

information to report, we will be complying with House rules in making such a report. That is an actual quote.

These complaints are all politically motivated, and the public should know as well as our colleagues that since 1989 Democrats in the House of Representatives have filed literally hundreds and hundreds of allegations against NEWT GINGRICH without one, without one ethics complaint being referred for further action.

In fact the only—just over the last year they have filed numerous complaints, all of which have been effectively dismissed, and the only remaining issue is a technical issue regarding tax laws, which relates to a college course that the Speaker was teaching, and I find it remarkable and commendable that he would teach a college course on the side, in addition to being Speaker of the House and a Congressman representing a Georgia congressional district.

So what is going on here? Do our Democrat colleagues in the House, are they really attempting to divert attention from the ethical problems of the Clinton administration? Because some of us remember when Bill Clinton was sworn in; in fact, when he said on the campaign trail as candidate Clinton that he would have the most ethical administration in the history of the Republic, when arguably he has given us one of the more corrupt administrations in the history of the Republic, including 14 business associates and friends who have either been convicted or pled guilty in conjunction with the Whitewater matter, and that does not even begin to speak to his wife's involvement in those same affairs.

So what is going on here? This has been, in fact, a very reform-minded Congress. We passed the Congressional Accountability Act saying that Congress has to live under the same laws as everybody else, under the same laws that we impose on American citizens and businesses. We passed a very strict gift ban. We passed tough lobbying reform. And tomorrow on this floor I am going to be able to offer legislation with some of my colleagues, eliminating taxpayer funded pensions for Members of Congress convicted of felony crimes while serving in office.

Mr. Speaker, that is something I attempted to do 2 Congresses ago in the 102nd Congress, but the leadership of the House then, the Democratic Party leadership, would not allow it, my bill to come to the House floor. Our leadership has allowed it. We will be debating on it and voting on it tomorrow. I am sure it will pass overwhelmingly.

My legislation was the direct outgrowth of the House bank and post office scandals two Congresses ago, and we do not hear our colleagues, many of whom were serving then, talking, you know, expressing outrage or ire at not only the ethical lapses of the Clinton administration, but about the things that happened on their watch: The Dan Rostenkowski affair in the last Con-

gress. There was concerted effort to cover up then-Congressman Rostenkowski's involvement in the House post office scandal and allegations of ghost employees. That was led by many of the Democrats who are now in an incredible, I think, feed of hypocrisy and role reversal attacking the Speaker.

When we took over last January, we lost an independent audit by an outside accounting firm of House finances, and we found incredible disarray and mismanagement. Again that is something that happened, and the American people need to understand this, on the watch of the Democrat Party leadership. So they are hardly models of propriety, having conducted and presided over the whitewashed Congresses of years past, and somebody has got to stand up on this floor and provide a little institutional memory, if you will, and someone has to say to my colleagues and to the American people: Look, you are smarter than they think you are. They are banking on the facts, they are betting that you do not know and you do not care about the truth, and we think you do.

#### THE DRUG ISSUE IN OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I first want to make a brief comment on Medicare. I get tired, night after night, hearing us being accused of cutting Medicare. I know the President alleges that this year, and I know many Americans have probably seen the tape or heard that Mrs. Clinton last year, when the President proposed a smaller increase than we said, explained very carefully that it was an increase and not a cut, and President Clinton before we took power carefully explained that it was an increase and not a cut, and, quite frankly, two or three Clintons is not bad, and I think that the Democratic Party should listen to two of the three Clintons who said it was not a cut, rather than coming up and giving misinformation to the American people.

But I came here tonight to talk about the drug issue. A lot of people think this just came up at the last minute here in the campaign. I serve on the Government Reform Subcommittee on Internal Security and Foreign Affairs where we deal with the drug issue regularly, and our subcommittee chairman, BILL ZELIFF, started right after we took over Congress in focusing on this issue and deserves tremendous credit for his persistence in keeping us in front of Congress and America and working with—when he started working with then-Senator Dole in New Hampshire over a year ago—to show him what had happened and what we had learned from our hearings. We thought we were

going to have one or two hearings on the drug issue. We started with Nancy Reagan and Bill Bennett and heard some of the devastation and were shocked at the cutbacks that this administration did, and as we got in and had hearings with then-drug czar Lee Brown and had multiple hearings with the current drug czar, General McCaffrey, we have had multiple hearings with the Coalition for Partnership for Drug-free America. We met multiple times with the director of the DEA, Mr. Constantine. We have met with all branches. It became more and more clear that this was not a little issue, this was a huge issue.

Sometimes here in Washington it takes us awhile to realize what the people back home know already, and that is kids are getting shot in the streets, there are gangs all over not only our major cities, but in small towns throughout. In northeast Indiana, in my home area, in Bluffton, in Auburn and Huntington, the gangs have spread out into the small towns and dealing drugs, and we have drug battles going on. It was Congress and Washington that was slow.

It is not that this is some kind of a political effort at the last minute. We are responding to what American people saw.

A number of us went down to Central and South America and met with the leaders of those nations in Bolivia and Peru and Columbia and Mexico and Panama, and delivered very strong messages and are trying to work with source country eradication and interdiction. We also held regional hearings in the Northeast and the Midwest, two in California. We have an upcoming one in Arizona, and going down to the border there, and over in Florida. We have been all over this Nation. It also is not a last minute political issue, it is an issue that the American people are screaming for attention, and we have been slow in responding.

I also want to comment briefly on two hearings that we did this past weekend in California. One in particular I want to talk about is one we did in Hollywood looking at the movie industry, and also one last week on the music industry. I am not going to get heavily into that, but I want to make two points.

One is we are very concerned that the message is being sent out in our music and our movies. Let me give two examples.

After I was challenged by the leader of the recording industry of America to produce some names, and I am not a big rock music fan, but the staff provided some names, she said in the newspaper that "Heroin Girl" was an antidrug message. I went out and bought it. The group Everclear whose very name basically stands for some sort of white lightning or something; there is another song on there called "Chemical Smile". If you—the song "Heroin Girl", it is at best marginal as an antidrug message. But as we heard

in Hollywood, the plain fact, that and movies like "Trainspotting", while to adults may look like they have a subtle antidrug message, that when you are looking at music and movies with the glorification of death, of black clothing and skulls and so on, even presenting something with a slightly negative image like the song "Heroin Girl" does, slightly is, in fact, advancing the cause of drugs and adding to the kind of perverse romance.

In other words what they said: When you talk about drugs either direction on heroin, you advance many young people using heroin.

I want to say also why this administration I believe wants to forget about the past. I am tired of hearing that, well, we should focus on what is next, not talk about the last few years. Quite frankly, if I had their past, I would want to forget about it too. The plain truth of the matter is interdiction funds went down, supply went up, and prices went down. The acceptability of drugs in the schools went up in our teenagers.

It is very clear what happened. The President diverted funds from all operations around the country from drug interdiction and more drugs came into America. He sent messages. We had a witness at the Hollywood hearing, a psychologist who is a consultant to the movie industry, who said that when adults say to their children, look, everybody did drugs when I was a kid, do not do it now, you are sending a double message, particularly when the President of the United States laughs it off. Kids look at it and say, when I get to be an old fuddy-duddy, I will not do it either. Every kid did it, even you did it, Dad, and unless you stand up, you are going to be held accountable, and I am glad to have President Clinton on board at this point, but we cannot bring back the lives that have been lost the last few years because of past neglect.

□ 2245

#### AMERICA SHOULD TAKE A STAND AGAINST THE GROWING PROBLEM OF DRUG ABUSE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

MISREPRESENTING SPEAKER GINGRICH TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I, too, came to the floor to discuss the issue of drugs. Before I do, I have to turn my remarks to a comment made by one Member from the other side.

I have watched time and time and time again in this Congress, on this floor, and in television ads across America, a clear fraud and deception perpetrated on the American people. A quote from the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives that he want-

ed to see HCFA, a huge, massive Federal bureaucracy that has failed for decades to do its job well, wither on the vine. He wanted to see HCFA wither on the vine. I have watched my colleagues, one after the other on this floor, come to the floor, as happened earlier tonight, and tell the American people that that statement, wither on the vine, was said by the Speaker in reference to Medicare.

No honest, self-respecting Member of this institution can come to the floor and continue to perpetrate that misrepresentation to the American people. The Speaker did not then nor has he ever urged that Medicare wither on the vine. He urged that HCFA, a failed Federal bureaucracy, should be replaced. I am tired of hearing it misrepresented.

Mr. Speaker, last night at my home I turned on the television after having returned from a weekend trip where I attended two hearings on the problem of drugs in America. As I turned on the television, the camera went live from the TV studio to a location at an apartment complex in my congressional district, where the Arizona Department of Public Safety had just busted a metamphetamine lab in a large complex of apartments. They detailed the danger to the other residents and the fact that the operator of that metamphetamine lab had himself been arrested on the exact same charge just 2 weeks earlier.

My colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER], has pointed out that the issue of illegal drugs is one that is not new, nor is it being brought forth just for its political points. Rather, it is an issue that our committee, the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice, under the leadership of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF], has been aggressively pursuing since the beginning of this Congress.

But I must tell the Members, we have so much more to do, and I am so distressed by what has happened. I hope America is listening. I hope they are paying attention. I hope they will cut through the fog of those who say this is just politics.

Mr. Speaker, let me bring you some facts. Drug use among American teenagers since 1992 has doubled in America. Overall drug use surged in 1 year, from 1994 to 1995, by a full 33 percent. That is a one-third increase in a single year. Since 1992, 3 years ago, it has increased by 105 percent.

Yet, in the face of these staggering statistics, what has the White House said? The White House said that this issue should not be politicized. I agree. The issue of drug use, its terrorization of our children, the testimony that I heard this weekend in Los Angeles County, CA, about the music industry and the entertainment industry and their casual attitude toward drug use in America, indeed, their promotion in movies and records of the drug lifestyle, should not be politicized.

The evidence I heard in San Luis Obispo at a hearing sponsored by my

colleague, the gentlewoman from California, ANDREA SEASTRAND, where witness after witness from the DEA in Los Angeles, from the DEA in San Francisco, from the Border Patrol in San Diego, from the FBI, from the San Luis Obispo County sheriff's office about the fight they are in for the survival of this Nation and for the lives of our children against the war of drugs being waged on America should not be politicized.

Yet, we ought to look at this issue. The President, who says we should not make drugs a political issue, who says they should not be politicized, in February, 1993, eliminated on his own, 83 percent of the staff of the Office of National Drug Control Policy. The President says we should not now politicize the issue of drugs. In his fiscal year 1995 budget he called for eliminating 621 drug enforcement agents at the DEA, the FBI, the INS, the Customs Service, and the Coast Guard.

The same administration which now says, in the face of the staggering increase of drug usage by our children at every age level and among every drug, it should not be politicized, issued an executive order early in his administration which eliminated nearly 1,000 antidrug positions in our U.S. military. The same President who now says we should not politicize the drug issue in his fiscal year 1997 budget proposal reduced drug ring interdiction spending, proposed that it be reduced by an additional 25 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the testimony in San Luis Obispo, testimony by the special agent in charge of the Drug Enforcement Administration in San Francisco, Mr. William Mitchell, that marijuana is today the No. 1 cash crop in the State of California.

When questioned by myself and others on the panel if that was a factual statement, he said, absolutely, it is the No. 1 drug problem, drug cash crop in the State of California. This is a serious problem. I commend those who testified, and I urge our Nation to take a stand against the continued plague of illegal drugs in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the testimony before the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs and Criminal Justice.

The material referred to is as follows: TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

(By Edward C. Williams, Sheriff-Coroner, San Luis Obispo, CA)

Congressman Zeliff, members of the subcommittee, Congresswoman Seastrand, I am Ed Williams, Sheriff-Corner and Marshal of San Luis Obispo County. I have been a sworn police officer in California for over 38 years, during portions of five decades. I wish to thank you for the opportunity to testify before you on a subject about which I have very strong feelings and unfortunately extensive exposure.

The time allotted for me to appear before you does not allow me the opportunity to bring large boxes containing the thousands of research documents I have reviewed nor copies of lesson plans and speeches I have developed, to train police officers and inform