

gene destructive marijuana than kids have ever used before, up 105 percent. LSD use, 105 percent, cocaine, 166 percent increase.

This is among our teenagers. So we see why we have 1.6 million of our Americans in jail, 70 percent of them in jail because of drug-related incidents. We see why we have honest citizens and senior citizens and Americans living behind bars in fear, afraid to go out at night, afraid to go out of their home because we have created this situation.

Mr. Speaker, this is the problem, and what are we doing about it? As part of this new majority, as someone who called on the previous Congress to look at the situation and do something and examine it and restore drug interdiction, we are doing something. Today we are meeting and there are hearings on restoring our Coast Guard effort. Today we are working in the appropriations measures that are before this Congress to restore our military effort to stop drugs in a cost-effective manner at their source. We are going to restore also our efforts with our Drug Enforcement Agency that were proposed for slashing by this administration, not by this new majority.

So, Mr. Speaker, it takes leadership. It takes leadership from the WhiteHouse. It takes leadership from the Congress. We must set the standard. We cannot lower the standard. We cannot have a WhiteHouse or a President that in fact lower the standards for our young people because this is the results we get. This is a headline that every American should see, every American should see that.

ETHICS COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of theHouse, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, just a few moments ago, a member of theHouse Ethics Committee from Florida came and spoke about the rules of that committee. Earlier today we had a discussion on this floor. In fact, we were prevented from having a discussion about whether or not that committee should release a report that is currently before it with respect to the activities of Speaker GINGRICH and the tax laws of this country and the misuse of nonprofit charitable foundations in political campaigns.

The speaker said that apparently they could not release the report, and the chairman of that committee has said they cannot release that report, that the rules do not allow for it.

I would refer them to the rules of theHouse which have been mimicked in the rules of the committee. It said, no information or testimony received—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state his point of order.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my point of order is, the gentleman is proceeding out of order. This is a matter before the Ethics Committee. The gentleman knows the rules of this body.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, if I may be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker from Florida got up and was talking about his initiative to reform the rules of theHouse Ethics Committee and stated about whether or not a report could be released or information can be released. I am differing with the gentleman with respect to that statement and the statement of the rules of theHouse. I believe the rules of the Ethics Committee are not a matter before the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from discussing specific official conduct cases.

The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] may proceed in order.

Mr. MILLER of California. The point being this, if I can finish reading this section: That no information or testimony received or the contents of a complaint or the fact of a finding, of a filing shall be publicly disclosed by any committee or staff member unless, unless specifically authorized in each instance by a vote of the full committee. The point being this: Any report that is before the committee on House ethics at any time can be released by a vote of that committee. Should the committee choose not to vote, that report will continue to be secret. If the committee shall choose to vote, that report will become public both to the Members of this House and to the Members of the public in general.

This issue, this issue about the committee's ability to release or not release a report is not one of first impression before this Congress. It was raised in 1988 in the matter regarding Speaker Jim Wright. At that time Congressman NEWT GINGRICH, not then-Speaker but now-Speaker, Congressman NEWT GINGRICH wrote to the gentleman from California, JULIAN DIXON, then chairman of the Ethics Committee, and said to him that he believed that it was absolutely essential that all 435 Members of this House have access to the reports and to information.

He went on to list, I believe, eight or nine criteria in that letter that he believed should be invoked, the most important of which have not been currently done in this session of the Congress. That is that any special or independent counsel appointed by the Ethics Committee shall have the ability to conduct a free and full investigation, that the committee shall in no way hamper that, the committee shall only cooperate, and that that special counsel shall have the discretion from time

to time to make a decision to release information or to make public statements.

Speaker GINGRICH in 1988 said he had serious concerns about whether or not the Ethics Committee was engaging in that fashion, asked for the release of the report on Speaker Wright before the subcommittee had a chance to fully consider it or the full committee and all, all relevant documents, transcripts, statements, interviews of any witnesses before that committee.

Now we find that in fact we are told that we cannot adhere to what has been the policy of the Ethics Committee from its inception on a bipartisan basis to deliver to this Congress and to the people of this country a report on ethical charges by any Member against any other Member, by members of the public against Members, an unbiased report.

The problem that we have today is the problem that we had in 1988. Again, that problem was recognized by Speaker GINGRICH when he stated that it was simply untenable for the American public to believe and for Members of this House to believe that we could have a free and open and fair investigation of the most powerful Member of this House, the Speaker of theHouse of Representatives, by the Ethics Committee, and there should be in place at all times a free and fair investigation by an independent and special counsel.

SITUATION IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of theHouse, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue the dialog that we started before theHouse went into special orders regarding the current situation in Iraq.

As a senior member of Committee on National Security and chairman of Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, I take great pride in supporting our troops in all possible ways. I supported the President when he initially went in to take action in Iraq because I had an idea of what was occurring. In fact, I sat through a briefing a week ago that, I might add, was attended by less than 100 of my colleagues, where we were briefed by the State Department and the military on what was happening. Unfortunately, the briefing, which was closed, did not tell me much more than that as reported by CNN and the national news media.

My concern is right now, Mr. Speaker, that we are reading reports that the President, in his position as Commander in Chief, is now escalating that. First, we have seen additional shots of cruise missiles. Now we are hearing that F-117's are being transferred to the theater. We are hearing that those F-117's may be based in Kuwait, partly because the Saudis are saying they do not want to have them

based in their country. We are furthermore hearing that Saddam, in fact, has considered Kuwait's action, in allowing the basing to take place there, an act of aggression against Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we may want to, in fact, support all of this. But the point is that the President is doing this unilaterally. There, in fact, has been no consultation with this body.

My colleagues on the other side raised the issue of how they supported President Bush during Desert Storm. In fact, I went back and checked the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Two of the three speakers who stood up just a few short moments ago actually voted against President Bush's involvement of our troops. That is OK, because they should have that right to speak their mind. But we are not being given the opportunity to even understand what is going on, let alone vote to put our troops into harm's way.

Right now we are sending young troops and 117's over to the Middle East and no one has been briefed. The chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the chairman of the Committee on National Security, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, even the majority leader has told me he has not been given a briefing as to what is going on. This, Mr. Speaker, is unacceptable. We need to know what is going on because we are putting our troops in a situation this weekend that could result in actions, hostile actions against our people.

I, for one, as a representative of 600,000 constituents, I want to know what, in fact, my constituents are being subjected to in terms of this President's operations.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, that has not been done. I yield to my friend.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I know the gentleman was a Member of this body back with events leading, where at the time events leading up to Desert Storm occurred. Can you tell us that President Bush did at that time as far as informing the Members of this body what was going on?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman raises an excellent point and one that we need to keep in mind. President Bush went to the United Nations six or seven consecutive times and had the United Nations pass very specific resolutions, and then he came to this body and allowed us to have a vote, and I might add, by the way, just for the record, that I checked the RECORD. The Speaker at the time, Mr. Foley, voted "no" against President Bush; the majority leader at the time, Mr. GEPHARDT, voted "no"; Mr. BONIOR voted "no"; all against the deployment and the support of our troops in the Middle East as requested by President Bush. But that is OK. They are allowed to do that.

My point is that we are not being given that opportunity. Who knows

what this President is getting us into? We have no idea. We do not know. All we know is our allies are not supporting us except for Great Britain, and all we know is now even some of the Arab countries are having second thoughts about what unilateral actions we are taking. That to me, Mr. Speaker, is outrageous and should allow this body to have a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I am preparing right now today, and I would hope that our colleagues who are sitting in their offices, or their staff members, would call my office to support not only a letter asking what is going on but a resolution asking for the legal justification under the United Nations resolution that is very specific for us to take unilateral action, and also asking for the compliance with the War Powers Act. Why have not the leader of the Committee on National Security, why have not the bipartisan leaders of the Committee on International Affairs been consulted in the current plans for this weekend? Perhaps it is that we do not have any plans, or perhaps those plans have not been totally thought out.

We, in this body, whether a member of those appropriate committees or not, have the right and the responsibility to know what situations our troops are being placed into, and in my opinion based upon what I am seeing and hearing that, in fact, is not occurring.

This is an issue, Mr. Speaker, that is going to be on the minds of the American people this weekend because right now our kids who fly those F-117's are gassing them up and fueling them up for a 2-day flight to the Middle East. There is not one Member in this body who has any idea of what they are doing there. Are we going to be attacking specific targets? Do we know if there is backup support being provided? What is our exit plan? Is our goal to go in and get Saddam Hussein or to go in after chemical weapons facilities? What we are going after? No one knows.

Mr. Speaker, we demand some answers.

MAKING CLOUDS GO AWAY

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a sad day for me as a Member of this body having served here 20 years. You know, last year when the ethics complaints were being filed against the Speaker, I characterized what is happening to this House as there was a great cloud over this House and we needed to remove that cloud. That cloud has not been removed; in fact, it has gotten darker. It has done more to harm the image of the U.S. House of Representatives than any actions that have been taken on legislation.

Even though their Contract With America would have cut Medicare,

would have cut environmental protection, would have cut education, all to give tax cuts for the wealthy; that is bad enough. But what is going on today and has been going on with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and its coverup of what the Speaker of the House has done is shameful beyond any comprehension.

It is a sad day when Members of the House cannot even get a copy of the report that the special counsel has filed with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct on just one of several, seven, complaints that have been filed against the Speaker. Only on one. They have not done anything on the others.

What is the gentlewoman from Connecticut doing? Well, she met with the floor leader the other day. She has had press conferences in Connecticut. But she will not tell us anything. In fact they met just yesterday. Why did they not release the report?

I am sure not one of the five Republican Members of that Committee on Standards of Official Conduct will ever vote to release that report. All they have to do is vote to release it and it comes out. You and the public, Members of the House, the media, everybody, will know what is in that report. They do not want you and I or anybody else to know what is in that report.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes, and by the way, for the public's edification, no Democratic member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct can tell us what is in that report. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, as a body, has to release it. So we cannot find out from them—

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If the gentleman will yield, one of the things that troubled me was I believe they are now trying to say, "Oh, well, this is not a report."

Now I want to know what we spent \$500,000 for, for a hundred pages of paper, and they think they can escape all the rules of this House by calling it something other than a report. It is a very—what was this? Just kind of a gift to someone to go put some papers together? I mean that does not make any sense to me at all.

Mr. VOLKMER. I say it is a huge waste of taxpayer's money to spend \$500,000 to have a very good attorney to gather up all this evidence and give it to the committee, which the committee already had, and if it is not a report, then I do not know what it is, but it is their way of getting out of releasing it.

That is all it amounts to.

Ms. DELAURO. If the gentleman will yield? If I might, there is precedent here for what we are talking about. All you have to do is to go back a few years, and I just will read you two or three quotes, and I will let you guess who said them.

Now that report is secret. I do not know what is in it. I do not know of anybody other than the committee