

friends, people whom I agree with in the special interest, the issue advocacy organizations that believe that somehow, some way, that by having public disclosure of who is in fact contributing to the ads that they are responsible for offering, that somehow that is against their constitutional right. I fail to understand that.

Anybody that wants to run ads against me, as they will between now and November, that is a first amendment right. I just believe very strongly that the people of the 17th District deserve the right to know who is paying for those ads, called public disclosure. This is a debate that I hope we will spend some considerable time on, because I think there is a little misunderstanding about this.

No one is talking about doing away with individual rights to express themselves under the first amendment of the Constitution, but we are talking about something which we are seeing live and in living color played out on both sides of the aisle, tremendous expenditures of dollars in which accusations are occurring on both sides.

□ 1600

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me just say again to those who are negotiating the rule in which we are going to consider this, it is extremely important, and we ask of you in a very respectful way, to go back and look at the discharge petition and to make sure when that rule comes to the floor of the House you are truly going to allow the will of the House to be followed in allowing the Members to express themselves in a free and unhindered manner.

AMENDMENT TO ADDRESS CAMPUS CRIME

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise first to take a moment to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN). Shawn Gallagher, my legislative assistant, and I in working on our amendment yesterday that we offered to H.R. 6 thanked a number of people that were extremely helpful and valuable in this process. We neglected to mention the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN). I wanted to take a moment to thank him for his work on the Accuracy in Crime Reporting Act and particularly an amendment that I offered and we successfully passed that dealt with the releasing or potential releasing of names of those who commit violent offenses on campuses.

At times in this process, we in politics all think we have created and have this original, unique idea that is so vitally important to the Nation's interest that we forget to share some of the credit. I wanted to do that in a public

way, because this is a collaborative process. We are all in this business of helping and serving the public together. You hate to let time go by and not pay a special moment of thanks to those that have helped you achieve a significant victory.

I would like to talk just a moment about the amendment because it is very, very important. It has to deal with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act that was passed in 1974 that basically has allowed universities, Federal universities, to withhold the release of names of students found by disciplinary proceedings to have committed crimes of violence. I believe there should be a balance between one student's right of privacy to another student's right to know about a serious crime in his or her college community. The Foley amendment to the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1998 provides a well-balanced solution to the problem. It would remove the Federal protection that disciplinary records enjoy and make reporting subject to the State laws that apply. Campus law enforcement records, Mr. Speaker, are not included as part of a student's educational record and therefore are open to public scrutiny. But many colleges and universities have learned to circumvent crime reporting requirements by channeling felonies and misdemeanors into their confidential disciplinary committees which continue to be protected by FERPA.

According to a number of college newspapers, like the Daily Tar Heel in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, colleges have been expanding the jurisdiction of these secret courts to shield violent crime. While the amendment that I offered would not require campus disciplinary hearings to be open to the public, it would remove FERPA protection of disciplinary records which contain information that personally identifies a student or students who have committed or admitted to or been found to have committed any violent act which is a crime or a violation of institutional policy.

Why is this important? Because I think parents and community leaders and others deserve to know the statistical problems that are being experienced on our Nation's campuses. Whether it is date rape, whether it is sexual assault or physical violence, these types of incidents should not be held under seal. They should be open to the public so that parents can make decisions appropriate for their children. As they head off to college, which is supposed to be a learning environment, they should not be feeling threatened, they should not have to be scared being on campuses, and many newspapers around the country have in fact editorialized in support of our amendment.

It did pass yesterday. We hope the Senate will consider the amendment. We hope it will be included in the conference report, because I think it is vitally important in this day and age that we have all the facts about stu-

dent behavior on campus, that we do our best to try and minimize and change the dangers that are involved in campuses and that by illuminating some of the statistics and problems we may, in fact, be able to change behavior on campuses. As I say, colleges by and far the most part have complied and been very cooperative in these efforts, but there are some that have chosen to seal the records in order not to have a black eye in the community, not to have enrollment drop off or not lose alumni support.

But again in this era of openness and accountability, I think it is important that we make certain that all families and other members of society have access to this information and then to make appropriate judgments accordingly.

Again I would like to thank my staffer Shawn Gallagher and I would like to thank the committee and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), and, of course, as I mentioned, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for their leadership on this issue.

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

(Mr. DOGGETT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ILLEGAL DRUGS

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come once again before the House this afternoon to talk about the issue of illegal drugs and narcotics, its impact on our Nation and on our community and on our children. I have probably spoken more than any other Member in the last 5 years on this issue and I intend to speak every opportunity I can get about what drugs are doing to the lives of our young people.

I always like to review what took place when I came into Congress and the other party controlled the House, other body and the White House. In fact, their first steps under the Clinton administration were to cut the positions in the drug czar's office from almost 150 down to about 25. The next thing that the new President did, and I was a freshman and protested it here on the floor, was to cut the interdiction, to end the military involvement in the war on drugs, to stop and really cut the drug interdiction and eradication programs, to cut the Coast

Guard, to dismantle all kinds of enforcement programs, and then the ultimate insult to the American people was to appoint a Surgeon General, Joycelyn Elders, who adopted the policy that I entitled "just say maybe to our young people," not to mention that the leader of the free world, the highest office in our land, said to our children, "If I had it all to do over again, I would inhale."

That set a tremendous pattern. It changed the whole dynamics where drug use and abuse by our children had gone down, down, down from 1981 under Reagan and Bush, it began a steady climb. We have seen the dramatic results.

Let me tell you what the results are. 1.5 million Americans were arrested in 1996 for violating drug laws. We have over 2 million Americans behind bars and our law enforcement officials tell us more than 70 percent of those individuals are there because of a drug-related or drug involvement offense. Since 1992, overall drug use among 12 to 17-year-olds has jumped 78 percent. A study by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America shows the number of fourth to sixth graders experimenting with marijuana increased a staggering 71 percent between 1992 and 1997. What is the cost to this Congress? The cost to this Congress and the Federal Government is \$16 billion out of your taxpayer money. The total cost to the American economy is approaching \$67 billion a year in lost jobs and opportunities and again cost to our economy.

During this President's tenure in office, if we continue at the pace we have been at, 114,000 will die under President Clinton's tenure from drug-related problems. We are now killing our Americans at the rate of 20,000 a year. That is the toll. The story goes on and on.

But I must say that the Republican Congress has tried to turn that around in the last 36 months. We in fact have restored money to bring our military back into the war on drugs. We have restored money and funding for interdiction programs because we know it is most cost effective to stop drugs at their source and when they get to our streets and schools and our communities it is very difficult. And then we passed tough enforcement, and we know tough enforcement works. Look at New York City, look at what Rudy Giuliani has done with tough enforcement. Tough enforcement works. New York City has seen a 30 percent decrease in crime.

This week the Republicans, and we have tried in a bipartisan effort to bring our colleagues from the other side of the aisle in, have announced programs and extensive legislation which we will be introducing every week for the next 6 weeks to combat illegal drugs, to provide funding and programs that work and assistance to our local communities and our schools for education, for enforcement, for interdiction and also for treatment pro-

grams that work. This is one of the most critical issues, social issues, before this Congress and before the American people. I am committed to this and I think that if we have the cooperation of the administration now, the cooperation of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that we can come together, that we can make a difference, that we can reduce the drugs coming into this country, into our streets and into our schools. I reach out and ask all of my colleagues to join us in that effort.

WHITE HOUSE SILENCE:
AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT TRUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized for 20 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I find it unfortunate that I have to come down to the floor again to try to put things in perspective about what is going on around the White House and now is infecting the House of Representatives and its committees. There is a lot of spin out there. The spinmeisters of the President are trying to keep the American people from the right to know the truth. We keep asking the question, is the President of the United States above the law? Yet the spinmeisters are pushing hard and pushing often with a concerted strategy. We all know what the strategy is. The strategy, Mr. Speaker, is basically to stonewall, drag your feet, hide documents, claim executive privilege, hide behind your lawyers. But the bottom line is that it is the spin, the whole spin and nothing but the spin to block the American people's right to know the truth.

I took the well of the House not too long ago and asked for the President to tell the American people the truth. I guess he did not hear my speech and he did not want to do it. But it now has boiled over into the House of Representatives. I will talk about that in a minute, and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Mr. Speaker, I just ask the question, why are the Democrats trying to change the subject when it comes to the problems in the White House? Why are the House Democrats trying to cover up for the administration? Why do they not want a real investigation of the facts surrounding illegal foreign money in the Clinton campaign and possible charges of obstruction of justice in the Clinton administration?

Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, Judge Norma Holloway Johnson threw out President Clinton's claim of executive privilege regarding the latest scandal in the White House. No wonder. The President had been taking indecent liberties with the concept of the executive privilege. He has hidden behind executive privilege in order to keep the American people from knowing the truth. According to press accounts, the

White House may even appeal this decision, which fits into their strategy of use the courts and the system to stall, delay and stonewall. There is only one reason that the President would want to appeal this decision and that is to keep the American people from learning the truth. Why else would you claim executive privilege if you did not want the American people to know the truth? The whole idea of executive privilege is you do not want to tell the truth.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just said no man is above the law. Judge Johnson's decision reaffirms that basic American principle. No matter what the strategy that the White House decides to employ, the American people have a right to know the truth. An appeal by the President on this case would amount to one more effort to stonewall the Starr investigation and to keep the truth away from the American people. What is that truth? Nobody knows for certain. But bits and pieces of the truth continue to leak out. The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight recently released transcripts of conversations between Webster Hubbell and his wife that were recorded when Mr. Hubbell was in prison for a lying and fraud conviction, that he finally, after many months of claiming that he was innocent, finally admitted and pleaded guilty. He was in prison. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Hubbell knew that his conversations were being recorded. That is common practice in prison. There is a very large sign that is posted from the jail cell where he made the phone call that says that your phone conversations are being recorded. But even though he knew his conversations were being recorded and said so on the tapes, he made some statements that lead to some very serious questions.

□ 1615

Now the Washington Post, certainly not a fan of House Republicans, had this to say about those conversations, and I quote:

That said, however, the accurate transcripts are also damning and very nearly so. They make clear that Mr. Hubbell and his wife had a sense of themselves as being held on a kind of string by the White House to which they were beholden for badly needed income; that if Mr. Hubbell's silence was not being bought in the White House case, as the independent counsel's office suspects, at the very least he and his wife were sensitive to how their remarks and behavior were being received by the President and Mrs. Clinton, were anxious to please, and were carefully kept in that state of anxiety by the White House emissaries.

The Washington Post goes on to conclude that the tapes still raise real questions. The President's use of executive privilege, for instance, also raises serious questions that need to be answered by this administration:

Why did the President invoke this privilege when national security was not at issue?

Was it an abuse of power?