

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MCINNIS]. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 295, noes 136, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

AYES—295

Aderholt	Ewing	Lewis (KY)
Archer	Fawell	Linder
Army	Flake	Lipinski
Bachus	Foglietta	Livingston
Baesler	Foley	LoBiondo
Baker	Forbes	Lucas
Ballenger	Fowler	Maloney (CT)
Barcia	Fox	Manton
Barr	Franks (NJ)	Manzullo
Barrett (NE)	Frelinghuysen	Martinez
Barrett (WI)	Galleghy	Mascara
Bartlett	Ganske	McCollum
Barton	Gekas	McCrery
Bass	Gephardt	McDade
Bateman	Gibbons	McHale
Bereuter	Gilchrest	McHugh
Berry	Gillmor	McInnis
Bilbray	Gingrich	McIntosh
Bilirakis	Goode	McIntyre
Bliley	Goodlatte	McKeon
Blunt	Goodling	McNulty
Boehner	Gordon	Metcalfe
Bonilla	Goss	Mica
Bonior	Graham	Miller (FL)
Bono	Granger	Minge
Borski	Gutknecht	Moakley
Boswell	Hall (OH)	Molinari
Boyd	Hall (TX)	Mollohan
Brady	Hamilton	Moran (KS)
Bryant	Hansen	Moran (VA)
Bunning	Hastert	Murtha
Burr	Hastings (WA)	Myrick
Burton	Hayworth	Neal
Buyer	Hefley	Nethercutt
Callahan	Hefner	Neumann
Calvert	Herger	Ney
Camp	Hill	Northup
Canady	Hilleary	Norwood
Cannon	Hinojosa	Nussle
Castle	Hobson	Oberstar
Chabot	Hoekstra	Obey
Chambliss	Holden	Ortiz
Chenoweth	Hostettler	Packard
Christensen	Houghton	Pappas
Clement	Hulshof	Parker
Coble	Hunter	Pascrell
Coburn	Hutchinson	Paul
Collins	Hyde	Paxon
Combest	Inglis	Pease
Condit	Istook	Peterson (MN)
Cook	Jefferson	Peterson (PA)
Cooksey	Jenkins	Petri
Costello	John	Pickering
Cox	Johnson (WI)	Pitts
Cramer	Johnson, Sam	Pombo
Crane	Jones	Pomeroy
Crapo	Kanjorski	Porter
Cubin	Kasich	Portman
Cunningham	Kelly	Poshard
Danner	Kennedy (RI)	Pryce (OH)
Davis (FL)	Kildee	Quinn
Davis (VA)	Kim	Radanovich
Deal	Kind (WI)	Rahall
DeLay	King (NY)	Ramstad
Diaz-Balart	Kingston	Regula
Dickey	Kleczka	Reyes
Dingell	Klink	Riggs
Doolittle	Klug	Riley
Doyle	Knollenberg	Roemer
Dreier	Kucinich	Rogan
Duncan	LaFalce	Rogers
Dunn	LaHood	Rohrabacher
Ehlers	Lampson	Ros-Lehtinen
Ehrlich	Largent	Roukema
Emerson	Latham	Royce
English	LaTourette	Ryun
Ensign	Lazio	Salmon
Etheridge	Leach	Sandlin
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Sanford

Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Siskisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda

Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt

Traficant
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—136

Abercrombie	Frank (MA)	Morella
Ackerman	Frost	Nadler
Allen	Furse	Olver
Andrews	Gejdenson	Owens
Baldacci	Gilman	Pallone
Becerra	Gonzalez	Pastor
Bentsen	Green	Payne
Berman	Greenwood	Pelosi
Bishop	Gutierrez	Pickett
Blagojevich	Harman	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Rangel
Boehlert	Hilliard	Rivers
Boucher	Hinchee	Rothman
Brown (CA)	Hooley	Roybal-Allard
Brown (FL)	Horn	Rush
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Sabo
Campbell	Jackson (IL)	Sanchez
Capps	Jackson-Lee	Sanders
Cardin	(TX)	Sawyer
Carson	Johnson (CT)	Schumer
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Scott
Clayton	Kennedy (MA)	Serrano
Clyburn	Kennelly	Sherman
Conyers	Kilpatrick	Skaggs
Coyne	Kolbe	Slaughter
Cummings	Lantos	Smith, Adam
Davis (IL)	Levin	Snyder
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Stabenow
DeGette	Lofgren	Stark
Delahunt	Lowe	Stokes
DeLauro	Luther	Tauscher
Dellums	Maloney (NY)	Thompson
Deutsch	Markey	Thurman
Dicks	Matsui	Tierney
Dixon	McCarthy (MO)	Torres
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Dooley	McDermott	Velazquez
Edwards	McGovern	Vento
Engel	McKinney	Waters
Eshoo	Meehan	Watt (NC)
Evans	Meek	Waxman
Farr	Menendez	Wexler
Fattah	Millender	Wise
Fazio	McDonald	Woolsey
Miller (CA)	Miller (CA)	Wynn
Mink	Mink	Yates

NOT VOTING—2

Kaptur Oxley

□ 1618

Mr. BENTSEN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 91, PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES ON THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 101 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 101

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 91) providing amounts for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fifth Congress. The resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Oversight now printed in the resolution shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as amended, to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Oversight; (2) the further amendment specified in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by a Member designated in the report, which shall be considered as read, shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, and shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order House Resolution 91, authorizing funding for all but one of the committees of the House of Representatives for the 105th Congress under a modified closed rule.

It provides that the Committee on House Oversight amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the resolution shall be considered as adopted.

The rule further provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Oversight.

The rule provides the further amendment specified in the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by a Member designated in the report, shall be in order without intervention of any point of order and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. Finally the rule provides one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the process established by this rule for the consideration of House Resolution 91 is no different than the process established for previous committee funding resolutions.

Under clause 4(a) of rule XI, committee funding resolutions are privileged

on the House floor and unamendable. A rule is unnecessary to bring up the resolution unless there is a need to waive points of order that could legitimately be sustained against the resolution. Such a waiver is needed to address what I am sure the other side of the aisle agrees is a technical violation of House rules.

Specifically clause 2(d)(2) of House rule X requires committees to vote to approve their oversight plans for submission to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and the Committee on House Oversight by February 15 of the first session of each Congress.

The rule further prohibits consideration of a committee funding resolution if any committee has not submitted plans by February 15 or if the plans were not adopted in an open session with a quorum present.

As we know, certain committees were not able to organize before February 15 because the committee assignment process was not complete by that date. Therefore, these certain committees were unable to meet and vote to approve their oversight plans on time. However, I am pleased to report that every committee has submitted an approved oversight plan to both the Committee on House Oversight and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 91 is a responsible funding measure. I would like to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and our colleagues on his committee for producing a balanced plan under what are obviously challenging circumstances. It is clear that the current level of resources available to House committees is insufficient to meet their oversight responsibilities.

H. Res. 91 addresses the needs of committees while maintaining the bipartisan commitment made by the House at the beginning of the 104th Congress to reduce permanent committee staffs by a third and provide more resources to the minority party. To ensure that these new resources do not on their own result in increased spending on the operations of Congress, the rule makes in order an amendment by Mr. THOMAS that requires any net increase in spending to be offset by reductions in expenditures for other legislative branch activities.

In addition, to ensure that any additional staffing resources that the committees may need during the course of the 105th Congress do not become permanent staff, House Resolution 91 provides \$7.9 million for a reserve fund to cover the cost of any unanticipated needs.

This fund is in compliance with clause 5(a) of rule XI which authorizes the Committee on House Oversight to include with its primary expense resolution for committees a reserve fund for unanticipated committee expenses. The actual allocation of any money from the fund is subject to approval by that committee.

Contrary to charges that have been made, and I suspect will be made by the minority, this is not a slush fund to be spent by the Committee on House Oversight as it sees fit. As explained in the section-by-section analysis of the resolution adopting House rules for the 105th Congress, the funds will only be used in, and I quote, extraordinary emergency or high priority circumstances. That is what the House rules actually say. And, quote, any proposals for its allocation will be carefully scrutinized and coordinated at the highest levels prior to a vote by the Committee on House Oversight. Other committee requests beyond their initial biennial budget authorization will still require a supplemental expense resolution to be approved by the House. That is what the House rules state.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 91 is a fiscally responsible committee funding resolution. It maintains the commitment of this Congress to lead by example when it comes to streamlining the Federal Government. It also maintains the commitment of the Republican majority to provide more committee resources to the minority than were provided to the minority when Republicans held that status in the House.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this very fair and balanced rule and this balanced approach to committee funding.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] my colleague and very good friend, for yielding me the customary half hour.

□ 1630

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member on the House Committee on Rules, I have it pretty good. My good friend, the gentleman from New York, JERRY SOLOMON, treats the minority as fairly as he can. He gives us one-third of the committee's salary, and he is just as fair to us as we were to him, and we really appreciate it.

The gentleman from California [Mr. Thomas], chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, has always been gracious to us and has seen to it that the Rules minority is treated fairly and also for that, Mr. Speaker, we are very grateful.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, other committees are not quite as fair as the Committee on Rules. Given the American people's obvious dislike of partisan squabbling, given the promises of the collegiality retreat at Hershey, PA, I would expect some of my Republican colleagues would see the wisdom of bipartisanship. But, Mr. Speaker, the Republican members of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, in a lack of consideration for the needs and I believe rights of the Members of the minority party, are not giving Democrats anywhere near their share of the salary money.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the Republican side are operating with the slimmest majority in history. Republicans outnumber Democrats 227 to 205. Mr. Speaker, that hardly justifies a 7 to 1 ratio of salary money on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, whose chairman is the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. BURTON].

To make matters worse, to make sure that the American people completely lose their faith in the idea of cooperation in their Federal Government, my Republican colleagues are about to spend \$25 million investigating the Democratic Party and the Democratic White House.

Now, this is not to say that I think it is impossible that there have been occasions in which Democrats have engaged in questionable campaign fundraising. I think it is entirely possible that there have. But it is absolutely preposterous to suggest that there has not been one single such time on the Republican side, particularly given the recent stories about lobbyists in the news and the supposed use of congressional buildings for Republican fundraising activities.

Even my Republican colleagues on the Senate side admitted that they did not hold some sort of monopoly on perfect campaigning. They agreed that to be fair they had better investigate everybody; that is, if the U.S. Government is really going into the investigation business. Because, if not, Mr. Speaker, if my Republican colleagues spend those millions of taxpayers' dollars trying to dig up dirt on Democrats, I doubt many people will be able to take it without a very large grain of salt. About the size of a pillar.

Frankly, I do not think we should spend much money or time investigating anyone. I think the reason we are here, the reason the American people voted to send us to Washington is to make their lives better, and I cannot think of a single person who will benefit from more mud-slinging here in Washington.

Rather than sifting through people's garbage, we should be passing campaign finance reform to clarify and also to strengthen the rules. We should be expanding Head Start to more needy children. We should be looking into ways to strengthen our Medicare and our Social Security programs. We should be helping our police officers make America's streets as safe as they possibly can be. We should be working as hard as we possibly can to make a college education a reality for every single American student. We should not be wasting our time on these overpriced repetitive investigations.

Mr. Speaker, at the rate we are going, every committee in the Congress is going to be issuing subpoenas. And on the issue of subpoenas, I am sorry to see that the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight has issued over 30 subpoenas without his committee's approval.

Mr. Speaker, it does not take this former chairman of the House Committee on Rules to recognize these subpoenas are completely against the spirit of House rules. The subpoena power of Congress is a very sacred right given to us by the American people, and under no circumstance should it be used in such a partisan or a capricious way.

To make matters worse, in the beginning of this Congress my Republican colleagues changed the House rules and they created a committee slush fund. This \$7.9 million, I repeat it, this \$7.9 million, which is a Republican fund, is financed by American tax dollars and can be dipped into by any committee with a complaint. All they need to do is get approval from the Committee on House Oversight.

For the first time, the House never gets a chance to vote on the additional committee funding, and the American people's money will be squandered on yet another witch hunt.

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that the Congress has come to this. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, Members who vote for this rule should not be fooled into thinking that the amendment to pay for the bill with promises of spending cuts will provide them any cover. A vote for this \$22 million spending increase will leave Members completely exposed, and rightly so, to accusations of voting to waste exorbitant amounts of taxpayer money.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, a vote for this rule and a vote for this bill is a vote to increase the amount of money Congress spends on itself by nearly \$22 million. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. A vote for this bill is a vote to increase the amount of money Congress spends on itself by nearly \$22 million.

Mr. Speaker, I get a lot of letters and I get a lot of calls in my office from people asking the Congress to consider funding this or voting for that. They ask for all kinds of things, from saving Medicare to money for Irish orphans. But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that of all of my letters and e-mails that come into my office every day, not one single one of them has asked me to help vote for the \$22 million fund. Not one single constituent has asked me for this funding increase, and it is an irresponsible waste of taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule. If we are going to go into the business of investigations, if we are going to assume the mantle of the FEC or the Justice Department, we need to put on the same blindfolds that the statue of Justice wears and investigate every potential violation, and not just the alleged Democratic ones. If we are going to spend millions of tax dollars, then let us spend it on something that helps somebody. Let us send some kids to college. Let us find a cure for cancer.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Glens Falls, NY, [Mr. SOLOMON], my friend and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Claremont, CA, for yielding me this time.

Before I start off here, let me say it was nice to hear something nice said about the Committee on Rules in the beginning of my good friend the ranking member's testimony.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would just remind the gentleman that I also said something nice about the chairman.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman that that was very nice to hear, after the bashing we have been going through here for the last few hours.

Second, let me say to some of the Members that may be around here, however, I do not see them on the floor here, but I have been around here for about 19 years, and I guess there is not anybody more fiscally conservative than JERRY SOLOMON is, especially when I put my name on a bill like this and introduce \$800 billion in cuts. I say to the rest of my colleagues that if they want to cut this budget and they want to balance the budget, then they should come in here and take their pick. That is fiscal conservatism with guts. So I will say, come over here and vote for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, Members have two reasons to vote for it. One is because it is the right thing to do, and the other is because if they do not, I am going to tell them something right now: They will be back here tomorrow, they may be back here Monday, they may be back here Tuesday, because their staffs and their committee people do not get paid.

Members have an obligation to govern around here. And when I say there is no increase in this bill, they can believe it.

Mr. Speaker, before I speak in support of the resolution any further, I might point out that this measure is coming to the floor under a rule that gives the minority an opportunity for more input in the process than would normally happen in most cases.

Committee funding resolutions are typically privileged. They are unamendable on the House floor. The rule before us allows for the House to vote on an amendment to the resolution and allows a motion to recommit to further study the issue in the committee, if Members want to do that. That is their privilege. They would not have that privilege if it were brought here under a normal privileged resolution straight to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on House Oversight has produced what I would consider, and I give the gentleman from California, BILL THOMAS, wherever he is here, great credit. This resolution is reasonable and it deserves the support of this House. It keeps our commitment to maintaining, and this is what some of the new Members should listen to because they were not here 2 years ago, this resolution keeps our commitment to maintaining a reduction in staff levels by one-third from the 103d Congress.

That is right. We cut one-third of every single staff in this body, and we reduced the spending by one-third of every committee in this body.

The total authorization in this resolution is also 20 percent below the levels in the 103d Congress, the last Congress controlled by the other party, which represents a \$45 million savings. That means we did not spend \$45 million more.

Mr. Speaker, the reductions that the Congress has made in streamlining committees and the legislative branch budget overall should serve as a model for the rest of the Federal Government. That is why we slashed one-third in the last Congress.

We have made real cuts and we have saved real money in doing our part to try to set the example to shrink the size of the power of the Federal Government. That is what this is all about. That is what we are doing here today, we are maintaining that philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules performed its function in the House in the last Congress, living under the cuts we mandated. This was extremely difficult, given the frenetic pace of legislation in the last Congress. However, as partisan, and I will say to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MOAKLEY, and I will return the compliment, as partisan and pressure-filled as the Committee on Rules tends to be because of our institutional role, it is remarkable the degree to which Mr. MOAKLEY and I have worked together on our committee's budgets over the years.

Mr. Speaker, when I was the ranking member and he was the chairman, Mr. MOAKLEY was eminently fair as the chairman, and I have tried to return that favor and have had the same kind of ratios that we had under his leadership. We are a model in terms of our treatment of the minority.

The only increase that we ask for in our budget that is before us today is for a well-deserved COLA for our staff, who work many long hours into the night after the Congress has shut down and gone to bed. An example being last night, when we convened a Rules meeting late in the evening, and many of us stayed here until after midnight before we finally closed up shop and went home. They deserve that COLA. They deserve that little increase, cost-of-living increase.

Mr. Speaker, the other increases contained in the resolution, which are absolutely necessary, are guaranteed off-sets. Again I will say to the Members back in their offices, these are guaranteed off-sets through an amendment that will be offered today by chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, BILL THOMAS, sitting over here, or his designee. That amendment requires an offset, by reduction in expenses of other legislative branch activities, for expenses of committees in the 105th Congress that exceed the amount appropriated for the committees in the 104th Congress. That means there can be no increase in spending.

This amendment reflects the fiscally responsible policy of House Republicans, and that is that authorization or appropriation increases should be paid for, and we do that in this authorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on, but I simply want to urge every Member to come over here. I want them to vote for this eminently fair rule, and I want them to vote for this resolution. We need to get it done.

Additionally, House Resolution 91 provides funds for the campaign finance investigation already underway in the Government Reform and Oversight Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the revelations of wrongdoing among administration officials and campaign staff, appearing on an almost daily basis, are among the most serious I have seen in my time in public life.

The allegations involving economic espionage and national security breaches are even more serious than mere campaign finance law violations which are, in themselves, serious enough to warrant criminal indictments. And the suggestion that American foreign policy may have been directed by the flow of laundered money is absolutely appalling.

Mr. Speaker, this committee funding resolution provides the necessary resources to investigate the burgeoning campaign finance scandal in the Clinton administration.

The amendment that will be offered later today also ensures that any committee expenses increased beyond the authorization in the last Congress will be paid for. The rule allows the House to vote on these important items today.

I urge strong support for the rule and the committee funding resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

The Republican majority running this House likes to portray itself as the party of fiscal conservatism. However, I would like to know how they can justify this expenditure of up to \$12 million of the taxpayers' money for a fundraising investigation of the White House.

The other body has already budgeted itself less money than this House, and has broadened the scope of its investigation to include congressional fundraising, fundraising abuses of both Democrats and Republicans. I should also mention that every Republican in

the other body voted for a broader scope and a smaller budget.

Republicans in the House, however, have decided that they need significantly more than their colleagues in the other body, but they are going to investigate less.

I do not think the blatant partisanship of the Republican leadership has been lost on anyone here. They are not looking for fairness, nor are they looking to have a balanced investigation into campaign wrongdoing. They are taking up to \$12 million of the taxpayers' money and wasting it on a political witch hunt.

If anybody is wondering why the House Republican leadership has decided not to broaden the scope of the committee's investigation into improper acts by congressional campaigns, one only needs to look at the top.

□ 1645

Indeed, if the scope of the committee was broadened to consider congressional campaigns, I suppose the first witness to be called would have to be the Republican committee chairman. Only yesterday the Nation learned that the Republican chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight was appealing to a foreign ambassador for campaign contributions. How can this gentleman hold an objective view and write a committee report on the alleged abuses of the White House? Anything that comes of the investigation headed up by the gentleman from Indiana will be tainted. The Republican leadership of this House will better serve the integrity of this institution if they remove the gentleman from Indiana from the chair and broaden the scope of the investigation.

Without these actions, the country will rightly consider this investigation a joke. I would point out, as others have already, that already in the Washington Post today it was suggested, rightly I think, that the chairman should step down from the investigation, and in the New York Times it was very emphatically pointed out that the scope of the investigation should be broadened to include congressional campaigns, both Democrat and Republican. I think that the public is crying out to action in that regard, and that is why we should vote down this rule and we should vote against the resolution.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Albuquerque, NM [Mr. SCHIFF].

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle about fiscal responsibility, and they suggest that the amount of money being appropriated for an investigation is not fiscally appropriate. I respectfully suggest first that they never said that when they appropriated funds for investigations

conducted on whatever subject while they were the majority.

Second, and I think more important, even if there were no setoff to the spending proposed here and, as Chairman SOLOMON said, there will be an amendment offered that will have setoffs, even if there were no setoffs, the total funding for committees proposed in this bill is \$178.3 million for the 105th Congress. The total appropriation for the 103d Congress, two Congresses ago, under our Democratic colleagues' majority was \$223 million. So that is getting close to a \$50 million difference between what the majority spent in the 103d Congress and what the majority proposes to spend in the 105th Congress for the purpose of committees.

It will be interesting for our Democratic colleagues to explain what they were doing with all of the money that they spent in the 103rd Congress that came to \$223 million. How are we able to function on \$178.3 million, even with an investigation? So I submit that we are being entirely fiscally responsible.

Second, the average appropriation for the Democratic minority staff is 29 percent in our bill. In previous Congresses, the average appropriated to Republican minorities was 21 percent. So we are giving the Democrats a larger percentage of the budget for committees than we were given when we were in the minority. If one looks at all these figures, I submit that everyone should support the rule and support the bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, before I yield, I would like to just correct a statement of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF]. There are no specific off-sets in this bill. It is just general language.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

(Mr. WAXMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. In walking over here to speak on this matter, I wondered what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] would have said when he was in the minority if a Democratic majority brought a committee funding bill to the floor under a closed rule, meaning no amendments allowed, a bill that provided a record funding level, \$12 million, for one committee and created a mysterious \$8 million reserve fund that was controlled by the majority; a bill that provides this funding, even though the money will be used exclusively to investigate the minority and the chairman will unilaterally issue subpoenas and release documents, even confidential information, as he sees fit. And that bill provided at most 25 percent of the committee's resources to the minority?

Mr. Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH would have said that it was an arrogant abuse of power, that debate was quashed, that the funding was an outrageous waste of money, taxpayers' dollars, he would

have said it was an act of war against the minority, and he would have been right.

No matter what other wrongs we may have done when we were in the majority, we never went this far. Today, the Republican majority is crossing the line. They are trying to jam a funding bill through without any opportunity for an amendment, and they are authorizing an investigation that is limited to Democrats, limited to the White House, that is unwilling, at least at this point, to even examine what campaign finance abuses took place by the Congress of the United States. That cannot be interpreted as anything other than a coverup.

This bill would allow this investigation to be conducted under the rules that the chairman of the committee seeks to impose, which is he could act unilaterally. He can issue subpoenas everywhere. He can compel information to be submitted to him, which is a very serious matter. It involves people spending money, hiring lawyers, getting the information together at expense to them and facing criminal penalties if they do not comply. And this investigation, as the chairman of the committee would envision it, would allow him to take that information and release it as he sees fit, even if it involved national security.

This is a concentration of power that has never been given to any chairman anywhere. And as far as the funding is concerned, the majority would take 75 percent, leaving the minority with less, around 25 percent at best.

This is blatantly partisan and egregiously unfair. It poisons what should be a bipartisan effort to investigate all fund-raising abuses and reform the system. It is wrong, and I appeal to my Republican colleagues to say no to this outrageous travesty.

There is an easy and obvious solution. Fund all the other committees except the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. We have not even had a meeting of our committee to decide the rules under which this investigation will be conducted. We do not even know the scope yet except what the chairman would have us believe is the scope that he would want for this investigation. Fund the other committees, and allow us to not have a disruption of them, and then leave the investigation by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight to be decided later. Defeat this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Winter Park, FL [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I was elected to this body in 1992, and I have been waiting for this day. You cannot imagine in your wildest imagination, Mr. Speaker, the way our side was treated by the former predecessor of this committee, the Government Operations Committee. We now have the Government Reform and Oversight Committee.

I pulled these charts out of the attic, but look at these charts. You want to

talk about fairness? In the 103d Congress, this is the investigative staff that they gave the minority. This chart was presented on this floor, and I came to this well and railed against what was done to us. How dare they come here today and say we are mistreating them when we offer such an incredible increase in percentage. In fact, we are running Government Operations, we are running the Postal and Civil Service Committee, the D.C. Committee, all combined, for about half of what they were spending.

What this is about, is fairness and equity. We gave them in our proposal 25 percent. It is higher than anything they ever gave us. So I have been waiting for this day. I do not have enough time to go into all the grisly details, Mr. Speaker, but I will present every one of them when I get my full time when this rule is completed.

So do not come here and say this is unfair. In the 103d Congress, \$25 million for Government Operations, Civil Service and Post Office. What we are doing now, the 104th Congress, we spent \$13.5 million for the same task. This request is for \$20 million. It is still almost \$5 million less than what they expended.

Again, look at the distribution of what they did to us, and that is when they controlled the House, the Senate and the White House. There was no oversight. We see the results of it. The results of it is the scandal, the unprecedented scandal. I chair the House Subcommittee on Civil Service. I have 7 staffers that replaced 54 Civil Service staffers, 7 staffers. I have in my possession right now 1,000 documents, almost 10,000 pages, almost as much as we had in the Filegate matter.

Mr. Speaker, this is about a scandal that is unprecedented in the history of this Congress, and they are trying to blur the focus, they are trying to make it look like a partisan attack, they are trying to attack our chairman, they are trying to attack our Members and they are trying to say, most unfairly, that we are being unfair. Mr. Speaker, there could not be anything further from the truth.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, there has been so much talk about bipartisanship and so much self-congratulation around here that until just now I was of the opinion that momentum was building for a resolution for a joint session of Congress to convene and hear an address from Mr. Rogers. But I suppose that when we get down to substance, that the interest in bipartisanship and fairness is a little weaker than when it is just "I smile at you and you smile at me."

I believe that the alleged improprieties at the White House deserve a thorough investigation by this body. I think this should be adequately funded and adequately staffed. But why just the White House and not this House?

Has this House been exempt from complaints about the distribution of tobacco money right here on the floor of the House, from complaints about the "farsighted" use of tax-exempt money to fund campaign efforts, from one complaint after another? Why is it that we look only to the White House and not to this House with reference to the growing problem of members of any Federal position having to chase money for the increasing cost of campaigns?

Well, certainly it is not because it is not a problem. If you turn only to today's Roll Call, one finds a report of one lobbyist with Republican ties who said that Members routinely shake down lobbyists and foreign agents:

Are there shakedowns happening? Absolutely. Every minute of every day with very rare exceptions on both sides of the aisle, on both sides of the Capitol dome. It is a disgusting, despicable scene.

And so it is. I do not say it is all a Republican problem or all a Democratic problem, but that it is time to look not just at the White House but at this House, and if you vote for this resolution, what you are doing is voting to exempt this House from any investigation concerning financial improprieties in the course of campaigns. Why not look at the whole problem, not just to point fingers but to find solutions? That is what this matter should be about.

You would think with so many shakedowns someone would be concerned about shaking up the system and providing the American people a solution. I maintain we need more than Hershey kisses. We need the type of genuine bipartisanship the Senate finally engaged in to investigate all manner of improprieties in any part of the Federal system. Only then will the American people be adequately served.

□ 1700

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Smyrna, Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, were it not such a lengthy document and were it not also residing in the office of every Member of this body, I would ask to have the House Rules and Manual accepted into the RECORD at this point because apparently, even though I have only been here a little over 2 years, I know just a tiny bit more about what those rules contain than many Members of the other side who are out here blasting the resolution before this body.

The fact of the matter is that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight does not extend to Members of this body. Regardless of what the Senate may or may not do, we still have to abide not by what we see as press accounts, not by what the Senate does, but by the Rules of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and

those rules provide very clear jurisdiction for the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and it happens to be the executive branch of Government.

Despite the fact that we may wish on the other side that these rules said otherwise, despite the fact that Members on the other side who are so partisan they do not even understand what the rules are, may want the rules to say otherwise, they do not.

We have to abide by the rules, and the resolution before this body at this time does indeed reflect the rules of this House and it reflects the proper jurisdiction of each and every one of the committees, including the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight for which funds are proposed through this resolution.

Now we heard a little bit ago that, I believe it was the gentleman from New Jersey that seemed to feel that the scope of the investigation proposed to be conducted by the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight was inconsequential. Well, it may be to the people of his State but it is not to the people of the United States of America. They are deeply disturbed by the mounting evidence of very, very serious possible violations of law ethics and wasting government conducted by this administration and by agencies of the U.S. Government executive branch, and it does indeed fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight to conduct an investigation of those for the American people.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The statement of the gentleman is factually incorrect when it comes to the duties of the House Oversight jurisdiction, Government Reform rather. The argument is factually incorrect. The House gives House Oversight legislative jurisdiction over all Federal elections, both congressional and Presidential. Government Reform and Oversight has oversight responsibilities that are extraordinarily broad, so broad in fact that under House rules, Government Reform and Oversight may conduct investigations on any matter with regard to any committee's jurisdiction.

So what we have here is a situation where the Republicans on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight are selectively investigating some of the matters that fall within the legislative jurisdiction of the House Oversight, but not others; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] saying, "Well I think we should go and take a look at the Presidential election. I know that's within the jurisdiction of the House Oversight Committee, and I can do that under the rules of the House." But when pressed to look at congressional elections, Chairman BURTON says, "Oh, no, I can't do that. That is within the jurisdiction of the House Oversight Committee."

Mr. Speaker, that is not right, that is not fair, and I can only conclude that

this investigation is being conducted in a very partisan way.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOAKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I checked with the House Parliamentarian on this very issue, and he assured me that our committee does have jurisdiction, Government Reform and Oversight Committee, over all campaign finance issues. We need not be restricted only to the White House unless it is being done for partisan reasons.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I think the gentleman that spoke before the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] may have confused legislative and investigative oversight. It does have the investigative oversight over all committees.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Long Beach, California [Mr. HORN], my very good friend.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult situation. What we have, and it is the press that has done most of the work, the media, to this point, we have major national scandals, clear violations of the law, and the first emphasis, it would seem to me, would be to deal with those.

Now I am fascinated by my friends on the other side of the aisle. They are right, I think, on the jurisdictional point. We can go anywhere and investigate, anywhere an authorization committee can go. The question is what comes first?

What comes first is what bothered this Nation for the last 6 months because these were slowly, slowly unfolding during the election period, but mostly since the general election, and it seems to me we ought to concentrate our resources at this time on solving that problem. And I will tell my friend from California that as one that takes no PAC money, I would love nothing better than to be involved in an investigation of the fund-raising on both sides of the aisle. I do not think the gentleman wants that to happen, but I would be glad to get into that.

Mr. WAXMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORN. I yield to the gentleman for a question, but I have got a few other things I want to cover. A 10-second question.

Mr. WAXMAN. The Senate voted unanimously to investigate the Congress and the White House. I think we ought to do the same. There ought to be Democrats and Republicans. If we are only going to investigate the White House, it seems to me that the opens this up to the fact that we are covering up what goes on in the Congress.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleague that if the Senate is already investigating that area, and I know it is and that was my second point, why are we spending resources to be diverted into the area?

I hear a lot from liberals and a lot from conservatives about, "Gee, we have to save money on committee." Now frankly they are dead wrong on both sides because what we need to do is make sure that the prerogatives of the Congress of the United States can faithfully be carried out. To skimp on that budget is just dead wrong. Frankly, it means some people do not want the investigation to be carried out. We should want it to be completed.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, you know one of the problems we have here, there are a number of issues before us. First of all, if we fail to pass this resolution, it does not stop the legislative process. Frankly, when we came here in January we operated without a funding resolution. The Congress then organized and we are able to continue.

If we do not pass this rule today, we can come back here on the 8th or the 9th of April and pass a funding resolution that pays people for the work they have done, and there is no crisis in government if we do not pass this rule today.

One of the major issues as a Member of Congress, and we do not do this for Federal agencies as a general rule, is we do not create slush funds.

Now as my colleagues know, it seems the answer around here is, "If you put gates at the end of almost any term it becomes somehow criminalized." So I guess we have to call this Slushgate. We are bringing up here an amount of money that no Member of Congress in his right mind would vote for investigations—the October Surprise spent under \$2 million; I think a million four. We are taking the committee of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], and we are moving it from about 6½ million to around 12 million, and then we have got Slushgate. Then we got another 7.8 or \$9 million sitting there in a little pot that no Member of Congress on this floor is going to have a chance to vote on on the floor. They are going to do it back in the committee where there are no lights.

So we are taking almost \$8 million more, and again the focus is very narrow, but we are taking the committee that last year did three political investigations, and I know the country is better off for finding out what happened in the travel office and all the other things that we spend tens of millions of dollars investigating, but we are going to spend another 12 to \$20 million now.

What is the goal of our oversight? The goal of our oversight ought to be campaign reform. That is not the goal here. The goal here is to spend as much money as you can with as little opportunity for any real debate and looking at how we work.

We need to regain the confidence of the American people. We are not going to do that going after the White House

or Congress. If my colleagues want to rebuild the confidence in the American people, we have to pass campaign finance reform, and we have to bring a budget here for the Congress that does not have an \$8 million slush fund. We want to appropriate the funds as they are needed. Our colleagues have not got guts enough to come here and ask for 20 million bucks from the committee of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] so they are going to come here and say, "We're going 6 to 6½, we're going to bring that to 12, and then we got 8 million over here."

They got a slush fund on the floor of this House. It is no way to run this Congress. We ought to vote this rule down, we ought to come back here after the recess and try to pass a budget that will really address the issues we have to take care of as a Congress.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to inquire of the Chair what the ground rules are on personal references to Members of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should avoid personalities, derogatory personal references, to other Members of the House.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the very distinguished chairman and, I believe, unfairly maligned chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

As my colleagues know, the founder of our party, Abraham Lincoln, said one time, I hope I am quoting him correctly; he said, "If I do the wrong thing, a thousand angels screaming from the rooftops won't make it right, but if I do the right thing, history will prove I did the right thing."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that is what happens with my committee and my conducting of my committee's activities over the next few months.

I have been accused of some things that I think unfairly, but I expected that to happen because when we start investigating the executive branch of government that involves the President, we got to expect that they are going to be firing back, and I fully anticipated that. I did not think it would happen this soon, but nevertheless I expected it.

But let me just say to my colleagues I still commit to my Democrat friends that we are going to try to run this committee in as fair and as bipartisan a way as possible.

I told the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] on three different occasions when we had meetings that we would give him notice before we sent out correspondence, he would have 24 hours notice before we sent out subpoe-

nas, we would not release documents without his approval or give him 24 hours notice unless it was an emergency and we had to do it, and so far we have released no documents.

Today many people are talking about us releasing documents. We have released no documents. The White House has been doing that, and if Members do not believe me, ask the media. We are keeping our word, and our scope, the scope of our investigation, I want it to be relatively narrow so we can get this thing over with in a quick and a short period of time.

I want to investigate alleged illegal activities in the executive branch, illegal activities. Were we selling foreign influence overseas for campaign contributions?

This is something that is very important to the American people. Was our national security jeopardized because we were selling our national security for contributions? Were we selling business deals to foreigners for campaign contributions that might hurt the economy of the United States? These are things that we need to look into that are alleged illegal activities.

Now I did not say that we would not look into the illegal activities of Congressmen or Senators, or the DNC, the RNC, or the DCCC or NRCC. What I did say was, if we found illegal activities or what appeared to be illegal, we would turn them over to the committee of jurisdiction in the Congress.

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct investigates Congressmen. We knew that when Speaker GINGRICH and Speaker Wright were investigated; that is where we went when there was an alleged ethical or illegal violation. That is what I intend to do; not sweep it under the rug if it is a Republican, but turn it over to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct with the information we have.

The House administration or the Committee on House Oversight, if we find something going wrong with the RNC, or the DNC, we will give that illegal information, or that information looks like it is illegal, to that committee for proper work.

Let me just wrap up because we are running out of time. I want to pledge to Members that this will be a fair investigation. I will be as fair to the minority as I am the majority. But I want to tell my colleagues this:

As long as I can stand on my two legs, I am going to do my dead level best to get to the bottom of these scandals; make no mistake about it.

□ 1715

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIERNEY].

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

As a member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, let me say that I think that all of the Members of that committee would wish

that it were true that we had some indication that things were going to be done fairly and justly on that committee. I am here to tell you as a member that we have no indication that that is so.

It is very unique that we should have had a meeting called for last week to discuss these very issues about process, to discuss the very issues about funding, to discuss whether or not we would be investigating all of the irregularities in campaign finance reform, only to have that meeting postponed so that this issue could be brought to the floor and rushed through without any debate and without dealing with these matters.

The American public demands to know what went wrong with campaign financing at all levels, not just at the White House if anything went wrong there, but in Congress if something went wrong there and in the Senate if something went wrong there.

There is no clamoring, no clamoring at all that I know of in the public for us to duplicate the expenditure of funds on this investigation. Nobody that I know of out there is saying, let us spend \$6 million in the Senate and another \$6 million in the House, and oh, yes, please, if you can, put an \$8 million slush fund together so they can hold that in reserve. There is none of that out there in the public.

I think we should all take cognizance of the fact that we should have one thorough, complete, nonpartisan and fair investigation, get it done, have it done by a joint committee or by the Senate, because at least the Senate indicates that it wants to do it right. If we insist on having the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight of the House want to be partisan and want to be unfair, at the very least the appearance of being unfair and partisan, then we ought to back off, we ought to let the Senate do it and we ought to get on with the people's business. There are many things we could be doing in this Congress; providing a slush fund is not one of them.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would like to join my colleagues and add my voice as a member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, speaking out against the \$7.9 million slush fund that will not go to the House floor. It is really wrong. I also oppose the \$12 million that they are asking for for clearly a partisan investigation against the White House and the Democratic party.

The committee has yet to reveal any information or any details about how they intend to spend this slush fund or any of this money.

I would like to quote, please, Becky Cain, president of the League of Women Voters. She said about this, "The House investigation into campaign fundraising should include a thorough examination of both parties' Presidential and congressional practices, both improper and illegal. A limited scope will turn the investigation into a partisan charade."

Today's Washington Post editorial goes even further. It warns that this investigation runs the risk of becoming, and I quote, "its own cartoon, a joke and a deserved embarrassment."

The New York Times editorial recommended today that the House should follow the Watergate precedent and let the Senate conduct a single investigation.

I would like to submit into the RECORD the editorials in both the Washington Times and in the Washington Post against this investigation, and also the Roll Call editorial.

Instead of using this money for the slush fund for a partisan investigation of the House, we should be increasing funding for the bipartisan agency that is charged with regulating campaigns: The Federal Election Commission. The FEC has requested an increase of \$8.2 billion for fiscal year 1998 to deal with its increasing caseload. In the last 3 years the FEC's caseload has increased. I am opposed to the slush fund. We should be funding the FEC instead.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, we have a job here and the job is to make a decision as to what the proper method to proceed is.

Now, we are going to go back and see our constituents over this next recess. The question as constituents meet us on the street, whether we are on this side of the aisle or the other, is can we explain to them an \$8 million slush fund. That is the real question here. Are we going to vote for a process, adding all of the other issues about fairness, about how the investigation ought to proceed? Should we not really be looking at campaign finance reform and not just more partisan battles?

Putting all of that aside, the question is, do we want to walk down the streets of our hometown and have them ask, should Congress have a slush fund? We do not do that for other agencies. If we think this investigation warrants \$8 million more, then put it in the committee of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. My colleagues on the other side do not have guts enough to do that. Frankly, I do not think we should support that kind of process.

Let us vote this rule down, because we were not given any opportunities to amend it; let us vote the rule down, let us continue the regular order. We can either have an extension tonight by unanimous consent, our side is ready

to do that, or we can stay here tomorrow and do it.

A lot of Members have plans. I think we can come back here on April 8 or 9 and deal with this properly. I do not think the American people want us to have an \$8 million slush fund in the budget. When we take a look at how we operate here and how we ought to operate here, we have never before put slush funds in. We have always come back to the Congress. We come back to the Congress, we say there is a need, we have a debate on the floor of the House, and when we complete that debate, we make a decision.

Not this time. This time we double the funding of the committee of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]; we come here, and on top of that doubling of funding we have the slush fund in the budget. Vote down this slush fund. Let us come back here and have campaign finance reform. Let us come back here, examine the way we work, not with a political motive, but a motive on how to rebuild confidence of the American people in our system.

We have to have real reform that limits spending, that limits the large amounts of money. That is what we have to do. But we are not going to achieve that in this game. This is a political game. I say to my colleagues, you are going to embarrass yourselves in this process.

Let us join together and vote this resolution down. Let us come back with a fair resolution, without a slush fund, with a proper activity legislatively that will give us the basis for coming together and passing campaign finance reform. That is what we ought to be doing. Join with us together, Democrats and Republicans, in rejecting this proposal which has a slush fund in it, and come back here with a bill that will make us proud to be Members of Congress.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 66]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—421

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman

Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher

Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson

Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)

Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre

McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalfe
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascarella
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman