The picture of an agitated president making late-night calls is very different from the calm image the White House has sought to project. The incident testifies to the increased tension between Mr. Clinton and Congress amid the almost daily revelations regarding his past fund-raising practices.

Trying to seize the high ground, Democrats are demanding that Republicans make a commitment to allow campaign-finance-reform legislation to come to the floor this year. But Mr. Clinton's outbursts may only feed Republican complaints that Democrats are stalling on behalf of the embattled president—an important fund-raiser.

The fight is expected to come to a head in the Senate as early as next Wednesday. Mr. Dashcle said yesterday that Republicans must promise to bring up campaign reform this spring if Democrats are to support funding for a GOP-backed inquiry of campaign abuses by the White House.

''We will not agree to funding . . . to anything, until we get campaign-finance reform,'' said the South Dakota Democrat. His statement, the clearest linkage of the two issues to date, is designed to exploit GOP division on this front.

The Republicans' strongest reform advocate, Arizona Sen. John McCain, supports both an independent counsel and a campaign-finance bill, but Majority Leader Trent Lott (R., Miss.) is decidedly cool to overhauling the current system. Caught in the middle is Sen. Fred Thompson (R., Tenn.), who chairs the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, charged with carrying out the planned inquiry. And some Republicans are openly proposing to scuttle Mr. Thompson's budget if the investigation becomes a vehicle to advance campaign reform.

Mr. Lott last night warned Democrats against filibustering the committee's funding but said he had exhausted efforts to reach a compromise and expected to meet the issue head-on next week.

As the Thompson inquiry has stalled, smaller investigations are springing up. One of the latest comes from a Senate Judiciary subcommittee overseeing the National Bankruptcy Review Commission. The commission's chairman, Brady Williamson, attended a fund-raiser for Mr. Clinton last September that drew a large set of big donors from the bankruptcy professional community.

In an interview this week, Mr. Williamson said he went as a ''private citizen'' and only after seeking an opinion from the White House counsel's office. But Sen. Charles Grassley (R. Iowa), chairman of the Judiciary subcommittee, said yesterday he had received written correspondence indicating those running the event had pressured members of the banking industry to attend if they wanted to be heard on bankruptcy issues.

In another development, Federal Bureau of Investigation agents who this week raided the Washington offices of the U.S.-Thai Business Council couldn't find records related to Ban Chang International, which shared offices with the council and helped finance it. Pauline Kanchanalak, a major Democratic contributor whose gifts are now under srcutiny by the FBI, worked for Ban Chang and helped organize the council.

Ban Chang is a subsidiary of Ban Chang Group, a conglomerate based in Bangkok, Thailand. Last June Ms. Kanchanalak and a relative gave $185,000 to the Democratic National Committee in conjunction with a coffee event at the White House with President Clinton, attended by top executives of another Thai conglomerate, CP Group.

People familar with the matter say the FBI wants to know if Ms. Kanchanalak knows where the records are, but she is currently thought to be in Thailand. Her Washington-based attorney, and an attorney for Ban Chang in Washington, couldn't be reached for comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Hampshire.

MEXICAN CERTIFICATION

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to address an issue which has been raised by other Members on this floor, which I believe is of great significance and which must be resolved in the next few days. That is that the Clinton administration has a difficult matter of rendering a decision, in consultation with the Secretary of State, as to whether or not to certify Mexico as a nation that is cooperating in the area of our war on drugs.

There are many factors to consider before making such a decision, but the primary factor for me is what effect does such a decision have on our ability to fight the use of drugs here in the United States? Drug abuse continues to be one of the primary serious problems, primary and most serious problems, our Nation is facing, especially among our young people in our inner cities. Fighting drugs has to be one of the most important goals of this administration and of this Congress.

Since the so-called certification process was begun in the mid-1980's, Mexico has always been deemed to be a nation that is making a strong effort in the drug war, and many of us in Congress have had concerns, and continue to have concerns, about Mexico's progress.

So at some point, you have to evaluate the effects of bestowing certification status on Mexico. Has certification improved Mexico's ability to deal with drug cartels? Have cocaine seizures increased? Are drug dealers being arrested and convicted? Are antimoney-laundering bills being enacted into law in Mexico? And finally, and perhaps most important, are the Mexican law enforcement agencies cooperating with us and are they free of corruption?

It is this last point that I think remains the most single significant concern and impediment to certification. The arrest of the Mexican General Jesus Gutierrez Rebollo, the Mexican drug czar in charge of Mexico's counternarcotics efforts, on a charge of bribery, cocaine trafficking and for having ties to organized crime leaders in Mexico's drug cartels, was, in the words of our own United States drug czar, General McCaffrey, a ''terrible blow.'' It really is more than that, of course. To have the chief law enforcement officer in the area of drug enforcement in Mexico turn out to be nothing more than a front man for the Mexican drug cartels undermines all credibility of the effort of Mexico in the area of fighting drugs.

Our intelligence agencies are now conducting a damage assessment to establish how many of our agents, informants and counterdrug operatives were put at risk. It is believed that a very large number have been put at risk, and, in fact, the damage to this intelligence network may exceed the damage that was created in the CIA by the Aldrich Ames case. If you remember, in the Aldrich Ames case a large number of agents and operatives for the CIA died.

When you add up the evidence about the results of certification, you have to wonder what effect it has had on stemming the flow of drugs into this country. Mexico is the source of 70 percent of the cocaine on American streets and is the growing source of the most violent types of drugs. The primary cartels which are now shipping their drugs to the United States are no longer centered in Colombia. They are two cartels centered in Mexico. The antimoney-laundering laws are incomplete and not yet implemented. In short, the battle against drugs being shipped to the United States from Mexico is being lost in Mexico.

In light of the ongoing corruption and the flow of drugs into our Nation, I believe the United States must withhold full certification. The cost of drug abuse to our society remains too high to take any other course. There is no doubt that on the domestic front, we can do a great deal more, and we must. In fact, it was unfortunate that this administration essentially ignored this problem during its first term, but the administration has now turned its attention to this issue, and, hopefully, we can make greater progress. We need strong leadership from the White House. The President does control the bully pulpit and, as we saw with Mrs. Reagan's efforts under the ''Just Say No'' program in the eighties, the White House can have a dramatic effect on utilization.

But at the same time, we must pursue a more effective policy that will cut off the flow of drugs from source countries like Mexico. I believe that withholding full certification to Mexico would send the right message from the American people to the Government of Mexico, and that message is that the status quo is not acceptable. I urge the President to hear the concerns of our agents on the front lines who cannot trust their Mexican counterparts for fear of being compromised. As the DEA Administrator, Mr. Constantine, stated, ''There is not one single law enforcement institution with whom DEA has a really trusting relationship.''

It is time, Mr. President, to take strong action, and I strongly suggest that we not pursue certification.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I want to also speak on another subject which is of equal importance. It is of importance, however, to the next generation in a different way. It is of importance in the area of fiscal policy, and that is the question of Social Security.