

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

Shimkus	Stump	Visclosky
Shuster	Stupak	Walsh
Sisisky	Sununu	Wamp
Skaggs	Talent	Waters
Skeen	Tanner	Watkins
Skelton	Tauscher	Watt (NC)
Slaughter	Tauzin	Watts (OK)
Smith (MI)	Taylor (MS)	Waxman
Smith (NJ)	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (FL)
Smith (OR)	Thomas	Weldon (PA)
Smith (TX)	Thompson	Weller
Smith, Adam	Thornberry	Wexler
Snowbarger	Thune	Weygand
Snyder	Thurman	White
Solomon	Tiahrt	Whitfield
Souder	Tierney	Wicker
Spence	Torres	Wise
Spratt	Towns	Wolf
Stabenow	Trafigant	Woolsey
Stearns	Turner	Wynn
Stenholm	Upton	Yates
Stokes	Velazquez	Young (AK)
Strickland	Vento	Young (FL)

□ 1757

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LATOURETTE]. On this rollcall, 421 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

#### PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] be able to reclaim the 1 minute that he yielded back, and I ask unanimous consent that I be able to yield to him 2 minutes of the 5¼ minutes that I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 3¾ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

□ 1800

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I stand today opposed to the rule.

Let me say that all of us in this body today are working frantically to try to do what we can to balance the budget of this country. Both my Republican colleagues and my Democratic colleagues are working very hard to do that. Yet today we stand here considering expending \$15 million to do an investigation in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, \$15 million, when we are trying very hard to balance the budget of this country.

This is confusing to the American people. We are spending \$15 million, or requesting \$15 million, when in the Senate they are spending \$4 million. They are spending \$4 million to do a bigger and broader, more encompassing investigation than what we are consid-

ering here in the House. That does not make sense to the American people.

I came here in 1989. I do not think there has been 30 days since I have been here that we have not been investigating someone or something. I will tell my colleagues, the American people are sick and tired of that.

I think that we ought to have full disclosure. We ought to have investigations, but it makes no sense when the Senate or the other body has an investigation, asks questions, calls in witnesses, and then 2 weeks later we are doing the very same thing over here. That is a show. That is a show, and we are doing it over here to the tune of twice, three times as much money as the Senate is spending.

What we need to do is to change the process. We need to quit this. If we are going to have investigations, and we should, from time to time, we ought to clean the process up. We ought not to duplicate what the other body does. We ought not to spend money that we do not have to spend.

This is about the process. This is about doing what is right and what is fair. We did not even have a committee hearing about this issue. We did not discuss it a bit. That is not right. We can do better than that. That is not the way to do the House's business. We, at a minimum, should have discussed this in a committee hearing.

I want to tell my colleagues that out of the \$15 million we have \$8 million in a fund that we do not even know what is done with it. What are the American people going to say about that, when we are talking about reducing the costs of Medicare and Medicaid? This is wrong. This is not right and we ought to reject this rule today.

I say to my colleagues, if we want to do what we said we were going to do a couple of weeks ago, we ought to start today. We ought to start today by rejecting this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to inform my colleagues that on July 16th of 1987 we established the Connecticut compromise, a bicameral legislature.

Someone who understands that is the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, my friend from Bakersfield, California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have to admit I am genuinely confused. It is indeed a rare occasion when I come to the floor and I find out that not only is my friend from Massachusetts saying good things about me in terms of the way I run a committee and the way we split funds, but I read the minority views from my friend from Connecticut, signed by all the members of the committee, about how fair I am and the fact that the distribution of the

funds was reasonable. And my colleagues really ought to read it, it is almost embarrassing how flattering they are about the way I run the committee, and then they immediately turn around and talk about this slush fund and they are worried about the slush fund and what is going to happen with it.

I am the same person who is chairman of the committee who is going to control the reserve fund. The reserve fund is just exactly that, reserve.

Now, these folks ought to know what a slush fund is. In the 103d Congress they had \$223 million to slush around. And what my colleagues need to know is that out of that \$223 million, more than half was spent outside public scrutiny. More than \$112 million was spent in the shadows, in closed door rooms.

What we did in the 104th Congress was put it all together, let sunshine in, and what you see is what you get. What we are asking for for this Congress is \$45 million less than they spent.

Now, how about a slush fund for \$45 million. Where was it? Soaked away in the committees. I just do not understand it, but we cannot have it both ways.

My friend from California, Mr. WAXMAN, he does understand it, his concern is that we said the funds are controlled by the majority. That is true, majority rules. That is called democracy.

He also said when we are in the majority we never went this far. That is a quote, and he is right. He is right. They never did go that far. He said, "We only have 25 percent of the resources." My friends, the 103d Congress, the minority, us at the time, had 14 percent of the resources in the Committee on Commerce. We had 15 percent of the resources in the Committee on House Oversight. We had 11 percent of the resources in the Committee on the Judiciary.

I tell my friend from California, he is right, they never went as far as we have.

My friend from Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, says we should not just point fingers, we ought to offer solutions. And then what he says is he wants more money to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight for the gentleman from California, Mr. WAXMAN, because Mr. WAXMAN has a letter from the Parliamentarian that says all they can do is investigate.

What is investigating? It is exposing. They cannot offer solutions. They cannot have it both ways. The committee that has the jurisdiction to pass the laws is the Committee on House Oversight. We have what we believe is appropriate. We will do the job.

Then I listened to a number of my friends in terms of how much money we are spending. My good friend from California, Mr. CONDIT, talks about how much money this is. In the 103d Congress they had \$223 million. We have passed welfare, we have passed reforming, we have ended patronage, and