bowl and then invite him into the house and maybe he'll behave himself.

It's an argument that doesn't make any sense, Read James Q. Wilson's brilliant refutation of it in this month's Commentary Magazine. But on the other hand, we're now seeing -- we got a rope, and we got a stick, and we got a cage that we're building for Godzilla and, lo and behold, people in neighborhoods and in South America and other places have started to poke at Godzilla. And you know what, we didn't get all fire and teeth; we saw him backing off a little bit. And that's very encouraging. We've got a long way to go, we're not there yet, but we've got the momentum. I got to go.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

2:44 P.M. EST

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
01. Fax	David Tell to Peggy Dooley, Re: Drug Material in the "Accomplishments" Package. (2 pp.)	11/16/89	P-5	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Grant, Mary Kate
Subseries: Subject File
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Drug Strategy 9/89 - 1/90

Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)
 By SN (NLGD) on 4/8/2005

Date Closed: 12/20/2004	OA/ID Number: 04423
FOIA/SYS Case #:	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #: 2005-0482-S	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #:
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition:
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
 P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
 P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
 P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
 P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
 P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
 (b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
 (b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
 (b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
 (b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
 (b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
 (b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
 (b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.




OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
Washington, D.C. 20500



November 16, 1989

FAX TRANSMISSION TO: Peggy Dooley
Office of Research, WHO

FROM: David Tell 
Deputy Chief of Staff, ONDCP

SUBJECT: Drug Material in the
"Accomplishments" Package

PAGES: Five (4), including this

I attach a copy of the three-page fact sheet issued by Fitzwater's office on September 5 as a summary accompaniment to the President's speech -- and to his National Drug Control Strategy. This fact sheet still makes the best short guide to existing Administration drug policies and proposals, and I would suggest that you steal from it quite heavily as you formulate the drug section of your "accomplishments" package.

The draft you sent me has a number of misplaced emphases, and some significant parts of it (especially the budget numbers) are now obsolete. As a quick and dirty, I caution you especially about the following:

1) The President does not, in fact, believe that a "four-pronged approach is key." He highlighted those four prongs in his television address, but those were highlights only; they were not the whole enchilada. The Drug strategy in fact lays out major new priorities in five principal areas: the criminal justice system; drug treatment; education, community action, and the workplace; international initiatives; and interdiction efforts. It also outlines an agenda for supporting activities in two areas: research and intelligence.

2) It'll probably cause you unnecessary trouble if you discuss "zero tolerance" in this document. Technically speaking, "zero tolerance" describes a Coast Guard policy about seizures of people's yachts and whatnot. It's difficult to say that zero tolerance is "the policy of this Administration" as a whole. And since CG's zero tolerance guidelines have been revised more than once since originally promulgated in the last Administration, it's not the strongest plank on which to stand President Bush's entire

-2-

drug strategy. ZT isn't mentioned -- not even once -- in the entire National Drug Control Strategy.

3) I'm not sure how old the material on which you guys are basing your budget discussion is. "Over \$6 billion" as a figure for the President's 9/5 drug request is accurate, sort of. But the actual figure was \$7.9 billion. "Nearly \$1.1 billion for education and prevention" isn't quite right, either; the actual outlay figure was \$1.001 billion, and the BA figure was \$1.176 billion. That wasn't a 16% plus-up over FY89; it was 25% (BA) and 47% (outlays).

All the other categories' numbers are weird, too; I'm not sure where you're getting them. But it doesn't really matter anyhow, since the final bills the President will sign are going to reflect some additional Congressionally derived budget increases. Depending on when your accomplishments package is going to be released, I'd suggest you leave the numbers blank until we know for sure what the final legislation is going to look like. Then you can plug some general numbers into your paper, and the President can justly claim credit for instituting and formulating the entire, new Federal effort.

4) Better not to conflate interdiction and enforcement all the time. At least budgetarily, we're backing off the old interdiction-heavy Reagan strategies just a bit, and we're getting a lot of praise for it. Also, I wouldn't brag that 70 percent of the President's budget is going toward "supply." That's the biggest reason Congress was able to attach several hundred million extra "demand" dollars onto our package in the first place. The President's supply-demand ratio is the right and proper one, but it's been a difficult and complicated argument to make in public, and you shouldn't bother trying to make it again here.

5) It's kind of funny to mention Operation Snowcap after the phrase "inspection, interdiction, intelligence efforts and crop eradication programs." That covers a lot of ground. Operation Snowcap is just a single operation; there are lots of others.

6) I don't think the District of Columbia emergency assistance plan merits separate mention. That, too, is just a single operation. And it might be best to give the President some distance on this one, in any case.

7) You should make separate mention of the President's television address to the nation -- his only such speech, and a major demonstration of Presidential commitment. You should also make separate (and primary) mention of the President's submission of the first National Drug Control Strategy, and its overwhelming popular and Congressional support.

Call me if you'd like to discuss any of this.

THE WHITE HOUSE**Office of the Press Secretary**

Embargoed For Release Until 9:00 P.M. EDT
September 5, 1989

FACT SHEET**NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY**

The National Drug Control Strategy describes a coordinated and comprehensive plan of attack involving all basic anti-drug initiatives and agencies. The Strategy recommends the largest dollar increase in the history of the drug war -- nearly \$2.2 billion, 39 percent above the Fiscal 1989 level. Throughout, the Strategy emphasizes the principle of user accountability -- in law enforcement efforts focused on individual users; in decisions regarding sentencing and parole; in school, college, and university policies regarding the use of drugs by students and employees; in the workplace; and in treatment.

The Strategy also calls for increased efforts in cocaine source countries and a more active international campaign by the United States to engage other nations in the fight against drugs. Interdiction efforts will be better targeted on key individuals in the drug organizations and on high-value shipments.

Another major priority is increasing the capacity of the drug treatment system and making it more accountable for results. Significant emphasis is also given to providing increased support for prevention and education efforts aimed at helping young people and others resist and reject drugs.

The Strategy embodies the following elements:

Expand the criminal justice system

- o Provide funds for larger police forces, and increased numbers of jails, prosecutors, and courts.
- o Develop alternatives for incarceration such as boot camps to free up jail and prison space.
- o Require drug testing of prisoners, parolees, and arrestees.

Page 2

Hold users, whether casual or heavy users, accountable for their actionsUndertake a vigorous program to eradicate domestically-grown marijuanaMobilize communities in the war on drugs

- o Emphasize community-level prevention of drug use before it starts.
- o Require schools and colleges to implement firm drug-free policies in order to receive Federal funds.
- o Clean up and secure public housing.

Expand drug-free workplace policies

- o Promote drug-free workplace policies in the private sector; *and implement drug-free workplace policies w/in Fed Gov't*
- o Recommend testing for job applicants and employers in safety and sensitive positions.
- o Aggressively implement Executive Order 12564 to assure drug-free workplace plans and policies within the Federal government.

Expand treatment and target services to improve the number of individuals served and the effectiveness of treatment

- o Hold Federally-funded treatment programs accountable for their effectiveness by establishing performance criteria.
- o Require drug testing in treatment programs receiving Federal funds.
- o Explore expanded use of "civil commitment" whereby addicts are sent by the courts to residential treatment facilities.
- o Improve drug treatment services for pregnant women.

Place heavier emphasis on targeted international efforts closer to production and trafficking sources

- o Elevate the drug issue as a foreign policy priority.
- o Dismantle drug trafficking organizations.
- o Reduce trafficking profits by focusing increased efforts on money laundering.

Page 3

Take a fresh approach to interdiction

- o Create interagency and interdisciplinary teams to analyze and target smuggling modes, methods, and routes.
- o Target key individuals and high-value shipments.
- o Enhance border interdiction systems, operations, and activities.

Improve the quality of research, information, and technological capabilities available for drug control efforts

- o Establish a Federal Drug Control Research and Development Committee.
- o Develop a more current and flexible information base.

Improve coordination of Federal anti-drug policy and intelligence support

- o Establish interagency working groups chaired by the Office of National Drug Control Policy to coordinate supply and demand reduction efforts.
- o Establish an interagency working group chaired by the Office of National Drug Control Policy to develop plans for an intelligence center to unite U.S. drug-related analytical capabilities, and to improve intelligence capabilities.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
02. Report	Prepared for the Cabinet by Office of National Drug Control Policy and OMB [Office of Management and Budget], Re: Briefing Papers: Selected Questions and Answers on The President's Natinoal Drug Control Strategy. (18 pp.)	09/05/89	B-5	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Grant, Mary Kate
Subseries: Subject File
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Drug Strategy 9/89 - 1/90

**Open on Expiration of PRA
(Document Follows)**
By SN (NLGB) on 4/5/2005

Date Closed: 12/20/2004	OA/ID Number: 04423
FOIA/SYS Case #:	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #: 2005-0482-S	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #:
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition:
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

<p>Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]</p> <p>P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA] P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA] P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA] P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA] P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA] P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]</p> <p>C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.</p> <p>PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.</p>	<p>Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]</p> <p>(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA] (b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA] (b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA] (b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA] (b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA] (b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA] (b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA] (b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information</p>
---	---

CLOSE HOLD

BRIEFING PAPERS

Selected Questions and Answers on
The President's National Drug Control Strategy

September 5, 1989

Note: This material was prepared for the Cabinet by the Office of National Drug Control Policy and OMB. This document is not for public circulation. For additional information, contact John Walters (673-2520) or Bruce Carnes (673-2628) at ONDCP.

DEMAND vs. SUPPLY

QUESTION:

How have you divided your budget between "supply" vs. "demand" programs?

ANSWER:

- The "simple" answer to your question is about 73 percent for supply reduction, and about 27 percent for demand reduction.
- But let me comment on the question and elaborate on the answer.
- Often, law enforcement resources are viewed entirely as supply reduction in nature and only those resources that are directly spent on education or treatment activities are considered demand reduction.
- A supply/demand distinction that looks only at the bottom line of the budget overlooks a very important residual impact of supply side programs. Many law enforcement activities have a profound impact on demand reduction, and are so intended. When a juvenile is arrested and punished for illegal drug use it sends a message to his friends and schoolmates that will deter them from drug use. When users are held accountable for their actions many people will be persuaded never to try drugs in the first place or to stop. Thus, while 73 percent of the budget's "bottom line" is for supply reduction programs, a large portion of this funding will have an impact on and is aimed at reducing demand.
- Further, supply reduction activities are inherently expensive (cars, aircraft, and prisons are all very costly), whereas many demand reduction activities rely less on capital outlays and more on community involvement and individual commitment (e.g., getting schools to treat drug abuse seriously doesn't require a budget line item).
- Lastly, many of the supply reduction activities can only be done by the Federal government (international activities and interdiction operations, for example), whereas most of the demand reduction efforts can and should be shared in by State and local governments, our schools, churches, and communities.

BALANCE BETWEEN SUPPLY AND DEMAND RESOURCES

QUESTION:

How did you reach the conclusion that this was the appropriate balance between supply and demand?

ANSWER:

- I started by asking the question, "What would make people stop using drugs?" The conclusion I reached, after months of looking at the problem and talking with hundreds of experts, was two-fold: reduce the easy access to drugs and increase people's motivation to stay away from drugs.
- To reduce the availability of drugs, we have proposed an ambitious international initiative and other enhancements to the Federal law enforcement program.
- To increase people's motivation to become or stay drug-free, we are proposing increases for traditional prevention and treatment activities and increases for State and local law enforcement grants, Federal prison construction and prosecutions to increase the likelihood that drug users will be held accountable for their drug use, and thereby be deterred from further drug use.

Prepared by F. Kalder

LAW ENFORCEMENT AND DRUG DEMAND

QUESTION

We could solve the drug problem if people just stopped buying drugs. Why spend large sums on police and interdiction when we could just stop the problem through prevention and treatment programs?

ANSWER

- We need to deal with both the supply and demand side of the equation. It is harder for users to stop while drugs are easily available. We must attempt to reduce the supply because fewer people will be able to use drugs when drugs are less available.
- Good law enforcement deters demand. For the so-called casual user, creating a real cost of present drug use is a true deterrent to future demand. And for the addicted user, who may resort to a life of crime to support his habit, the certainty of punishment may finally lead to an acceptance of personal responsibility and a motivation to enter treatment.
- In addition, law abiding citizens are entitled to live without fear of drug-related violence. When drug dealers move into a neighborhood, it is incumbent on local government to provide necessary levels of police protection.
- Reducing drug availability makes it easier to prevent drug use from ever starting. By making it harder to obtain drugs, we increase the effectiveness of prevention programs.

TOBACCO AND ALCOHOL

QUESTION

The Strategy doesn't emphasize or even talk about the most dangerous drugs in America, alcohol and tobacco. At the same time, cocaine and crack are special targets for the Strategy. Why?

ANSWER

- Many Surgeons General have emphasized the dangers of alcohol and tobacco, and the use of both is falling. However, we must remember that alcohol and tobacco are not controlled substances.
- The greatest current dangers are cocaine and crack. These are especially addictive and increasingly popular drugs. For example, the period between first use and addiction for cocaine is extraordinarily short, and there are few simple strategies for treatment; there are fewer for crack although there is hope. At the same time, emergency room visits and deaths from cocaine and crack have risen very steeply.
- As a result, cocaine and crack are special targets for the Strategy if we are to win the war on drugs.

USER ACCOUNTABILITY PROVISIONS

QUESTION

Your Strategy heavily emphasizes the notion of "user accountability." Is this primarily a criminal justice priority?

ANSWER

No. In addition to the criminal justice aspects, there are "user accountability" provisions throughout the entire Strategy.

Criminal Justice

- o Stiffer penalties for drug dealers and violent offenders.
- o Military-style boot camps for young, non-violent, first-time offenders.
- o Denial of Federal benefits for convicted offenders.
- o Drug-testing probationers and parolees, and re-incarcerating those with "dirty" urines.
- o Sanctions for casual users:
 - Fines.
 - Forfeitures of cars or other property.
 - Publication of names in local newspapers.
 - Suspension of driver's license.
 - Notification of employer.
 - Overnight or weekend detention.
 - Eviction from public housing.
- o Sanctions for young people:
 - Postponement of eligibility for driver's license.
 - Weekends of community service.

Drug Treatment

- o Random urinalysis of users in treatment.
- o Sanctions for those who test positive:
 - Denial of methadone.
 - Transfer to a more structured program.
 - Loss of job.
 - Loss of weekend passes.
 - Loss of visiting privileges.

Education and Workplace

- o Sanctions for students:
 - Suspension from school.
 - Notification of parents.
 - Mandatory drug abuse counseling.
- o Workplace:
 - Drug testing.
 - Employee assistance programs.
 - Referral to treatment programs.
 - Suspension or termination of employment.

TREATMENT ON DEMAND

QUESTION

Do you favor treatment on demand?

ANSWER

- More treatment slots should be available, and the Strategy recommends substantial increases in Federal aid for treatment. However, I believe that those who can afford to pay for treatment should be required to pay.
- In addition, "treatment on demand" puts the addict completely in the driver's seat, with all decisions about when to start and when to stop completely up to him. Such programs often result in "revolving door" treatment where addicts don't go to treatment to end addiction but to reduce their habit to more manageable proportions. That is not adequate treatment.

NUMBER TO BE HELPED BY DRUG TREATMENT

QUESTION

Why do you think that only 2 million of the 4 million people with serious drug problems could be helped by treatment?

ANSWER

- o The 4 million estimate is based on the number of serious drug users in 1988 who used drugs more than 200 times in a year.
- o The estimate of 2 million out of 4 million is based on prior professional judgments by clinicians who work with drug addicts, and the Strategy calls for additional research so we learn know more exactly what treatment works best for which people.
- o Clinicians believe that about one quarter of drug users will stop when sanctions are increased and one quarter of addicts are not likely to benefit from treatment.

TREATMENT WAITING LISTS

QUESTION

Why are there waiting lists at some treatment facilities while others have room for patients? How will your Strategy reduce waiting lists?

ANSWER

- o Treatment facilities today may not be located in the neighborhoods where need is greatest. They may not offer the type of treatment needed in the particular community. Appropriate coordination in the treatment system is overdue. That is why the Strategy calls for greater coordination among local treatment facilities so that treatment resources and availability match community needs.
- o The Strategy recommends changes in both the quantity and quality of drug treatment. We call for increases in Federal support to treatment in order to expand the number of treatment slots and the range of treatment methods available. The Strategy calls for about \$700 million in 1990 Federal support for treatment. If State and local funding and third-party payment continue in their present pattern, the number of treatment slots will more than double compared to 1987, the latest year for which we have data.
- o In addition, the Strategy calls for improved coordination at the State and local level so that treatment availability matches community need.
- o Further, the Strategy recommends changes in Federal funding to hold treatment programs accountable for their effectiveness. We support more treatment slots that work.

TREATMENT SLOTS

QUESTION

How many treatment slots are there, and how many people need treatment? How many slots will there be if your funding proposal is accepted? How many of these slots will be provided by the Federal government?

ANSWER

o How Federal funds work:

- The Federal government does not fund treatment slots, except for those in VA and Department of Defense hospitals. Direct Federal support for drug treatment in States and localities flows primarily through block grant and other program support to State governments. The States then channel these Federal funds, together with funds of their own, to localities or directly to treatment facilities, to use for the programs and patients they deem appropriate.
- At the treatment facility level funds are pooled. How much Federal money will be used for a given patient in a given treatment slot depends on the cost of treatment at the particular facility, the type of treatment, the type of patient, and whether the patient has insurance coverage, Medicaid coverage, or pays a fee for treatment. [NOTE: This is like Chapter 1 of Elementary and Secondary Education]. Thus, Federal support helps to pay for treatment across the whole range of slots in the entire treatment system.

o Number of Slots:

- The National Institute on Drug Abuse reported that in October 1987 there were 338,365 treatment slots and 263,510 drug clients, at a total cost of approximately \$1.3 billion. Federal support for treatment was almost \$300 million.
- o We recommend Federal funding for treatment in 1990 of about \$700 million, more than doubling Federal funding for treatment in inflation-adjusted dollars compared to 1987.
- o If the previous pattern of State and local funding, insurance, other third-party coverage holds, this new funding level would more than double the treatment capacity, compared to 1987, to about 700,000 treatment slots.

COST OF TREATING COCAINE USER

QUESTION

What is the range of costs, and what is the average cost, of treating a cocaine user?

ANSWER

- Our current cost information on the national treatment system (the NDATUS survey from NIDA) does not separate treatment costs for cocaine from costs of other drug treatment.
- There is information on the average cost of treatment slots from facilities that provide only a single type of treatment. In 1987, these costs ranged from approximately \$2,000 per year for outpatient slots to \$28,000 per year for inpatient slots.
- The average annual cost per filled slot was approximately \$5,000 in 1987.
- The average cocaine user in treatment is likely to have outpatient treatment. NIDA indicates that those slots cost approximately \$2,000 per year; however, that figure may be low.

FUNDING INCREASES FOR PREVENTION AND EDUCATION

QUESTION:

You are requesting an additional \$233 million for prevention and education in 1990. What will these funds be used for?

ANSWER:

- Almost one-half of these funds will be used by HHS/ADAMHA for drug prevention grants and for research.
- The remaining funds will be used by other agencies including ED for the Drug Free Schools and Communities program, HUD for the Public Housing Drug Elimination program, and OJP for the Drug Control and System Improvement program.

prepared by DW Kade, 8/25

DRUG TESTING - WORKPLACE

QUESTION

What should happen to employees who test positive in the workplace for drug use?

ANSWER

- People who test positive for drugs should be offered assistance, but also face sanctions. Assistance may take the form of a formalized employee assistance program (EAPs) or it may constitute referral to available community resources.
- Employers should take appropriate personnel action against employees who refuse voluntary treatment or who are repeat offenders. Appropriate action could include immediate suspension or termination or mandatory completion of a drug treatment program.
- EAPs can benefit both employers and employees. In the private sector, over 31 percent of all American workers are currently employed by companies with EAPs. These plans deter drug use, keep the workplace safe, and help employees who have problems by referring them to treatment, counseling, and rehabilitation.
- The EAP is an important component of the Federal drug-free workplace plans, required by Executive Order 12564. Our strategy recommends that each Federal agency fully implement these plans by April 5, 1990.

WAR ON DRUGS - THE ROLE OF INTELLIGENCE

QUESTION

What is the overall role of intelligence in the war on drugs and have we been effective in using our existing intelligence resources in the war?

ANSWER

- o No war can be fought -- much less won -- without good intelligence. As we wage our war on drugs, we must have the best available information about our adversaries and the field of battle itself. The role of intelligence is to give us the information we need about our enemy -- so we can better understand how he thinks, what he can and can't do, and how he might respond to our attack.
- o To consistently attack drug traffickers where it will do the most good, we must know much more about them than we do now. We must know how their infrastructure is organized and where the most vulnerable points of that structure are found. This could include where they base their operations, how they provide for security and intelligence gathering, who they control, who controls them, how they move and launder their profits, who their enemies are, and where their strengths and weaknesses lie.
- o Past efforts have not been as successful as they could have been. Change is needed. This does not mean simply spending more money - it means using all our resources in coordinated and imaginative ways. We must expand and improve our intelligence network and better use our vast intelligence resources to stay one step ahead of the cartels and trafficking organizations - we must be quicker and smarter than they are. They are our enemies, and we need to make it clear to them that they are in a war they cannot win against a foe that will not quit.

FUNDING -- INTERNATIONAL

QUESTION:

You are requesting \$448.5 million for international activities in FY 1990. What will these funds be used for?

ANSWER:

- o The FY 1990 \$448.5 million proposed for international counter-narcotics activities represents an increase of \$198.5 million, or 79% over the level for FY 1989.
- o These funds will support the activities of DOD, DEA, the Department of State's Bureau of International Narcotics Matters (INM), AID, INTERPOL, USIA, the FBI, and the U.S. Marshals Service. It will also provide other types of foreign assistance to cooperating drug producing countries.
- o Funding highlights are:
 - \$136.8 million in FY 1990 DOD funds will support a comprehensive multi-year counter-narcotics effort in the three principal cocaine producing countries.
 - For DEA \$118.3 million in FY 1990 funds will permit the expansion of foreign drug suppression/enforcement programs in source countries as well as support the international initiative.
 - \$115 million intended for State's INM will allow for enhanced enforcement and eradication, especially in the cocaine-producing countries of South America.
 - With \$4.8 million in FY 1990 funds, AID will support narcotics control objectives through targeted development assistance, and narcotics awareness and administration of justice programs.
 - INTERPOL will use \$1.1 million of FY 1990 funds to facilitate drug-related international law enforcement cooperation by providing enhancements for telecommunications improvements that will significantly increase the speed and accuracy with which cases and investigative material is processed.
 - For USIA, \$1 million in FY 1990 funds will support drug-related diplomacy programs in their overseas missions and Voice of America broadcasts.
 - \$0.5 million for the FBI will facilitate the targeting of major international drug trafficking organizations and international money laundering investigations.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE INTERDICTION PROGRAM

QUESTION

Why doesn't the Strategy recommend additional funds for interdiction?

ANSWER:

- For many years, Federal drug control resources were concentrated on drug law enforcement, primarily for interdiction and investigations. The strategy seeks to provide a balance to the drug control program by now concentrating more resources on the demand side, for prevention and education, on going to the source countries, and on street-level law enforcement.
- Interdiction received the lion's share of the increase in resources in recent years for drug law enforcement, a full 64 percent of the \$1.2 billion increase in drug law enforcement resources between 1986 and 1989.
- Evidence suggests interdiction alone will not win the war on drugs. The supply of illegal drugs entering the country continues to grow and drug prices continue to drop despite increased seizures by law enforcement agencies. This suggests that our interdiction successes are having only a limited impact on the drug traffickers.
- Moreover, recent experience demonstrates that smugglers adapt to efforts to prevent them from exporting drugs to our country. Responding to a vigorous air interdiction effort, the drug threat has shifted from the air to the land borders and containerized cargo. For this reason, we are recommending increases for the Customs Service and Border Patrol.
- We do not believe that increased investments in interdiction are warranted at this time. Past investments in detection and monitoring assets are only now coming on line and we should evaluate their efficacy before investing in other systems. The Strategy supports the operation of these assets to full advantage so as to not leave our borders unprotected.

FUNDING FOR THE AEROSTAT NETWORK

QUESTION

Why didn't you recommend funding to complete the aerostat network already so close to completion?

ANSWER:

- o The Strategy supports completion of the fixed and mobile detection network along our Southern border.
- o By our accounting, not much more remains to be done. The National Drug Policy Board called for a total of 16 aerostats along the Southern border. Twelve of these are already fully funded. The relocation of one more should be completed in FY 1990. The three remaining aerostats (two in the Gulf and one in the Caribbean) may be funded in FY 1990 using funds appropriated to DoD for detection and monitoring.

BACKGROUND: According to the National Drug Policy Board's Air Interdiction Strategy, sixteen aerostats are planned for the Southern border. Six aerostats are along the Southwest border, five are planned for the Gulf, and five for the Caribbean. This strategy is almost fully implemented.

- o The six on the Southwest border are fully funded and all will be operational by the end of calendar year 1989.
- o Two aerostats are funded in the Gulf and will be operational by the end of calendar year 1990. A third is being relocated (from Patrick AFB to Venice, FL) and may also be operational during 1990. The status of the remaining two is uncertain but could be funded by DoD with 1990 funds.
- o Two of the five Caribbean aerostats are operational, a third will be operational this December, and a fourth in February. The status of the fifth is uncertain.

DoD has lead agency responsibility for detection and monitoring. It is developing a project plan for 1990, which will likely determine the outcome of the remaining unfunded aerostats.

Prepared by: John Carnevale

DoD INTERDICTION BUDGET

QUESTION

The Strategy recommends a total of \$568 million for DoD in 1990. What will these funds be used for?

ANSWER

- o Of the total \$568 million planned for DoD in 1990, \$313 million will be used to continue DoD's interdiction efforts, \$137 million will be used for international efforts, and \$118 million will be used for prevention and treatment.
- o The resources planned for interdiction are for intelligence upgrades, for moving an aerostat from Cape Canaveral to Venice, Florida, for national guard operations, and for other anti-drug initiatives.
- o The \$137 million proposed will provide military assistance to certain governments in cocaine-producing countries.

TALKING POINTS: PRESIDENTIAL BRIEFING
METRO REPORTERS FROM REGIONAL PRESS
ON NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY

The strength of the Administration's **National Drug Control Strategy** lies in three aspects:

- o **Comprehensive Strategy:** This is the first such national strategy to end the evil of drug use and drug trafficking, a fully integrated approach that is an assault on every front. Our plan addresses all the elements necessary to an effective strategy: school and drug prevention programs, our treatment system, our laws and criminal justice system, and our foreign policy.
- o **Coordinated Approach:** Jurisdictional and "turf" problems have slowed past anti-drug efforts. Therefore, we have emphasized the need for a coordinated national effort. This means federal, state and local levels must work together. At the federal level, with the leadership of the Director of National Drug Control Policy, William Bennett, strong inter-agency cooperation has already resulted.
- o **Bipartisan Consensus:** Americans agree that the gravest domestic threat facing the country today is drugs. I am looking to the leadership in Congress for bipartisan support in the implementation of this strategy, and am looking to the grass-roots support of America's communities in the fight against drugs.

The evidence suggests that the drug problem is a grave threat:

- o **Good and Bad News:** The National Institute of Drug Abuse's recently released national survey of drug use (the first since 1985) indicates that number of Americans using any illegal drug on a "current" basis has dropped 37 percent. That means that almost nine million Americans have given up "casual" drug use. However, among the more than eight million people who used cocaine at all in the past year, almost one million of them used it once a week or more. So while overall cocaine use is down, habitual cocaine use has almost doubled.

Elements of the plan of special interest to regional press:

I. Criminal Justice:

- o Increase Federal funding to States and localities for **street-level law enforcement.**
- o Provide Federal funding to States for planning, developing, and implementing **alternative sentencing programs** for non-violent drug offenders, including house arrest and boot camps.
- o **Tighten bail, probation, parole and sentencing practices;** require **drug testing** of prisoners, parolees and arrestees; encourage States to **prosecute vigorously** all misdemeanor drug offenses.
- o Expand programs to eradicate the **domestic marijuana crop.**

- o Provide funding through the Department of Housing and Urban Development to help **restore order in hard-hit public housing projects** by kicking dealers out for good.
- o Strongly encourage States to adopt policies revoking the **drivers licenses** of those convicted of a drug offense.

II. Treatment:

- o **Increase Federal spending** by 53 percent, to \$321 million, on drug treatment programs that work.
- o Expand the **availability of drug treatment** by increasing treatment capacity and the range of treatment methods available.
- o Improve the efficacy of drug treatment by encouraging treatment facilities to **coordinate among themselves** so that **resources match community needs** and drug users are referred to the most appropriate treatment.
- o Expand outreach and treatment efforts for **pregnant women and newborn babies**, a special population of drug users.

III. Education and Prevention:

- o Education and prevention **programs in schools and communities** will be increased by \$233 million.
- o We are calling on every school, college, university, and workplace to **adopt tough, fair anti-drug policies**.
- o I will be addressing American schoolchildren in a special **televised address**, to discuss the war on drugs.

Budget Recommendations:

The Administration is proposing a \$2 billion increase in drug funding, from \$5.6 billion in 1989 to \$7.6 billion in 1990. Key funding priorities for fiscal year 1990:

- o Increase assistance to State and local law enforcement (\$200 million over FY 1989).
- o Build more Federal prisons, expand Federal and State courts and correctional systems, and add more prosecutors (\$790 million over FY 1989).
- o Expand resources for treatment and prevention programs (\$565 million over FY 1989).
- o Initiate a major anti-drug campaign in the source countries.
- o Establish order in the nation's public housing projects.
- o Step up efforts against money laundering operations.
- o Provide sufficient resources to operate and maintain our border interdiction system at its present level.

High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas:

The 1988 Anti-Drug Abuse Act authorizes the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy to designate "high intensity drug trafficking areas" for targeted Federal assistance. Designations will be made in a subsequent strategy, after consulting with the AG and governors.

#

September 5, 1989

TALKING POINTS

NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY

On September 5, President Bush announced the Administration's National Drug Control Strategy.

- o **Comprehensive Strategy:** This is the first such national strategy to end the evil of drug use and drug trafficking, a fully integrated approach that is an assault on every front. The President's strategy addresses all the elements necessary to an effective strategy: school and drug prevention programs, our treatment system, our laws and criminal justice system, and our foreign policy.
- o **Coordinated Approach:** Jurisdictional and "turf" problems have slowed past anti-drug efforts. Therefore, President Bush has emphasized the need for a coordinated national effort. This means federal, state and local levels must work together. At the federal level, with the leadership of the Director of National Drug Control Policy, William Bennett, strong interagency cooperation has already resulted.
- o **Bipartisan Consensus:** Americans agree that the gravest domestic threat facing the country today is drugs. The President is looking to the leadership in Congress for bipartisan support in the implementation of his strategy, and is looking to the grass-roots support of America's communities in the fight against drugs.
- o **Call to Action:** President Bush is issuing an urgent call to action to all Americans to support this national strategy. He challenges every citizen to make a personal commitment to help in the fight against drug abuse.

The evidence suggests that the drug problem is a grave threat:

- o **Good and Bad News:** The National Institute on Drug Abuse's recently released national survey of drug use (the first since 1985) indicates that number of Americans using any illegal drug on a "current" basis has dropped 37 percent. That means that almost nine million Americans have given up "casual" drug use. Among the more than eight million people who used cocaine at all in the past year, almost one million of them used it once a week or more. So while overall cocaine use is down, habitual cocaine use has almost doubled.

- o **Crime:** Fear of drugs and attendant crime are at an all-time high. Rates of drug-related homicide continue to rise -- sometimes alarmingly -- in cities around the country.
- o **Health:** The number of drug-related emergency hospital admissions increased by 121 percent between 1985 and 1988, and hundreds of thousands of babies are born each year to mothers who use drugs.
- o **The Economy:** A U.S. Chamber of Commerce estimate puts annual gross drug sales at \$100 billion -- more than our total gross agricultural income, and more than double the profits enjoyed by the Fortune 500 companies combined.
- o **Overseas:** In many foreign nations, the drug trade and the violence and corruption that go with it are causing serious social, economic, and political disruption. Trafficking threatens stability and democratic institutions.

The National Drug Control Strategy:

- o **Enforcement:** The Administration's enforcement strategy is based upon this principle: If you sell drugs, you will be caught; when caught you will be prosecuted; and if convicted, you will do time.
 - The criminal justice system will be enlarged across the board, at the local, state and federal levels.
 - The Administration is requesting a \$1.4 billion increase in drug-related federal spending on law enforcement, including a 133 percent increase -- or \$200 million -- in federal assistance to state and local law enforcement.
 - President Bush is seeking \$50 million through the Department of Housing and Urban Development to restore order in hard-hit public housing projects by kicking dealers out for good.
- o **International Interdiction:** The international drug trade poses a serious threat to the welfare, economy and national security of the United States.
 - \$1.5 billion dollars will be requested for interdiction efforts, especially for continued support of our Coast Guard and Customs agents to stop drugs at our borders.
 - \$260 million in military and law enforcement assistance for next year will be sought for Colombia, Bolivia and Peru, the first part of a five-year, \$2 billion program to fight drug producers, traffickers and smugglers.

Andean and other -- President Bush is seeking a drug summit with affected Western Hemisphere nations, to coordinate an Inter-American strategy against the cartels. *The President also* will negotiate international agreements to track drug money and punish money laundering.

- o **Treatment:** Experts believe that there are two million American drug users who can be helped by well-designed, existing programs, yet only 40 percent of them are actually getting the help they need.
 - A 53 percent increase, of \$321 million, will be sought in Federal spending on drug treatment programs that work.
 - The federal government will work with states to better coordinate the drug treatment system, and will encourage employers to establish Employee Assistance Programs that cover drug use.
 - Research will be expanded in the search for improved methods to break cocaine and crack addiction, and treatment efforts will be targeted on expectant mothers and crack babies.

- o **Education and Prevention:** We must stop drug abuse before it starts. The President is proposing:
 - Education and prevention programs in schools and communities will be increased by \$233 million.
 - The President called on every school, college, university, and workplace to adopt tough, fair anti-drug policies.
 - President Bush will be addressing American schoolchildren in a special televised address, to discuss the war on drugs.

#

FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY

September 5, 1989

TALKING POINTS

NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY

On September 5, President Bush announced the Administration's National Drug Control Strategy.

- o **Comprehensive Strategy:** This is the first such national strategy to end the evil of drug use and drug trafficking, a fully integrated approach that is an assault on every front. The President's strategy addresses all the elements necessary to an effective strategy: school and drug prevention programs, our treatment system, our laws and criminal justice system, and our foreign policy.
- o **Coordinated Approach:** Jurisdictional and "turf" problems have slowed past anti-drug efforts. Therefore, President Bush has emphasized the need for a coordinated national effort. This means federal, state and local levels must work together. At the federal level, with the leadership of the Director of National Drug Control Policy, William Bennett, strong interagency cooperation has already resulted.
- o **Bipartisan Consensus:** Americans agree that the gravest domestic threat facing the country today is drugs. The President is looking to the leadership in Congress for bipartisan support in the implementation of his strategy, and is looking to the grass-roots support of America's communities in the fight against drugs.
- o **Call to Action:** President Bush is issuing an urgent call to action to all Americans to support this national strategy. He challenges every citizen to make a personal commitment to help in the fight against drug abuse.

The evidence suggests that the drug problem is a grave threat:

- o **Good and Bad News:** The National Institute on Drug Abuse's recently released national survey of drug use (the first since 1985) indicates that number of Americans using any illegal drug on a "current" basis has dropped 37 percent. That means that almost nine million Americans have given up "casual" drug use. Among the more than eight million people who used cocaine at all in the past year, almost one million of them used it once a week or more. **So while overall cocaine use is down, habitual cocaine use has almost doubled.**

- o **Crime:** Fear of drugs and attendant crime are at an all-time high. Rates of drug-related homicide continue to rise -- sometimes alarmingly -- in cities around the country.
- o **Health:** The number of drug-related emergency hospital admissions increased by 121 percent between 1985 and 1988, and hundreds of thousands of babies are born each year to mothers who use drugs.
- o **The Economy:** A U.S. Chamber of Commerce estimate puts annual gross drug sales at \$100 billion -- more than our total gross agricultural income, and more than double the profits enjoyed by the Fortune 500 companies combined.
- o **Overseas:** In many foreign nations, the drug trade and the violence and corruption that go with it are causing serious social, economic, and political disruption. Trafficking threatens stability and democratic institutions.

The National Drug Control Strategy:

- o **Enforcement:** The Administration's enforcement strategy is based upon this principle: If you sell drugs, you will be caught; when caught you will be prosecuted; and if convicted, you will do time.
 - The criminal justice system will be enlarged across the board, at the local, state and federal levels.
 - The Administration is requesting a \$1.4 billion increase in drug-related federal spending on law enforcement, including a 133 percent increase -- or \$200 million -- in federal assistance to state and local law enforcement.
 - President Bush is seeking \$50 million through the Department of Housing and Urban Development to restore order in hard-hit public housing projects by kicking dealers out for good.
- o **International Interdiction:** The international drug trade poses a serious threat to the welfare, economy and national security of the United States.
 - \$1.5 billion dollars will be requested for interdiction efforts, especially for continued support of our Coast Guard and Customs agents to stop drugs at our borders.
 - \$260 million in military and law enforcement assistance for next year will be sought for Colombia, Bolivia and Peru, the first part of a five-year, \$2 billion program to fight drug producers, traffickers and smugglers.

- President Bush is seeking a drug summit with affected Western Hemisphere nations, to coordinate an Inter-American strategy against the cartels.
- The President will also negotiate international agreements to track drug money and punish money laundering.
- o **Treatment:** Experts believe that there are two million American drug users who can be helped by well-designed, existing programs, yet only 40 percent of them are actually getting the help they need.
 - A 53 percent increase, of \$321 million, will be sought in Federal spending on drug treatment programs that work.
 - The federal government will work with states to better coordinate the drug treatment system, and will encourage employers to establish Employee Assistance Programs that cover drug use.
 - Research will be expanded in the search for improved methods to break cocaine and crack addiction, and treatment efforts will be targeted on expectant mothers and crack babies.
- o **Education and Prevention:** We must stop drug abuse before it starts.
 - Education and prevention programs in schools and communities will be increased by \$233 million.
 - The President called on every school, college, university, and workplace to adopt tough, fair anti-drug policies.
 - President Bush will be addressing American schoolchildren in a special televised address, to discuss the war on drugs.

#