

think the problems exist in their local high schools. They go on to say, earth to parents, it is spring, and it may be time for a chat.

I would suggest everybody needs to take a chat with a youngster today, and I commend your reading this Wall Street Journal editorial.

The text of the Wall Street Journal editorial is as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

REVIEW & OUTLOOK—THE DOPE ON SPRING

About this time last year, a forwarded email message was making the rounds of college campuses. "Don't forget," the message advised, "the appropriate greeting is 'hi, how are you?' not 'how high are you?'"

This month, while grown-ups were busy preparing tax returns, a lot of their college-attending children were partaking in the annual springtime bacchanalian festivals either in warmer climes or in on-campus celebrations of some meaningful date in their school's history. On these occasions many of the students ingest a cornucopia of drugs that most of their parents (despite imagined babyboomer sophistication) have never heard of.

Nor does it seem they have much interest in knowing what's going on. Despite all the attention given to drug abuse, parents are apparently disinclined to believe that their kids are using drugs. In a study released last week by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, 71% of teenagers said they "had friends who use" marijuana and almost half admitted they themselves had tried it. But only 21% of parents thought that their little angels might partake (admittedly even that must go down as a higher percentage than their own parents would have conceded).

In fact, this is a drug "culture" with frightening differences from the glory days of 25 or 30 years ago. Today even "soft" drugs like marijuana can be as much as 10 times more potent than the joints their parents smoked. Because of crackdowns or smuggling, the neighborhood greenhouse business has flourished: New strains like "hydroponic," where the plants are grown without soil and "wet"—marijuana soaked in formaldehyde—have been increasing the drug's potency exponentially. Meanwhile, drug use among teenagers has doubled since 1990.

Other drugs, like methamphetamine, are also the product of basement alchemy, often involving youths producing it, which in turn introduces some of them to criminal enterprises. There are substantial profit margins in this new underworld for chemists who turn over-the-counter cold medicines into a particularly wicked concoction called "ice," "crank" or speed." Costing \$5 to \$25 a dose, it offers a high similar to powder cocaine, which retails at upward of \$100 a gram, but it is much more accessible to a middle-schooler's allowance. And these laboratories are proliferating.

Something else that's new: The spread of black-market pharmaceuticals like Ritalin and Ephedrine, which have become a hot commodity in many suburban neighborhoods. Last November, a group of suburban middle-schoolers got hauled in by Virginia police when the principal caught a seventh grader selling his Ritalin prescription to his pals. Other favorites come right off the store shelves: Krylon gold paint for inhaling and whipped-cream cans for nitrous oxide.

Last April, a 16-year old in a Chicago suburb was caught with 37 grams of marijuana, some opium and paraphernalia stashed in his parents' house. A 15-year-old set up shop selling pot, PCP, Ecstasy and Special K in an affluent District of Columbia suburb. These aren't just the kids from the wrong side of

the tracks. Ask any college student about the prevalence and diversity of the new chemical culture. You'll get an education.

For the '70s generation, famous for its hedonistic experimentalism, the statistics suggest a willful ignorance. Parents disbelieve, perhaps because they're afraid to find out the truth. Polls show that 82% believe drugs are a "serious problem nationally," but only 6% think the problem exists in their local high school.

The baby-boomers' self-indulgence has come home to roots, only this time there's no ideological crutch. What's becoming increasingly obvious is that Gen-X drug use involves teenagers who've rejected their parents' political ideals but adopted their libertinism. A 1995 study by the University of Michigan revealed that after a 13-year lull, teenage drug use had climbed three years in a row. Yet nearly one kid in three claimed that his or her parents have never discussed drugs with them. Only a quarter say it's a topic of frequent conversation.

Earth to parents: It's spring, and it might be time for a chat.

□ 1830

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

RANDOM DRUG TESTING OF HOUSE MEMBERS AND STAFF IS ILL-ADVISED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, the House is about to implement rule changes that will require random drug testing of all House Members and staff. Drug usage in this country, both legal and illegal, is a major problem and deserves serious attention. However, the proposal to test randomly individuals as a method to cut down on drug usage is ill-advised and should not be done.

The real issue here is not drugs but rather the issues of privacy, due process, probable cause and the fourth amendment. We are dealing with a constitutional issue of the utmost importance. It raises the question of whether or not we understand the overriding principle of the fourth amendment.

A broader but related question is whether or not it is the government's role to mold behavior, any more than it is the government's role to mold, regulate, tax and impede voluntary economic contractual arrangements.

No one advocates prior restraint to regulate journalistic expression, even though great harm has come over the century from the promotion of authoritarian ideas. Likewise, we do not advocate the regulation of political expression and religious beliefs, however bizarre and potentially harmful they may seem.

Yet we casually assume it is the role of government to regulate personal be-

havior to make one act more responsibly. A large number of us in this Chamber do not call for the regulation or banning of guns because someone might use a gun in an illegal fashion. We argue that it is the criminal that needs regulated and refuse to call for diminishing the freedom of law-abiding citizens because some individual might commit a crime with a gun.

Random drug testing is based on the same assumption made by anti-gun proponents. Unreasonable efforts at identifying the occasional and improbable drug user should not replace respect for our privacy. It is not worth it.

While some Members are more interested in regulating economic transactions in order to make a fairer society, there are others here who are more anxious to regulate personal behavior to make a good society. But both cling to the failed notion that governments, politicians and bureaucrats know what is best for everyone. If we casually allow our persons to be searched, why is it less important that our conversations, our papers and our telephones not be monitored as well? Vital information regarding drugs might be obtained in this manner as well. Especially we who champion the cause of limited government ought not be the promoters of the roving eye of Big Brother.

If we embark on this course to check randomly all congressional personnel for possible drug usage, it might be noted that the two most dangerous and destructive drugs in this country are alcohol and nicotine. To not include these in the efforts to do good is inconsistent, to say the least. Unfortunately, the administration is now pursuing an anti-tobacco policy that will be even less successful than the ill-fated Federal war on drugs.

I have one question for my colleagues: If we have so little respect for our own privacy, our own liberty and our own innocence, how can we be expected to protect the liberties, the privacy and the innocence of our constituents, which we have sworn an oath to do?

Those promoting these drug testing rules are well motivated, just as are those who promote economic welfare legislation. Members with good intentions attempting to solve social problems perversely use government power and inevitably hurt innocent people while rarely doing anything to prevent the anticipated destructive behavior of a few.

It is said that if one has nothing to hide, why object to testing? Because, quite simply, we have something to keep: our freedom, our privacy and the fourth amendment. The only answer to solving problems like this is to encourage purely voluntary drug testing, whereby each individual and each Member of the House makes the information available to those who are worried about issues like this.

VOUCHER PLAN RAISES UNREASONABLE EXPECTATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, in anticipation of bringing a bill to the floor, the Republican majority is pouring thousands of dollars into ads for a voucher bill. But I challenge them to use that to send some of the 7,500 kids they want to help to parochial schools, as they claim they want to do.

This is a political exercise. It has become a political perennial, because it comes every year. This year it is an election year charade. We know it is a charade because the President has promised to veto. If the majority is sincere, I challenge them to sit down with me and write a bill that can be signed.

This year a bill of this kind is a real insult because we have a real shot at exponential improvement in the D.C. public schools, finally.

One good example is the Summer Stars program about to begin. We will become the first big city school system to eliminate social promotion and replace it not only with a remedial program but with a program in the summer that helps youngsters catch up so they do not fail in the first place. A rigorous academic program is going to be put in place. Our youngsters are going to have to read 25 books next year in order to pass the grade.

Want to help? There are ways to make a real difference for the many and not merely the few. It is cruel to raise the expectations of 75 youngsters for 2,000 school vouchers. It is cruel because there are two insurmountable barriers, and we know they are insurmountable. First is the veto, but, second, no serious constitutional scholar believes public school vouchers are constitutional.

As I speak, there are two injunctions on public school vouchers right now. Two courts in Wisconsin have stopped public school vouchers with injunctions on constitutional grounds. An appeals court in Ohio has stopped public school vouchers on constitutional grounds.

D.C. schools need help. If Members want to raise people's expectations and then let them fall, they should go do it in their own districts. Do not come in and do it to my folks. I challenge the majority, if they want to see D.C. kids go to parochial schools, I will join Members in raising private funds to send them to private schools.

Everyone knows what they are doing. They are preparing for a \$1 billion raid on the public Treasury to take money that would go to public schools and give it to private and parochial schools. We are not going to let them do it. Either the President will stop them or the courts will stop them. Meanwhile, they are playing with the lives of the people I represent.

I ask Members to stand back and instead come forward and join me in

truly helping youngsters who are crying out for help but cannot get it, as Members know they cannot, in the way they have chosen.

We can work together. No one has even come to me and approached me about this issue. They would not dare go into the district of another Member without even approaching her on the district. They have not asked me if there is an approach that we can agree upon.

I can tell them that the approach that they are depending upon, a starkly partisan approach that has nothing to do with the youngsters I represent, will in fact be turned down not only by me but by those I represent. And, for them, I resent Members coming forward to raise their expectations, knowing full well that they cannot meet them and having no intention whatsoever to meet them in yet another election year charade designed falsely to show what Members cannot show, and that is that public schools cannot be improved. Perhaps they cannot be. Neither, I assure the Members, will the courts of this great country allow us to empty the Federal Treasury of funds and put them into private schools.

If Members want to help my kids, understand that they want your help, need your help, and that their Member is willing to cooperate with others in order to get help. But I ask Members to cooperate with us, not to exercise their will on us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GREENWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HINCHEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GILCHREST addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL JAMES J. LYONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HULSHOF. Madam Speaker, I have come to the floor of the United States House of Representatives tonight to talk about big news in a small town in Missouri's Ninth Congressional District. That town is Kirksville, Missouri. For those who do not know about Kirksville, it is the home of nationally-recognized Truman State University.

Tonight my good friend, Jack Magruder, the President of Truman State, and some of his colleagues have tuned in for this tribute, because it is time, Madam Speaker, to pay tribute to a man of honor.

Tonight I am here to salute a great countryman, Lieutenant Colonel James J. Lyons. His friends call him Jim. They also call him dependable. Lieutenant Colonel James Lyons has dedicated more than 29 years to Army service.

He entered the Army as a private in the Ohio Army National Guard in 1968, completed basic training, completed Advanced Individual Training-Infantry at Fort Jackson, South Carolina; and after a period of enlisted service with the Ohio Guard, he entered Officer Candidate School at Fort Hayes, Ohio. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in 1970 and assigned to C Company, 113th Medical Battalion, where he served as ambulance platoon leader and training officer.

Lt. Col. Lyons moved to Kirksville in 1972 and was assigned to the 5503d U.S. Army Hospital in Columbia, Missouri. He served in a number of staff officer positions, including assistant personnel officer, food service officer and hospital company commander.

In 1976, he was project officer for the First Army Reserve Medical Symposium. A year later, he led the quartering party which organized the 901st Medical Detachment which, Madam Speaker, was the first Army Reserve Medical Unit in northern Missouri. Subsequently, he served as that unit's training officer and executive officer.

In 1988, Lt. Col. Lyons helped establish the 303d Field Hospital in Kirksville. He also served as that unit's executive officer and deployable medical systems project officer.

Lt. Col. Lyons was selected to be the first commander for the newly formed